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“The relative neglect of gender has been something of an embarrassment to research on cultural capital, which has dwelt intently on the impact of socioeconomic status on cultural capital without systematically noting or theorizing the sometimes larger impact of gender.”

Paul DiMaggio, 2004 (p. 99)

1 Introduction

1.1 Why gender and cultural taste?

Since Bourdieu (1984) wrote his groundbreaking work on cultural tastes, or ‘manifested cultural preferences’¹ (p. 56), there has been a surge in research on inequalities in cultural consumption. A lot of this research has focused on class-related and educational differences in participation in so-called highbrow or ‘legitimate’ cultural activities, which refers to involvement in the arts—art, music, and theatre—and literature. In line with Bourdieu’s work (1986) it is argued in this literature that highbrow cultural tastes function as a form of cultural capital, which is defined by Lamont and Lareau (1988, p. 156) as “institutionalized, i.e., widely shared, high status cultural signals (attitudes, preferences, formal knowledge, behaviors, goods and credentials) used for social and cultural exclusion”. Cultural capital is theorized to reproduce the privileged position of the middle and upper classes and to be transposable into economic and social advantages (Bourdieu, 1984, 1986; Lehman & Dumais, 2017; Lizardo, 2006a). Because of the social importance of (studying) highbrow cultural tastes, research in Sociology of Culture has, for a long time, focused more on legitimate cultural tastes, related to involvement in the arts and literature, than on non-legitimate cultural practices.

As exemplified by DiMaggio’s argument cited in the beginning of this chapter (DiMaggio, 2004, p. 99), the seemingly simple question of how gender affects cultural tastes has generally been overlooked in Sociology of Culture. Especially before the beginning of the 21st century, differences in cultural tastes between men and women received almost no scientific
attention (Christin, 2012). Whether a respondent was a man or a woman was at best a control variable in analyses (Siongers & Lievens, 2014). While we know from empirical research that women are generally more likely to participate in highbrow cultural activities than men (van Eijck, 2001; van Eijck & Bargeman, 2004), the mechanisms behind the differential cultural tastes of men and women were for a long time left unexplored.

The relative lack of research on gender and cultural tastes is in fact surprising for two reasons. First, differences between men and women are generally large and quite consistently found across a variety of highbrow cultural activities, across countries and through the life course. We know that women are more likely than men to go to the opera, theatre, ballet, to visit arts museums or to read literary books (Bihagen & Katz-Gerro, 2000; Christin, 2012; Falk & Katz-Gerro, 2016; Lizardo, 2006b; Purhonen, Gronow, & Rahkonen, 2011). Moreover, this gender gap is found to a smaller or larger extent in many Western societies, such as Belgium (Willekens & Lievens, 2014, 2016), Denmark (Katz-Gerro & Jaeger, 2015), Finland (Purhonen et al., 2011), Sweden (Bihagen & Katz-Gerro, 2000), and the US (Christin, 2012; Lizardo, 2006b; Tepper, 2000). Even though many studies in Sociology of Culture focus on adults, there is evidence that gender differences are already present at a younger age, among children and adolescents (Katz-Gerro & Jaeger, 2015; Lehman & Dumais, 2017; Schmutz, Stearns, & Glennie, 2016; Siongers & Lievens, 2014). So, there is vast evidence for women’s higher involvement in legitimate culture, while the extent to which research is able to explain this difference is relatively modest (Christin, 2012; Hallmann, Muñiz, Breuer, Dallmeyer, & Metz, 2017).

Second, the dearth of work on this topic is remarkable because from a sociological perspective, women’s higher involvement in highbrow culture than men’s is intriguing and even puzzling (cf. Lizardo, 2006b). Women are disadvantaged compared to men in many respects, when it comes to income or career opportunities for instance (Blumberg, 1984; Chafetz, 1991; Christin, 2012, p. 424; Rivera & Tilcsik, 2016), but apparently not when it comes to highbrow cultural participation, which is considered to function as cultural capital (see Bourdieu, 1986). Interestingly, educational attainment, another important status marker in which women currently do better than men (see Buchmann, DiPrete, & McDaniel, 2008; van Hek,
Kraaykamp, & Wolbers, 2016), is also a form of cultural capital according to Bourdieu (1986). What is it about cultural tastes that they appear to trump what we (think we) know about the gender hierarchy? Which mechanisms reinforce this ‘unexpected’ relationship between gender and cultural tastes? What kind of social processes are at play? In short, how does gender affect cultural taste?

To answer these questions, most studies in Sociology of Culture have kept close to the traditional topics and ideas that occupy research on cultural capital. These include the highbrow-lowbrow distinction in cultural practices, with empirical attention almost only going to gender and highbrow tastes; women and cultural reproduction in the family; and the effects of education, occupation and other class-related characteristics (Bihagen & Katz-Gerro, 2000; Christin, 2012; Collins, 1988; Lizardo, 2006b). A typical example are studies on how the effect of gender on highbrow cultural taste is intertwined with the effect of social class and educational attainment (Bihagen & Katz-Gerro, 2000; Christin, 2012; Lizardo, 2006b). This line of thinking clearly reflects Bourdieu’s (1984, p. 107) contention that gender is a “secondary principle”, a personal characteristic of secondary importance compared to social class (Hall, 1992, pp. 259, 267). In short, in Sociology of Culture, gender differences in highbrow cultural tastes are often predominantly defined and perceived in ‘cultural capital’-related and class-related terms. In this dissertation, I argue that the downplaying of gender as a fundamental stratification mechanism and as a relevant predictor of cultural involvement in its own right has put important limits to our understanding of the social processes underlying men’s and women’s cultural taste patterns.

What current research often overlooks is that cultural activities are not only legitimate or illegitimate, but often have very feminine or masculine connotations. Indeed, cultural domains such as the Arts and Sports are often cited as crucial spheres through which norms of masculinity and femininity are expressed (Bermingham, 1993; Lorber, 1994). Arts-related practices are generally considered to be typically feminine activities, while sport-related activities are often labeled as typically masculine (Zinkhan, Prenshaw, & Close, 2004). In other words, cultural and sportive taste patterns do not only reflect socio-economic status differences but also different expectations for men and women in current societies. These socially constructed ideals of masculinity and femininity, and the different opportunities that one’s sex
category brings about, which is what scholars refer to as ‘gender’, are central in dissertation (cf. Connell, 1985; West & Zimmerman, 1987; Wood & Eagly, 2009). This highlights an important problem in current research on men’s and women’s cultural taste: many scholars using the concept of ‘gender’ actually only pay attention to a person’s sex category, i.e., whether someone is a man or a woman. As such, how cultural tastes are influenced by gender, defined as “the cultural meanings ascribed to male and female social categories in societies” (Wood & Eagly, 2009, p. 109), is still very much neglected in the literature on cultural taste (notable exceptions are Lehman, 2017; Lehman & Dumais, 2017). While some scholars in Sociology of Culture explicitly acknowledge the existence of cultural norms that define arts participation as feminine and sports participation as masculine (Christin, 2012; Tepper, 2000), little effort is made to understand how exactly unequal gendered expectations and opportunities would affect cultural involvement, beyond the platitude ‘it is socialized’. So, this dissertation contributes to the scientific understanding of the gender gap in cultural tastes by examining the various gendered processes linked to men’s and women’s differential tastes.

Based on the work of gender theorist Barbara Risman (2004; 2013), I argue that to understand how societal norms of masculinity and femininity influence men’s and women’s cultural tastes, we need to acknowledge that gender impacts on people’s lives on three related levels: i.e., the intrapersonal, the interpersonal and the contextual level. Firstly, the intrapersonal or individual level relates to how gender beliefs crystallize in gender identities. Secondly, the interpersonal or interactional dimension focuses on how gender is constructed in social encounters and through gendered expectations inherent to social interactions. Thirdly, gender affects men’s and women’s behavior through differential structural opportunities and constraints and through normative gender ideologies prevailing in certain contexts.

In this PhD thesis, I argue that by focusing on how variation in (the gap between) men’s and women’s cultural taste is connected to gender-related processes on the intrapersonal, interpersonal and contextual level, we are able to obtain insight in the processes through which gender can shape men’s and women’s cultural preferences. In other words, this dissertation offers a better understanding of the gender gap in cultural tastes, by showing how gender differences depend on the extent to which gendered norms, expectations and constraints are
ingrained in peoples’ identities, social interactions and social contexts. Thus, this approach contrasts with the undifferentiated view on gender in current research on cultural tastes that treats gender as binary and static, as if there is no variation within the groups of men and women, which relates to gender fluidity⁴, and as if gender has the same effect across space and time⁵.

More specifically, in this dissertation, men’s and women’s cultural taste in the domains of Arts and Sports is connected to gender identity at the intrapersonal level and pressure for gender conformity at the interpersonal level. Moreover, on the contextual level I pay attention to variation in men’s and women’s tastes across countries and across generations. I examine the importance of gender ideology and equality. Thus, this dissertation complements current knowledge on men’s and women’s differential cultural tastes that is rooted in Bourdieu’s ‘cultural-capital perspective’ by proposing an alternative, gender perspective and by providing a differentiated and contextual understanding of how gender affects cultural tastes.

1.2 Why arts participation and sport event attendance?

As the aim of this dissertation is to obtain a better understanding of the gendering of cultural tastes, it is a logical choice to focus on both arts-related and sport-related cultural practices. Arts and Sports are very gendered cultural domains because these are central spheres in and through which cultural expectations about femininity and masculinity are expressed (Bermingham, 1993; Lorber, 1994; Pascoe, 2007; Zinkhan et al., 2004). Zinkhan and colleagues (2004) show that people tend to gender-type arts-related activities, such as ballet and opera attendance and visiting arts museums, as feminine⁶. On the contrary, sport-related activities such as attending sport events as a spectator or playing football or basketball have strong masculine connotations. Moreover, people with traditional gender role attitudes are more likely to gender-type leisure activities.

It is argued that the feminine connotation of the Arts and the masculine connotation of Sports fit within wider stereotypical gender role beliefs that originate in Victorian separate spheres ideology, i.e., the idea that the private sphere is feminine and the public sphere is masculine (Bermingham, 1993; Tepper, 2000). Arts participation is considered an appropriate
pastime for women because these activities are passive, private, non-competitive, emotional, aesthetic and academic (cf. Leib & Bulman, 2009; Martino, 1999; Pascoe, 2007; Tepper, 2000, p. 257). Competitive, aggressive and outwardly expressive activities that emphasize physical prowess, such as playing and watching sports, are labeled as masculine and are, thus, considered acceptable for boys (Messner, 2011; Smith & Leaper, 2005; Tepper, 2000, p. 257). Sports are for many (young) men a way of constructing a masculine identity, both as players and as spectators (Dufur, 1999; Lorber, 1994, p. 43). Nevertheless, there are differences between specific sports, with some sports being gender-typed as masculine and others as feminine (see Plaza, Boiché, Brunel, & Ruchaud, 2017). Football, which is the activity studied in the last empirical chapter, has strong masculine connotations (Koivula, 2001; Zinkhan et al., 2004).

Empirically, I focus on the one hand on a range of arts-related cultural activities, such as theatre and ballet attendance and museum visits, and on the other hand on sport event attendance as a spectator. Studying a range of cultural activities allows to assess the scope of the proposed multidimensional gendered approach and to evaluate whether similar processes are at play across different gendered leisure activities. I have restricted the studied cultural practices as much as possible to gender-typed, passive and out-door leisure activities for reasons of comparability: other gender-related mechanisms could be at play for in-door cultural activities, such as reading literary books (because of gendered time constraints for instance (e.g., Bittman & Wajcman, 2000; Sullivan, 1997)), and for active sports participation and amateur arts participation.

While activities such as theatre and opera attendance and museum visits are regarded as highbrow, legitimate forms of cultural competence, sport event attendance is traditionally not considered to yield cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1984). However, what constitutes cultural capital is not stable over time (Prieur & Savage, 2013). A growing body of research studies new or ‘emerging’ forms of cultural capital, a term used by Prieur and Savage (2013) to refer to contemporary mostly urban, screen-based cultural practices that function as legitimate tastes next to the classic highbrow tastes (Friedman, Savage, Hanquinet, & Miles, 2015; Roose, 2015; Savage et al., 2013). Sports consumption, both active and passive, is sometimes labeled as such
in this literature and, thus, could function as cultural capital, at least in specific contexts (see Savage et al., 2013, pp. 226-227).

Working in two different but related fields was a very enriching experience for me as a researcher. Even though Bourdieu has always seen sport-related tastes as cultural tastes, the fields of ‘Sport’ and ‘Culture’ are often somewhat artificially separated and have developed almost independently (e.g., Hallmann et al., 2017). Both domains differ in terms of the lacunae in the scientific understanding of gender differences, the questions that are considered relevant, and the way these questions are addressed in research. While there is much more attention to gender inequality in the sports literature and even though the field is less ‘stuck’ in a binary and static vision on gender, the literature has its own issues. There is a lot of qualitative research focusing on the experiences of inequality of female athletes and sports fans, but there are few quantitative, representative studies on gender inequality in participation, particularly on passive sports consumption, i.e., watching sports live or on a screen. The existing quantitative research on gender differences is well embedded in the gender literature but generally very basic and descriptive in terms of methods used. As a consequence, there is little cross-national comparative and longitudinal research on sport spectatorship as this requires advanced statistical techniques, leading to a similar hiatus as in Sociology of Culture but for different reasons. Thus, in the empirical chapters of the PhD similar research questions are addressed for both (groups of) activities, but the way these are addressed can be different as I tried to integrate the articles into the specific research fields.

1.3 Why does it matter?

The scientific contribution of this dissertation is in the first place related to the proposed gender perspective that adds to current literature that is indebted to Bourdieu’s ‘cultural-capital paradigm’ because this new approach overcomes the sometimes problematic assumptions about gender as a theoretical concept that dominant explanations make. Especially in the field of Sociology of Culture, research has overlooked that the socially constructed notions of masculinity and femininity and the differential opportunities and constraints for men and women may be a crucial element to understand the gender gap in cultural tastes. In a way, this
dissertation introduces gender in research on gender and cultural taste. Also the individual empirical chapters are innovative. The influence of identity-related and interactional gendered processes on boys’ and girls’ differential interests in the arts and in sport spectatorship was never systematically evaluated. Moreover, the cross-national comparative and longitudinal studies in this doctoral thesis, assessing variation in the gender gap across space and time, are the first in their kind, both in research on highbrow cultural tastes and in the literature on sport event attendance.

This dissertation is also important from a social equality perspective. This work shows how even in current societies supposedly personal preferences and behaviors are still very much shaped by cultural notions of femininity and masculinity. While there is generally more attention to equal opportunities and expectations in visible domains such as the economy, politics or the educational system, gender inequality is also expressed in seemingly innocent spheres, such as the leisure context, which are often perceived to reflect individual choices or to be less important for men’s and women’s life chances. However, we should not forget that (gendered) leisure time experiences have an important effect on a person’s identity development (e.g., Cherland, 1994; Frønes, 2009; McHale, Ji-Yeon, Whiteman, & Crouter, 2004; Meân, 2001; Octobre, 2005; Sharp, Coatsworth, Darling, Cumsille, & Ranieri, 2007), social interactions (Hallmann et al., 2017; Toepoel, 2013) and the gender norms someone is confronted with (Slater & Tiggemann, 2010). In other words, the leisure context is a site of reproduction of traditional gender beliefs and expectations (Shaw, 1994, 2001). It is therefore crucial to obtain insight in the gendered mechanisms underlying differences in leisure cultural participation, which is the aim of this dissertation.

Furthermore, it is important to highlight that cultural participation is associated with several positive outcomes. Cultural participation and involvement in arts- and sports-related extracurricular activities are connected to several benefits for youngsters, such as higher emotional well-being, resiliency, self-esteem, life-satisfaction, school engagement, school belonging and school motivation (Boyes & Reid, 2005; Fredricks & Eccles, 2008; Martin et al., 2013; Tramonte & Willms, 2010). Moreover, these activities allow youth to acquire specific cognitive and non-cognitive, i.e., personal and social skills (Boyes & Reid, 2005; Covay &
Carbonaro, 2010; Lareau, 2003). These benefits and skills lead to higher grades in school (Covay & Carbonaro, 2010; Fredricks & Eccles, 2008), resulting in a quite consistent positive association between cultural participation and academic achievement (see Jaeger, 2011 for an overview of previous studies), and between cultural participation and occupational aspirations (Tramonte & Willms, 2010). Arts participation also facilitates access to elite colleges and generates better career opportunities (DiMaggio, 1982; Jaeger, 2011; Kaufman & Gabler, 2004; Lareau, 2003).

Positive effects of cultural participation are also found for adults. Because participation in cultural and sport-related activities stimulates social contact and integration in the context of a meaningful leisure activity (e.g., Hallmann et al., 2017; Toepoel, 2013), it is not surprising that adults’ cultural, sport-related and arts participation is associated with (slightly) higher life satisfaction (Kim & Kim, 2009; Michalos, 2005) and subjective well-being (Wheatley & Bickerton, 2017). A study using an experimental design further indicates that fine arts participation (films, concerts, art exhibition visits, or singing in a choir) leads to improved perceived physical health, social functioning, and vitality (Bygren et al., 2009), which is in line with other studies showing positive associations between cultural participation and (mental) health (Anwar-McHenry, Carmichael, & McHenry, In press; Castora-Binkley, Noelker, Prohaska, & Satariano, 2010; Davies, Knuiman, & Rosenberg, 2015; Renton et al., 2012).

From a social equality perspective, it is important to provide equal access to these enriching and beneficial activities to all. Not surprisingly, governments invest a lot of money to make cultural and sports facilities accessible to a wide range of people (Feder & Katz-Gerro, 2012; Getzner, 2015). Thus, policy makers want to reduce inequality by avoiding that an unequal distribution of resources becomes an obstacle for participation. In this respect, it is particularly inefficient that half of the population experiences restrictions for participation in arts-related activities (for men) and in sport-related activities (for women), because gender norms make it very un-masculine or un-feminine to participate in certain leisure activities. Uncovering the mechanisms behind the gendering of leisure cultural consumption is a necessary step to be able to eliminate these gendered expectations that impede participation.
1.4 Outlining of the dissertation

This dissertation has the following structure. In Chapter 2, I review the existing literature on cultural taste differences between men and women. I highlight the problematic assumptions about gender as a theoretical construct and a social category made in this research. I discuss how gender theory has evolved beyond these limited views on gender, that are inherent to the now criticized gender role socialization perspectives. Inspired by Barbara Risman’s integrative approach that treats gender as a multidimensional system, I argue that to obtain a broader understanding of how gender affects cultural taste, we need to pay attention to intrapersonal, interpersonal and contextual processes. Next, I show how the different empirical chapters offer a better understanding of how differences in men’s and women’s cultural tastes are connected to intrapersonal, interactional and contextual mechanisms.

In Chapter 3, I provide an overview of the data sets that were used in the empirical chapters and of how the data was collected. I introduce the studied cultural practices for each data set and give more insight in the gender-related measures used in this dissertation. This chapter concludes with a review of the multilevel method used for the empirical analyses.

Chapter 4 addresses both intrapersonal and interpersonal processes and studies the effect of gender identity and pressure for gender-conforming behavior on the highbrow cultural interests of male and female Flemish adolescents. Similarly, in Chapter 5, I examine how gender differences in interest in sport spectatorship relate to adolescents’ gender identity, experienced pressures for gender-conforming behavior and gender ideology.

In Chapter 6 and 7, I focus on how gender differences in cultural tastes vary across EU countries and depend on the level of societal gender equality. Thus, I pay attention to contextual mechanisms. In Chapter 6, I investigate whether macro-level gender equality in the spheres of work and care for the family can explain cross-national variation in the gender gap in theatre attendance; ballet, dance performance and opera attendance; and museum and art gallery visits. In Chapter 7, I examine to what extent the gender gap in sport event attendance in EU countries varies cross-nationally and is related to macro-level gender equality.
In Chapter 8, I pay attention to how gender differences in cultural tastes vary across time. I evaluate whether gender differences in the consumption of gender-typed cultural practices depend on a person’s birth cohort. More specifically, I focus on generational trends in professional theatre and ballet attendance, museum visits, art gallery visits and football match attendance.

To conclude, in Chapter 9, I discuss how this dissertation was able to provide a broader perspective on how gender affects cultural taste that gives more insight in the gender-related processes behind the consistent cultural taste differences between men and women. I make suggestions for future research, including but not limited to the question on what counts as cultural capital and whether there is equality in the rewards men and women reap. Moreover, I highlight some limitations of the dissertation. I conclude with policy implications directed at increasing youngsters’ opportunities for cultural participation.
1.5 Notes

1 In other words, the term ‘cultural taste’ encompasses both expressed interests and actual participation in cultural activities. Both cultural interest and actual cultural consumption are studied in this dissertation.

2 An important strand of research in Sociology of Education shows how the gender gap in educational attainment is connected to gender norms, which is similar to the gendered approach used in this dissertation (e.g., Heyder & Kessels, 2013; Huyge, Van Maele, & Van Houtte, 2015; Vantieghem, 2015).

3 Sex category refers to “the social labeling of people as male or female on the basis of social cues presumed to stand for physical sex” (Ridgeway, 2011, p. 9; see also West & Zimmerman, 1987). It is, therefore, to be differentiated from ‘sex’, which refers to biological maleness and feminality and gender which refers to “the cultural meanings ascribed to male and female social categories in societies” (Wood & Eagly, 2009, p. 109). The terms ‘sex’ and ‘gender’ are frequently used interchangeably. Often gender theorists advise to reserve the term ‘sex’ for the purely biological differences between men and women and to use the term ‘gender’ in all other cases, which means: as soon as it refers to differences that have some social aspects.

4 Gender fluidity is “an umbrella term to describe possibilities for gender identity beyond the binary ‘man’ or ‘woman’” (Parker, 2016, p. 166).

5 As explained in Chapter 2, this binary and static vision on gender is inherent to the gender role socialization perspective to which many studies on gender, socialization and cultural taste are indebted.

6 However, connoisseurship and knowledge about art is historically masculine (Bermingham, 1993).

7 Even though I recognize that participation in the Arts and in Sports may be positively related and is part of an ‘active’ or ‘participatory’ lifestyle, I have never used sports consumption to predict arts consumption or vice versa (except for Chapter 4 in which sports consumption is part of the measure of youth-cultural taste). Because of the divergent gendered connotations to the activities, doing this would obscure the understanding of what the studied gendered mechanisms actually capture.

8 Nevertheless, sport fandom can also have a ‘dark’ side, that is often intertwined with the masculine nature of the activity, such as violence, hooliganism and excessive alcohol intake (Nelson & Wechsler, 2003; Spaaij, 2008; Wakefield & Wann, 2006).
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2 Gender and cultural taste: what we know and we do not know

2.1 Dominant explanations for gender differences in cultural taste in Sociology of Culture

Many of the dominant explanations for gender differences in cultural tastes in the field of Sociology of Culture are strongly influenced by Bourdieu’s ‘cultural-capital paradigm’ and his thinking on women and cultural taste.

2.1.1 Gender in Bourdieu’s ‘cultural-capital paradigm’

Bourdieu’s seminal work was the start of a rich tradition in the study of cultural tastes (Bourdieu, 1984, 1986). Bourdieu (1984) describes how cultural tastes and cultural consumption reflect and reproduce differences between social classes through childhood socialization in mid-20th century France. He convincingly argues that individuals’ social status does not only depend on their ‘economic capital’ or financial resources, but also on their ‘cultural capital’. Cultural capital exists in different forms according to Bourdieu (1986). It can take on an objectified, material form, such as paintings displayed in someone’s living room. It can be an institutionalized form of capital, such as a degree at a prestigious university. However, most importantly, cultural capital can exist in an embodied state, which refers to long-lasting cultural dispositions. Drawing on the traditional notion of Bildung as classical ideal of civilization — ‘participation in the fine arts refines one’s mind and soul ...’ (van Eijck & Knulst, 2005, p. 513; Vander Stichele & Laermans, 2006, p. 59), embodied cultural capital relates to the extent to which someone is considered cultured or cultivated. Therefore, cultural tastes are an expression of someone’s embodied cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1984). In Bourdieu’s thinking on France in the 1960’s - 1970’s, especially ‘legitimate’ or highbrow tastes for arts-related cultural activities, such as going to the opera, ballet or theatre, are considered a marker of social status. However, Bourdieu’s thinking also applies to taste patterns in food, clothing and sports.

While Bourdieu (1984) pays a lot of attention to class differences in cultural tastes, gender only plays a minor role in his thinking, especially in his earlier work on cultural tastes (see also Atkinson, 2016). In ‘Distinction’, Bourdieu (1984) tends to treat gender as a specific manifestation of social class (J. R. Hall, 1992, pp. 259, 267). Bourdieu (1984, p. 107) sees
gender as a “secondary principle”, a personal characteristic of secondary importance (compared to social class) that would only affect people through their social class position. According to Bourdieu (1984, pp. 382, 383, 404), gendered dispositions are more similar among people high in (especially) cultural capital. In later work, in particular in ‘Masculine domination’ (2001), Bourdieu does focus on the dichotomy between men and women and he appears to recognize the gender hierarchy as an autonomous stratification mechanism that affects people independently of their social class position, in contrast to his earlier views. However, this does not mean that his thinking on gender evolved a lot or became much richer through time (Silva, 2005). Quite the contrary, in ‘Masculine Domination’ Bourdieu (2001) draws on his earliest work on the Algerian society in the 1950’s and on the book ‘To the lighthouse’ by Virginia Woolf (1927). This stagnation in Bourdieu’s reflection on gender and taste is to an important extent the result of his lack of effort to incorporate feminist literature in the ‘cultural-capital paradigm’ (Silva, 2005, p. 85), even though other scholars have shown that this is indeed possible (Laberge, 1995; Lovell, 2001; McCall, 1992; McNay, 1999; Reay, 2000, 2004).

Despite minor changes in Bourdieu’s view on gender and cultural tastes, there are some central elements in his work. A first recurring theme is the family, which is the site where cultural socialization takes place (Silva, 2005). Bourdieu has the (implicit and patriarchal) assumption that women’s social position is determined by their husbands’ or fathers’ social position. This reflects Bourdieu’s thinking on ‘normal’ families, where fathers work outside the home and mothers are in charge of the household. According to Bourdieu, this traditional division of labor is perceived as natural. In exceptional cases where women do paid work, this has in the first place a symbolic function. According to Bourdieu, women’s higher highbrow cultural participation is related to their role as a mother and a wife. Women are considered to be responsible for the family’s public image, the cultural reproduction in the family and for the transmission of certain cultural values during early socialization of the next generation; they do what Lovell (2001, p. 39) calls the “cultural housekeeping”. Or in Bourdieu’s own words, women are “assigned to the management of the symbolic capital of the family” (Bourdieu, 2001, p. 99). In short, women function mainly as aesthetic objects in Bourdieu’s thinking. This
argument was further developed by Collins (1988, 1992), who extended it to women’s position in the work place.

Another persisting element in Bourdieu’s work is his dichotomous and ahistorical vision on gender and the gender hierarchy, which is based on a biological binary and on a one-on-one relationship between the biological body and gender identification (see also Calhoun, 1993; Silva, 2005). In his work on the Algerian society, he argues that the entire social order is based on the dichotomy between men and women, between what is considered male or masculine and what is considered female or feminine (see Bourdieu, 2001). He extends this to the opposition between what is public, which is considered a masculine sphere, and what is private, belonging to the feminine sphere. In his perspective, there is a strong gender hierarchy in which what is male or masculine dominates what is female or feminine. This gender hierarchy is naturally given, rooted in the physical body (i.e. via embodied dispositions) and treated as ahistorical (Silva, 2005, p. 88). Throughout his work, Bourdieu tends to have an a-contextual perspective, which means that he often treats as universal what he has observed in a specific social context in terms of time and space, e.g., Algeria in the 1950s, Paris in the 1960s-1970’s etc. (Calhoun, 1993). The gender hierarchy he describes is invariable across time and across space. In other words, the dichotomy between male and female remains stable or constant. This relates to a general and important critique on Bourdieu’s thinking: it easily explains reproduction, but it has more difficulties in explaining social change (King, 2000).

In the overview of the overarching themes and ideas in Bourdieu’s thinking on gender, it becomes clear that the simple picture he depicts may not suffice to explain gender differences in the 21st century. Some important questions can be raised. Can such a binary vision on gender be maintained in times of growing attention to gender fluidity, which refers to “possibilities for gender identity beyond the binary ‘man’ or ‘woman’” (Parker, 2016, p. 166)? Has being a woman the same effect on tastes across time, space and social contexts? And what about the changing position of women in society? Even though Bourdieu himself acknowledges that the ideal type of the ‘normal’ family where the father does paid labor and the mother unpaid labor is a “well-founded illusion”, he gets stuck in his own fiction according to Silva (2005, pp. 87, 97). While Bourdieu’s focus on male breadwinner families was to some degree defendable
when he wrote his work several decades ago, it is clear that his assumption about what ‘normal’ families look like cannot hold in current societies. Many women and mothers participate in the labor market and the male breadwinner model has been put under pressure (Bettio, 2017; Ciccia & Bleijenbergh, 2014; Olivetti & Petrongolo, 2016). The division of household labor and child care is far more gender equal now than it was several decades ago (Fuwa, 2004). So, even though women’s position in the family has changed, gender differences in cultural participation (and in many other domains) persist (Christin, 2012; Ridgeway, 2011). This means that Bourdieu’s explanation for gender differences in cultural tastes is incomplete and insufficient to clarify why women participate more often in highbrow culture than men.

2.1.2 Research on men’s and women’s cultural taste in post-Bourdieuian times

Bourdieu’s ‘cultural-capital perspective’ has to an important extent determined the questions asked and answered by later empirical work on gender and cultural participation. Two related groups of explanations are used. A first group of studies explains the ‘puzzling’ finding that women are more likely to express highbrow tastes by examining how men’s and women’s differential cultural involvement is intertwined with the effects of social class, work and educational attainment (Bihagen & Katz-Gerro, 2000; Christin, 2012; Lizardo, 2006). This research reflects Bourdieu’s idea in Distinction (1984) that gender mainly affects cultural consumption through class- and cultural capital-related mechanisms (Gans, 1992, p. vii; J. R. Hall, 1992, pp. 259, 267). A second group of studies pays more attention to how the gender hierarchy can function as an autonomous stratification mechanism and to how gendered connotations to cultural practices may shape individual cultural behavior. This strand of literature follows Bourdieu’s focus on the family as the primary site of (gender) socialization.

2.1.2.1 Class-, work-, education- and cultural capital-related explanations

Some researchers argue that the differences in cultural tastes, and by extension in cultural capital, between men and women originate in unequal access to the labor force and in divergent educational and work-related choices and contexts (Bihagen and Katz-Gerro, 2000; Collins, 1988; DiMaggio, 2004). In this view, the effect of gender on taste works mainly through class- and cultural capital-related mechanisms.
In the 1980’s and 1990’s, scholars paid attention to marital selection, recognizing women’s inability to fully translate a (culturally) privileged background into advantaged positions in the labor market at the time. These scholars argue, in line with Bourdieu’s thinking, that women’s investments in cultural capital (which can be employed in the family) lead to a better position in the marriage market (DiMaggio & Mohr, 1985; Kalmijn, 1994; Silva & Le Roux, 2011; Uunk & Ultee, 1996). Thus, women who signal that they come from a cultivated family would marry men with an advantageous class position and a high level of educational attainment. However, there is little evidence that marital status explains the gender gap in cultural taste in more recent literature (Bihagen & Katz-Gerro, 2000; Christin, 2012). This is not surprising as it is not likely that in the 21st century, a woman’s societal position is in the first place defined by whom she marries because the male breadwinner model is losing its importance (Bettio, 2017; Ciccia & Bleijenbergh, 2014).

Because we know that a person’s level of education is an important predictor of cultural participation (see Bourdieu, 1984), another expectation in this research tradition is that women’s higher involvement in highbrow culture can be explained by their educational attainment. This expectation is related to the finding that in the last decades of the past century, women’s levels of educational attainment started to surpass men’s across developed societies (Buchmann, DiPrete, & McDaniel, 2008; van Hek, Kraaykamp, & Wolbers, 2016). However, Bihagen and Katz-Gerro (2000) indicate that men’s and women’s differential educational attainment cannot explain the gap in highbrow cultural taste in Sweden (Bihagen & Katz-Gerro, 2000). Moreover, the effect of having followed tertiary education on highbrow cultural consumption is not smaller or larger for women than for men in the USA (Christin, 2012). This lack of support for women’s higher educational attainment as a crucial mechanism behind women’s higher highbrow cultural taste is not surprising as there is little evidence that women’s improved opportunities in the educational system actually chronologically preceded the gender gap in cultural taste (DiMaggio & Mukhtar, 2004; see also Chapters 8 and 9 of this dissertation).

Women’s investments in cultural capital may also be a way to compensate for their lack of economical capital and opportunities to participate in the labor market (DiMaggio, 2004, pp. 99-100). However, there is no overwhelming support for this hypothesis as a Swedish study
indicates that gender differences remain stable when controlling for income (Bihagen & Katz-Gerro, 2000). Moreover, the fact that women are less likely to work full time than men—and therefore face less time constraints—explains the gender gap in highbrow participation in the US only to a limited extent (Christin, 2012). However, also in this case evidence is mixed as not working or working part-time is associated with lower rates of female cultural participation in Belgium (Willekens & Lievens, 2016).

Another employment-related explanation for the “puzzle of women’s highbrow consumption” (cf. the title of Lizardo, 2006) concerns occupational choices and work contexts (Bihagen & Katz-Gerro, 2000; Christin, 2012; Collins, 1988, 1992; Lizardo, 2006). Collins (1988, 1992) expands Bourdieu’s argument that women function as aesthetic objects in his work on women’s role in the work place. According to Collins (1988, 1992), the return on women’s investment in cultural capital is especially high in ‘female’ jobs and sectors, where impression management is important. Generally, women—even in subordinate positions—are more likely to do so-called ‘frontstage work’ or ‘Goffmanian labor’ in the work place. This means that they represent the organization or institution, similar to the responsibilities they bear for the family’s public image according to Bourdieu. As a consequence, women (even in subordinate positions) tend to express cultural tastes typically associated with the higher social classes, as reflected in a study by Willekens and Lievens (2015) on taste patterns in food and clothing.

Lizardo (2006) further integrates Collins’ perspective and Bourdieu’s ‘cultural-capital paradigm’ and focuses on the effect of capital composition in occupational fields. He finds that the gender gap is smaller in occupational fields where the proportion of cultural capital (relative to the proportion of economic capital) is higher, and that there is no gender gap for those who do not participate in the labor market. Lizardo relates the finding that gender differences are larger in occupational fields where economic capital dominates (which are generally also male-dominated) to Erickson’s (1996) argument on ‘business-oriented occupational cultures’. According to Erickson (1996), highbrow cultural consumption is devalued and considered irrelevant in workplaces with a business-oriented culture. Because in these contexts interaction across class lines is necessary, other cultural expressions that focus on coordination instead of (class) domination are highly valued. An example is ‘“the sports talk that links native-born men
in all levels [...] simultaneously excludes the female and foreign born minorities in each class” (Erickson, 1996, p. 248). According to Erickson, these occupational cultures are very much oriented towards active and passive sports consumption, which is known to be a male-typed activity (Dufur, 1999; Pope, 2017).

Other scholars have a more narrow, empirical focus and argue that women’s higher highbrow consumption could make sense if women disproportionately choose for jobs in the cultural or educational sector, where cultural competence is very important. While Christin (2012) finds some (although modest) evidence that in the US gender differences in highbrow cultural consumption are explained by women’s overrepresentation in the cultural and educational sector, Bihagen and Katz-Gerro (2000) cannot confirm that differences in men’s and women’s cultural participation are explained by women’s choice for jobs in the cultural sector in Sweden.

Overall, research focusing on how the effect of gender on cultural taste is intertwined with indicators of class position has provided interesting results. However, class-, work-, education- and cultural capital-related explanations are generally not able to explain a large part of the gender gap in cultural tastes (Bihagen & Katz-Gerro, 2000; Christin, 2012; Hallmann, Muñiz, Breuer, Dallmeyer, & Metz, 2017). Bihagen and Katz-Gerro (2000, p. 329) argue that their finding that gender differences persist, even when controlling for occupational class position, educational attainment, income, working in the cultural sector, marital status, etc., is an indication that gender is an “independent source of differentiation in cultural consumption”. Indeed, gender is more than just a manifestation of socio-economic status. Some studies put so much emphasis on the fact that cultural tastes can function as a marker of cultural capital and are related to social inequality, that they easily forget that gender differences may also originate in gender inequality, even when it concerns a gender gap in which women appear advantaged. Cultural activities are not only legitimate or illegitimate, but they often have very feminine or masculine connotations. Cultural domains such as the Arts and Sports are central spheres in and through which cultural expectations about (respectively) femininity and masculinity are conveyed (Bermingham, 1993; Lorber, 1994; Pascoe, 2007; Zinkhan et al., 2004). Before turning to research on gender and cultural tastes that pays more attention to these
gendered connotations of cultural tastes and to my critique on how ‘gender’ is treated in current literature, it is important to highlight two issues concerning highbrow cultural participation as an indicator of cultural capital.

2.1.2.1.1 A note on highbrow taste as an indicator of cultural capital
In many studies it is seen as self-evident that participation in legitimate, arts-related cultural practices is a marker of social status (e.g., the quote by DiMaggio, 2004 in Chapter 1). Highbrow tastes are theorized to function as cultural capital that can be transposed in other forms of capital and in various social benefits. However, the extent to which women are able to convert cultural competence and knowledge into cultural capital is, in light of their generally disadvantaged position in society, something that has to be empirically verified instead of a priori assumed. Evidence regarding who is best able to translate cultural tastes into social rewards is mixed. While some studies suggest that girls/women appear to be advantaged in the short-term, in the long term and in fields that really matter boys/men may be better able to convert cultural competence in social advantage. For instance, the effect of cultural capital on school grades in secondary education is larger for girls than for boys (Dumais, 2002), but young men seem to be better able to convert cultural capital in access to elite colleges and universities (Kaufman & Gabler, 2004; Zimdars, Sullivan, & Heath, 2009) and to associate positions in elite law-firms (Rivera & Tilcsik, 2016) than young women. Moreover, “connoisseurship”, which is recognized knowledge about fine arts, is traditionally male (Bermingham, 1993). Examining to what extent women’s higher cultural consumption also means that they have more cultural capital to invest, is beyond the scope of this dissertation. In this PhD thesis, I aim to uncover the gendered processes underlying cultural taste differences between men and women, bearing in mind that this does not necessarily reflect cultural capital.

2.1.2.1.2 What about non-legitimate tastes and gender? A complementary focus on sport event attendance
Most studies on men’s and women’s cultural tastes have focused on highbrow cultural participation, exactly because it is traditionally considered to be an indicator of social status. Much less attention has been paid to other, lowbrow, non-legitimate cultural tastes. However, what counts as cultural capital can change through time. Scholars argue that high social status is increasingly expressed through an openness in tastes, with as a classical example research on
‘cultural omnivores’ who consume a variety of traditionally legitimate and more popular forms of culture (Peterson & Kern, 1996). Recent literature focuses on new or ‘emerging’ forms of cultural capital (Friedman, Savage, Hanquinet, & Miles, 2015; Prieur & Savage, 2013; Roose, 2015; Savage et al., 2013). This refers to popular, contemporary, mostly urban, screen-based cultural practices such as sport- and media-related tastes, that increasingly function as legitimate tastes in addition to the classic highbrow tastes (Prieur & Savage, 2013; Roose, 2015; Savage et al., 2013, p. 226). Scholars argue that there is growing recognition of non-exclusive cultural expressions such as pop music besides traditional legitimate tastes in secondary school curricula (Daenekindt & Roose, 2015) and culture sections in quality newspapers (Janssen, 1999; Purhonen, Heikkilä, & Hazir, 2017). Considering the changing value of arts participation as cultural capital, the almost exclusive focus on gender differences in highbrow participation is no longer tenable.

In this dissertation, the study of highbrow cultural participation is complemented with the study of sport event attendance. In contrast to arts-related cultural practices, this is a traditionally non-legitimate cultural activity. However, it may increasingly count as a status marker in current societies as an emerging form of capital (Savage et al., 2013, p. 226). Moreover, passive sports consumption (or sport spectatorship) plays an important status-enhancing role in ‘business cultures’ in the work place (Erickson, 1996). Furthermore, contrary to feminine arts-related activities, sport event attendance is a cultural practice with masculine connotations in which men participate more than women (Pope, 2017; Zinkhan et al., 2004). Considering that the Arts and Sports are highly gender-typed cultural domains (see also section 1.2), the combined study of art-related activities and sport event attendance enriches the gendered approach developed in this dissertation.

The field of Sport Sociology in general and the literature on sport event attendance in particular have developed almost independently from research on highbrow cultural participation in Sociology of Culture, even though predictors of the consumption of sport and culture are to a large extent similar (Hallmann et al., 2017). Gender differences in sports consumption have received a lot of attention in Sports Sociology, but the vast majority of studies on the topic focus on active sports participation, not on sport spectatorship. Before
giving a short review of the literature, I want to stress that ‘sport spectatorship’, ‘sport event attendance’ and ‘sport fandom’ are related, but different concepts. Being a ‘sports fan’ requires more emotion, commitment, enthusiasm, intensity and identification than just attending a sports event (Hirt, Zillmann, Erickson, & Kennedy, 1992; Tinson, Sinclair, & Kolyperas, 2017). Moreover, sport event attendance is a form of sport spectatorship, but the term sport spectatorship also encompasses watching sport matches on TV for instance. Research on sport event attendance is often marketing-oriented and explores attributes that increase participation (Ferreira & Armstrong, 2004; Funk, Filo, Beaton, & Pritchard, 2009). So, it does generally not uncover the sociological mechanisms behind sport consumption that are relevant for this dissertation; these social processes are, on the contrary, more addressed in the literature on sport spectatorship and sport fandom. Despite these conceptual differences, this thesis draws on these three strands of literature because of the overall limited scientific attention paid to sport spectatorship, sport event attendance and sport fandom.

Research on gender and sport spectatorship or sport fandom is often qualitative in nature and has focused on themes as identification as a sports fan, (in)authenticity, sexism and hegemonic masculinity (Esmonde, Cooky, & Andrews, 2015; Farrell, Fink, & Fields, 2011; Hoeber & Kerwin, 2013; Johnson & Schiappa, 2010; Jones, 2008; Kennedy, 2007; Pope, 2011, 2017; Pope & Williams, 2011). Female sport fans are often perceived as inauthentic, new consumers of sport, who are present in the stadium for other reasons (e.g., physical appearance of the male athletes, taking care of the children, …) than the motives of a true fan (Crawford & Gosling, 2004; Esmonde et al., 2015; Hoeber & Kerwin, 2013; Jones, 2008). As a consequence, their knowledge of and commitment to the team often goes unrecognized. Other work focusses on how men control women’s access to leisure time in general and sport matches in particular (Farrell et al., 2011; Pope & Williams, 2011). A relatively new strand of literature addresses the so-called ‘feminization’ of sport fandom and sport spectatorship: sports crowds appear to be less male-dominated than they used to be and this would change the nature of being a sports fan (Meier, Strauss, & Riedl, 2017; Pope, 2017; Pope & Williams, 2011).
2.1.2.2 Cultural taste and gendered socialization in the family

Now my reservations regarding what counts as cultural capital (for women) and the relevance of examining the domains of Arts and Sports have been made clear, I would like to return to the review of the dominant explanations for cultural taste differences between men and women. A second strand of research in Sociology of Culture pays more attention to the gendered connotations of (highbrow) cultural activities to explain gender differences in cultural tastes. Studies in this line of thinking identify gender role socialization as an important mechanism behind men’s and women’s differential tastes. So, men and women are differently involved in culture because they are socialized into gender-specific behavior that is consistent with the roles they are expected to take on in social life. In this strand of research on gender and cultural tastes, it is argued that “girls are socialized in gender roles that emphasize compliance with formal culture, which leads to a stronger inclination to adopt an aesthetic disposition” (Willekens & Lievens, 2016, p. 53). Arts participation is considered feminine and an appropriate pastime for women because these activities are passive, private, non-competitive and academic (cf. Leib & Bulman, 2009; Martino, 1999; Pascoe, 2007; Tepper, 2000, p. 257). Competitive, aggressive and outwardly expressive activities that stress physical ability and force, such as playing and watching sports, are perceived as acceptable for boys (Messner, 2011; Smith & Leaper, 2005; Tepper, 2000, p. 257). Thus, the feminine connotation of the Arts and the masculine connotation of Sports fit within wider stereotypical gender role beliefs that originate in the Victorian separate spheres ideology, which is the idea that the private sphere is feminine and the public sphere is masculine² (Bermingham, 1993; Tepper, 2000; Welter, 1966).

Scholars expect that the gendered connotations to cultural activities lead to gender-specific early socialization in the arts and literature within the family (Bihagen & Katz-Gerro, 2000; Christin, 2012; Eccles, Freedman-Doan, Frome, Jacobs, & Yoon, 2000; Katz-Gerro & Jaeger, 2015; López-Sintas, Ghahraman, & Pérez Rubiales, 2017; Tepper, 2000). Also in Sports, parental socialization is theorized to play an important role (Chalabaev, Sarrazin, Fontayne, Boiché, & Clément-Guillotin, 2013; Fredricks & Eccles, 2005; Jacobs & Eccles, 1992). In an extensive review of the literature, Lytton and Romney (1991) show that while there is generally little evidence for parental gender-specific socialization, parents do encourage their boys and girls to engage in gender-typical leisure interests and activities. Based on data gathered
in the 1990, Eccles and colleagues (2000; 2005) show that parents appear to stimulate their daughters more than their sons to participate in certain artistic activities (e.g., to read, take dance lessons, take music lessons, play a musical instrument), while boys are encouraged to engage in sports-related activities (e.g., play competitive sports, watch sports on TV). Moreover, fathers and mothers are shown to use different culture-related parenting styles for their sons and daughters (Cheadle & Amato, 2011). They stimulate their daughters somewhat more than their sons to engage in organized cultural extra-curricular activities (cf. Lareau’s (2003) ‘concerted cultivation’). Furthermore, parents (sometimes) disapprove of what they perceive as gender atypical behavior; especially heterosexual fathers seem to reject gender non-conformity of their sons (Kane, 2006). Next to this more or less explicit socialization guided by parents, parents can also influence the (gendered) cultural behavior of their children because children copy the leisure-related behavior of their mothers and fathers who, as such, function as cultural and sportive role models (Fredricks & Eccles, 2005; Siongers & Smits, 2014; van Hek & Kraaykamp, 2015). However, support for these modeling effects is equivocal.

Several studies have examined whether mothers or fathers are most important in the cultural socialization process. Thus, this literature examines women’s role in the cultural reproduction within the family, that is central to Bourdieu’s ‘cultural-capital paradigm’. Research often indicates that mothers have a larger influence on their children’s arts-related participation than fathers (see Nagel, 2002; van Eijck, 1997; Voorpostel & van der Lippe, 2001; Willekens, Daenekindt, & Lievens, 2014; Willekens & Lievens, 2014); fathers would then especially affect their children’s sports-related interests (Siongers & Smits, 2014, p. 41) and popular tastes for pop and rock music (Willekens et al., 2014). Nagel (2002) indicates that the effect of mothers on children’s highbrow cultural taste is up to two times as large as the impact of fathers. In particular, mothers’ embodied and institutionalized cultural capital plays an important role in the transmission of cultural values to the next generation (van Eijck, 1997; Willekens et al., 2014; Willekens & Lievens, 2014). These findings are in line with Bourdieu’s contention that women are in charge of the management of symbolic capital in the family (Bourdieu, 2001, p. 99).
Some scholars expect that gendered parental socialization will follow same-sex lines, which means that fathers would be particularly important for the cultural socialization of their sons, while girls model the cultural behavior of their mother (Mohr & DiMaggio, 1995; Siongers & Smits, 2014, pp. 43-44). Evidence is mixed. Wollscheid (2014) finds evidence for stronger effects of parental reading behavior on the child’s reading behavior for the parent of the same sex. Mohr and DiMaggio (1995) also indicate that the mother’s educational level has a substantial effect on her daughter’s cultural participation, but they do not find evidence for similar processes among boys. Willekens and colleagues (2014) cannot confirm this same-sex socialization model, neither for boys nor for girls.

Many studies evaluating parental gender-specific socialization in highbrow cultural tastes focus on the Dutch, Belgian or American context. A recent study in Denmark, which is generally considered a gender-equal context, however, finds little evidence that the uncovered gender differences in cultural participation among brothers and sisters actually originate in the family (Katz-Gerro & Jaeger, 2015). So, even when parents do not engage in gender-specific cultural socialization, other socializing agents may reinforce gender differences in cultural tastes. Some recent studies in Sociology of Culture, that are more closely related to the perspective used in this dissertation, emphasize the role peers in the school-context play in the cultural socialization of youngsters, both in terms of arts participation as in terms of sports participation (Lehman, 2017; Lehman & Dumais, 2017; Patrick et al., 1999; Schmutz, Stearns, & Glennie, 2016). Lehman and Dumais (2017) show how participation in cultural capital-endorsing extra-curricular activities in school leads to increased bullying victimization, especially for male students. Moreover, female students do not run the risk of being bullied when participating in athletics in itself, but they are more often the victim of bullying when they express attitudes supporting gender equality in athletics (Lehman, 2017). Moreover, Schmutz and colleagues (2016) indicate that the size of the gender gap in arts consumption varies across schools. In particular, the school location and racial composition affect the magnitude of the taste difference between male and female students; they relate this finding to the (non)traditional gender role attitudes expressed in some school contexts. This is similar to older findings in Sociology of Education that indicate that interactional pressures in the school
context influence female and especially male adolescents’ interest in gender-typed cultural activities (Martino, 1999; Pascoe, 2007).

2.2 The study of ‘gender’ in sociology of culture: some critiques

I identify two important issues concerning how gender is studied in the literature on gender and cultural tastes. A first issue is that many studies do not recognize gender as an independent stratification mechanism. This is related to the undifferentiated view on gender as a concept in the literature which reflects the limited integration of gender theory in research on gender and cultural tastes. A second, related issue concerns the uncritical adoption of a gender role socialization perspective in some studies. While this theory has important merits, it also has important limitations that need to be addressed to advance our understanding of the social processes behind gender differences in cultural taste.

2.2.1 Gender as an independent source of differentiation in cultural tastes

An important problem in current literature on gender and cultural taste is the minimization of gender as an autonomous source of cultural taste differences (cf. Bihagen & Katz-Gerro, 2000, p. 329). This criticism is especially applicable to the studies focusing on class-, work-, education- and cultural capital-related explanations for the gender gap. This strand of literature is heavily influenced by Bourdieu’s (1984) ‘cultural-capital paradigm’ in which gender only plays a minimal role as a ‘secondary principle’ and is in the first place an individual characteristic that moderates social class effects. This perspective overlooks that gender is an independent stratification mechanism in current societies that merits scientific attention in its own right, not just another dimension of social class (A. Hall, 1988; J. R. Hall, 1992). This does not mean that it is uninteresting to examine how class and gender inequalities intersect (cf. the intersectional approach advocated by Anthias (2004), Crenshaw (1991) and Yuval-Davis (2006)), but gender and class need to be treated as the major, fundamental and equivalent stratification systems they are. By only examining how the effect of gender depends on a person’s social class, cultural capital or educational attainment, the fundamental question “how does gender affect cultural tastes” remains unanswered. If one treats gender as ‘secondary principle’, one easily gets stuck in explanations of secondary importance. Thus, the
downplaying of gender as a relevant predictor of cultural involvement in its own right puts important limits to our understanding of the variety of mechanisms behind gender differences.

The limited attention to gender as an independent stratification mechanism parallels the incomplete knowledge of the theoretical progress made in Gender Studies. While many studies on gender and taste are strongly indebted to ideas developed in Sociology of Culture, there is a poor integration of gender theory (apart from gender role socialization perspectives as I will show later). Thus, research in this tradition has generally a very rich and nuanced understanding of how someone’s social class position can affect cultural consumption, but at the same time it tends to have an undifferentiated view when it comes to how gender affects cultural tastes. As a consequence, current literature makes problematic assumptions about gender as a theoretical concept. So, the development of a gendered perspective that incorporates theoretical insights from gender theory to understand the processes behind gender differences in tastes is the logical and necessary next step to take.

An important issue is that in many studies on gender and cultural taste, ‘gender’ is reduced to ‘being a man or being a woman’. Thus, the conceptual difference between ‘gender’, ‘sex’ and ‘sex category’ becomes unclear. While ‘sex’ refers to biological maleness and femaleness, and the related term ‘sex category’ to the labeling of people as (f)e)male on the basis of cues presumed to stand for physical sex, ‘gender’ has an inherently social dimension (Ridgeway, 2011; West & Zimmerman, 1987; Wood & Eagly, 2009). More specifically, gender refers to culturally ascribed ideas of femininity and masculinity and the constraints that are associated with one’s sex category (Wood & Eagly, 2009). The conceptual vagueness is reinforced by the common practice to empirically treat as a binary difference between two sex categories what is theoretically (incorrectly) referred to as a ‘gender’ gap. In such an approach, gender is just another dichotomous variable that can be included in an empirical analysis (Stacey & Thorne, 1985). Thus, the effect of gender is (presumed to be) statistically accounted for (Siongers & Lievens, 2014), as if you would be able to understand or even ‘control away’ the effects of such a pervasive source of stratification that is central to people’s lives, by using a dummy variable.
However, if this binary variable distinguishing the sex categories ‘women’ and ‘men’ is the only indicator of ‘gender’ in a study, we actually continue to neglect how *gender* influences cultural taste. Indeed, such a restricted, individual perspective on differences between men and women does not do justice to what ‘gender’ really is, *i.e.*, the socially constructed ideals of femininity and masculinity representing the *social* aspects of the difference between men and women as a principle of societal organization, that affects people through various normative and structural mechanisms. It is these social and contextual dimensions of the relationship between gender and cultural tastes that sociological research should try to uncover. While it is –admittedly– not easy to really study ‘gender’ instead of ‘sex categories’ in quantitative research because of the technical limits statistical methods entail (see Westbrook & Saperstein, 2015), the study of how cultural taste differences between men and women relate to social beliefs about femininity and masculinity and to differential constraints for men and women allows for a better understanding of the gendered processes linked to the gender gap in cultural taste.

Another example of the unreflective approach to gender is that some studies refer to *gender* differences in cultural consumption, but actually mainly try to explain *women’s* cultural consumption by focusing on women’s characteristics, as if men do not have a gender (A. Hall, 1988). In other words, implicitly or explicitly, what is fundamentally a “gender gap” is reduced to a “women’s thing”. This is something that not only happens in Sociology of Culture but also happened in Sports Sociology in the 1980’s (see Birrell, 1984; A. Hall, 1988, p. 331). While studies try to explain ‘the puzzle of women’s highbrow culture consumption’, the reversed question ‘why do men participate infrequently in highbrow culture?’ is just as relevant from a gender perspective that focuses on social ideas about masculinity and femininity. It is important to know what kind of mechanisms are at play when it comes to men’s cultural participation and how these processes are different for men and women. Acknowledging that gender differences in cultural tastes concern both women and men will allow for a more nuanced understanding of the gendered processes at play. Moreover, when considering men’s role in the gender gap in cultural tastes, it is particularly relevant to study cultural activities that men participate in more often. In this dissertation, I pay attention to ‘sport event attendance’, which is a male-dominated
activity that is an important means to produce a masculine identity (Dufur, 1999; Lorber, 1994, p. 43; Pope, 2017).

2.2.2  The gender role socialization perspective: its merits and its problems
Many scholars in Sociology of Culture agree that there are society-wide cultural norms that define arts participation as belonging to the feminine sphere, which leads to gender-specific early socialization in the arts (Christin, 2012; Tepper, 2000). Most of these studies –implicitly or explicitly– apply a gender role socialization perspective (sometimes also referred to as sex-role socialization approach)3 to gender differences. This perspective, that was developed in the 1960’s and 1970’s has fundamentally changed the field of Gender Studies, even to the extent that the field itself was initially named ‘Sociology of Sex Roles’ (Chafetz, 2006). The large merit of the gender role socialization perspective was that it did no longer treat differences between men and women as biological, but saw them as inherently social. The idea that differences between men and women originate in early childhood socialization in typically masculine or feminine roles (such as nurturing, caring roles for women versus male leadership), was dominant for several decades and has influenced the view on gender of many scholars, including Pierre Bourdieu (1984, 2001; see also Silva, 2005). However, despite the merits, there are several weak points in the approach. As a consequence, a lot of research on gender and cultural tastes that uncritically accepts this perspective, is vulnerable to the critiques on the gender role socialization theory formulated by feminist scholars in the 1980’s-1990’s (A. Hall, 1988; Lopata & Thorne, 1978; Risman & Davis, 2013; Stacey & Thorne, 1985).

2.2.2.1 The theoretical roots of the gender role socialization perspective
The gender role socialization perspective has its roots in the nature-nurture debate (Haig, 2004; Risman & Davis, 2013). While the development of masculine and feminine identities and roles was traditionally linked to natural, biological differences between men and women, in the 1950’s scholars such as John Money (1955; 1957) and Robert Stoller (1964) innovatively argued that these differences are also a result of ‘nurture’ and are related to social factors. As part of his research on people born with intersex conditions, Money used the term ‘gender role’ to refer to behavioral differences between men and women that are socialized. He argued that gender is not about being male or female, but about being masculine or feminine. People would be treated differently depending on whether they have a masculine or feminine gender. Due to
this gender-specific socialization that starts from birth, people will begin to identify themselves as a boy/man or a girl/woman.

According to the gender role socialization perspective, socialization makes boys and girls ready to take on the roles that are expected from them as a boy/man or a girl/woman (Blakemore, Berenbaum, & Liben, 2009; Risman & Davis, 2013). Girls are socialized to be feminine, which means they are caring, empathic, sensitive, obedient and altruistic, to be prepared for the role of homemaker and wife (Bem, 1974; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975). Boys are socialized to be masculine, which refers to traits such as competitiveness, ambition, independence, assertiveness, leadership etc., which would serve them well later, in the workplace. In other words, feminine personality traits are communal or expressive characteristics, masculine traits are instrumental or agentic characteristics (Blakemore et al., 2009). These feminine and masculine personality traits are considered to be central to a person’s gender identification.

Theoretically, socialization is perceived to lead to gender development in different ways. Social learning theory (later: social cognitive theory) was initially developed by psychologist Bandura and his colleagues (1977; 1963), who focus on imitation and modeling (Blakemore et al., 2009). Children learn through observation and model the behavior of people of their own sex who they identify with, especially their mother for girls and their father for boys. Parents reinforce gender-typical behavior, sometimes even via explicit teaching of cultural gender-related rules. Others argue that children develop cognitive gender schemas that help them to process information and to choose gender-stereotypical behaviors (Blakemore et al., 2009; Martin & Halverson Jr, 1981). Sandra Bem’s gender schema theory combines both ideas (Bem, 1981, 1983). She argues that children learn and see that gender is an important stratification mechanism and as a consequence it is central to children’s cognitive schemas. Children become ‘cultural natives’ as social ideals of masculinity and femininity become part of the cognitive schemas that constitute their gender identity (Bem, 1993, p. 139).

Two things are clear from this short overview. First, gender role socialization perspectives have their roots in social psychology and are strongly linked to people’s identity.
and personality characteristics. As a consequence, gender role socialization perspectives tend to treat gender primarily as an individual characteristic, and only to a lesser extent an aspect of social relations or the social structure. Second, the research on gendered socialization of cultural tastes in the family reviewed earlier applies the ideas about gender roles, feminine and masculine traits and social learning of gendered behavior that are central to the gender role socialization perspective.

2.2.2.2 The critiques on the gender role socialization perspective
Many of the critiques on the gender role socialization perspective are related to the functionalist, Parsonian roots of the concept ‘sex role’ or ‘gender role’; this is an issue that many studies using a gender role socialization approach are not fully aware of (A. Hall, 1988; Stacey & Thorne, 1985). As a consequence of the functionalist origin of the concept, it is taken for granted that women’s role revolves around the institution of the family and that complementary male and female roles serve to ensure social maintenance and reproduction. Thus, the concept makes it easy to explain continuity and stability, but it is more difficult to explain social change, not in the least because the perspective stimulates an ahistorical and a-contextual view on gender differences that overlooks privilege- and power-dimensions to gender inequality (A. Hall, 1988; Stacey & Thorne, 1985). As Ann Hall (1988, p. 335) puts it: “functionalist conceptions of gender fail to recognize that femininity and masculinity are socially constructed and historically specific”. Overall, there are three problems with the gender role socialization approach that need to be addressed to provide a richer understanding of the social processes behind the gender gap in cultural tastes (Carter, 2014; Connell, 1985; Ferree, 1990; A. Hall, 1988; Hicks, 2008; Lopata & Thorne, 1978; Risman & Davis, 2013; Stacey & Thorne, 1985).

First, gender role socialization perspectives invoke a binary, naturalized and undifferentiated vision on gender (Carter, 2014; Ferree, 1990; Hicks, 2008). You are either a woman or a man. Women have a feminine gender identity which originates in a biologically female body and they have a feminine gender expression (e.g., they are caring, they like arts, … etc.). Men have a masculine identity which is rooted in a male body and they have a masculine gender expression (e.g., they are competitive, they like sports, … etc.). Thus, the groups of men and women are treated as monolithic blocks. As a result, many quantitative
studies analyze gender differences using a dichotomous variable “man/woman” in order to draw conclusions based on “average” women and men (Stacey & Thorne, 1985). However, there is a lot more variation in terms of identification and expression among men and women than this dualistic vision on gender is able to recognize. This means that there needs to be attention to gender fluidity (Thorne, 1997), which is “an umbrella term to describe possibilities for gender identity beyond the binary ‘man’ or ‘woman’” (Parker, 2016, p. 166). In other words, only when considering within-gender variation, we can move beyond a binary approach to gender differences in cultural taste.

Second, gender role socialization perspectives invoke a static vision on gender, gender norms and constraints for men and women. They presuppose a stable, unchangeable relation between gender and behavior. There is little attention to how the impact of gender on a person’s life differs across space, cultures, time and social contexts. This reveals an essentialist view on gender, which means that gender is treated as if it is a-contextual, ahistorical and exists outside the social and cultural discourses, practices and structures in which it actually has its roots (Jackson, 1998). However, we cannot assume that gender means the same thing and has the same consequences across societies and across time. The extent to which gender is associated with certain opportunities or constraints, with privilege and power and with stringent norms is context- and time-dependent. Another repercussion of the static vision on gender is that people appear to have little agency, as if there is no other way than conforming to gendered expectations. Gender norms are stringent, but there are always people who resist those norms. What happens when people do not follow traditional conceptions of masculinity and femininity? Understanding how men and women deal with gender-related pressures improves our understanding of how gender impacts on people’s lives.

Third, gender role perspectives overemphasize early childhood socialization in the family as the origin of gender differences. The effects of socialization later in life by other socializing agents and contexts, such as peers at school or colleagues at work, receive limited attention. Similarly, in Sociology of Childhood (James, 2009; Qvortrup, Corsaro, & Honig, 2009) and in Socialization Research (Maccoby, 2007), the traditional way of thinking about childhood and socialization is challenged. Rather than treating youngsters as passive receptors
of socialization by adults (parents and teachers) that are only interesting because they are ‘future adults’, these alternative child-centered perspectives recognize youngsters’ unique experiences as worth studying in their own right. Moreover, paying attention to youngsters’ agency, the approach sees a crucial role for youngers in their own socialization and in the socialization of their peers.

While socialization is undeniably an important element in the reproduction of gender inequalities, gender role socialization perspectives do not pay attention to the variety of social processes reinforcing gender differences and the variation in the effect of gender, both within the groups of men and women (i.e., intrasexual variation), and across countries and time. The approach overemphasizes the individual aspects of gender and overlooks how it is inherently part of peoples’ social relations and how it is ingrained in the historically-specific norms and structure of social contexts. It entails many assumptions about what ‘gender’ means and has a superficial view on how gender shapes peoples’ choices, that were questioned in later gender theoretical work and that have to be abandoned to make progress in the understanding of gender differences in cultural tastes. By comparing different contexts, by looking at gender fluidity and by adopting an up-dated multidimensional vision on gender, we can obtain a much richer understanding of the various processes that connect gender to cultural tastes.

2.3 Beyond the gender role socialization perspective: alternative perspectives in gender theory

The fundamental critiques on the gender role socialization perspective had important repercussions for the literature on how gender affects peoples’ lives. New developments in social psychology have provided a more nuanced discussion of gender identity-related processes that depart from the idea that gender is essentially a personality trait (Risman & Davis, 2013). In sociology, a first group of scholars, inspired by the symbolic-interactionist tradition, has focused on how gender is constructed and reproduced through social interaction and discourse (see for instance Butler, 2004; Butler, 2006 [1999]; West & Zimmerman, 1987, 2009). A second group of scholars is indebted to the literature on structural gender inequality and gender as a social stratification mechanism. They study the structural opportunities and
constraints and normative beliefs that men and women face in certain institutional contexts, specifically the work-context and the family-context (Blumberg, 1984; Chafetz, 1984, 1990, 1991; Epstein, 1988). In other words, three strands of literature have developed that try to move beyond the gender role socialization perspective and they have focused on how gender shapes people’s lives through intrapersonal, interpersonal or contextual mechanisms.

2.3.1 The study of gender identity in Social Psychology
Social psychology has established a more nuanced study of gender identity, defined as the extent to which a person perceives and identifies the self to be masculine or feminine in relation to what is considered masculine or feminine in a specific context (Egan & Perry, 2001; Tobin et al., 2010; Vantieghem, Vermeersch, & Van Houtte, 2014; Wood & Eagly, 2009). The study of gender identity in social psychology still bears the traces of the gender role socialization perspective, but has clearly moved forward. Instead of reducing gender to socialized personality traits that appertain to gender roles, gender identity is perceived as one dimension of gender that is not restricted to personality traits (see Vantieghem et al., 2014). In this new perspective, gender identity is multidimensional, which means that it relates to physical, social, behavioral, attitudinal, personality-related, interest-related … etc. attributes. Moreover, gender identity is viewed as multifactorial which means that what are the most important elements for perceived gender identity differs between individuals. For instance, some girls may feel to be a typical girl because they have a nurturing personality even though they are not interested in fashion, while other girls may feel a typical girl exactly because they like to wear dresses and fashionable outfits. So, essentially, gender identity is about self-identification. It is a personal appraisal of the extent to which one belongs to the social categories of man or woman, considering the different elements that may constitute such an identification (Vantieghem et al., 2014; Wood & Eagly, 2009).

2.3.2 The construction of gender in social interaction
Using a symbolic-interactionist perspective, West and Zimmerman (1987, 2009) provided a ground-breaking new approach to gender inequality. Instead of seeing gender as a role or as personal identity-related, West and Zimmerman argue that people continuously produce, construct or simply ‘do gender’ through social interaction. In their work, West and Zimmerman (2002, p. 5) define gender as “the activity of managing situated conduct in light of normative
conceptions of attitudes and activities appropriate for one’s sex category”. So, gender is a social construct that is actively reproduced and legitimized in day-to-day social encounters. In other words, gender is not a natural, essentialist attribute of an individual, it does not reflect what someone is, but instead it is a routine social accomplishment. However – ironically –, when ‘doing gender’ appropriately, it seems as if it is an expression of a feminine or masculine ‘nature’. Gender is cross-situational which means that is not linked to specific situations, but instead impacts on all aspects of private and social life. Through the display of gendered behavior and the use of gendered symbols, people continuously justify their gender by showing that they conform to societal beliefs of how men and women should behave. This way, West and Zimmerman recognize the impact of elements outside of social interaction, such as gender ideologies prevailing in a certain context, but in their perspective the (re)production and legitimation of gender differences takes place at the interpersonal level via social relations.

West and Zimmerman pay attention to how behaviors and preferences are constrained and controlled during social interaction and argue that one is, in every situation, held accountable or responsible for performing gender: one is only considered a competent member of society when producing gender in an acceptable way and when not performing gender as expected an individual faces punishment (e.g., ostracism, bullying or even violence). Thus, the ‘doing gender’-perspective can explain reproduction of gender inequality. However, the approach also allows for individual agency. People can actively decide to go against societal gender expectations and ‘undo’ their gender.

Since their initial paper, the ‘doing gender’-perspective has been developed in two ways. The authors themselves have extended their perspective to other stratifying mechanisms, such as class and race (West & Fenstermaker, 1995). People do not only ‘do gender’, but ‘do difference’ in general. Deutsch (2007) has changed the focus from ‘doing gender’ to ‘un-doing gender’ (see also Butler, 2004). She argues that from a social change-perspective it is very interesting to study in which cases and contexts people stop displaying the gendered behavior that is expected from them to understand how social change can occur through social interactions. We indeed know that there is more and more social acceptance of gender nonconformity, especially for girls (Risman, 2009).
Similar to the ‘doing gender’-perspective, Judith Butler (2006 [1999]) sees gender as an act or display. Her research on ‘gender performativity’ describes gender as the performance through which (the illusion) of gender identity is constructed. Moreover, using a Foucauldian, post-structuralist perspective she argues that not only gender, but also sex (as a physical binary) is socially constructed, for instance by scholars and scientists (e.g., gynecologists). In that sense, gender and sex are quite similar, but scholars construct them as different. According to Butler, there is a ‘gender discourse’ via which a dichotomous vision on ‘biological’, natural sex, that is supposedly different from gender, is constructed via language. The disciplinary construction of gender via scientific discourse obscures the falsehood of the popular perception that gender is stable, has an essence, and supposes a close link between the binary biological sex and a dichotomous gender identity. While the practical applicability of Butler’s ideas in quantitative sociological research is limited in my opinion, her perspective is able to contextualize the critiques on the gender role socialization approach that is the theoretical backbone of much thinking on gender and taste in Sociology of Culture. Indeed, if scientists take popular binary conceptions of what is male/masculine and female/feminine as a starting point in their thinking on gender, they unintentionally legitimize and (re)construct these dichotomous visions on gender.

2.3.3 **Structural and normative gender inequality in the spheres of work and family**
A last group of structuralist gender theorists has focused on societal gender inequality and on how gender as a fundamental stratification mechanism is embedded in the very structure of societal organization. While scholars in this tradition recognize that gender differences exist at different levels, they argue that gender inequalities at the micro level, which is closer to individuals, are the consequence of macro-level, structural gender stratification (Chafetz, 2001; see also Lorber, 1994). In this strand of literature, gender stratification refers to “the degree to which men and women, who are otherwise social equals, are unequal in their access to the scarce and valued resources and opportunities of their society” (Chafetz, 2006, p. 10). Traditionally, macro-level gender theories stress the importance of gender inequality in the organization of paid labor in the economy and unpaid labor in the family (which refers to housework and care for children) for the maintenance and reproduction of patriarchal gender stratification systems (Blumberg, 1984, 1991; Chafetz, 1984, 1990, 1991).
The structural division of labor is the origin of inequality between men and women because men’s positions in important social institutions such as the economy and politics give them access to (power) resources. This produces and maintains gender inequality in various domains (e.g., health, education) at the micro (or individual) level and macro level of society. This reproduction is possible because the different levels of society are interrelated. Because the male dominance at the macro-level of social organization reduces or ‘discounts’ the power women may have at the micro-level in the household (see Blumberg, 1984), individual behavior, such as cultural choice, would be constrained by structural opportunities and access to resources.

Even though structural mechanisms are of primary interest, gender stratification at the macro-level of society has both a structural and a cultural component. On the one hand, macro-level gender inequality can affect individual behavior through unequal structural resources, such as money, power, time and other divergent opportunities and constraints men and women encounter (Hook, 2006, 2010). On the other hand, individuals are influenced by the gender ideologies or normative beliefs of what is normal, typical and acceptable behavior for men and women that are dominant in societal contexts. According to Chafetz (1990), men’s access to power resources at the macro level of social organization enables them to produce gender norms that attach higher value to men’s attributes, identify women’s proper place in society as being related to the domestic sphere and stimulate female passivity (see also Tepper, 2000). As a result, women will ‘voluntarily’ act according to these cultural definitions that are reinforced in the socialization process and, thus, gender inequality in the family and work place is maintained.

Central to the work of early structuralist feminists such as Chafetz and Blumberg is the idea that if you would provide men and women with the same structural opportunities and constraints, gender differences would vanish by themselves. However, we know now that this is not necessarily the case. Gender-stereotypical behavior persists much longer than women’s objective structural conditions (for instance, access to the labor market) would lead scholars to expect (e.g., Bettio, 2017). Cecilia Ridgeway (2011) refers to this as a ‘cultural lag’. She claims that “the central, underlying factor that allows inequality to persist is the way that changes in
cultural beliefs about gender lag changes in material arrangements based on gender” (Ridgeway, 2011, p. 159). In other words, gender norms often change at a slower pace than structural opportunities. Moreover, even when people personally have more progressive views on gender, they often continue to behave in gender-appropriate ways because they assume that gender stereotypes are widely accepted and that other people hold on to them, thus reinforcing gender norms. So, cultural beliefs about gender in social contexts appear to be more important than is recognized by some macro-level gender theorists. Attention has to be paid to both structural and normative components of societal gender stratification.

2.4 An integrative approach: gender as a social system

Barbara Risman and colleagues (2004, 2009, 2011; 2013) integrate these different traditions in gender theory that argue that gender differences originate either in gendered selves, in social interaction or in structural gender stratification. Thus, they provide a useful perspective to analyze how gender—or the social notion of masculinity and femininity—impacts on people’s lives, that can broaden the scientific understanding of gender differences in cultural tastes. In their work, Risman and colleagues argue that gender functions as a multidimensional social structure or system. Just like all societies have a political or an economic structure, societies have an overarching gender structure that can theoretically range from entirely patriarchal to entirely egalitarian (Risman, 2011). The use of the term ‘structure’ could give the false impression that this perspective gives primary attention to structural gender inequalities at the macro-level of social organization. Quite the contrary, the gender structure (or as I prefer: system) is constituted by three interrelated levels on which ‘gender’ impacts on peoples’ everyday life: the individual level, the interactional level and the institutional level (see Figure 2-1 representing Risman’s original schematic representation of the gender structure). In Risman’s (2004, p. 433) own words, “gender is deeply embedded as a basis for stratification not just in our personalities, our cultural rules, or institutions but in all these, and in complicated ways”.

The individual or intrapersonal dimension is related to identity-processes and the development of gendered selves as a result of socializing experiences and modeling in early
childhood and later in life. Via socialization, cultural beliefs about gender are internalized in people’s self-definitions and become part of the cognitive schema’s through which they perceive themselves and the world (cf. Bem, 1993). At the *interactional or interpersonal level* of analysis, it is important to pay attention to how gendered cultural expectations are expressed in day-to-day interaction and, thus, affect people’s behavior. These cultural expectations can range from very explicit forms of gender policing (e.g., bullying of peers that show a-typical gendered behavior) to subtle indicators of gender norms during social encounters that are so taken-for granted that they often go unnoticed (e.g., waiters giving the bill to the male customer, instead of the female costumer). Moreover, these expectations apply to interactions in known and unknown social contexts because gender-specific status expectations are shown to be cross-situational (see Ridgeway, 2011).

*Figure 2-1: Gender as structure. Source: Risman (1998, p. 29)*

At the *institutional and contextual level* of the gender system both normative and structural mechanisms are at play. Structural factors include unequal access to resources, such as money and material advantage, job opportunities, leisure time, education, …, and manifestations of gender inequality that are formally cemented via laws, regulations and organizational practices. Normative forces residing at this level relate to gender ideologies or cultural beliefs about gender, that are dominant in certain institutions or societies. While
structural and normative mechanisms refer to analytically different processes, they are in practice often closely intertwined and difficult to disentangle.

The three dimensions of gender as a social system are fundamentally interrelated. The gender ideologies and gender-related structural opportunities and constraints prevailing in certain social contexts (countries, schools, work places, …) will shape the social encounters people have within these institutions. Gendered expectations conveyed in social interaction can become socializing experiences and as a consequence they are internalized into peoples’ gender identities and self-perceptions. In other words, through social interaction, people can internalize gender norms and thus become gendered cultural natives (see Bem, 1983, p. 139). The other way around, gendered self-definitions (whether they are typical or not) and the identity work they entail, shape social encounters and ultimately reproduce or transform the norms prevailing in a social context.

Risman and colleagues are not the first to recognize that gender inequality can play out at the intrapersonal, interpersonal and contextual level (see for instance Lorber, 1994, p. 1; Ridgeway, 2011; West & Zimmerman, 1987, p. 126). However, a strength of their approach is that it does not attach higher importance to one dimension than to another. Their perspective does not identify one level of analysis as the principal dimension in which gender differences are rooted and that causes gender inequality on the other levels. Quite the contrary, the perspective pays attention to reciprocal relationships between the levels, instead of assuming causal directions between the dimensions. Thus, Risman and colleagues avoid the trap that some other gender theorists tend to fall in: that one should have ór, a structuralist view on gender differences focusing on contextual opportunities, constraints and ideologies ór, a symbolic interactionist perspective focusing on how gendered meanings are constructed in social interaction, ór an approach that reduces gender to gendered selves and self-perceptions. According to Risman’s perspective, all gendered mechanisms are at play at the same time, even though in certain contexts or times processes on one level could outweigh processes on another. Which mechanisms are the most important explanation for gender differences in a certain field of study is something that needs to be empirically evaluated, not just assumed. Another advantage of the perspective is that the analytical distinction between the levels on which
gender works allows us to “pay attention to how structure shapes individual choice and social interaction and how human agency creates, sustains, and modifies current structure” (Risman & Davis, 2013, p. 744). Thus, this perspective addresses both social reproduction and social change.

The perspective serves as a useful tool to explore how gender shapes cultural tastes in a more systematic way. The intrapersonal, interpersonal and contextual dimensions of the gender system offer a framework to identify potential processes behind the gender gap in cultural tastes. Essentially, this is what sociology is about: not only observing the inequalities in cultural tastes, but also reflecting on how cultural tastes become gendered and trying to uncover the social mechanisms at play. Thus, the approach provides a way to organize thinking on the gender gap in cultural tastes, without losing sight of the bigger picture, and to identify lacunae in current knowledge. Related to the intrapersonal level of the gender system, a first strand of existing research in Sociology of Culture concentrates on socialization into gender stereotypes in early childhood. So, what is missing is the study of gender identity-processes and cultural tastes on this individual level of analysis. The interpersonal level of analysis and how cultural taste differences between men and women may originate in interactional expectations is overlooked altogether (with the exception of recent studies by Lehman, 2017; Lehman & Dumais, 2017). Lastly, current empirical research on cultural tastes investigates the effects of participation in the labor market and in specific occupational sectors on the gender gap in single countries (e.g., Christin, 2012; Lizardo, 2006). These topics relate to the structural opportunities and constraints that result from the societal organization of paid labor, which is connected to the institutional, contextual or macro level of the gender system. Regarding this contextual dimension, we need to know more about how gender affects cultural taste across contexts, in particular across time and space as highlighted earlier in the review of the critiques on the gender role socialization perspective. Focusing on cross-contextual variation allows to assess the effect of societal gender equality, which is related to structural opportunities and constraints (also in other domains than the work sphere) and to normative beliefs and gender ideologies.
2.5 Applying an integrated gender theoretical perspective to the study of gender differences in cultural tastes: theoretical and empirical contribution of the dissertation

In this PhD thesis, I want to provide an alternative to the undifferentiated view on gender differences in cultural tastes in Sociology of Culture. Thus, I address the problematic assumptions about gender as a construct that are currently made in research. Instead of the common focus on highbrow cultural tastes, I draw attention to the feminine or masculine connotation of cultural practices in the domains of Arts and Sports. In particular, I focus on arts consumption and preferences, which relate to feminine-typed activities, and on passive sports consumption (or sport event attendance and spectatorship) and related preferences, which has masculine connotations. In this dissertation, I complement the one-sided perspective that perceives cultural taste patterns primarily in ‘cultural capital’- and ‘class’-related terms with an approach that focuses on how cultural taste differences between men and women are connected to ‘gender’, referring to the social notions of masculinity and femininity and the opportunities and constraints associated with one’s sex category. This way, I recognize gender as a fundamental stratification mechanism in our society that is more than a ‘women’s issue’ and that cannot be reduced to the traditional dichotomy between men and women. My approach is visualized in the schematic (and thus, simplified) overview shown in Figure 2-2.

To obtain a broader understanding of how gender shapes cultural tastes, I examine how differences in cultural tastes between men and women are connected to a variety of gendered mechanisms at the intrapersonal, interpersonal and contextual level of the gender system. I argue that gender can shape cultural tastes via (1) gender identity-related processes at the intrapersonal level, (2) interactional gendered expectations that are part of the interpersonal dimension and (3) normative gender ideologies and structural opportunities and constraints residing at the contextual, institutional level of social organization.
With this multidimensional approach to gender, I address some of the limitations of the gender role socialization perspective, that apply to traditional perspectives on gender and taste in Sociology of Culture. Two important issues are that gender is treated as binary and static. Firstly, as a response to research that studies the sex categories ‘men’ and ‘women’ as dichotomous, monolithic blocks, I pay attention to within-gender variation, which refers to variation within the groups of men and women. This focus on gender fluidity lays bare how (young) men’s and women’s cultural taste patterns are intertwined with identity processes. Secondly, the gender role socialization perspective endorses an a-contextual vision on gender, as if the effect of gender on people’s lives and behaviors is invariable across cultures and time. Therefore, it is important to study how men’s and women’s cultural tastes differ across national contexts and across generations. It is exactly when paying attention to within-gender and cross-contextual variation that we can uncover the multidimensional processes through which gender shapes men’s and women’s cultural tastes. Next, I show how these theoretical contributions were translated into the research questions addressed in Chapters 4-8.

In the first two empirical chapters, I study Flemish adolescents’ cultural tastes, more specifically their interest in arts-, music- and literature-related activities (Chapter 4) and in sport
spectatorship (Chapter 5). In these chapters, I examine how differences in cultural taste between young men and young women (and within these groups) relate to variation in youngsters’ gender identification and experienced pressures for gender conformity. In the study on adolescent’s interest in sport spectatorship, I also focus on adolescents’ gender role attitudes and how these affect gender differences in preference.

The schematic overview provided in Figure 2-3 and Figure 2-4 visualizes that Chapters 4 and 5 examine processes operating on different levels of the gender system. At the intrapersonal level of analysis, I focus on self-perceived gender typicality, i.e., whether male and female students perceive themselves as typically masculine or feminine. By acknowledging that students may define themselves as more or less typical for their gender, I recognize gender as a fluid, potentially shifting category and I consider within-gender variability. This part of my research is rooted in the multidimensional and multifactorial views on gender identity that are increasingly popular in Social Psychology.

At the interpersonal level, I pay attention to normative pressures, expressing gendered expectations, that originate in social interaction. These pressures for gender-conforming behavior highlight West and Zimmerman’s idea (1987) that people are held accountable for ‘doing gender’ as societally expected. I allow for youngsters’ agency in the socialization process as these gender conformity pressures can relate to already internalized pressures, leading to self-socialization, as well as pressures from peers. Thus, I touch upon a third limitation of the gender role socialization perspective which is the overemphasis of early childhood socialization by parents. Acknowledging youngsters’ role in gender socialization avoids seeing young people as passive receptors of socialization and recognizes their agency, in line with current developments in the Sociology of Childhood (James, 2009; Messner & Musto, 2014; Qvortrup et al., 2009) and in Socialization Research (Maccoby, 2007). Lastly, in the study on interest in sport spectatorship, I also examine the effect of gender role attitudes (sometimes also referred to as gender ideology) on male and female adolescents’ cultural tastes. This is interesting because gender norms and ideologies that prevail in social contexts and institutions can affect people’s behavior when they become part of an individual’s gender
ideology (see Risman & Davis, 2013). I have placed gender role attitudes on the contextual dimension to highlight the inherently contextual nature of peoples’ gender belief systems.

*Figure 2-3: Schematic visualization of the processes studied in Chapter 4*

In the last three empirical chapters, I contribute to current literature by evaluating how gender differences in cultural tastes vary across country-contexts and across generations. Thus, this dissertation addresses the important critique on gender role socialization perspectives that they promote an a-contextual vision on gender. I investigate how gender differences in cultural tastes are influenced by structural and normative forces at the contextual dimension of the gender structure. Thus, the perspective in these empirical chapters is partially indebted to the macro-
level theories focusing on gender inequality and gender as a stratification mechanism reviewed earlier.

*Figure 2-5: Schematic visualization of the processes studied in Chapter 6*
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Chapter 6 focuses on how variation in men’s and women’s theatre attendance, ballet, dance performance and opera attendance, and museum and art gallery visits across European Union countries relates to societal gender equality in the organization of work and care for the family (see Figure 2-5). Chapter 7 shows how cross-national variation in the gender gap in sport event attendance is associated with societal gender equality (see Figure 2-6). In the last empirical chapter and using Dutch data, I examine generational trends in men’s and women’s professional theatre attendance, ballet attendance, museum visits, art gallery visits and football match attendance between 1983 and 2007 (see Figure 2-7). This chapter analyzes to what extent differences in men’s and women’s cultural taste vary across birth cohorts, who were socialized differently. While cohort is not a gender-related measure in itself, it reflects the different cultural beliefs, norms and opportunities that people born in different generations encountered when growing up, as explained in detail in Chapter 8. Thus, this chapter gives more insight in how cultural taste differences between men and women vary across time and offers a reflection.
on how generational trends in cultural consumption bear the traces of the changing structural position of women in society and especially of the transforming gender beliefs.

*Figure 2-6: Schematic visualization of the processes studied in Chapter 7*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Intrapersonal</th>
<th>Interpersonal</th>
<th>Contextual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gendered processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Variation across EU countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Societal gender equality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2-7: Schematic visualization of the processes studied in Chapter 8*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Intrapersonal</th>
<th>Interpersonal</th>
<th>Contextual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gendered processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Variation across Dutch generations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(– differential structural opportunities and gender ideology)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Professional theatre attendance
- Ballet attendance
- Museum visits
- Art gallery visits
- Paid football match attendance
2.6 Notes

1 Lizardo’s finding that the gender gap is almost only present among individuals who are active in the labor force could be seen as an exception, but his finding is generally not reproduced in other studies. Also in the studies presented in this dissertation, I found that there is a ‘general’ gender gap in cultural consumption, contrary to what Lizardo (2006, p. 18) finds.

2 This distinction between the private and the public sphere is also manifest in Bourdieu’s work on gender in the Algerian society.

3 Actually, ‘sex role’ is an oxymoron (i.e., contradictory terms appearing in conjunction) as ‘role’ is per definition social and ‘sex’ is per definition biological. The use of the term ‘sex role’ dates back from before the beginning of the 1980’s when a universal definition of the concepts sex and gender still had to be agreed upon by gender theorists (Haig, 2004).

4 While Risman herself talks about gender as a social structure, I find the word ‘structure’ confusing as it can easily be confounded with the third, ‘institutional’, contextual level on which gender affects people. Moreover, it gives the false impression that it is a perspective that gives primary attention to structural gender inequalities. Therefore, I refer to Risman’s thinking as gender as a multilevel system following England (2010, p. 162) or frame following Ridgeway (2009, 2011).
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3 Methods

3.1 Chapters 4 and 5 on Flemish adolescents in the first year of secondary education, project ‘Teaching in the bed of Procrustes’ (2012-2013)

3.1.1 Data set and data collection procedure
The data used in Chapters 4 and 5 on adolescents’ cultural interests were collected as part of the project ‘Teaching in the bed of Procrustes’. This project was financed by the Agency for Innovation by Science and Technology (IWT) and focused on gender differences in education. The project examines mechanisms such as gender identity, pressure for gender conformity, gender role attitudes, homonegativity, etc. which are known to affect youngsters’ gender-typed behavior in the school context (Leaper, Farkas, & Brown, 2012; Leaper & Van, 2008; Martino, 1999; Pascoe, 2007; Smith & Leaper, 2005). Measures of various leisure interests and various forms of leisure participation were included to get a better understanding of who these youngsters were and what they liked to do. So, while the aim of the data collection was not to look into gender differences in cultural tastes, the Procrustes-data was perfectly suitable to address this topic. The fact that the research project is embedded in the field of Sociology of Education actually turned out to be an advantage. While this field of research is closely related to literature on cultural tastes and capital, it has a more developed knowledge of gender-related processes and is more aware of novel perspectives in the study of gender and gender identity. So, the data allowed for a very nuanced, up-to-date study of gender differences in cultural taste through a gendered lens.

The data set provides information on Flemish youngsters in the first year of secondary education (7th grade in the American educational system), which means that they are about 12 years old. Early adolescence is an interesting life phase to study, because gender is very salient at this age as a consequence of biological maturing processes and gender differences tend to intensify in this stage of life (Galambos, Almeida, & Petersen, 1990; Hill & Lynch, 1983). For instance, we know that gender differences in interest in sport become larger in adolescence (Colley, Griffiths, Hugh, Landers, & Jaggli, 1996). Moreover, research indicates that in adolescence arts-related and sport-related leisure interests and participation can give rise to
gender-related bullying (Lehman, 2017; Lehman & Dumais, 2017; Pascoe, 2007). So, leisure is thoroughly gendered in adolescence. Furthermore, these pupils are old enough to expect that leisure interests formed in this life stage will be related to leisure preferences in adult life, even though there is inevitably dropout in participation (Elsley & McMellon, 2010; Nagel & Ganzeboom, 2002; Nagel & Verboord, 2012; Perkins, Jacobs, Barber, & Eccles, 2004; Scheerder et al., 2006; Slater & Tiggemann, 2010; Vanreusel et al., 1997).

As part of the Procrustes-project, data on over 5000 Flemish secondary school students were collected in the first semester of the academic year 2012-2013 (see also Halimi, Consuegra, Struyven, & Engels, 2018; Huyge, Van Maele, & Van Houtte, 2015; Van Maele et al., 2015; Vantieghem, 2015, pp. 63-73; Vantieghem & Van Houtte, 2015, 2018; Vantieghem, Vermeersch, & Van Houtte, 2014). A waiver of parental consent and the use of child assent were approved by the school and the Belgian Commission for the Protection of Privacy, based in the minimal risk and confidential nature of the study (Vantieghem, 2015, p. 66). Schools were selected from the entire population of schools that offer 7th grade education (based on information from the Flemish department of education), using a disproportionally stratified sampling method. Three parameters, which are school denomination (public vs. Catholic), geographical region (provinces and Brussels) and location (urban vs. rural), were used to outline subpopulations in which random samples were drawn. Thus, the Flemish educational context is adequately represented. Within these criteria, three random samples were drawn. This way, a school in the first sample could be replaced by a matched school in the second sample in case of refusal for participation. Because Flemish schools are generally inundated with research requests, the response rate of about 47% was fairly low (59 participating schools out of 124 contacted schools). The representativeness of the sample was assessed by comparing the sample to the Flemish school population, based on the statistical yearbook 2012-2013 from the Educational Department of the Flemish government. There are only small differences between the sample and the school population it represents in terms of the percentage of students that are on track, the percentage of students who do not speak Dutch at home and the percentage of non-Belgian students, for instance. There is a slight overrepresentation of boys in the sample, which is the consequence of the stepwise nature of the sample in which schools were selected.
instead of pupils. In Flanders, technical and vocational tracks, which generally attract more boys than girls, can often only be followed in separate schools that do not offer academic tracks. Consequently, some schools in the sample were in reality “boys’ schools”, which could explain the small overrepresentation of boys in the overall sample. However, this overrepresentation is small and the used multilevel modeling techniques separate individual-level from school-level variance, so there is no reason to expect systematic biases in the results or that the sample would not be representative for the Flemish school population.

All pupils in the first year of secondary education in the participating schools were asked to complete the paper-and-pencil questionnaire, administered by a researcher, in their classrooms in the time span of one course (50 minutes). A researcher was present the entire time to explain the purpose and procedure of the survey and to answer questions. Students were assured that the survey was confidential: the unique code on the questionnaire was necessary to link their answers to a follow-up survey, but the datasets for analysis contain only anonymous data. In total, 6,380 students (partially) filled out the questionnaire. However, students with missing data on one of the variables were excluded. For the scales used in the analysis, having missing answers on more than 25% of the constituent items resulted in a missing on the scale. About 53% of the respondents were male adolescents. About one fifth come from working class families and about 22% have an upper class background.

3.1.2 Studied cultural practices
In chapter 4, we study interest in highbrow culture. We employ a mean scale based on interests in a variety of high-status, arts-, music- and literature-related cultural activities, which were measured using a 4-point scale ranging from 0 (not interested) to 3 (very interested). These arts-related activities are: making music, doing drama/word courses, painting/drawing/clay modelling, attending a concert, attending a play or dance performance, visiting a library, visiting an (art) museum, and reading. The scale has high internal consistency (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.77$). Higher scores on this scale mean higher interest in highbrow cultural activities. Boys tend to score lower on the scale than girls. Chapter 5 focuses on adolescents’ interest in watching sports as a spectator or fan. On average, boys report higher interest in the activity than
More detailed information on the measurement of highbrow cultural interest and of interest in sport spectatorship can be found in—respectively—Chapters 4 and 5.

Important to highlight is that we use an indicator of cultural interest instead of actual cultural participation. According to Peterson (2005, p. 265), “respondents’ self-reports of their preferences [compared to actual cultural participation] seem a more direct measure of the way they use art in shaping identity and symbolically announcing their place in the world” (Peterson 2005, p. 265). Because identity processes are central in our approach, studying cultural taste preferences as measured by interests makes sense. Moreover, arts- and sport-related consumption among early adolescents is frequently mediated by parents or school and compulsory, and thus not always an expression of individual preference (Melnick & Wann, 2011; Siongers & Lievens, 2014; Tinson, Sinclair, & Kolyperas, 2017, p. 67; van Hek & Kraaykamp, 2015). This is especially the case for pupils in the first grade of secondary education, such as the students studied in this dissertation (Siongers & Lievens, 2014, p. 67).

3.1.3 The measurement of adolescents’ gender identity, experienced interactional pressures and gender ideology

Three gender-related measures give insight into how gender, referring to socially constructed ideas of masculinity and femininity, affects cultural tastes on different levels. Gender typicality is used to focus on gender identity-related processes on the individual, intrapersonal level of the gender system. Pressure for gender-conforming behavior relates to interactional gendered expectations on the interpersonal level of the gender system. Gender ideology or gender role attitudes refer to the extent to which gender norms or cultural beliefs about gender prevailing in an individual’s social context (related to the contextual level of analysis) are internalized in the self and in peoples’ gender schemas via socialization processes.

3.1.3.1 Gender typicality

Gender typicality refers to the extent to which a boy or a girl perceives him/herself to be typical for his/her gender. The measure is part of Egan and Perry’s (2001) Self-Perception Profile and is often used in research on children’s and adolescents’ gender identity (e.g., Leaper & Van, 2008; Perry & Pauletti, 2011; Smith & Leaper, 2005; Vantieghem & Van Houtte, 2018; Vantieghem et al., 2014). The measure is a self-perception scale which means that respondents can indicate the extent to which they identify themselves as typically male or female, both in
general as in relation to important dimensions of gender identification. So, this measurement is in line with the increasingly dominant idea in research on gender identity that the factors that are most important for gendered selves differ from person to person and are not restricted to personality traits (Perry & Pauletti, 2011; Tobin et al., 2010).

The translation of the English original scale to Dutch and the Likert-type response formats were based on the study by Bos and Sandfort (2010). The measure is a mean scale based on six items using a 5-point Likert response format ranging from completely disagree (0) to completely agree (4) and has different versions for boys and girls. Sample items are: “I feel that I am a good example of a typical boy/girl”, “I feel that the things I am good at are similar to those of most boys/girls”, and “I feel that my personality is similar to that of most boys/girls” with each designation matching the gender of the respondent. An overview of the Dutch questions is found in Appendix on pages 278-279. The higher a pupil scores on the measure, the stronger his/her feeling of gender typicality. On average, male adolescents scored higher on self-perceived gender typicality than girls.

3.1.3.2 Gender conformity pressure
Pressure for gender conformity is measured using a subscale of Egan and Perry’s (2001) Self-Perception Profile. The scale indicates to what extent youngsters experience pressure from peers and from themselves to show gender-conforming behavior, which is behavior that is stereotypically expected from boys and girls. The translation of the English original scale to Dutch and the 4-point Likert-type response formats, ranging from completely disagree (0) to completely agree (4), were based on the study by Bos and Sandfort (2010). The scale has a version for girls and a version for boys, matching items to the respondent’s gender. The variable contains 4 items on pressure from peers, such as “The boys (girls) I know would be upset if I wanted to learn an activity that only girls (boys) usually do” or “My friends would be upset if I wanted to play with [opposite gender’s] toys”. The indicator also contains 4 items on internalized pressure, such as “I think it is important to act just like other girls/boys” or “I get mad when somebody says I behave like a [opposite gender]”. An overview of the Dutch questions is found in Appendix on pages 280-281.
The measure is a mean scale and has a good internal consistency ($\alpha = .82$), with all items loading highly on the first dimension of an oblique factor analysis, which indicates that the questions measuring internalized pressure and measuring pressure from peers do not have a different underlying construct. This overlap is not surprising because, like pressure from peers, pressure from oneself originates in social interaction as it relates to internalized expectations. On average, boys reported more experienced pressure for gender conformity than girls.

3.1.3.3 Gender ideology or gender role attitudes
In chapter 5 on interest in sport spectatorship, I also look into the gender-specific effects of gender role attitudes (sometimes also referred to as gender ideology in the literature). Gender role attitudes relate to the extent to which pupils hold traditional or egalitarian beliefs about the appropriate (often caring and work) roles for men and women (Cotter, Hermsen, & Vanneman, 2011; Halimi et al., 2018). Gender role attitudes were measured using an adapted version of the traditional ideology scale by Vermeersch and colleagues (2010), which is itself adapted from the indicator by King and King (1997). The scale consists of 15 items and has 5-point Likert-style answering formats, ranging from 0, completely disagree to 4, completely agree.

The scale focuses on both stereotypically male roles related to autonomy, status, toughness and anti-femininity, and female roles associated with attractiveness and domestic, care-related tasks (see Halimi et al., 2018; Huyge et al., 2015). Sample items are “There is something wrong with girls who talk dirty”, “A man should avoid being dependent on others”, and “Women should first consider their children, and only then their career”. An overview of the Dutch questions is found in Appendix on page 282. The indicator is used as a mean scale with good internal consistency ($\alpha = .80$). The measure used in Chapter 5 ranges from egalitarian attitudes (low scores) to traditional gender role attitudes (high scores)$^2$. On average, male adolescents have more traditional attitudes than female adolescents.

3.2 Chapters 6 and 7: cross-national comparisons based on Eurobarometer surveys 67.1 (2007) and 79.2 (2013), European Commission

3.2.1 Data sets and data collection procedure
For the cross-national comparative studies in this dissertation that are presented in chapters 6 and 7, I used Eurobarometer surveys that contain comparable information on cultural taste
across EU countries. For the study on highbrow cultural participation in chapter 6, I used the Eurobarometer 79.2 survey, which was collected in 2013 (European Commission, 2013). For the study on sport event attendance in chapter 7, I used the Eurobarometer 67.1 survey which was collected in 2007 (European Commission, 2007). Eurobarometer data are publicly available online via GESIS, the Leibniz Institute for the social sciences.

Even though cross-national comparative research on cultural tastes is relatively scarce, there are other studies who use Eurobarometer data as well (Gerhards, Hans, & Mutz, 2013; Lizardo & Skiles, 2009; Szlendak & Karwacki, 2012; van Hek & Kraaykamp, 2013; Veal, 2016). This is not surprising as there are not that many alternatives if you want to use recent, publicly available data that covers a variety of (highbrow) cultural activities. Other cross-national comparative datasets, such as the ISSP 2007 on ‘leisure time and sports’ and the World Value Surveys are older and/or have lumped together different forms of cultural participation, which impedes differentiation between different cultural practices. The advantage of Eurobarometer surveys over other international surveys is also that data collection procedures across the countries are generally more similar because the Eurobarometer surveys are ordered by the European Union. Nevertheless, there is a clear need for recent, high-quality, internationally comparative data on cultural participation (O’Hagan, 2016).

The Eurobarometer surveys are conducted in all member states of the European Union (27 countries in the Eurobarometer 67.1 (2007) and 28 countries in the Eurobarometer 79.2(2013)). These countries are Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia (only in EB 79.2), Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, The Netherlands and the United Kingdom. GESIS, the Leibniz Institute for the social sciences, who is responsible for archiving the Eurobarometer data reports the following sampling procedures (GESIS, 2018): “For each survey new and independent samples are drawn. [...] The basic sampling design in all member states is a multi-stage, random (probability) one. The sampling is based on a random selection of sampling points after stratification by the distribution of the national, resident population in terms of metropolitan, urban and rural areas, i.e., proportional to the population size (for a total coverage of the
country) and to the population density. These primary sampling units (PSU) are selected from each of the administrative regions in every country [...] (NUTS). [...] In the second stage, a cluster of addresses is selected from each sampled PSU. Addresses are chosen systematically using standard random route procedures, beginning with an initial address selected at random. [...] In each household, a respondent [aged 18 or over] is selected by a random procedure, such as the first birthday method. Up to two recalls are made to obtain an interview with the selected respondent. No more than one interview is conducted in each household.” Data of about 1000 respondents per country are collected, except for Germany, Cyprus, Luxembourg and Malta. In Germany about 1500 respondents were surveyed, in the three other, smaller countries approximately 500 respondents were interviewed. In total, information on 26,746 respondents was collected in Eurobarometer 67.1. Eurobarometer 79.2 contains data on 27,563 respondents. As explained in the empirical chapters, the sample size was reduced because I omitted students and respondents younger than 25 and respondents with missing values. The research is coordinated and carried out by TNS opinion.

With regard to the fieldwork procedures, the GESIS (2018) reports: “In all Eurobarometer member countries, fieldwork is conducted on the basis of detailed and uniform instructions. Equivalent basic bilingual questionnaires (English/French) are developed and translated into the other relevant languages. Back-translation control is applied. TNS Opinion describes the translation as a multistage process, starting from the master questionnaire finalized by TNS and translated by the local partner institutes. Proof reading and back-translation - after interim adaptation through the institutes - is performed by independent translators, followed by central checks, local changes and final approvement through TNS.” Interviews were conducted computer-assisted and face-to-face in the respondents’ homes (CAPI).

3.2.2 Studied cultural practices
Chapter 6 focusses on participation in three types of highbrow, arts-related cultural activities: (1) theatre, (2) ballet, dance performance and opera, (3) museum and art gallery. In chapter 7, attention is paid to sport event attendance. Unfortunately, in the Eurobarometer survey there is no information on the kind of sport event that was attended (which sport, whether it was at a
professional or an amateur level or whether the players were men or women). So, this variable indicates general, overall attendance of sport events of all kinds of sports, which is a limitation discussed later in this dissertation. Respondents indicated how many times in the last 12 months they had participated in these activities. Possible answers were ‘not in the last 12 months’, ‘1–2 times’, ‘3–5 times’ and ‘more than 5 times’. Most respondents had not participated or had only participated irregularly in the three highbrow activities.

3.2.3 The measurement of societal gender equality
In Chapters 6 and 7, I study the contextual dimension of the gender system. I use a cross-national comparative perspective to evaluate to what extent macro-level gender equality explains cross-national variation in the gender gap in cultural tastes. As an indicator for societal gender equality, I decided to use the Gender Equality Index (GEI) that was commissioned by the European Commission and developed by the European Institute for Gender Equality, EIGE (2013). The measure captures important dimensions of gender equality in the European Union and is a composition of gender inequalities in the domains of work, money, knowledge, time, power and health.

More specifically, the work-related dimension of the GEI reflects (in)equality in terms of access to employment, segregation into female sectors (education, human health and social work) and quality of work (among others the flexibility of the working time). Gender (in)equality in terms of money is expressed by gender gaps in financial resources (earnings and income) and economic situation (risk of poverty and income distribution). The knowledge-dimension of structural gender equality refers to differential tertiary educational attainment, educational segregation of women into the female fields of education, health and welfare, and humanities and arts, and divergent possibilities for lifelong learning. The time-aspect of gender (in)equality relates to gender inequalities in time used for leisure activities and voluntary activities and gender gaps in the time devoted to child care and to domestic tasks (e.g., cooking) by men and women participating in the labor market. The health-dimension of the measure relates to gender (in)equalities in health status, health behavior and access to health care.

The GEI and each of its dimensions can theoretically range from ‘0’, total gender inequality to ‘100’, total gender equality. The domain of health is almost gender equal, while
time- and power-related inequalities are generally large (EIGE, 2013). Moreover, occupational and educational sectors remain segregated, clearly lowering EU countries’ scores on gender equality in these domains. In Chapter 6, I focus on gender equality in the domains of work and of time for care for the family. In chapter 7, I use the total GEI-score. For a description of EU countries’ scores on the (subdimensions of the) GEI, I refer to chapters 6 and 7 (see Table 6-1 on page 157 and Table 7-1 on page 190).

Of course, the Gender Equality Index (GEI) is not the only available indicator for societal gender equality; other measures include the Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM), the Gender Development Index (GDI), the Gender Inequality Index (GII), all three developed by the United Nations Development Programme, the Gender Parity Index (GPI) developed by UNESCO, and the Global Gender Gap Index (GGI) published by World Economic Forum. In contrast to the used Gender Equality Index, most other gender equality measures such as the ones mentioned above are developed to describe gender equality world-wide and as a consequence, they often lack discriminative power when studying European countries that are relatively gender equal. Indeed, as many of the traditional measures of gender equality are crude and focus on very visible inequalities in the domains of health, politics or economy, they do not fully capture the more subtle ways in which gender inequality still works in contexts that are – from a comparative perspective– fairly gender equal. A related issue is that many traditional measures are (fairly) unidimensional, even though it is increasingly accepted that gender inequality has several dimensions and is connected to different domains of public and private life (Permanyer, 2010; Plantenga, Remery, Figueiredo, & Smith, 2009). For instance, the GEM focusses only on inequality in the economy and politics; the GPI addresses in the first place educational inequalities. Another domain often included in measures of gender equality is (reproductive) health (e.g., the GII and the GGI). However, it is unlikely that in developed contexts health indicators such as maternal mortality ratios touch upon the relevant aspects of gender equality. So, we need a more refined measure that pays attention to the variety of domains on which gender equality works in order to capture gender inequality in a context that is relatively gender-equal. I deemed the Gender Equality Index (GEI) most suitable for the research questions addressed in chapters 6 and 7, because the measure is specially developed
for the European countries, excluding aspects of inequality that lack discriminative power in the European context (such as the maternal mortality ratio) and taking into account various dimensions of gender equality with meaningful differences between EU countries (Plantenga et al., 2009). Especially the time-(in)equalities that are included in this measure are of interest when studying the gendering of leisure time (see Chapter 6). Other indicators of macro-level gender stratification neglect this less visible dimension of inequality.

3.3 Chapter 8: generational trends using the Dutch AVO-survey (Aanvullend Voorzieningenengebruik Onderzoek), Sociaal-Cultureel Planbureau

3.3.1 Data set and data collection procedure
Chapter 8 focuses on generational trends in men’s and women’s cultural consumption in the Netherlands. As explained in Chapter 8, the Netherlands is an interesting case for the study of gendered generational trends in cultural taste because (cultural norms about) women’s societal position have changed a lot across generations (Braun & Scott, 2009; EIGE, 2013; Pott-Buter, 1993) and because research presented in chapters 6 and 7 indicates that gender differences in cultural taste are currently relatively small in the Netherlands (Lagaert & Roose, 2018, In press). I use the four-yearly Dutch AVO-surveys (‘Amenities and Social Services Utilization Survey’ or ‘Aanvullend Voorzieningenengebruik Onderzoek’) that were collected by The Netherlands Institute for Social Research and Statistics Netherlands (Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau (SCP) & Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (CBS)) in 1983, 1987, 1991, 1995, 1999, 2003 and 2007. The AVO-survey was actually first administered in 1979, but because most of the activities studied in chapter 8 were only included in the questionnaire from 1983 onwards, the data of 1979 was not included in the sample of the study. The AVO-survey offers information on the utilization of a large number of social and cultural services and amenities for a representative sample of Dutch households5, including all household members aged six and over6, and has been used in other studies as well (Nagel, 2002; Nagel & de Haan, 2003; van Eijck & Knulst, 2005).

The survey has a repeated cross-sectional design, which means that it is a cross-sectional survey that is repeated several times, or in other words, in each wave of the survey new respondents received a similar questionnaire. While the general aim was to keep the survey and
data collection similar across the waves of the survey, some changes were made over time (see the publication of Huysmans, Van den Broek, & De Haan, 2005, pp. 109-113, which was ordered by The Netherlands Institute for Social Research). Since 1995, a different agency has carried out the field work and it has applied measures to improve the response rate. However, additional analysis by Burhenne and van der Leest (1997) indicates that this would not have biased the results. In 2003, the response categories for some of the cultural participation variables (including the highbrow activities studied) were revised to create better consistency in the question formulation, but efforts were made to ensure comparability with earlier years (Huysmans et al., 2005, p. 109). I see no indication that the changes had large implications on the participation rates in the studied activities. Moreover, for the results in Chapter 8 to be biased, these changes would have to affect men and women (across generations) differently, which is not very likely. An overview of the question formulation across the waves is provided in Appendix on pages 283-291. AVO-data is available online for researchers via the web page of DANS (Data Archiving and Networked Services, 2018). More methodological information regarding the data collection is available online on the website of The Netherlands Institute for Social Research (Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau, 2018).

In the first waves, roughly 6000 households per wave were selected, which are about 11,500 respondents per wave. In 2007, households were randomly administered to one of the two versions of the questionnaire, one with the old question battery on cultural consumption and one with an adapted version. For reasons of comparability, we only used information on respondents that had received the same questions as in the previous waves. In the analyses, we use information on the respondents that are between 25-64 years old. At the age of 25, people are likely to have left the parental home and to have reached their highest level of education. Moreover, at this age, individuals’ cultural tastes are likely to be more or less solidified (even though cultural socialization later in life is of course possible). We decided to leave out people of 65 or older to avoid that health issues encountered in old age would bias the results and, thus, our understanding of changing cultural tastes across generations. Declining health and mobility are important impediments to out-door cultural participation (Agahi, Ahacic, & Parker, 2006; Reeves, 2016; Scherger, 2009; Scherger, Nazroo, & Higgs, 2011). An additional complicating
factor is that the detrimental effects of old age are closely related to a person’s birth cohort and
gender. Elderly women are more likely to report chronic illnesses and functional disabilities,
such as not being able to take the stairs or walk longer than a few minutes (Arber & Ginn, 1993;
Rueda & Artazcoz, 2009). Moreover, the healthy life expectancy of people over 60 has risen
considerably in the last decades of the 20th century, especially for women (Doblhammer &
Kytir, 2001). So, to avoid that the uncovered generational differences could actually reflect
health differences and gendered effects of old age instead of changing tastes, it is best to leave
the oldest age groups out of the analyses. Preliminary analyses on all respondents of 25 years
old and over confirmed this fundamental intertwining of cohort effects and old age. The
reported analyses are performed on 51,151 respondents; 25,526 (49.9%) are men. The oldest
respondents are born in 1919, the youngest respondents were born in 1982.

3.3.2 Studied cultural practices
The studied cultural practices in Chapter 8 are: theatre attendance of plays performed by
professional actors, ballet attendance (not of performances of own children), museum visits (of
national museums, including temporary exhibitions), art gallery visits and (paid) football match
attendance. Respondents indicated whether or not they had participated in the last 12 months
and how frequently they had participated. Respondents who reported that they had participated
at least once in the last 12 months in the arts-related activities could indicate whether they had
participated once, 2 to 3 times, 4 to 11 times, or once a month or more often. Respondents who
reported that they had attended a (paid) football match as a spectator (Dutch: ‘toeschouwer’) at
least once in the last 12 months could indicate whether they had participated less than once a
month, 1 to 3 times a month, or once a week or more often. As explained in the study, a binary
dependent variable distinguishing participation versus no participation is used.

3.4 Research strategy and statistical techniques
Throughout this dissertation, I have used a consistent research strategy. In order to obtain a
broader understanding of how gender affects cultural tastes, I have evaluated whether the
differences in cultural tastes between men and women vary along with several aspects of the
gender system, such as gender identity processes, societal gender equality, etc. In practice, I
have used interaction terms between ‘being a man or a woman’ and the gendered processes
under study to evaluate whether the size of the gender gap in cultural tastes depends on gendered mechanisms on the different levels of the gender structure.

3.4.1 **Multilevel modeling**

In all empirical chapters, I have used multilevel modeling techniques performed in MLwiN. Multilevel modelling allows to take into account the nested structure of the data used in all empirical chapters (Hox, 2010). In the Procrustes data set pupils are nested in schools, in the Eurobarometer surveys, respondents are nested in countries and in the AVO-survey respondents are nested in families. Moreover, as part of the used Hierarchical Age-, Period- and Cohort modeling technique individuals are also cross-classified in birth cohorts and in survey waves (i.e., they are at the same time nested in cohorts and survey waves, see chapter 8). As a consequence of the hierarchical structure of the data, observations are no longer independent from each other. This means that respondents living in the same country, pupils going to the same school and members of the same family will be more alike than respondents coming from different countries or families, or pupils in different schools. This is called autocorrelation. Using regular regression models for nested data would lead to an underestimation of standard errors. As a consequence, it would be too easy to reject the null hypotheses when doing analyses. Using multilevel modeling techniques can solve this issue.

In the first two empirical chapters using the Procrustes data, I did not use indicators on the higher level (schools), so in these instances I only used multilevel techniques to account for the clustering of the data in order to avoid that autocorrelation would bias the results. As can be seen in Table 4-2 and in Table 5-3, a first model, the null model, separates variance situated on the higher (school) level from variance situated at the individual (pupil) level. Next, I included gender, the controls and the central independent variables on the individual level in subsequent models. For the cross-national comparative analyses presented in Chapter 6 and 7, I also ran random slope models in which the effect of gender was allowed to vary across national contexts. Moreover, cross-level interactions were estimated, which allow to evaluate whether the macro-level indicators can explain cross-country variation in the gender gap. In empirical Chapter 8, the effects of generation on men’s and women’s cultural tastes are modeled using the Hierarchical Age-, Period- and Cohort technique (HAPC). This modeling technique is
introduced in the methods section of Chapter 8. In this chapter, interaction terms between gender and cohort were used to evaluate whether gender differences in cultural taste vary across generations.

3.4.2 Modeling cultural participation data
In this dissertation, I often use indicators of cultural participation as a dependent variable. So, in the empirical chapters, I often deal with categorical or count data. This is because measures of cultural consumption indicate whether respondents have participated in a certain activity or not and/or how frequently they have participated. In the analyses in which the dependent variable was non-metric, I was not able to use standard multilevel modeling techniques. Instead, I used logistic or Poisson multilevel modeling techniques to deal with the specific nature of participation data. Important to mention is that I have always tried to keep the reported analyses as simple as possible. This means, for instance, that I have preferred binary logistic multilevel models over multinomial logistic multilevel models or ordered logit models when the interpretation was similar and assumptions held. Multinomial logistic multilevel models allow to pay more attention to the frequency of participation than binomial models but have the disadvantage that the effect of gender has to be estimated for each category of the dependent variable (compared to a reference category) separately. As a consequence, you obtain multiple regression equations for each cultural practice studied. Moreover, multinomial models often lead to power issues because of the skewed distribution of the dependent variables when studying cultural tastes: frequent participation is generally rare and almost non-existent for some practices, in some countries, or in some cohorts, making it very difficult to fit the necessary models. Ordered logit models can also be used to predict an ordinal response variable, but these models imply the often problematic proportional odds assumption (or parallel slopes assumption) which means that the coefficients for each (category of the) independent variable must be consistent, or have parallel slopes, across all levels of the response (Hox, 2010, p. 143). Because the alternatives have their own disadvantages, and because my aim has always been to provide an analysis of cultural tastes that is comprehensible also for readers with limited statistical background, I have –in each chapter– chosen the most straight-forward technique as long as it did not affect the conclusions and was statistically correct. In case there was a (slight) difference between models, it was reported in a note.
A noteworthy characteristic of the used techniques suitable to predict a non-metric outcome is that level 1 variance is fixed, which explains why I do not report an individual level random component, but only a higher level random component in Table 6-3, Table 7-3 and Table 8-3. Moreover, because there is no random component on level 1, it is actually not possible to calculate the Variance Partitioning Coefficient (VPC) that is used in standard multilevel analysis to estimate the proportion of the variance that is situated at the higher level. However, there are some alternatives used in the literature. According to Snijders and Bosker (1999, pp. 224-229), the logistic distribution implies a fixed variance at the individual level of $\pi^2/3=3.29$ which can be used to calculate the proportion of variance at the higher level. Because there is no consensus on this topic and because it was not crucial for the studies, I have decided not to report this measure. Another typical attribute of the used models is that the likelihood test that is typically used to assess improvement of model fit is unreliable (Snijders & Bosker, 1999, p. 220). Wald tests are an often-used alternative but are also an approximation. However, the DIC diagnostics calculated in MCMC-estimations (see infra) combined with $\chi^2$-difference tests are reliable indicators for improvement of model fit. Wald tests and $\chi^2$-difference tests on DIC diagnostics were performed and the presented models in this dissertation showed improved model fit.

Apart from the analyses presented in Chapter 8, the presented models in this dissertation were estimated using 2nd order PQL-estimations as this estimation method produces better estimates than 1st order MQL estimations (Hox, 2010, p. 122). During the data analysis, the obtained models were compared to models based on Bayesian MCMC estimations. MCMC-methods are argued to produce better estimates of the coefficients than 2nd order PQL-estimations, especially when the number of observations on the higher level is limited (below 30) (Bryan & Jenkins, 2016). However, the checks indicated that the coefficients of the fixed effects produced by the 2nd order PQL estimations and the MCMC estimations were highly similar and lead to the same conclusions. The random components were generally somewhat underestimated in the 2nd order PQL estimations, but they remained large enough to permit further investigation. Because the comparison indicated that we can have confidence in the interpretations based on the 2nd order PQL estimations, these estimates were reported. An
exception is Chapter 8, where Hierarchical Age-, Period-, and Cohort models are used, which are cross-classified models that have to be estimated using MCMC-estimations.
3.5 Notes

1 One additional school dropped out later in the project.

2 In Chapter 4, where gender ideology is used as a control variable, the variable is reversed scored, which means that higher scores indicate that students have more egalitarian attitudes.

3 I could have used the ISSP 2007 for the study on sport event attendance which was collected in the same year as the Eurobarometer 67.1, but I preferred using data sets with the same range of countries and the same data collection strategy for the studies on highbrow participation and sport event attendance.

4 Analyses using the subdimensions of the Gender Equality Index indicated that the significant effect of the GEI on sport event attendance is not due to the GEI’s subcomponent measuring time-inequalities in leisure and voluntary activities. These analyses indicated that care-related time equality, the power-dimension and knowledge-related gender equality were the most important dimensions of gender equality in the explanation of cross-national variation in the gender gap in sport event attendance.

5 The sampling method was simple random sampling based on address for most of the waves and a two-stage sampling method (municipalities/addresses and stratification by municipality size) in 1991 and 2007.

6 The questionnaire has an adult and a child version. Data was collected using personal interviews and written questionnaires that were left behind for the other household members.
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Engendering culture: The relationship of gender identity and pressure for gender conformity with adolescents’ interests in the arts and literature

Chapter based on the article published as:


Research indicates that women are more interested in highbrow culture (i.e., the arts—art, music, and theatre—and literature) than men are. Current explanations for women’s higher involvement in highbrow cultural activities primarily focus on adults; overemphasize class-, work- and cultural capital-related explanations; and do not uncover the identity-related and interactional mechanisms behind the gendering of taste during socialization. In the present study, we use gender identity theory and a “doing gender” perspective to understand cultural taste differences between male and female adolescents. Using multilevel analyses on a random sample of 5,227 Flemish 7th graders (*M*<sub>age</sub> = 12.18) who completed a survey in their classrooms, we find that higher gender typicality (i.e., identification as a typical male or female) and higher pressure to conform to gender stereotypes are associated with much lower highbrow interests for young men, but are largely unrelated to women’s interests in arts-, music- and literature-related activities. Identity-related processes and interactional conformity pressures are important mechanisms reinforcing the gendering of cultural tastes. Implications for research on gender, class, and cultural capital, as well as potential ways to make schools safe environments for the expression of gender non-stereotypical cultural tastes, are discussed.
4.1 Introduction

Since Bourdieu’s (1984) seminal work, research has focused on inequalities in highbrow cultural tastes, that is, involvement in the arts—art, music, and theatre—and literature. Bourdieu (1984, 1986) argues that highbrow cultural tastes function as a form of cultural capital that is transposable into economic and social advantages (see for instance Lizardo, 2006a). Indeed, leisure-time cultural activities in childhood and adolescence yield important benefits, such as the acquisition of specific cognitive and non-cognitive skills that lead to higher grades in school and access to elite colleges, as well as generate better career opportunities (Covay & Carbonaro, 2010; DiMaggio, 1982; Dumais, 2002; Kaufman & Gabler, 2004; Lareau, 2003).

Although researchers heavily focus on the relationship between tastes and social class inequalities, gender differences in cultural tastes and the mechanisms behind these differences remain relatively understudied, in particular among adolescents (DiMaggio, 2004; Schmutz et al., 2016; Siongers & Lievens, 2014). In fact, the emphasis on highbrow tastes as a manifestation of cultural capital makes the consistent empirical finding that women are more involved in highbrow culture than men are puzzling (Bihagen & Katz-Gerro, 2000; Christin, 2012; Lizardo, 2006b; Purhonen et al., 2011). Even though women are more likely to have highbrow tastes and tend to do better in school and thus appear to be advantaged in terms of cultural capital, they are not always able to translate this into an advantaged socioeconomic position (Bihagen & Katz-Gerro, 2000; Christin, 2012). Nevertheless, current explanations of the gender gap in cultural tastes often endorse a ‘cultural-capital perspective’, overlooking that highbrow cultural tastes do not only function as a marker of cultural capital and underlying social differences, but also reflect unequal expectations for (young) men/boys and (young) women/girls. These expectations mirror society-wide cultural norms that define highbrow culture as belonging to the feminine sphere, even among young people (Bihagen & Katz-Gerro, 2000; Christin, 2012; Nosek et al., 2002; Nosek & Smyth, 2011; Tepper, 2000).

In the present paper, we propose an alternative perspective on the puzzle of women’s highbrow cultural taste by addressing two lacunae in existing research. A first hiatus is that empirical research on gender differences in cultural preferences mainly studies adults, not children or adolescents, and often uses explanations that apply to adults’ life worlds, for
instance class- and work-related explanations. Thus, even though childhood and adolescence are crucial periods in the development of cultural preferences (Bourdieu, 1984), empirical research tends to overlook the finding that there is already a substantial gender gap in cultural tastes before children and adolescents reach adulthood, irrespective of social class (Dumais, 2002; Kaufman & Gabler, 2004; Schmutz et al., 2016; Siongers & Lievens, 2014; Willekens & Lievens, 2014). This calls for research that tries to clarify how young people’s interests in arts and literature become gendered, keeping social inequalities constant.

A second shortcoming is that many existing studies apply a gender role socialization approach to gender differences and invoke a dichotomous and unidimensional vision on gender. Such an approach neglects current perspectives in gender studies that treat gender as a multidimensional and fluid concept that pertains to all aspects of social life (Egan & Perry, 2001; Risman, 2004; Thorne, 1997). So, there should be more attention to the dynamic identity-related and interactional mechanisms underlying the gender gap in cultural interests in quantitative research. It is during childhood and adolescence that young men and women become gendered: they learn from parents and peers what kind of behavior is expected from a man or woman and they learn to identify the self as masculine or feminine and behave accordingly (Egan & Perry, 2001; Leaper & Friedman, 2007). The dynamic view on gender differences that we endorse argues that socialization does not result into a prototypical man versus woman, but leads to a diversity in terms of gender typicality and gender conformity within each gender.

The present paper adds to existing research by relating gender differences in highbrow cultural taste to adolescents’ gender identity and experienced cultural expectations of gender-conforming behavior, keeping social inequalities constant (Egan & Perry, 2001; West & Fenstermaker, 1995). Using survey data from a representative sample of over 5,000 Flemish secondary school students (7th grade), we analyze whether (a) female adolescents show higher interest in highbrow cultural activities than do male adolescents and (b) whether this difference is associated with gender identity and with (internalized and peer) pressure for gender-conforming behavior, particularly for boys.
4.2 Gender and highbrow cultural preferences

Current research in various Western countries shows that adult women are more likely to express a taste for what is traditionally considered high culture: they are more likely than are men to be interested in and to participate in high-status cultural activities such as going to the opera, attending a play, and visiting an (arts) museum (Bihagen & Katz-Gerro, 2000; Christin, 2012; Falk & Katz-Gerro, 2016; Lizardo, 2006b; Purhonen et al., 2011). Research on adolescents is more scarce, but shows a similar gender gap among youth (Schmutz et al., 2016; Siongers & Lievens, 2014, Willekens & Lievens, 2014).

Based on research on adults, there are two large groups of partially overlapping explanations for the gender gap in highbrow culture consumption. A first group of explanations focuses on cultural capital, employment, and social class. It is argued that the gap originates in gendered educational and work-related choices and contexts and in differential involvement in the labor force (Bihagen & Katz-Gerro, 2000; Collins, 1988; DiMaggio, 2004). For instance, Christin (2012) shows that women’s overrepresentation in the cultural and education sectors explains part of the gender differences in the United States. Relatedly, Lizardo (2006b) indicates that the gender gap is much smaller in occupational fields where the proportion of cultural capital (relative to the proportion of economic capital) is higher. Moreover, DiMaggio and Mohr (1985) argue that women invest in cultural capital to have a better position on the marriage market. Bourdieu (1984, 2001) and Collins (1988) suggest that (middle-class) women consume more highbrow culture because they are responsible for the family’s public image and for the cultural reproduction, that is, the “cultural housekeeping” (see Lovell 2001, p. 39) within the family.

However, these explanations overlook that highbrow cultural tastes are not necessarily a marker of cultural capital related to social inequality, but may also originate in gender inequality. Indeed, activities related to the arts and literature have strong feminine connotations, especially for people with traditional gender role attitudes (cf. Zinkhan, Prenshaw, & Close, 2004). There is substantial evidence for this gender-typing of highbrow cultural activities, also among youngsters. For instance, psychological research explaining engagement in different
school topics using Implicit Association Tests indicates that children and (young) adults consider math and science as “male” subjects, but arts and reading have a feminine connotation (Cvencek et al., 2011; Heyder & Kessels, 2013; Nosek et al., 2002; Nosek & Smyth, 2011). Martino (1999) shows that the academic and emotional nature of cultural practices, like reading books and playing theatre, is at odds with the conceptions of masculinity in an Australian high school. Other work on ballroom dancing in the United States, for example, suggests that the artistic, creative, and aesthetic aspects of the activity give it a feminine connotation (Leib & Bulman, 2009).

A second group of explanations of the gender gap in tastes focuses on gendered socialization and separate spheres ideologies. These arguments pay more attention to the feminine connotations of the arts and literature. Tepper (2000) for example, suggests that differential cultural taste is explained by society-wide cultural norms, originating in Victorian separate spheres ideology, that define highbrow cultural activities as related to the feminine sphere because these activities are passive, private, non-competitive, and academic. The gendered connotations to cultural activities are expected to lead to gender-specific early socialization in the arts and literature within the family (Bihagen & Katz-Gerro, 2000; Christin, 2012; Katz-Gerro & Jaeger, 2015; Tepper, 2000). For instance, using adults’ retrospective accounts, Christin (2012) shows that a quarter of the gender differences in cultural participation among American adults is explained by differential participation in the arts as a child, and she argues that parents may stimulate their sons and daughters to like those practices that are deemed acceptable for boys and girls. Even though Katz-Gerro and Jaeger (2015) show that there is little evidence that parents engage in gender-specific cultural socialization in Denmark, other socializing agents, such as peers, may be responsible for the gender differences they find.

The gendered socialization and separate spheres explanations in research on cultural tastes share the assumptions of the gender role socialization approach to the study of gender differences, tracing differences between men and women back to childhood gender role socialization. This approach—common in Bourdieu’s days (Bourdieu, 2001; Silva, 2005)—has received much critique (Lopata & Thorne, 1978; Risman & Davis, 2013). First of all, gender role socialization approaches overemphasize the importance of early childhood and
socialization in the family as the site of gender socialization and overlook that peers play an important part in youths’ gender socialization as well (see Harris, 1995; Leaper & Friedman, 2007). Moreover, they have a static vision on gender that leaves little agency and possibilities for resistance to the individual, as if (young) men and women always conform to pressures from others to adhere to stereotypical gender beliefs. Lastly, gender role socialization perspectives encumber current explanations with a dualistic vision of gender, which often results in analyzing gender differences by including an independent variable “man/woman” in the analysis and drawing conclusions based on “average” women and men. We argue that treating gender as a multidimensional and fluid concept and thus explicitly considering gender identity and gender conformity as variable processes holds most promise to solve the puzzle of gender differences in cultural preferences (Egan & Perry, 2001; Risman, 2004; Thorne, 1997).

4.2.1 Gender identity and interactional cultural expectations
As a response to the critiques on the gender role socialization perspective, social psychology has focused on gender identity at the individual level and sociology on interactional expectations (Risman, 2004; Risman & Davis, 2013). Gender identity is the extent to which a person perceives and identifies the self to be masculine or feminine in relation to what is considered masculine or feminine in a specific context (Egan & Perry, 2001; Tobin et al., 2010; Vantieghem et al., 2014b; Wood & Eagly, 2009). According to gender identity theory, differences between males and females originate in masculine and feminine gender identities (Egan & Perry, 2001). Since the downfall of the gender role socialization perspective, gender identity is understood to be multidimensional; it relates to different fields of life (not only psychological traits for instance; see Vantieghem et al., 2014b, for an overview of the evolution of the concept gender identity).

The multidimensional approach to gender identity of Egan and Perry (2001) has been highly influential in the field. According to Egan and Perry, gender identity has several facets, two of which are the focus of this article because qualitative research has shown them to influence cultural tastes (Cann, 2014, 2015; Pascoe, 2007): gender typicality and pressure for gender conformity. Gender typicality is the extent to which one feels to be a typical member of one’s gender category, of course in reference to the social ideas of what a woman or a man is.
**Pressure for gender conformity** refers to the pressure people experience from themselves and from others to conform to gender stereotypes.

The idea of gender conformity can also be traced back to the sociological “doing gender” perspective, where it refers to cultural expectations on the interactional level (West and Fenstermaker, 1995; West and Zimmerman, 1987, 2009). This symbolic-interactionist theory argues that people display gendered behavior and use gendered symbols in everyday social interactions in the production and justification of their gender. Gender is theorized to be a process, something one continually *does* (rather than is) as a constant proof that one lives up to the cultural expectations of what women and men should be and do. As a consequence, gender is not a natural, essentialist attribute of an individual but something that originates in social interactions. One is only considered a competent member of society when producing gender in an acceptable way, and when not performing gender as expected, an individual faces punishment (e.g., ostracism and bullying). However, the theory allows for agency because the individual still has the choice to consciously resist these gendered expectations and “undo” his/her gender, which is of course easier in contexts where there is less pressure to conform to gender stereotypes.

Currently, there is a growing body of research in educational sociology using gender identity theory and doing gender perspectives to explain girls’ and female adolescents’ advantage in certain educational outcomes and to explain (fe)male adolescents’ gendered subject interest and motivation (Leaper & Van, 2008; Leaper et al., 2012; Vantieghem et al., 2014b). Furthermore, there is some qualitative research linking leisure-time activities to the formation of gender identity. Cann (2014, 2015), for example, shows how gender and gender identity is experienced, negotiated, and (re)produced in pop-cultural tastes regarding sports, music, and reading among British adolescents. Cherland (1994) finds that fiction reading among Canadian girls—much approved by their parents—is part of the production of a feminine identity. The constructed gender identities in cultural activities are often complex, fluid, and multi-faceted as research on ballroom dancing by American adults shows (Leib and Bulman, 2009). Recent work by Schmutz and colleagues (2016) indicates that the gender gap in highbrow tastes of adolescents differs across school contexts and is larger in rural schools than
in urban schools, which is assumed to reflect gender conservative versus progressive attitudes in those schools.

Moreover, it appears to be more important for boys and young men not to be feminine or engage in feminine activities than it is for girls and young women to perform the “right” gender through feminine cultural activities (Cann, 2014, 2015; Cherland, 1994; Reay, 2002). It is theorized that because of the devaluation of the feminine, it is more acceptable for (certain) girls and female adolescents to do or like things that boys and male adolescents usually do or like than vice versa, because those girls and young women engage in behavior that is socially valued (e.g., pursuing a degree in engineering, rather than in humanities, which will lead to a better paid job) (Cann, 2014, 2015; Kane, 2006). Boys and young men however, have much more status and prestige to lose when showing gender-incongruent behavior and have to resist being associated with devalued feminine attributes. As a consequence, young men define masculinity in terms of it not being feminine and try to distance themselves from femininity (Martino, 1999).

Whereas for girls and young women it is possible to express their femininity in other ways than via highbrow cultural preferences, for boys and young men being associated with feminine activities is suspect per definition (Tepper, 2000). Boys and (young) men interested in reading, ballroom dancing or taking drama classes are considered sissies, poofers or fags (Leib & Bulman, 2009; Martino, 1999; Pascoe, 2007). These homonegative slurs are theorized to be important means by which boys’ masculinity and gender conformity is policed and judged by their peers. Gender non-congruent boys have fewer friends and are more likely to be bullied by peers (Young & Sweeting, 2004). Peers are considered to be an important socializing factor in the formation of identity among adolescents, sometimes even more so than parents are (Harris, 1995).

4.2.2 The present study
Turning to the present study involving male and female adolescents, we expect young women to be more interested in highbrow culture than young men will be (Hypothesis 1). We expect this difference in interest between male and female adolescents to be related to both individual gender identity (as measured by gender typicality) and gendered interactional cultural
expectations (as measured by gender conformity pressure). Specifically, we hypothesize that higher gender typicality will be related to lower highbrow cultural interest for male adolescents, but to higher interest for female adolescents (Hypothesis 2a). The association between gender typicality and highbrow cultural interest is expected to be stronger for male adolescents than for female adolescents (Hypothesis 2b). Moreover, we predict that higher pressure for gender conformity will be related to lower interest in highbrow culture for male adolescents, but to higher interest for female adolescents (Hypothesis 3a). The association between gender conformity pressure and highbrow cultural interest is hypothesized to be stronger for male adolescents than for female adolescents (Hypothesis 3b).

4.3 Methods

4.3.1 Participants
We employ data from 5,227 Flemish secondary school students (2,773 young men; 2,454 young women) in the first year of secondary education (7th grade in the American educational system). The study of 7th graders is useful for our purpose because the onset of biological puberty in early adolescence makes gender differences particularly salient and pressures to conform to gender norms become stronger (see research on the gender intensification hypothesis, such as Galambos et al., 1990; Hill & Lynch, 1983). Moreover, these adolescents are old enough to expect that tastes formed in this life phase will remain more or less stable and continue in adulthood (see for instance Nagel and Verboord, 2012). Most of them (80.2%) were 12 years old ($M_{age} = 12.18, SD = 0.48, range = 10-15$), meaning that the majority of the students were on track, whereas 949 (18.2%) of the students were older than 12 and had school delay. A small group of 88 (1.7%) students was younger than 12, meaning that they were allowed to skip one or two grades during their school career. The large majority ($n = 4833, 92.5\%$) of the students were in a general, academic track, whereas 394 (7.5%) were in a vocational track. About 20% ($n = 1015$) of the students had a working-class background; a majority ($n = 3028, 57.9\%$) had a middle-class background and the remaining 22.7% ($n = 1184$) had a service-class background. A complete description of the sample (total as well as for boys and girls separately) is shown in Table 4-1.
4.3.2 Procedure
Data were gathered from September to December 2012 as part of the project ‘Teaching in the bed of Procrustes,’; detailed methodological information is also available in Vantieghem, 2015, pp. 63-73. Based on an inventory of all Flemish schools that offer 7th grade education, certain criteria were applied to define subpopulations. Schools were selected to represent all geographical regions in Flanders, the northern Dutch-speaking part of Belgium. Selection was also based on school denomination (public versus Catholic), and a proportional representation of schools in cities and rural areas was assured. Within these parameters, three random samples were drawn. When a school in the first sample refused, a matched school in the next random sample was contacted. Thus, the selected schools represent the Flemish educational context on important dimensions, while the randomness within these subgroups was maintained. In total, 58 (47%) schools participated in the study (124 were contacted). Comparison of the sample to the Flemish school population indicated that the schools are representative and that no systematic biases occurred. A waiver of parental consent and the use of child assent were approved by the school and the Belgian Commission for the Protection of Privacy, based on the minimal risk and confidential nature of the study (see Vantieghem, 2015, p. 66).

All seventh graders in the participating schools were asked to complete the paper-and-pencil questionnaire, administered by a researcher, in their classrooms in the time span of one course (50 minutes). A researcher was present the entire time to explain the purpose and procedure of the survey and to answer questions. Students were assured that the survey was confidential: the unique code on the questionnaire was necessary to link their answers to a follow-up survey, but the datasets for analysis contain only anonymous data. In total, 6,380 students filled out the questionnaire. However, students with missing data on one of the variables were excluded, so the analyses are based on 5,227 (82%) students. For the scales used in the analysis, having missing answers on more than 25% of the constituent items resulted in a missing on the scale.
Table 4-1: Descriptive statistics for the total sample (n = 5,227) and separately for young men (n = 2,773) and young women (n = 2,454)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric variables</th>
<th>Total sample</th>
<th>Young men</th>
<th>Young women</th>
<th>Young women versus young men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>Min–Max</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in highbrow act.</td>
<td>1.33 (0.61)</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>0 – 3</td>
<td>1.11 (0.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender typicality</td>
<td>2.48 (0.67)</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>0 – 4</td>
<td>2.55 (0.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender conformity pressure</td>
<td>1.46 (0.56)</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>0 – 3</td>
<td>1.69 (0.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result reading test</td>
<td>14.71 (5.25)</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>0 – 25</td>
<td>13.95 (5.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in pop-cultural act.</td>
<td>2.19 (0.45)</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>0 – 3</td>
<td>2.31 (0.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian gender ideology</td>
<td>2.38 (0.55)</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>0.2 – 4</td>
<td>2.21 (0.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>12.18 (0.48)</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>10 – 15</td>
<td>12.21 (0.51)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorical variables</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>% total</th>
<th>% males</th>
<th>% females</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Cramer’s V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Young Men (ref)</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young Women</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social class</td>
<td>Working class (ref)</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service class</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>General (ref)</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>12 years old or younger (ref)</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 years old or older</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Parents Western-European (ref)</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One parent non-W-European</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both parents non-W-European</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.3 **Dependent variable: interest in highbrow culture**

As an indicator of highbrow cultural taste, we use a scale measuring interest in a variety of highbrow cultural activities. We choose an indicator of cultural taste preferences, and not of cultural participation, for the following reasons. According to Peterson, “respondents’ self-reports of their preferences [compared to cultural participation] seem a more direct measure of the way they use art in shaping identity and symbolically announcing their place in the world” (Peterson, 2005, p. 265). Because identity processes are central in our approach, studying cultural taste preferences as measured by interests makes sense. Although cultural participation may appear more interesting at first sight in relation to the “doing gender” perspective, one has to keep in mind that displaying specific attitudes toward the arts and literature are as much a part of the performance of gender as participation in those realms (see Cherland, 1994). After all, the cultural participation of early adolescents is frequently mediated by parents or teachers and compulsory, and thus not always an expression of individual preference.

In the survey, students were asked how interested they are in 24 leisure activities: watching sport as a spectator or fan, doing sports, making music, doing drama/word courses, painting/drawing/clay modelling, cooking, going to the movies, listening to music, attending a concert, attending a play or dance performance, visiting a library, visiting an (art) museum, watching TV, playing video games, using social media (Facebook, Twitter, …), surfing on the Internet, collecting things (stamps, comic books, …), reading, playing board games (e.g., Monopoly), shopping, going out (to parties, …), meeting friends (at home or somewhere else), spending time with family, youth organization (e.g., Scouting). Each was rated using a 4-point scale from 0 (not interested) to 3 (very interested).

Categorical Principal Component Analyses (CatPCA), which were performed on the wide range of (highbrow and other) cultural activities included in the questionnaire, showed that the following cultural activities have high loadings on the first dimension: making music, doing drama/word courses, painting/drawing/clay modelling, attending a concert, attending a play or dance performance, visiting a library, visiting an (art) museum, and reading. These activities are all related to the arts and literature and were used to measure interest in highbrow
culture. A mean scale score with high internal consistency (Cronbach’s α = 0.77) was computed. Higher scores on this scale mean higher interest in highbrow cultural activities. On average, young men scored almost 0.5 points lower on this scale (see Table 4-1). Six activities loaded on the second dimension: watching sport as a spectator or fan, doing sports, going to the movies, listening to music, watching TV and playing video games. The composite measure based on these activities indicates pop-cultural taste and is used as a control in the analysis (see infra).

4.3.4 Independent variables: gender, typicality, and conformity
The central explanatory variables are gender of the student, gender typicality, and pressure for gender conformity. As can be seen in Table 4-1, 53% of the adolescents in the sample are boys (the reference group). The indicators of gender typicality and gender conformity pressure are based on the Self-Perception Profile of Egan and Perry (2001), which is increasingly used for research on gender identity in children (Perry & Pauletti, 2011) and applied in research on gendered educational outcomes (Leaper et al., 2012; Leaper & Van, 2008; Vantieghem & Van Houtte, 2015; Vantieghem et al., 2014a). The Dutch translation and answer formats of the measures were based on the study of Bos and Sandfort (2010).

To measure gender identity, we used the gender typicality subscale of this gender identity questionnaire. Gender typicality measures the extent to which males and females feel they are typical for their gender (in general and with regard to important dimensions) and is a mean scale based on six items using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (completely disagree) to 4 (completely agree). Sample items are: “I feel that I am a good example of a typical boy/girl,” “I feel that the things I am good at are similar to those of most boys/girls,” and “I feel that my personality is similar to that of most boys/girls,” with each designation matching the gender of the respondent. The higher a student scores on the measure, the stronger his/her feeling of gender typicality. The scale has good internal consistency reliability (α = .78). On average pupils had a score of 2.48, ranging from 0 to 4, and young men reported higher typicality than did young women (see Table 4-1).

The pressure for gender conformity scale indicates the extent to which a pupil experiences pressure for gender-conforming behavior. Four items measure pressure from peers and four items measure pressure experienced from oneself, each using a 4-point Likert-type
response scale from 0 (completely disagree) to 3 (completely agree). Sample items are: “I think it is important to act just like other girls/boys” (internalized pressure) and “The boys (girls) I know would be upset if I wanted to learn an activity that only girls (boys) usually do” (pressure from peers), again matching items to the respondent’s gender. Higher scores mean higher perceived pressure for gender conformity. The measure is a mean scale with good internal consistency reliability ($\alpha = .82$), with all items loading highly on the first dimension of an oblique factor analysis, which indicates that the questions measuring internalized pressure and measuring pressure from peers do not have a different underlying construct. This overlap is not surprising because, like pressure from peers, pressure from oneself originates in social interaction. On average, male adolescents scored considerably higher on the scale than did female adolescents (see Table 4-1), which means that young men perceive more pressure from others and themselves to conform to gender stereotypes. Also young women experience a considerable amount of pressure (see Table 4-1). Gender typicality and gender conformity pressure are correlated ($r = .22, p < .001$), but they can still be meaningfully separated.

4.3.5 Controls
We take into account the following demographics and indicators that are associated with the independent variables and that might influence the effects of these variables on the dependent variable (see Table 4-1). Age group indicates whether the pupil is 12-years-old or younger (reference category) or whether (s)he is 13 or older, meaning s/he has school delay. We also account for the student’s educational track: general (reference) or vocational. We include a categorical indicator of the socio-economic background of the student. Similar to the EGP-classification (Erikson & Goldthorpe, 1992; Evans, 1992), this variable is based on the current or last occupation of the father and mother and distinguishes working-class youth (reference category) from middle class and service class youth. The adolescent’s social class is the highest score of both parents (when applicable). We add ethnicity to the model, which is based on the country of birth of the adolescent’s parents. The variable distinguishes students from Belgian or Western-European origin (reference group) from students with either one or both parents from non-Western European origin.
We also consider the adolescent’s results on a reading test as a proxy for academic attainment because we know that there is an association between cultural preferences and academic attainment (Dumais, 2002; DiMaggio, 1982), as well as between gender typicality and gender conformity pressure and educational outcomes (Vantieghem & Van Houtte, 2015; Vantieghem et al., 2014a). In this test, students answered questions on content and vocabulary of four texts they had to read. As mentioned, we also include a mean scale of interest in pop-cultural activities. Preliminary analyses showed that many adolescents reporting high interest in highbrow cultural activities were also interested in these other cultural activities. Because research shows that these pop-cultural tastes are influenced by identity and pressure-related processes (Cann, 2014, 2015), we control for interest in these other common cultural activities.

Lastly, we control for the egalitarian gender role ideology of each adolescent. This variable is a mean scale of 15 variables indicating egalitarian and traditional beliefs about female and male roles ($\alpha = .79$), developed by Vermeersch and colleagues (2010). It includes questions such as “The husband should be the decision-maker of the family”; “There is something wrong with girls who talk dirty”; and “Women should first consider their children, and only then their career” (all reverse-scored). The higher a pupil scores, the more egalitarian the ideas about gender roles the pupil holds. We take gender beliefs into account because research has shown that traditional gender beliefs are associated with worse outcomes on academic indicators for both males and females (Davis & Pearce, 2007; Scott, 2004) and because egalitarian gender role attitudes are highly correlated with pressure for gender-conforming behavior ($r = -.50, p < .001$). Adolescents growing up in contexts where traditional ideas about gender roles prevail experience higher pressure for gender-conforming behavior (both internalized and from peers) and vice versa.

### 4.4 Results

We used multilevel models to account for the nested structure of the data given that pupils are clustered in schools (Hox, 2010). First, we ran an intercept-only model which separates variance at the individual level from variance on the school level (shown in Table 4-2, null model). This model served as the baseline model for the following models. Without any controls, about 10%
of the variation was on the school level as indicated by the Intra-class Correlation Coefficient (ICC) or the Variance Partitioning Coefficient (VPC): ICC=0.038/(0.038+0.335)=0.102.

To test Hypothesis 1, which predicted that young women are more interested in highbrow culture than young men are, we added the variable ‘gender’, which had a significant effect, in Model 1 (see Table 4-2). On average, young women scored .42 higher on the highbrow interest scale than young men did. Thus, Hypothesis 1 was supported. Using the variance components on the individual level ($e_{ij}$), we calculated that adding gender in Model 1 explained almost 11% of the variation in highbrow cultural taste among these adolescents compared to the null model [level 1 explained variance=1-(0.299/0.335)=0.107]. This indicates that gender has a substantial effect on highbrow cultural interest. As shown in Model 2, the coefficient of gender was only slightly reduced when all control variables were introduced.

To evaluate Hypothesis 2a (which predicted that gender typicality has a positive association with highbrow cultural taste for young women, but a negative association for young men) and Hypothesis 2b (which expects the association for male adolescents to be stronger), we added gender typicality, gender conformity pressure, and an interaction term between students’ gender and gender typicality in Model 3 (see Table 4-2). To make the interpretation easier, the relationship between gender, gender typicality and highbrow cultural taste for the young men and women in the sample is also diagrammed in Figure 4-1. In line with Hypothesis 2a, we found that the more typical a male adolescent considers himself to be, the lower his interest in highbrow culture (because we are using an interaction term, the effect of gender typicality for boys is indicated by $b_{\text{gender typicality}} = -0.054^{***}$). The interaction effect ($b_{\text{girl x gender typicality}} = 0.063^{**}$) indicates that the effect of gender typicality is significantly different for girls. As is reflected in Figure 4-1, gender typicality appears to have a slightly positive effect on highbrow cultural interest for girls (because of the interaction term the effect of gender typicality for girls equals $b_{\text{gender typicality}} + b_{\text{girl x gender typicality}} = -0.054^{***} + 0.063^{**} = 0.009$). This would suggest that the more gender congruent a female adolescent is, the higher her interest in highbrow cultural activities. However, additional analyses indicate that this small positive effect for girls is not significantly different from 0 on the .05-level.
### Table 4-2: Multilevel regression models predicting highbrow cultural tastes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Null model</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.275*** (0.028)</td>
<td>1.092*** (0.022)</td>
<td>1.034*** (0.024)</td>
<td>1.039*** (0.024)</td>
<td>1.044*** (0.024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl (Boy = ref)</td>
<td>0.420*** (0.016)</td>
<td>0.411*** (0.016)</td>
<td>0.401*** (0.016)</td>
<td>0.404*** (0.017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>0.065** (0.021)</td>
<td>0.067** (0.021)</td>
<td>0.067** (0.021)</td>
<td>0.067** (0.021)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service class (Working class = ref)</td>
<td>0.161*** (0.025)</td>
<td>0.161*** (0.025)</td>
<td>0.161*** (0.025)</td>
<td>0.161*** (0.025)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational track (General track = ref)</td>
<td>0.048 (0.031)</td>
<td>0.048 (0.031)</td>
<td>0.047 (0.031)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 years or older (12 years or younger = ref)</td>
<td>0.000 (0.021)</td>
<td>-0.002 (0.021)</td>
<td>-0.001 (0.021)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One parent non-Western-European</td>
<td>0.063* (0.027)</td>
<td>0.060* (0.027)</td>
<td>0.060* (0.027)</td>
<td>0.060* (0.027)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both parents non-Western-European (Parents Western-European = ref)</td>
<td>0.183*** (0.028)</td>
<td>0.182*** (0.028)</td>
<td>0.182*** (0.028)</td>
<td>0.182*** (0.028)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result reading test</td>
<td>0.024*** (0.002)</td>
<td>0.024*** (0.002)</td>
<td>0.024*** (0.002)</td>
<td>0.024*** (0.002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in pop-cultural activities</td>
<td>0.206*** (0.017)</td>
<td>0.217*** (0.017)</td>
<td>0.216*** (0.017)</td>
<td>0.216*** (0.017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian gender ideology</td>
<td>0.147*** (0.015)</td>
<td>0.129*** (0.016)</td>
<td>0.128*** (0.016)</td>
<td>0.128*** (0.016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender typicality</td>
<td>-0.054*** (0.015)</td>
<td>-0.024* (0.011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender conformity pressure</td>
<td>-0.033* (0.016)</td>
<td>-0.063** (0.020)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl x gender typicality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.063** (0.022)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl x gender conformity pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.066* (0.029)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Variance components                             |           |         |         |         |         |
| School ($\nu_0$)                                 | 0.038 (0.008) | 0.019 (0.004) | 0.005 (0.002) | 0.005 (0.002) | 0.005 (0.002) |
| Adolescent ($\varepsilon_0$)                    | **0.335 (0.007)** | **0.299 (0.006)** | **0.269 (0.005)** | **0.268 (0.005)** | **0.268 (0.005)** |

| Model fit                                       |           |         |         |         |         |
| Deviance ($\chi^2$ difference test)             | 9249.483 | 8622.632*** | 8014.368*** | 7995.449*** | 7998.626** |

*Note. N = 5,227 adolescents in 58 schools. All metric independent variables are grand mean centered; *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Figure 4-1: The association among gender, gender typicality and highbrow cultural taste

As can be seen in Figure 4-1, the predicted gap in highbrow interest between atypical male adolescents and atypical female adolescents (on the left-hand side of the figure, $\Delta_a = 0.244$) is only half of the gap in highbrow cultural taste between gender typical male and female adolescents (on the right-hand side, $\Delta_b = 0.497$). Thus, gender typicality is strongly related to the gender gap in cultural taste between young men and women. As illustrated in Figure 4-1, the negative effect of gender typicality on highbrow cultural taste for young men is much more pronounced than the positive (but insignificant) effect is for girls: the line depicting the relationship between gender typicality and highbrow cultural tastes for young women is rather flat, whereas the line for young men is much steeper. Thus, Hypothesis 2b was supported.

To evaluate Hypothesis 3a (which expected a negative association between gender conformity pressure and highbrow cultural interest for young men and a positive association for young women) and Hypothesis 3b (which expected the association for young men to be stronger), we included gender typicality, gender conformity pressure, and an interaction term between students’ gender and gender conformity pressure in Model 4 (see Table 4-2). The relationship among gender, gender conformity pressure, and highbrow cultural taste for the
male and female adolescents in the sample is illustrated in Figure 4-2. In line with Hypothesis 3a, gender conformity pressure has a negative effect for male adolescents ($b_{gender\ conformit\ pressure} = -0.063^{**}$). The more pressure for gender conformity a young man experiences, the lower his interest in highbrow culture. The effect of gender conformity pressure is significantly different for young women ($b_{girl \times gender\ conformit\ pressure} = 0.066^*$). For young women, higher gender conformity pressures were associated with very slightly higher interests in highbrow culture ($b_{gender\ conformit\ pressure} + b_{girl \times gender\ conformit\ pressure} = -0.063^{**} + 0.066^* = 0.003$). Additional analyses showed this small positive coefficient for girls to be non-significantly different from 0 on the .05-level. In other words, pressure to conform to gender stereotypes does not really affect young women’s highbrow cultural interest.

Figure 4-2: The association among gender, gender conformity pressure and highbrow cultural taste

As illustrated in Figure 4-2, the difference in highbrow interest between male and female adolescents who do not experience pressure for gender conformity is only 61% of the difference between male and female adolescents who experience a lot of pressure for gender conformity ($\Delta_a = .308$ versus $\Delta_b = .506$). So, pressure for gender conformity influences the highbrow cultural taste gap between young men and women substantially. As illustrated in Figure 4-2,
the negative effect of gender conformity pressure on highbrow cultural taste for young men is much more pronounced than the positive effect is for young women: the line depicting the relationship between gender conformity pressure and highbrow cultural tastes for young women is almost flat (and the effect is not significantly different from 0), whereas the line for young men is much steeper. Thus, Hypothesis 3b was supported.

4.5 Discussion

In the present paper, we studied gender differences in highbrow cultural taste among a representative sample of Flemish 7th graders. As expected, compared to male adolescents, female adolescents report considerably higher interest in highbrow cultural activities related to arts, music, theatre, and literature, which are known to have feminine connotations (Christin, 2012; Nosek & Smyth, 2011; Tepper, 2000; Zinkhan et al., 2004). Interestingly, the gender gap in tastes is strongly related to the gender typicality and gender conformity pressures experienced by (male) early adolescents. Higher gender typicality and higher pressure for gender-conforming behavior are associated with much lower highbrow cultural interest for young men, but are largely unrelated to young women’s highbrow cultural interest. We conclude that gender typicality and gender conformity pressure are –through their effects on male adolescents– important mechanisms reinforcing the gender gap in highbrow cultural tastes. Thus, our results are in line with existing qualitative research on children’s and adolescents’ cultural preferences which already suggested that they construct their gender identity and do their gender through gender-typed cultural activities such as reading (specific) books and listening to certain kinds of (popular) music (Cann, 2014, 2015; Cherland, 1994).

Moreover, the stronger effects of gender typicality and gender conformity pressure for male adolescents indicate that it is more difficult for young men to like an activity perceived as feminine than it is for young women to dislike a feminine activity. Female adolescents probably have other ways to do their gender appropriately whereas for male adolescents being associated with femininity is suspicious per se. While existing research mostly focuses on why women express high interest in highbrow culture, our results show that from a gender perspective another question is equally important: Why do (young) men have so little interest in highbrow
cultural activities? Although this re-framed question has been ignored by most existing research, our study shows that gendered identity-related and interactional processes make it particularly difficult for growing-up boys and young men to engage in activities that are considered as feminine. Cultural conceptions of what (young) men are and should like are very much linked to their highbrow cultural tastes, which prevents them from exploring their talents in arts, music, theatre, and literature and from learning the specific skills (creativity, self-expression, etc.) that these activities have to offer.

4.5.1 Limitations
An important limitation of our study is related to the cross-sectional nature of the data; we were only able to uncover the associations among the variables, not their causal direction. For example, there is research that suggests that identity processes and pressures influence the interest in cultural activities of (fe)male adolescents (Martino, 1999; Pascoe, 2007). Other work indicates that participation in gender-typed leisure activities in childhood may also affect the identity development later in adolescence (McHale et al., 2004). When it comes to identity-processes, it is possible that (a) feeling a(n) (a)typical young (wo)man leads to (a)stereotypical cultural tastes, that (b) having (a)stereotypical cultural tastes causes feelings of gender (a)typicality or that (c) gender typicality and gendered cultural tastes have reciprocal effects. Further research looking into this causality question is needed.

We further argue that the longitudinal data needed for this analysis has to comply with certain conditions and standards that at present are not yet met by existing data. First, there have to be many measurement points because as a consequence of regression to the mean, adolescents with extreme scores on the measures may score values closer to the mean in subsequent measurements, and this natural variation may be mistaken for real change. Second, there has to be enough time between measuring points for gender identity to vary because gender identity tends to be stable for shorter time periods (Egan & Perry, 2001). However and third, the measuring points should be close enough in time to minimize biological changes during adolescence (for instance development of secondary sex characteristics between measurements), which may change the meaning and assessment of gender identity independent of changing tastes. Fourth, the first measurement needs to be as early in life as possible because
gender identification is an ongoing process starting very early in life (Leaper & Friedman, 2007). We expect this kind of longitudinal research to find feedback processes: although specific gender identities and conformity pressures make it more likely that a child or an adolescent is interested in highbrow culture, an interest in culture, and particularly participation in highbrow activities, provide a context that can influence the adolescent’s identity development and the pressures for conformity s/he experiences. Most likely, the processes described in our paper are the result of a complex interplay in which tastes, on the one hand, and identity and pressure, on the other, are both causes and consequences. This intertwining of gender and cultural tastes underscores the relevance of the research question.

4.5.2 Future Research Directions

Our approach to the study of the gender gap in highbrow cultural tastes among adolescents can be extended by looking into the relationship with the student’s social class, with the pupil’s school context, and with current perspectives on cultural capital. Additionally, we should investigate whether it can be applied to adults’ tastes or in other parts of the world. First, although we argued that existing explanations tend to focus too much on work- and class-related inequalities, the social background of the adolescent remains relevant. Although the gap between young men and women does not differ significantly according to social class in the final models we presented, working-class youth in the sample experienced more pressure for gender-conforming behavior than did middle-class and service-class youth (who experience the least pressure; analyses not reported). In this way, social class does reinforce gender inequalities.

Although we contributed to existing research by unraveling the gendered processes at play, it is true that an adolescent does not have a gender or a class position, but rather both at the same time and these are intertwined in complex ways, as understood by proponents of an intersectional perspective (Anthias, 2004; Crenshaw, 1991; Yuval-Davis, 2006). Qualitative educational research such as Willis’ (1977) classic “Learning to labour” suggests that there are specific types of young men and women with specific femininities and masculinities (in terms of the combinations of identity, pressure, gender role ideology, etc.) that are more prevalent in some social classes than in others (Jackson, 2006; McRobbie, 2000; Willis, 1977). A good
example is Willis’ working-class lads. An integration of our gender perspective and social class research will allow researchers to explore how mechanisms behind the gendering of cultural taste relate to the formation of the (class) habitus and will add to research on why masculinity is so important for lower class boys and young men (Reay, 2002). Future research that studies how class and different manifestations of gender intersect in their relation with highbrow cultural taste will also benefit from looking into the effects of school characteristics: being an atypical young man with a certain social background may be something different in secondary schools with only vocational versus academic tracks, in urban versus rural schools (see for instance Schmutz et al., 2016), schools with low or high average gender conformity pressure and typicality, etc.

Second, we now know that gender identity and pressures for gender-conforming behavior support the gendering of tastes in adolescence—a life stage in which gender differences intensify (Hill & Lynch, 1983), but the question remains as to what extent these mechanisms are relevant to explain the gender gap in adulthood. It is important to stress that we consider our perspective complementary and not contradictory to existing explanations that have mainly focused on gendered early socialization, separate spheres arguments, and differential educational, work-related and class-related contexts. Our approach adds to existing separate spheres arguments because we uncover the mechanisms by which cultural beliefs of the femininity of highbrow culture may become part of an enduring set of dispositions. Furthermore, although Christin (2012) links the gender gap in cultural participation among adults to the gender gap in childhood participation, for instance, our perspective offers part of the explanation of why there is a gap between boys and girls in the first place.

Moreover, while current educational, work-related, and class-related explanations often mistake manifestations of gender inequality for social inequalities, our perspective stimulates to look beyond the surface, to the gendered nature of taste differences between men and women. For instance, Christin’s (2012) finding that the gender gap in tastes is explained by women’s overrepresentation in the cultural and education sectors and Lizardo’s (2006b) finding that the gender gap is largest in sectors with high economic capital (relative to cultural capital) may actually reflect gender identity processes and interactional pressures, because gender typicality
and experienced pressures for gender conformity can lead to stereotypical subject choices (Leaper & Van, 2008; Leaper et al., 2012) and because occupational gender stereotypes and gender (in)congruence potentially affect men’s interest in female-dominated occupations (Forsman & Barth, 2017). Gender congruent women who experience a lot of pressure to conform to stereotypical gender beliefs and atypical men may choose to work in those high-cultural-capital, mostly female-dominated sectors, whereas gender congruent men experiencing pressure for gender conformity in adolescence and young adulthood self-select into those male-dominated sectors where economic capital dominates. Thus, the relationship between tastes and the different dimensions of gender among adults needs to be examined.

Although the association between the gender gap in cultural tastes and gender identity and pressure will most likely not be as strong among adults as among adolescents because other group identifications may be more relevant (e.g., class or ethnicity), it is to be expected that there will remain at least a modest association between these gendered mechanisms and the gender gap in tastes among adults. This finding would call for a revised perspective on cultural tastes as a marker of cultural capital because, if a substantial part of the gender gap is related to gender inequality rather than social inequality, this could contribute to our understanding of why women may not be able to translate cultural tastes into social advantages to the extent that men can (cfr. Kaufman & Gabler, 2004; Rivera & Tilcsik, 2016). Thus, women’s cultural tastes may only partly function as capital. More research is needed on whether women have the same exchange rate for their highbrow cultural tastes, knowledge, and investments as men do, also considering the growing relevance of new or so-called emerging forms of cultural capital, which reduce the importance of highbrow culture (Prieur & Savage, 2013, Roose, 2015).

Third, research in other contexts should verify whether the processes underlying the gendering of tastes in Flanders are similar in other countries. We have reason to expect that the processes we uncovered are at least fairly similar in other Western societies. The gender gap in cultural involvement is present in most Western countries (for the US: Christin, 2012; and for the EU countries: Falk & Katz-Gerro, 2016). Additionally, British and Canadian qualitative research links gender identity to (pop-)cultural preferences (Cann, 2014, 2015; Cherland, 1994), and American research shows that gender identity and conformity pressures impact on
stereotypical subject choices and engagement among students (Leaper et al., 2012; Leaper & Van, 2008) and that (young) adults associate arts with femininity (Nosek & Smyth, 2011). In this regard, it is important to consider that the meaning of highbrow culture and what is understood as masculine or feminine may differ slightly from country to country, highlighting the need for complementary qualitative research on this topic.

4.5.3 Practice Implications

Our work shows that gender identity processes and pressures for gender-conforming behavior are important mechanisms reinforcing the gap in cultural tastes between young men and women. This suggests that changes in what kind of cultural behavior is expected from (young) women and especially (young) men will go hand in hand with a decline in the gender differences in taste. Trying to create equal access to arts-, music-, theatre-, and literature-related leisure activities is important because leisure time is an important part of adolescents’ lives and identities (Cann, 2014, 2015; Frønes, 2009). Leisure time cultural activities give them the opportunity to develop and grow as a person, to express creativity and emotions, to explore new talents, and to develop artistic abilities in which they can excel.

Our research suggests that the creation of safe environments where there is little pressure to conform to stereotypes of what typical (fe)male adolescents should do and like is important for young men to be able to explore their talents in the domains of arts, music, literature and theatre and to get access to these enriching experiences. Because education is an institution with an emancipatory role that has a large impact on the everyday lives of young people, it is important that schools can provide such a safe environment in which all gender expressions are welcomed and valued. One of the aims of project “Teaching in the bed of Procrustes” (Vantieghem, 2015) was to provide guidelines and workshops for teachers to work towards a gender-progressive environment in their classrooms and schools, which has materialized in a practice-oriented book for teachers on which many of the suggestions proposed here are based (Van Maele et al., 2015, see also the doctoral dissertation of Vantieghem, 2015, p. 196-201).

A more gender-equal environment in schools can be achieved by avoiding school policies, curricula, and teacher-student interactions that reinforce traditional gender binaries. Because we know that bullying is an important means by which the behavior of youth is policed
by their peers, it is important that schools have a developed anti-bullying policy that pays attention to gender-based bullying and creates recognition for different gender expressions. Of course, teachers are essential for the implementation of these policies and they should receive guidelines on how to recognize and deal with gender-based bullying. Moreover, using gender as a means to organize groups and courses should be avoided. For instance, often sport-classes are gender-segregated, even though segregation in courses reinforces stereotypical behavior (Martin et al., 2014). Segregated classes or group work will not benefit atypical young men who experience a lot of pressure to conform to stereotypes.

Furthermore, schools and teachers should stimulate pupils, young men and women alike, to use arts and poetry to express themselves, for instance through workshops in which different talents (music, visual arts, dance, theatre, handicrafts, …) can be discovered. Lastly, when it comes to studying arts, literature, and poetry in class, it is important that teachers do not (consciously or not) reinforce stereotypes by having different expectations for young men and women or by focusing on topics that are closer to young men’s interests. Cherland (1994), for instance, indicates that teachers’ reading lists in elementary school tended to contain adventure books with male protagonists because they expect boys to avoid books regarded as being for girls. Although the intention behind the teachers’ decision may be to make boys more committed to their school work, it also accepts the stereotype that literary books are just not something for boys.

4.6 Conclusions

Gender differences in adolescents’ highbrow cultural tastes are important to study—not only because these preferences function as cultural capital later in life, but also because the gendered nature of these tastes shapes gendered experiences in childhood. Our study shows that young men’s experienced pressures for gender-conforming behavior and gender typicality are strongly related to their low interests in arts-, theatre-, music- and literature-related activities. Thus, the gender gap in highbrow cultural tastes among adolescents is strongly associated with the gender identity and interactional pressures experienced by adolescents. By focusing on youth and
studying gender as a multidimensional and fluid concept, our paper adds to existing research by uncovering the mechanisms supporting the gendering of cultural preferences.
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5 Gender differences in sport spectatorship and (fe)male adolescents’ gender identity, experienced pressure for gender conformity and gender role attitudes

Chapter revised and resubmitted for Sociology of Sport Journal (coauthored by Mieke Van Houtte and Henk Roose)

We study (fe)male adolescents’ interest in watching sports as a spectator using logistic multilevel analyses based on a representative sample of 5837 Flemish (Belgian) pupils in the first year of secondary education. To uncover the mechanisms behind the ‘gendering’ of passive sports consumption, this study evaluates how the gender gap (characterized by higher male involvement) relates to the gender identity, experienced pressures for gender-conforming behavior and gender role attitudes of the students. Results indicate that the gender gap in interest is to a large extent related to the studied mechanisms. The findings have implications for research on the feminization of sports fandom and call for further analysis of the processes behind the gender gap in consumption of different sports with masculine or feminine connotations and of on-site and TV spectatorship.
5.1 Introduction

For decades, the unequal access of men and women to sport-related activities has been considered a social problem and has been studied extensively (Dufur, 1999; Hartmann-Tews & Pfister, 2003; Messner, 1988). Because sports are competitive and emphasize physical prowess, sport is often considered a male-dominated domain and gender-typed as belonging to masculine sphere (Messner, 2011; Smith & Leaper, 2005). Because of its competitive (and sometimes violent) nature, not only sports participation but also sports fandom and sport spectatorship – the focus of this contribution – have a masculine connotation (Dufur, 1999). Even though there are differences between specific sports, with some sports being gender-typed as feminine and others as masculine (see Plaza, Boiché, Brunel, & Ruchaud, 2017), a lot of research indicates that in several ways ‘sport’ remains a men’s world. For instance, masculine sports are considered more prestigious than feminine sports and they generally receive more media coverage (Chalabaev, Sarrazin, Fontayne, Boiché, & Clément-Guillotin, 2013), even though this not the case for the Summer Olympic Games (see Delorme, 2014). Furthermore, both male and female athletes in masculine and feminine sports are rated highly masculine, which is evidence for a male norm in the sports domain (Ruchaud, Chalabaev, & Fontayne, 2017). Moreover, research by Colley and colleagues (1996) indicates that most adolescents – even girls – draw a man when they are asked to draw someone who does a lot of sport.

We see three important lacunae in the extensive research on gender and sports consumption. Firstly, most research has focused on gender inequality in active sports participation while gender differences in passive sports consumption, such as going to sport events or watching sport on the television remain relatively understudied (Lagaert & Roose, in press; Pope & Williams, 2011). Secondly, most studies focus on adults, neglecting that unequal involvement in sports has its roots in childhood and that children’s and youngsters’ unique sport- and gender-related experiences need to be studied in their own right (Messner & Musto, 2014). Indeed, even though gender differences intensify in adolescence (see Colley et al., 1996; Galambos, Almeida, & Petersen, 1990), it remains unclear how exactly involvement in sports becomes gendered in childhood and adolescence. This is problematic because we need to understand the mechanisms reinforcing differential participation and consumption to provide
equal opportunities for boys and girls. The new perspective in Sociology of Childhood and Socialization Research, which is increasingly popular in sports sociology (see Messner & Musto, 2014; and the book edited by Messner & Musto, 2016), goes beyond treating youngsters as passive receptors of socialization by adults and sees a crucial role for youngsters in their own socialization and in the socialization of their peers (James, 2009; Maccoby, 2007; Qvortrup, Corsaro, & Honig, 2009). Thirdly, many researchers use a qualitative approach or a small sample-based quantitative study on athletes or avid sport fans to look into the processes behind women’s disadvantaged position in the sports domain (e.g., Athenstaedt, Mikula, & Bredt, 2009; Esmonde, Cooky, & Andrews, 2015; McCabe, 2008; Ruchaud, Chalabaev, & Fontayne, 2015). Thus, research is never able to evaluate whether these processes apply for all adults or youngsters (i.e., also those who are not involved in sports) and whether the results are representative for a larger population.

As a partial response to these lacunae in the literature, in this article, we study the mechanisms behind gender differences in interest in watching sports as a spectator or fan for a representative sample of almost 6000 Flemish early adolescents in the first year of secondary education ($M_{age} = 12.18$). Drawing on gender identity theory (Egan & Perry, 2001), the ‘doing gender’-perspective (West & Zimmerman, 1987), Risman’s ideas on gender as a social structure (Risman & Davis, 2013) and the Sociology of Childhood perspective (James, 2009; Messner & Musto, 2014; Qvortrup et al., 2009), we evaluate three possible mechanisms behind the gendering of taste that receive increasing attention in sports sociology: gender identity, pressure to conform to gender stereotypes and gender role attitudes (Boiché, Plaza, Chalabaev, Guillet-Descas, & Sarrazin, 2014; Chalabaev et al., 2013; McCabe, 2008; Ruchaud et al., 2015).

### 5.2 Theoretical Framework

The three potential mechanisms reinforcing the gender differences in interest in sport spectatorship studied in this article, i.e., gender identity, gender role attitudes and pressure for gender conformity, are related to the different levels or dimensions on which gender impacts on our daily lives (Risman, 2004; Risman & Davis, 2013). When paying attention to the effects of gender on the individual level (e.g., identity processes), on interational cultural expectations
(e.g., conformity pressures) and on the institutional domain (e.g., gender roles and ideologies, organizational practices), we will attain a more thorough understanding of how having a certain gender influences youngsters’ taste for sport spectatorship (see Risman & Davis, 2013). So, by analyzing the effects of gender identity, interactional pressures and gender norms on passive sports consumption in one study, we can theoretically distinguish and empirically disentangle the different but related levels on which ‘gender’ functions as a social structure (Risman & Davis, 2013).

5.2.1 Gender identity
‘Gender identity’ is the extent to which a person perceives and identifies the self to be masculine or feminine in relation to what is considered masculine or feminine in a specific social context (Egan & Perry, 2001; Tobin et al., 2010; Vantieghem, Vermeersch, & Van Houtte, 2014). Thus, identity is inherently social, but at the same time situated at the individual or personal level of the gender structure (Risman & Davis, 2013). Gender identity theory postulates that differences between boys and girls originate in masculine and feminine gender identities (Egan & Perry, 2001). According to the stereotype emulation hypothesis, people try to match their gender-typed behaviors to their gender identity: they adopt behaviors with a masculine or feminine connotation that correspond to their gender identification and avoid counter-stereotypical attributes (Tobin et al., 2010). This mechanism may be particularly relevant when it comes to sport involvement, because leisure preferences are an important context for (gendered) identity work (Sharp, Coatsworth, Darling, Cumsille, & Ranieri, 2007).

To test this expectation, gender identity research in sports psychology and sociology has mainly focused on masculinity and femininity based on an individual’s self-rating of masculine and feminine personality traits (e.g., independence, dominance, instrumentality vs. sensitivity, empathy, warmth, expressiveness) (see Athenstaedt, 2002; Athenstaedt et al., 2009; Colley et al., 1996; McCabe, 2008; Wann, Waddill, & Dunham, 2004). These studies confirm that people are drawn to gender-typed sport-related activities that correspond to their level of masculinity/femininity. According to McCabe (2008), reporting expressive (i.e., feminine) traits (and not instrumental traits) influences spectators' affect toward women's professional basketball. Moreover, Wann and colleagues (2004) show that masculine personality traits
predict the level of sport fandom (in general, not limited to female teams) among adult college students of both genders. For male and female adolescents, having masculine traits is positively related to participation in sports and outdoor activities (e.g., participating at sport competitions, visiting sport events, doing soccer) (Athenstaedt et al., 2009).

However, there is currently growing consensus that gender identity is not only dependent on personality characteristics, but also related to physical, social, behavioral and attitudinal attributes (Egan & Perry, 2001; Perry & Pauletti, 2011; Tobin et al., 2010; Vantieghem et al., 2014). Moreover, the aspects considered to be essential for gender self-definitions can differ from individual to individual. Indeed, women who score high on masculine personality traits may strongly identify as a woman. In a sense, the focus on personality traits instead of self-perceived gender identity risks to reproduce and justify stereotypical and essentialist ideas, for instance that to be considered feminine you have to be nurturing and that people who are competitive or dominant must have a more masculine gender identity. This researcher-driven (instead of self-perceived) gender identity is particularly problematic when studying youngsters, because a researcher may impose an adult perspective on gender identity, while youngsters may experience their life-worlds differently (see Messner & Musto, 2014). This new approach to self-perceived gender identity advocated by Egan and Perry (2001) is increasingly influential in research on youngsters’ gender identification (Patterson, 2012; Perry & Pauletti, 2011), but is not employed in sports sociology (with the exception of the French work by Ruchaud et al., 2015).

Knowing that sport fandom has a strong masculine connotation (Dufur, 1999), we can expect that higher levels of self-perceived gender identity are associated with a higher likelihood of having (moderately) high interest in watching sports as a spectator or fan for male adolescents, but with lower likelihood of having (moderately) high interest in watching sports as a spectator or fan for female adolescents (hypothesis 1a). Moreover, research by Sharp and colleagues (2007) indicates that male adolescents are more likely to indicate sport-related activities as self-defining activities (i.e., activities that people define as being important to who they are). So, in light of the stereotype emulation hypothesis, it can be expected that gender
identity and interest in sport spectatorship will be more strongly related among boys than among girls (hypothesis 1b).

5.2.2 Socialization and interactional expectations and pressures

Gender role socialization is often used as an explanation for the continuing gender differences in the domain of sport (Fredricks & Eccles, 2005). Because boys and girls are treated differently and have different experiences as a consequence of normative expectations and pressures to behave in a gender-appropriate way, they eventually develop into different persons with different tastes (Coltrane, 2006). A lot of research has focused on how the internalization of gender norms and sport-related expectations conveyed by parents influences boys’ and girls’ sport-related interests (e.g., Boiché et al., 2014; Fredricks & Eccles, 2005; Kane, 2006; Zeijl, te Poel, du Bois-Reymond, Ravesloot, & Meulman, 2000). In these studies, it is shown that parents often encourage boys’ participation in (certain) sports and discourage girls’ involvement according to the prevailing gender stereotypes. However, in line with growing attention to youngsters’ experiences and life-worlds (see Messner & Musto, 2014), there is increasing attention to the impact of peers on the gendered socialization of youth (e.g., Musto, 2014; Patrick et al., 1999; Slater & Tiggemann, 2010, 2011; Zeijl et al., 2000), even though research on youngsters’ role in their own self-socialization is still scarce.

Youngsters’ gendered behavior is strongly policed by peers (Leaper & Friedman, 2007). Research shows that an important group of gender non-conforming youngsters, especially boys, feel unaccepted by their peers (Smith & Leaper, 2005) and are more likely to be bullied (Young & Sweeting, 2004). This resonates with the ‘doing gender’-perspective of West and Zimmerman (1987, 2009). According to this perspective, people display gendered behavior in their social interactions to produce and justify their gender. Because one is held accountable for doing gender in an acceptable way, people tend to adhere to gendered normative expectations as a self-socializing mechanism in order to avoid negative social consequences of gender non-conformity, such as ostracism and bullying (West & Zimmerman, 1987, 2009). Therefore, we expect that higher levels of pressure for gender conformity (both from peers and internalized) are associated with higher likelihood of having (moderately) high interest in watching sports as
a spectator or fan for male adolescents, but with lower likelihood of having (moderately) high interest in watching sports as a spectator or fan for female adolescents (*hypothesis 2a*).

Evidence is mixed when it comes to the question whether gender conformity pressure has larger effects on boys’ or on girls’ sport-related behavior. As indicated by Coltrane (2006, p. 302), a lot of research indicates that girls have more freedom or social latitude to refuse to conform to feminine ideals than boys have to go against masculine stereotypes (for instance Kane, 2006; Ruchaud et al., 2015; Schmalz & Kerstetter, 2006; Smith & Leaper, 2005). For instance, research by Young and Sweeting (2004) on adolescents indicates that particularly boys’ gender atypicality is associated with a higher likelihood of being bullied, of feeling lonely and of having fewer friends. This resonates with Michael Messner’s ideas on soft essentialism (Messner, 2011). According to Messner, soft essentialist discourses accord free sport-related choices to girls but lead to essentialist views on what boys should do and like.

However, another line of research indicates that also young women’s gender atypical behavior encounters resistance (Jackson & Tinkler, 2007). Moreover, Slater and Tiggemann (2011) show that girls experience more teasing when playing sports (which is a gender atypical activity) than boys. Teasing could be one of the reasons why girls are more likely to drop out early from physical activity than boys (Slater & Tiggemann, 2010). Furthermore, these girls indicated that their peers, particularly girls, have a negative opinion on their sports participation: it is considered uncool or unfeminine to play sports, in particular ‘guy’ sports. Thus in light of current research, it is unclear whether the effect of gender conformity pressure is larger for boys than for girls (*hypothesis 2b*) or whether the effect is larger for girls than for boys (*hypothesis 2c*).

5.2.3 **Gender role attitudes**

Gender roles refer to prescriptive ideals of how men and women should behave (Chalabaev et al., 2013). If someone has traditional gender role attitudes, (s)he has internalized these prescriptive stereotypes prevailing in the broader society in the self during the socialization process, which allows the stereotypes to influence his/her behavior (see Risman & Davis, 2013). However, another way sport-related stereotypes affect sport participation and performance is through stereotype threat and stereotype lift mechanisms (Chalabaev et al., 2013; Chalabaev,
Sarrazin, Stone, & Cury, 2008; Chalabaev, Stone, Sarrazin, & Croizet, 2008; Laurin, 2013). The former process predicts that when negative in-group (i.e., own gender) stereotypes about sport are salient in a certain context an individual’s sport performance is impeded, the latter indicates that when people are reminded of negative out-group stereotypes, performance is boosted. Sartore and Cunningham (2007, pp. 251-252) indicate that the male-dominated context of sport (for instance the gender imbalance among sports crowds and in sport institutions) makes feminine identities more salient which activates those gender stereotypes that result in stereotype treat (or lift) processes. Thus, women’s sport-related performance, motivations and aspirations are thwarted by stereotypes, while men’s are facilitated (see also Hively & El-Alayli, 2014).

Research in sports sociology has studied the effects of both sport-specific stereotypes and general gender role attitudes regarding women’s position in public and private life of which sport-specific stereotypes are derived. Given the gender stereotyping of sport fandom, (a)traditional ideals of femininity and masculinity are expected to impact on sport spectatorship: people with egalitarian ideas about men and women may feel more at ease to show counter-stereotypical behavior than people with traditional gender role attitudes (Dufur, 1999; Meier, Strauss, & Riedl, 2017; Wiley, Shaw, & Havitz, 2000). The hypothesis that gender stereotypes influence men’s and women’s sport-related involvement is generally supported (for a review, see Chalabaev et al., 2013). For instance, having egalitarian gender role attitudes predicts spectators’ positive attitudes towards women’s professional basketball (McCabe, 2008). Furthermore, men with traditional gender role attitudes tend to choose masculine leisure sport courses (Athenstaedt, 2002).

Not only adults, but also youngsters are aware of and affected by gender stereotypes within the sports sphere (Boiché et al., 2014; Hardin & Greer, 2009; Klomsten, Marsh, & Skaalvik, 2005; Schmalz & Kerstetter, 2006). Complementary to existing research on youth’s sport involvement that has mainly focused on sport-specific stereotypes, in this study the focus is on general gender role attitudes. In line with other studies, we hypothesize that higher levels of traditional gender role attitudes are associated with higher likelihood of having (moderately) high interest in watching sports as a spectator or fan for male adolescents, but with lower
likelihood of having (moderately) high interest in watching sports as a spectator or fan for female adolescents (*hypothesis 3a*).

In general, research suggests that having traditional gender role attitudes mainly affects males. Athenstaedt (2002) shows that for men traditional attitudes are associated with a higher likelihood of taking ‘masculine’ sports courses, but there is no effect for women. Schmalz and Kerstetter (2006) show that particularly boys’ behavior is affected by gender stereotypes in sports. Therefore, we expect that the effect of having traditional gender role attitudes is larger for boys than for girls (*hypothesis 3b*).

### 5.3 Methods

#### 5.3.1 Sample and data collection

We employ data from 5,837 Flemish secondary school students in the first year of secondary education (7th grade in the American educational system). Flanders is the northern Dutch-speaking part of Belgium. The study of 7th graders is useful for our purpose because the onset of biological puberty in early adolescence makes gender differences particularly salient and pressures to conform to gender norms become stronger (see research on the gender intensification hypothesis, such as Galambos et al., 1990). Not surprisingly, the gender gap in interest in sport becomes larger in adolescence (Colley et al., 1996).

About 53% of the studied pupils are male. About 79% of the pupils are 12 years old meaning that the majority of the students are on track. The large majority of the students are in a general track, while 9.7% are in a vocational track. About 22% of the students have a working-class background. A complete description of the sample (total and for boys and girls separately) is shown in Table 5-1.

Data were gathered from September to December 2012 as part of the ‘Teaching in the bed of Procrustes’-project (detailed methodological information available in Vantieghem, 2015, p. 63-73). Within relevant parameters (representation of all geographical regions, school denomination and community size), three random samples were drawn from an inventory of all Flemish schools that offer 7th grade education. When a school in the first sample refused, a matched school in the next random sample was contacted. Thus, the selected schools represent
the Flemish educational context on important dimensions, while the randomness within these subgroups was maintained. In total, 59 schools (48%) participated in the study (124 were contacted). Comparison of the sample to the Flemish school population indicated that the schools are representative and that no systematic biases occurred (p. 64). A waiver of parental consent and the use of child assent were approved by the school and the Belgian Commission for the Protection of Privacy, based on the minimal risk and confidential nature of the study (p. 66). In total, 6,380 students filled out the questionnaire. However, students with missing data on one of the variables were excluded, so the analyses are based on 5,837 students. For the scales used in the analysis, having missing answers on more than 25% of the constituent items resulted in a missing on the scale.

5.3.2 Statistical method
We employ multilevel analyses (in MLwiN) to take into account the nested structure of the data: pupils are nested in schools (Hox, 2010). In this study, we present the results of binary logistic multilevel analyses (2nd order PQL estimation) of youngsters’ interest in watching sports as a spectator or fan, distinguishing having no or little interest in watching sport as a spectator or fan from moderate to high interest in the activity. Even though the dependent variable originally distinguished four levels of interest, we will focus on the results of the analyses on the binary variable (no or low interest versus (moderately) high interest). Theoretically, the same mechanisms are at play and empirically, the multinomial logistic multilevel analyses on the original 4-category variable (with moderate as reference category) lead to similar conclusions, while the results are much more difficult to present because in multinomial models the equation is estimated for each category of the dependent variable (compared to the reference category). Where the results do somewhat differ it is explained in a footnote. The presented models have been tested using MCMC estimation methods as well, and the obtained coefficients were very similar (i.e., differences situated at the third digit after the decimal point, generally smaller than .004).
Table 5-1: Descriptive Statistics for the Total Sample (n = 5837, in 59 schools) and Separately for Boys (n = 3108) and Girls (n = 2729)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric variables</th>
<th>Total sample</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Girls versus Boys</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metric variables</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>Min–Max</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>Mean Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender typicality</td>
<td>2.47 (0.68)</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>0 – 4</td>
<td>2.54 (0.67)</td>
<td>2.40 (0.68)</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender conformity pressure</td>
<td>1.46 (0.57)</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>0 – 3</td>
<td>1.69 (0.53)</td>
<td>1.19 (0.49)</td>
<td>-.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional gender role attitudes</td>
<td>1.63 (0.56)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>0 – 4</td>
<td>1.80 (0.57)</td>
<td>1.44 (0.47)</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Boys (ref)</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in watching sports as spectator</td>
<td>No or little interest (ref)</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or fan</td>
<td>Moderate or high interest</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social class</td>
<td>Working class (ref)</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper class</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>General (ref)</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>11 years old</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 years old (ref)</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 years old</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 years old or older</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Parents Western-European (ref)</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One parent non-W-European</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both parents non-W-European</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.3 Variables

5.3.3.1 Dependent variable: Interest in watching sports as a spectator or fan

The dependent variable relates to students’ interest in watching sports as a spectator (in Dutch: ‘toeschouwer’, referring to on-site spectatorship) or fan. We study interest instead of actual consumption because actual sports consumption among early adolescents is frequently mediated by parents or school and compulsory, and thus not always an expression of individual preference (Melnick & Wann, 2011; Tinson, Sinclair, & Kolyperas, 2017). Interest in the activity was rated using a 4-point scale from 0 (not interested) to 3 (very interested). The distribution of the respondents with regard to interest in sport spectatorship (by gender) is shown in Table 5-2. A binary dependent variable was constructed which distinguishes youngsters with no or little interest in watching sport as a spectator or fan from youngsters with moderate to high interest in the activity. Unfortunately, we do not have information on the type of sport event that youngsters are interested in, a shortcoming addressed in the discussion.

Table 5-2: Interest in sport spectatorship, by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest in watching sports as a spectator or fan</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No interest</td>
<td>299 (9.6 %)</td>
<td>410 (15 %)</td>
<td>709 (12.1 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low interest</td>
<td>709 (22.8 %)</td>
<td>1230 (45.1 %)</td>
<td>1939 (33.2 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate interest</td>
<td>936 (30.1 %)</td>
<td>822 (30.1 %)</td>
<td>1758 (30.1 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High interest</td>
<td>1164 (37.5 %)</td>
<td>267 (9.8 %)</td>
<td>1431 (24.5 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3108 (100 %)</td>
<td>2729 (100 %)</td>
<td>5837 (100 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.3.2 Independent variables: Gender, typicality, attitudes and conformity

The central explanatory variables are gender of the student, gender typicality, pressure for gender conformity and traditional gender role attitudes. As can be seen in Table 5-1, 53% of the adolescents in the sample are boys (the reference group). The indicators of gender typicality and gender conformity pressure are both based on the Self-Perception Profile of Egan and Perry (2001). The Dutch translation and answer formats of the measures were based on the study of Bos and Sandfort (2010).

To measure gender identity, we used the gender typicality subscale of this questionnaire. Gender typicality measures the extent to which males and females feel they are typical for their gender and is a mean scale based on six items using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 0
(completely disagree) to 4 (completely agree). Sample items are: “I feel that the things I am good at are similar to those of most boys/girls” and “I feel that my personality is similar to that of most boys/girls” with each designation matching the gender of the respondent. The higher a student scores on the measure, the stronger his/her feeling of gender typicality. The scale has good internal consistency (α = .78). On average pupils had a score of 2.47, ranging from 0 to 4, and young men reported higher typicality than did young women (see Table 5-1).

The pressure for gender conformity scale indicates the extent to which a pupil experiences pressure for gender-conforming behavior. Four items measure pressure from peers and four items measure pressure experienced from oneself, each using a 4-point Likert-type response scale from 0 (completely disagree) to 3 (completely agree). Sample items are: “I think it is important to act just like other girls/boys” (internalized pressure) and “The boys (girls) I know would be upset if I wanted to learn an activity that only girls (boys) usually do” (pressure from peers), again matching items to the respondent’s gender. Higher scores mean higher perceived pressure for gender conformity. The measure is a mean scale with good internal consistency (α = .82). On average, male adolescents scored considerably higher on the scale than did female adolescents (see Table 5-1), which means that boys perceive more pressure from others and themselves to conform to gender stereotypes. However, also girls experience a considerable amount of pressure (see Table 5-1).

The traditional gender role attitudes of each adolescent are measured using a mean scale of 15 variables indicating traditional beliefs about female and male roles (α = .80), developed by Vermeersch and colleagues (2010). It includes items such as “There is something wrong with girls who talk dirty” and “Women should first consider their children, and only then their career”, which were evaluated using a 5-point Likert response scale ranging from 0 (completely disagree) to 4 (completely agree). On average, the students score 1.63, which means they have fairly egalitarian gender role attitudes. On average, male adolescents have more traditional attitudes than female adolescents. In the same vein, the minimum and maximum scores of boys and girls on this measure differ: boys’ scores range from 0.13 to 4, while girls’ scores range from 0 to 3.29.
The central independent variables are correlated ($r_{\text{gendertypicality.genderroleattitudes}} = 0.14$ (p<0.001); $r_{\text{gendertypicality.genderconformity}} = 0.23$ (p<0.001); $r_{\text{genderconformity.genderroleattitudes}} = 0.49$ (p<0.001)). However, the VIF’s remain below 2.5 in the presented models (apart from the VIF’s for gender and the interaction term but that is normal when estimating interactions). Moreover, because multicollinearity does typically not affect the estimated coefficient but only inflates the standard error, this may lead to a more conservative testing of the hypotheses but does not bias the interpretation of the results in our study (see Shieh & Fouladi, 2003).

5.3.3.3 Controls
We take into account the following demographics (see Table 5-1). Age group indicates whether the pupil is 11 years old, 12 years old (reference category), 13 years old, or 14 or older. We also account for the student’s educational track: general (reference category) or vocational. We include a categorical indicator of the socio-economic background of the student which is based on the current or last occupation of the father and mother and distinguishes working-class youth (reference category) from middle class and upper class youth. The adolescent’s social class is the highest score of both parents (when applicable). We add ethnicity to the model, which is based on the country of birth of the adolescent’s parents. The variable distinguishes students from Belgian or Western-European origin (reference group) from students with either one or both parents from non-Western European origin.

5.4 Results
In Table 5-3, the results of the binary logistic multilevel models predicting moderate or high interest in watching sports as a spectator or fan versus having no or little interest are presented. The null model is the baseline model and separates individual-level variance from school level variance. Model 1 estimates the effect of gender (in the analyses this means ‘being a girl’) and indicates that – as expected – female adolescents are less likely than male adolescents to report moderate to high interest in watching sports (versus no or low interest). To be exact: the odds ratio of gender (which can be obtained by calculating the exponent of the logistic regression coefficient $b_{\text{Girl}} = -1.173^{***}$) equals 0.31, which means that the odds for a female adolescent to have moderate to high interest (vs. no or limited interest) is 0.31 times higher than for male adolescents; or in other words, the odds to be in the higher interest categories (versus
the lower interest categories) is 3.23 (= 1/e^{-1.173}) times lower for girls than for boys. These numbers correspond with a predicted probability for girls to report moderate to high interest (versus no to limited interest) of .39 (=e^{(0.715 + (-1.173))} / (1 + e^{(0.715 + (-1.173))}), which is a fairly low probability, while the predicted probability for boys to have moderate to high interest is .67 (=e^{0.715} / (1 + e^{0.715})), which is a much higher probability. So, there is a substantial gender gap. Model 2 shows that the effect of gender does not change once controlled for several student characteristics.

Model 3 (Table 5-3) reports the differential effect of gender typicality on interest in sport spectatorship for boys and girls (controlled for gender conformity pressure and traditional gender role attitudes). These associations are visualized in Figure 5-1 to facilitate the interpretation of the interaction effect. For boys, higher self-perceived gender typicality is strongly associated with a higher likelihood of having moderate to high interest (versus no or little interest) in watching sport (because we are using an interaction term, the effect of gender typicality for boys is indicated by $b_{\text{Gender typicality}} = 0.547***$). The significant interaction effect ($b_{\text{Girl x Gender typicality}} = -0.440***$) indicates that the effect of gender typicality is lower for girls. So, for female adolescents, there is hardly any association between gender typicality and interest in sport spectatorship$^1$ (because of the interaction term the effect of gender typicality for girls equals $b_{\text{Gender typicality}} + b_{\text{Girl x Gender typicality}} = 0.547 + (-0.440) = 0.107$). Additional analyses showed this small positive coefficient for girls to be non-significant on the .05-level ($b = 0.107 (0.059)$). Nevertheless, because of the significant positive effect for boys, the gender gap is considerably larger among pupils with high self-perceived gender typicality than among youngsters with low gender typicality. To sum up, the results only partly support hypothesis 1a because there is a positive effect of gender typicality for boys, but unexpectedly no significant (negative) effect for girls. Consequently, the effect is stronger for boys, confirming hypothesis 1b.
Table 5-3: Binary logistic multilevel models predicting interest in watching sports as a spectator or fan (no or little interest versus moderate or high interest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Null model</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.168***</td>
<td>0.715***</td>
<td>0.711***</td>
<td>0.713***</td>
<td>0.674***</td>
<td>0.689***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl (Boy = ref)</td>
<td>-1.173***</td>
<td>-1.180***</td>
<td>-1.139***</td>
<td>-1.151***</td>
<td>-1.162***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>0.019 (0.078)</td>
<td>0.002 (0.079)</td>
<td>0.001 (0.079)</td>
<td>0.000 (0.079)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper class (Working class = ref)</td>
<td>-0.026 (0.095)</td>
<td>-0.027 (0.096)</td>
<td>-0.030 (0.096)</td>
<td>-0.030 (0.096)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational track (General track = ref)</td>
<td>-0.001 (0.102)</td>
<td>-0.016 (0.104)</td>
<td>-0.005 (0.105)</td>
<td>-0.022 (0.105)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One parent non-Western-European</td>
<td>0.004 (0.100)</td>
<td>-0.005 (0.101)</td>
<td>0.000 (0.101)</td>
<td>-0.005 (0.102)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both parents non-Western-European (Parents Western-European = ref)</td>
<td>0.251* (0.103)</td>
<td>0.200° (0.105)</td>
<td>0.196° (0.105)</td>
<td>0.205° (0.106)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 11 or younger</td>
<td>0.068 (0.219)</td>
<td>0.121 (0.220)</td>
<td>0.118 (0.219)</td>
<td>0.106 (0.219)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 13</td>
<td>-0.074 (0.079)</td>
<td>-0.071 (0.080)</td>
<td>-0.081 (0.080)</td>
<td>-0.085 (0.081)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 14 or older (Age 12 = ref)</td>
<td>-0.469* (0.199)</td>
<td>-0.481* (0.202)</td>
<td>-0.472* (0.202)</td>
<td>-0.500* (0.203)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender typicality</td>
<td>0.547*** (0.061)</td>
<td>0.329*** (0.043)</td>
<td>0.328*** (0.043)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender conformity pressure</td>
<td>-0.100 (0.061)</td>
<td>0.103 (0.080)</td>
<td>-0.092 (0.061)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional gender attitudes</td>
<td>0.199** (0.061)</td>
<td>0.196** (0.061)</td>
<td>0.421*** (0.076)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl x Gender typicality</td>
<td>-0.440*** (0.083)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl x Gender conformity pressure</td>
<td>-0.432*** (0.111)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl x Traditional gender attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.540***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variance components:

| School (υ0j)                            | 0.089 (0.026)| 0.056 (0.020)| 0.048 (0.018)| 0.044 (0.018)| 0.045 (0.018)| 0.045 (0.018)|

Note: N = 5837 adolescents in 59 schools. All metric independent variables are grand mean centered. °p < .10. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

a In binary logistic multilevel models the variance at the individual level is fixed.
Figure 5-1: The association between sex, gender typicality and interest in watching sport

![Graph showing the association between sex, gender typicality, and interest in watching sport for boys and girls.](image)

In model 4 (Table 5-3) and Figure 5-2, the differential effect of pressure for gender conformity on interest in sport spectatorship for male and female adolescents is shown. Figure

Figure 5-2: The association between sex, gender conformity pressure and interest in watching sport

![Graph showing the association between sex, gender conformity pressure, and interest in watching sport for boys and girls.](image)
suggests that higher pressure for gender-conforming behavior relates to a slightly higher likelihood of having moderate to high interest in watching sport events as a spectator or fan (vs. no or little interest) for boys, but as shown in model 4 this effect is not significant ($b_{\text{Gender conformity pressure}} = 0.103 \text{ ns}$). For girls, however, receiving more conformity pressure is strongly associated with a lower likelihood of reporting moderate to high interest (versus no or little interest) ($b_{\text{Gender conformity pressure}} + b_{\text{Girl X Gender conformity pressure}} = 0.103 \text{ ns} + (-0.432)*** = -0.329 (0.086)***$). In other words, while girls experience less gender conformity pressure than boys on average (see Table 5-1), the relationship between gender conformity pressure and interest in sport spectatorship is stronger for girls than for boys. As a result, the gender gap is larger among youngsters that experience a lot of pressure to conform to gender stereotypes than among pupils that do not experience pressure. To sum up, the results partly support hypothesis 2a which predicts that gender conformity pressure has a negative effect on girls’ interest, but a positive effect on boys’ involvement, because only the former association was confirmed. Moreover, hypothesis 2c (and not hypothesis 2b) could be confirmed: gender conformity has the largest effect on girls’ interest in sport spectatorship.

Model 5 (Table 5-3) and Figure 5-3 shed light on the relationship between gender, traditional gender role attitudes and sport spectatorship. The gender gap in interest in watching sport as a spectator or fan is clearly larger among youth with traditional gender beliefs than among youth with egalitarian beliefs. While having more traditional gender role attitudes has a significant and large positive association for boys ($b_{\text{Traditional gender attitudes}} = 0.421***$), it appears to be linked to a smaller likelihood of reporting moderate to high interest (versus no or little interest) for girls ($b_{\text{Traditional gender attitudes}} + b_{\text{Girl X Traditional gender attitudes}} = 0.421*** + (-0.540)*** = -0.119$). However, additional analyses indicated that this negative association for girls is nonsignificant at the .05-level ($b = -0.119 (0.089)\text{ ns}$). This means that for boys, the more traditional their gender role attitudes are, the more likely it is that they have moderate to high interest in watching sports as a spectator or fan (versus no or little interest), while there is no effect of gender role attitudes for girls (who have on average already more egalitarian attitudes than boys, see Table 5-1). Thus, hypothesis 3a which predicted that traditional gender role attitudes have a positive effect for boys, but a negative effect for girls was only partially
confirmed. Moreover, in line with hypothesis 3b, the analyses indicate that male adolescents’ interest in sport spectatorship is more strongly related to their gender role attitudes than female adolescents’ interest.

**Figure 5-3: The association between sex, traditional gender attitudes and interest in watching sport**

5.5 Discussion and conclusion

5.5.1 Aim and findings
In this article, we studied the effect of gender identity, gender conformity pressures and gender role attitudes on male and female adolescents’ interest in sport spectatorship using a representative sample of Flemish 7th graders. Thus, we extend existing research on gender differences in the sports domain, that has mainly focused on active sports participation and on adults.

Our findings indicate that there is a substantial gender gap in interest in watching sport as a spectator or fan among youngsters. Moreover, gender identity, gender conformity pressures and gender role attitudes are important mechanisms behind these gender differences in sport spectatorship: the gender gap is much larger between male and female adolescents that are gender typical, experience a lot of gender conformity pressure and have traditional gender role
attitudes than among gender atypical youngsters that do not experience conformity pressure and have egalitarian attitudes. So, these findings are in line with work by Risman and colleagues who argue that gender is a social structure that functions on three levels, the personal, the interactional and the macro level (Risman, 2004; Risman & Davis, 2013). However, the analyses indicate that the three studied elements have a differential effect for boys and girls. Gender identity and traditional gender role attitudes are shown to be strongly related to boys’ interest in watching sports, but not to girls’, while pressure for gender-conforming behavior is associated with girls’ involvement in the activity, but not with boys’. Moreover, the results indicate that also within the groups of boys and girls there is variation related to gender identity, pressure for gender conformity and gender role attitudes. This resonates with perspectives focusing on gender fluidity in adolescents (Egan & Perry, 2001; Thorne, 1997).

A striking result was that gender conformity pressure has a stronger effect on interest in sport spectatorship for girls than for boys. Even though this is in line with work by Slater and Tiggemann (2010, 2011) and Jackson and Tinkler (1997), it contradicts other studies that argue that girls have more social latitude to refuse to conform to feminine stereotypes than boys have to contradict ideals of masculinity (Coltrane, 2006; Kane, 2006; Young & Sweeting, 2004). A possible explanation is that when it comes to interest in specific sports with a feminine connotation, such as gymnastics, pressure is highest for boys, but when it comes to interest in sport in general, girls may experience more pressure.

### 5.5.2 Implications for research on the feminization of the sports crowds

This study sheds a new light on the processes behind the supposed feminization of sport spectatorship and sport fandom, which receives increasing scientific attention (Meier et al., 2017; Pope, 2017). A rising percentage of female fans among the sports crowds is likely to be reinforced by the mechanisms uncovered in this study. There are two potential processes behind the phenomenon. Firstly, reduced pressure to conform to gender stereotypes may have resulted in a growing interest in sport fandom among females. Secondly, an eventual decreasing interest of males in sport spectatorship may be influenced by changing gender role attitudes through time. Boys (with increasingly egalitarian gender attitudes) may choose alternative leisure
activities that do not have a masculine connotation such as arts-, literature- and music-related activities (see also Lagaert, Van Houtte & Roose, 2017).

5.5.3 Policy implications
Our focus on the mechanisms reinforcing gender differences in interest in sport spectatorship is particularly relevant from a social equality perspective. To create equal access to sport spectatorship for girls, it is particularly important to address the experienced pressure to conform to gender stereotypes. As elaborated on in a previous study (Lagaert, Van Houtte & Roose, 2017), we see an important role for the educational system to create safe environments where there is little pressure to conform to stereotypes of what typical (fe)male adolescents should do and like. Because bullying influences girls’ interest in sport-related activities (Slater & Tiggemann, 2010, 2011), the implementation of anti-bullying policies that pay attention to gender-based bullying and create recognition for different gender expressions in schools is important. Furthermore, using gender as means to organize groups and courses should be avoided. For instance, often sport-classes are gender-segregated, even though segregation in courses reinforces stereotypical behavior (Martin et al. 2014). Also during co-educational sports courses attention has to be paid to potential gender imbalances. For instance, when playing team sports mixed teams could be used that are comparable in ability. Moreover, different aspects such as power, speed, technical ability, being a team player, physical investment and improvement could be valued and praised to stimulate perceived competence, involvement and enjoyment in all students (cf. Araújo, Mesquita, & Hastie, 2014; Nicaise, Bois, Fairclough, Amorose, & Cogérino, 2007). These kind of measures could of course also benefit many boys as there is also considerable variation in sportive ability among boys (and girls).

5.5.4 Limitations and suggestions for future research
The limitations of this study are in the first place related to the definition of the dependent variable, which is very broad (cf. Lagaert & Roose, 2016). Youngsters were asked to indicate their interest in watching sport as a spectator or fan. So, we do not know whether the uncovered patterns would differ in terms of the kind of sport that is watched (individual versus team sports, sports with a feminine or a masculine connotation, amateur or professional sports, national or international matches, regular competition or special events such as a World Championship etc.) or whether female or male players are watched. For future research, it would be especially
interesting to study how gender identity, pressure for gender conformity and traditional gender role attitudes relate to adolescents’ interest in watching specific gender-typed sports. Additionally, it could be relevant to study the effect of these predictors on youngsters’ interest in watching male teams versus female teams. It can be expected that in studies on watching feminine-typed sports or watching female teams, pressure for gender-conforming behavior will be more strongly related to boys’ interest, than was found in this study.

Additionally, the relationship between gender identity, pressure for gender conformity and gender role attitudes on the one hand and interest in watching sport on the other hand could differ depending on whether it concerns on-site spectatorship, such as physically going to a football game, or TV spectatorship. Even though the Dutch word ‘toeschouwer’ used in the questionnaire is generally used in the context of live spectatorship of a performance, it is quite possible that 12-year olds have not understood the term as such. Moreover, in light of the large variety of ways people can consume sports nowadays, it is necessary to address more digitalized ways of consuming sports, for example following the updates and highlights of a match on a smartphone. Considering the strong gendered expectations attached to the domain of Sports, a crucial element may be the presence of others that could criticize atypical gender displays and express pressure for gender-conforming behavior (cf. West & Zimmerman, 1987). As such, experienced pressure for gender-conforming behavior could affect girls’ interests in watching a game as a spectator in the stadium, watching a match in a pub, and posting updates of scores on Facebook to a larger extent than more private ways of involvement in the activity, for instance watching a game on TV alone at home. Paying more attention to the relation between gender, gender norms and the various forms in which people can consume sports is crucial to achieve a better understanding of this often overlooked topic in Sports Sociology. This study informs future research on the gendering of sport spectatorship by showing that identity-processes, pressures for gender-conforming behavior and gender role attitudes are important processes.
5.6 Notes

The multinomial logit model shows that while higher gender typicality is associated with a higher likelihood for boys to report high versus moderate interest, it is associated with a lower likelihood to report high versus moderate interest for girls, which is more in line with hypothesis 1a. The effect sizes for boys and girls do not differ substantially.

In the multinomial logit models, gender role attitudes do not have a significant effect on the likelihood of reporting high versus moderate interest, neither for boys nor for girls. This suggests that gender role attitudes can predict why male adolescents have high versus low interest, but cannot explain levels of interest among those who are already relatively interested.
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6 Gender and highbrow cultural participation in Europe: The effect of societal gender equality and development

Chapter based on the article published as:


Existing individual-level research links women's higher participation in high-status cultural activities to their position in the work and family spheres. This article studies how cross-national variation in women's and men's cultural participation relates to societal care- and work-related gender equality and development. Multilevel analyses on Eurobarometer data (2013) indicate that male engagement in the feminine domain of care and societal development stimulate frequent participation in highbrow culture, but more for men than for women, thus partly explaining gender gap variation in highbrow cultural participation across EU countries. We conclude that men play an important but underestimated role in the explanation of the gender gap.
6.1 Introduction

Research indicates that women participate more than men in highbrow cultural and artistic activities, such as reading literary books and attending operas, plays or classical concerts (Christin, 2012). This gender gap is present in several Western countries, such as Denmark (Katz-Gerro and Jaeger, 2015), Finland (Purhonen et al., 2011), Sweden (Bihagen and Katz-Gerro, 2000), and the US (Christin, 2012; Lizardo, 2006; Tepper, 2000), even though the gap size differs cross-nationally (Falk and Katz-Gerro, 2016). Considering that highbrow cultural consumption functions as cultural capital, which is an important status marker in Western societies (Bourdieu, 1986; Lamont and Lareau, 1988), women’s higher participation is actually surprising: cultural capital appears to be one of the only status markers on which women do better than men (Christin, 2012).

Most existing studies tried to solve this ‘puzzle of women’s highbrow consumption’ (cf. Lizardo, 2006) by primarily focusing on women’s individual characteristics and on the cultural capital enhancing properties of cultural participation. In this paper, we complement current thinking in two ways. First, instead of reducing cultural consumption to its high-status character, we also highlight the feminine connotation of leisure-time artistic activities (Kraaykamp et al., 2008; Nosek et al., 2002; Zinkhan et al., 2004). Acknowledging the gender-typing of highbrow participation allows for explanations that focus on how gendered opportunities and expectations influence not only women, but also and maybe especially men. Indeed, understanding men’s role in the gender gap may be more important to solve the puzzle than is generally recognized (Lagaert et al., 2017; Lehman and Dumais, 2017).

Second and related, we depict how the societal context affects the frequency of both men’s and women’s highbrow participation: we evaluate to what extent gender equality in the societal division of labor impacts on both men’s and women’s theatre attendance, museum and art gallery visits and ballet, dance performance and opera attendance. Division of labor refers to how work, in terms of labor market participation and segregation, and family care, in terms of the division of housework and childcare responsibilities, are organized in a country. Thus, we contextualize existing individual-level research that describes how traditional gender role
expectations in the family sphere and female labor market participation and segregation in the work sphere shape the opportunities and norms regarding women’s highbrow cultural participation (Bihagen and Katz-Gerro, 2000; Christin, 2012; Collins, 1988; Lizardo, 2006; Willekens and Lievens, 2016).

We argue that in more gender equal countries, where women enter the masculine sphere of work and men engage in the feminine sphere of care, both men and women will more frequently participate in culture, as increased opportunities for the outsourcing of housework and childcare in these contexts will result in more available leisure time (Craig and Mullan, 2013; Nyberg, 2015). Moreover, we expect that in societies where traditional gender boundaries are crossed, less rigorous gender roles prevail (see Ridgeway, 2011). This makes it easier for men to engage in artistic activities traditionally considered as feminine and for women to refrain from doing so, thus reducing the gender gap.

We contrast the effect of gender equality on men’s and women’s highbrow participation with the potentially confounding effect of societal development, which is one of the mechanisms behind women’s improved position in modern societies (Charles and Bradley, 2009; Gerhards et al., 2009; Inglehart and Norris, 2003) and is known to stimulate appreciation of highbrow culture (Gerhards et al., 2013; van Hek and Kraaykamp, 2013). While gender equality would explain cross-national differences in men’s and women’s cultural participation because of the gendered nature of artistic leisure activities, societal development captures the high-status, exclusive and inequality-related aspects of leisure-time highbrow consumption. So, by recognizing that highbrow cultural activities are at the same time high-status, feminine and require leisure time, we get a better understanding of the specific mechanisms behind the relationship between gender and cultural consumption across social contexts. Moreover, this study is the first to analyze the gender gap in highbrow consumption across Europe and, thus, contributes to the growing body of research regarding inequalities in cultural consumption from a cross-national perspective (Falk and Katz-Gerro, 2016; Fishman and Lizardo, 2013; Gerhards et al., 2013; van Hek and Kraaykamp, 2013).
6.2 Theoretical background

6.2.1 Individual-level link between gender and highbrow cultural consumption
Research from various Western countries shows that women are more likely than men to participate in high-status cultural activities such as attending an opera, ballet or play, or visiting an (art) museum (Bihagen and Katz-Gerro, 2000; Christin, 2012; Lizardo, 2006; Purhonen et al., 2011). Explanations generally focus on expectations, opportunities and constraints related to a woman’s responsibilities in the work and family spheres.

First, some theories argue that the gender gap in highbrow cultural participation originates in women’s labor market participation. In the US, women are less likely to work full-time and therefore they have more free time to participate in these leisure activities (Christin, 2012). However, not working or working part-time is associated with lower rates of female cultural participation in Belgium (Willekens and Lievens, 2016). Among Dutch couples, women’s and men’s participation is higher when the male partner works part-time (Kraaykamp et al., 2008).

Second, the gender gap in cultural consumption may also relate to labor market segregation. According to Collins (1988, 1992), the return on women’s investment in cultural capital is especially high in ‘female’ jobs and sectors, where impression management is important. Similarly, Lizardo (2006) shows that the gender gap is smaller in occupational fields where the proportion of cultural capital (relative to the proportion of economic capital) is higher. While in the US, women’s higher cultural consumption is related to their overrepresentation in the cultural and educational sectors (Christin, 2012), Bihagen and Katz-Gerro (2000) find no empirical evidence for this in Sweden.

Third, the gender gap in arts participation may have its roots in socialization in traditional gender roles within the family and the household division of labor later in life. As Willekens and Lievens (2016: 53) state, “girls are socialized in gender roles that emphasize compliance with formal culture, which leads to a stronger inclination to adopt an aesthetic disposition.” Furthermore, many cultural activities, such as art museum visits and ballet, opera and theatre attendance are gender-typed as feminine, especially by people with traditional
gender role attitudes (Athenstaedt et al., 2009; Zinkhan et al., 2004). Arts participation is considered appropriate for women because these activities are passive, private, non-competitive and academic (Tepper, 2000). So, the feminine connotation of the arts fits within wider stereotypical gender role beliefs that originate in Victorian separate spheres ideology. This gender-typing may lead to gender-specific early socialization in arts and literature within the family (Bihagen and Katz-Gerro, 2000; Christin, 2012; Katz-Gerro and Jaeger, 2015; Tepper, 2000).

Traditional gender roles in the family context also affect adult women’s arts consumption. Collins (1988) argues that women are in charge of status production within the household. So, women consume more highbrow culture because they are responsible for the family’s public image and for the cultural reproduction within the family, i.e., “cultural housekeeping” (Lovell, 2001: 39). Belgian and Dutch research confirms that the mother’s cultural consumption has the largest influence on the embodied cultural capital of their children (van Eijck, 1997; Willekens and Lievens, 2014). However, women’s family care responsibilities consume time and hamper female participation in outdoor and time-inflexible activities (Bittman and Wajcman, 2000; Hook, 2010). Belgian research indicates that time constraints related to having young children have a stronger negative effect on frequency of arts participation for women than for men (Willekens and Lievens, 2016).

What becomes clear from this literature review is, first, that next to the frequently studied cultural capital enhancing properties of highbrow participation, it is equally important to recognize the gendered nature of these activities, i.e., their female connotation, and that they require leisure time (Lagaert et al., 2017; Kraaykamp et al., 2008; Lehman and Dumais, 2017; Schmutz et al., 2016). Second, research concentrates mainly on women’s characteristics and overlooks men’s role in the gender gap (Lagaert et al., 2017; Lehman and Dumais, 2017). Third, the spheres of work and family shape the norms (e.g., traditional gender role beliefs), the structural opportunities (e.g., jobs in feminine sectors) and the constraints (e.g., leisure time) for women’s highbrow cultural participation. However, evidence of whether and how these work and family-related mechanisms affect women’s arts consumption is inconsistent across countries. The (currently unexplained) cross-national variation in size of the gender gap in
Western countries further suggests that the processes behind gender differences are context dependent (see Falk and Katz-Gerro, 2016).

6.2.2  **Contextualizing work and family: Societal division of labor**

The gendered division of labor refers to the social organization of responsibilities in which women are usually more responsible for child care and domestic work and men are mainly in charge of tasks in the public sphere, especially the economy and politics (Chafetz, 1991; Hofäcker et al., 2013). Gender equality in the division of labor in the household and the workplace varies considerably across countries (Fuwa, 2004; Hook, 2006, 2010). This means that societies structurally organize work and family spheres differently, and these spheres are associated with divergent gender norms cross-nationally (see for instance Hofäcker et al., 2013; Hook, 2006, 2010; Sümer, 2009). This macro-level organization of the work and family spheres influences inequalities at the individual-level organization of work and family care (Bettio, 2017; Blumberg, 1991; Chafetz, 1991, 2001; Hofäcker et al., 2013; Mandel and Semyonov, 2006).

In other words, the way men and women combine work and family responsibilities and the amount of leisure time they have left, is influenced by how a society supports parenting, household work, family care and labor market participation. Therefore, we argue that (1) gender equality in the societal organization of work and care affects both women’s and men’s cultural consumption through its effects on the available leisure time; and (2) because of the gendered nature of arts-related activities, gender equality will affect men and women differently.

6.2.2.1  **Societal division of labor and overall highbrow participation**

Growing gender equality in the organization of care and work in Western welfare states in the last century has its roots in larger cultural and structural transformations of the economy, the organization of household labor and the availability of leisure time (Gerhards et al., 2009; Haller et al., 2013; Inglehart, 1997; Inglehart and Norris, 2003; Noll, 2016; Stanfors and Goldscheider, 2017; Stockemer and Sundström, 2016). Some scholars refer to these societal transformations as the ‘modernization or development’ of societies.

Growing female labor market participation is to a large extent the result of the increasing number of (part-time) jobs in the service sector in post-industrialized economies, which attract
women (Charles, 2011; Olivetti and Petrongolo, 2016; Stanfors and Goldscheider, 2017). The service-sector expansion also made the outsourcing of housework to the market cheaper (cf. cleaning and ironing services), which further facilitates female employment (Marx and Vandelannoote, 2015; Olivetti and Petrongolo, 2016). Moreover, to make the combination of work- and household-related demands easier on families, many European welfare states especially invested in parental leave policies and access to childcare facilities, allowing families to outsource more household- and care-related tasks to public services and mothers to stay at work (Bettio, 2017; Ciccia and Bleijenbergh, 2014; Sümer, 2009). As such, in modernized welfare states, gender equality in the domains of work and family is not only defined by which gender does more paid or unpaid work, but also represents an entire transformation of the societal organization of work, the labor market, the economy and care for the family.

This has implications for men’s and women’s leisure time (Craig and Mullan, 2013; Nyberg, 2015), which is an important predictor of participation in leisure activities (Kraaykamp et al., 2008; Willekens and Lievens, 2016). Cross-national comparative research by Craig and Mullan (2013) indicates that mothers and fathers have the most leisure time in Denmark, the most gender equal country under study, compared to Australia, France, Italy and the US. The large investments in systems to outsource housework to the service sector and public sector in many European countries give (especially highly educated) families more leisure time that can be used for cultural participation1 (Marx and Vandelannoote, 2015; Nyberg, 2015). Therefore, we expect that gender equality in the organization of work (H1a) and gender equality in the organization of care for the family (H2a) will have a positive effect on the frequency of highbrow cultural participation of both men and women.

6.2.2.2 Societal division of labor and the gender gap in highbrow participation
We expect that higher societal gender equality is associated with smaller gender gaps in cultural participation (see Blumberg, 1991; Chafetz, 1991, 2001). Explanations work through the effects of different structural opportunities and constraints for men and women, and through gendered normative expectations (Hook, 2010). Labor market segregation, which partly explains women’s higher participation at the individual level (Christin, 2012; Collins, 1988, 1992; Lizardo, 2006), can function as such a structural opportunity that stimulates women’s cultural
consumption. In societies where women’s responsibilities for the family can only be combined with educational sector jobs – a sector where cultural capital is important – women are more likely to participate in highbrow culture than they would in a context where there is no gendered job segregation and where women can enter any occupational sector (see Bihagen and Katz-Gerro, 2000; Christin, 2012; Lizardo, 2006).

Moreover, considering that traditional gender role beliefs and the idea that men and women belong to separate spheres are the basis of the female gender-typing of artistic activities (Tepper, 2000; Zinkhan et al., 2004), the normative expectations regarding acceptable behavior for men and women in a society will affect their highbrow cultural consumption. When women can enter the masculine sphere of work and men the feminine domain of care for the family, this signals that crucial gender boundaries are crossed and less rigorous gender roles prevail (Ridgeway, 2011; Sümer, 2009). We expect that in societies where these gender boundaries are crossed and where traditional gender roles are losing their importance, it is more acceptable for men to engage in artistic activities traditionally considered as feminine and for women to refrain from doing so, thus reducing the gender gap (see Ridgeway, 2011). On the contrary, when in a country care for the family is considered a female responsibility and women manage most care-related and household tasks, while having limited access to the labor market, traditional expectations prevail (see Tepper, 2000; Willekens and Lievens, 2016; Zinkhan et al., 2004). Therefore, we add to H1a and H2a the expectation that gender equality in organization of the spheres of work (H1b) and care for the family (H2b) will have a stronger positive effect on the frequency of highbrow cultural participation for men than women, thus reducing the gender gap.

6.2.2.3 Considering the effect of human development
Human development refers to the extent to which people in a country can live long, healthy, educated lives and have access to resources for a decent standard of living (UNDP, 2016). As such, human development complements purely economic perspectives on societal development by also incorporating living standard and quality-of-life dimensions. It represents important structural and cultural transformations of modernized Western societies (Inglehart, 1997; Noll, 2016; Schofer and Meyer, 2005). Moreover, we know that human development is closely
related to both gender equality and highbrow participation in a country (Gerhards et al., 2009, 2013). By contrasting the effect of gender equality that captures the gendered nature of the leisure activities under study with the effect of human development that affects highbrow leisure participation because of its high-status, exclusive and inequality-related aspects, we get a more complete picture of how societal contexts affect men’s and women’s cultural consumption.

There are several ways in which developed societies contribute to a context in which many people want to participate more frequently in highbrow culture. Some are related to leisure time availability, others concern the cultural capital enhancing and inequality-related properties of highbrow consumption: e.g., increased leisure time and the central role it plays in people’s lives (Haller et al., 2013; Noll, 2016; Verbakel, 2013; Webster et al., 2015), greater emphasis on opportunities for self-expression (Welzel et al., 2003), increasing upward social mobility (Yaish and Andersen, 2012), higher levels of educational attainment and a greater valuation of human capital (Schofer and Meyer, 2005), and the importance of achieved status (vs. ascribed status) (Mäenpää and Jalovaara, 2015). Moreover, developed countries with high living standards have larger cultural supply and easier access for all to highbrow cultural activities (Feder and Katz-Gerro, 2012; Getzner, 2015; van Hek and Kraaykamp, 2013). Not surprisingly, research shows that overall levels of highbrow cultural participation are higher in wealthier and more developed EU countries (Gerhards et al., 2013; van Hek et al., 2013).

Therefore, we expect to find that the level of human development has a positive effect on the frequency of highbrow cultural participation for both men and women (H3a).

Moreover, we expect that development has a stronger effect on men than on women. Because cultural capital is a means to acquire status in a context where achieved status (rather than ascribed status) is highly valued (Blossfeld, 2009; Mäenpää and Jalovaara, 2015) and where there is high social mobility (Yaish and Andersen, 2012), we can expect that social groups that initially participate less in highbrow cultural activities, such as men, will slowly catch up with groups with higher participation. Similar processes are found for socioeconomically disadvantaged groups who traditionally had restricted access to high culture (Gerhards et al., 2013). Social class differences in highbrow cultural consumption for example,
are smaller in countries with high levels of human development. Also van Hek and Kraaykamp (2013) show that high educational attainment is less predictive of highbrow cultural consumption in countries with high levels of social mobility and that individuals with a lower level of education and those with fewer financial resources are less restricted in their access to highbrow cultural participation in wealthier countries. Therefore, we add to H3a the expectation that the level of human development has a stronger positive effect on the frequency of highbrow participation for men than women, thus reducing the gender gap (H3b).

Figure 6-1 summarizes the proposed mechanisms as well as the corresponding hypotheses we will test.

Figure 6-1: Schematic visualization of the effect of gender equality in the spheres of work and family care and human development on men’s and women’s highbrow cultural participation and the corresponding hypotheses
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6.3 Data and methods

6.3.1 Data
We use data from the Eurobarometer 79.2 survey, which was conducted in the 28 member states of the European Union in 2013 (European Commission, 2013a). This survey contains comparable data on cultural participation from 27,563 respondents. Representative stratified probability samples of about 1,000 respondents per country were collected using a face-to-face,
computer-assisted interviewing mode. All Eurobarometer data are publicly available via GESIS, the Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences. More detailed methodological information can be found elsewhere (European Commission, 2013b). Eurobarometer surveys do not provide response rates.

Table 6-1: Sample description and country-level characteristics by country (n = 23,028)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Country abbreviation</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>GEI: work</th>
<th>GEI: care</th>
<th>HDI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>0.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>0.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>BG</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>0.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>0.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>0.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>0.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>0.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>EE</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>0.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>0.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>0.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>1239</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>0.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>0.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>0.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>0.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>IE</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>0.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>0.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>LV</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>0.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>0.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>LU</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>0.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>0.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>0.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>0.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>0.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>0.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>0.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>0.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>0.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>0.915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


For the analyses presented in this article, we omitted students and respondents younger than 25 years old. Respondents 25 years old or over are likely to have finished their education and to have left the parental home. Respondents with missing values on one of the variables were excluded from the dataset. The analyses were performed on 23,028 respondents nested in
28 countries, an average of about 822 respondents per country (see Table 6-1 for the number of respondents per country).

6.3.2 Dependent variables
To measure highbrow cultural participation, we use information on participation in three types of highbrow cultural activities: (1) theatre, (2) ballet, dance performance and opera, (3) museum and art gallery. These activities are often-used indicators of highbrow cultural participation. While theatre, ballet, dance performance and opera attendance are gender-typed as feminine activities, gender-typing museum visits is more complicated; museums can have diverse focuses, ranging from art – considered feminine – to science and technology – which have masculine connotations (Nosek et al., 2002; Zinkhan et al., 2004). Respondents indicated how many times in the last 12 months they had participated in these activities. Possible answers were ‘not in the last 12 months’, ‘1–2 times’, ‘3–5 times’ and ‘more than 5 times’. Responses range from 0 (no participation) to 3 (very frequent participation). Most respondents had not participated or had only participated irregularly in the three highbrow activities. There is a general trend towards low highbrow participation in many Eastern European countries (Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Romania and Slovakia) and in some Southern European countries (Cyprus, Greece and Portugal). In contrast, participation in the three types of activities is generally high in Western Europe (Austria, France, Germany, Great Britain, Ireland, Luxembourg and the Netherlands), in the Baltic states of Latvia and Estonia, and in Sweden (plots available in Appendix on pages 292, 293 and 294).

A first option would be to use multinomial logit models. However, these models estimate the effect of gender for the three categories of participation (compared to the reference category ‘no participation’) separately. This leads to power issues because of the skewed distribution of the dependent variables: frequent participation is generally rare and almost non-existent in some countries, making it very difficult to fit the necessary models. Using binary logit models would solve these issues but then information on the frequency of participation is lost. So, instead, we use a multilevel Poisson regression, which allows modeling the frequency of participation. The (skewed) distribution of the dependent variables fits the theoretical
distribution of the Poisson regression. Thus, the dependent variables function as count variables (instead of ordinal variables) in the analyses.\textsuperscript{3}

\textit{Table 6-2: Descriptive statistics for the individual level variables}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theatre attendance</td>
<td>0.425</td>
<td>0.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballet, dance performance and opera attendance</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum and art gallery visits</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>0.867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Men (ref)</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child(ren) aged 14 or younger in the household</td>
<td>No (ref)</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Married (ref)</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cohabiting</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td>Service class job (ref)</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate class job</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working class job</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retired or unable to work</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td>Education until age 15</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education until age 16-19</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education until age 20 or over (ref)</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial strain (difficulties in paying the bills at the end of the month)</td>
<td>Almost never or never difficulties (ref)</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From time to time difficulties</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most of the time difficulties</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of community</td>
<td>Rural or village</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small or middle-sized town</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large town (ref)</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>25-34 years old (ref)</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-44 years old</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-54 years old</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55-64 years old</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65-74 years old</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75 years old or over</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Eurobarometer 79.2, 2013 (European Commission, 2013a)
We analyze each cultural practice separately instead of focusing on one specific activity or using a compositional scale. Finding similar mechanisms among the three highbrow practices would strengthen our argument that human development and country-level gender equality in the organization of work and family care partly explain women’s and men’s highbrow consumption. Descriptive statistics are available in Table 6-2.

6.3.3 Independent variables at the country level
The country-level independent variables are the work and care components of the Gender Equality Index (GEI) and the Human Development Index (HDI). The country-level variables are grand-mean centered in the analyses. As an indicator for societal gender equality in the spheres of work and family care, we use the work- and care-related dimensions of the GEI of the European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE, 2013, 2015). The work-related dimension reflects equality in terms of access to employment, low segregation into female sectors (education, human health, social work) and quality of work (e.g., a flexible working schedule). A score of ‘0’ signifies total inequality; ‘100’ signifies total equality. Table 6-1 indicates that Slovakia has the lowest level of equality in terms of work in 2012 (52.8); Sweden shows the highest (81.0) (EIGE, 2015: 158).

The care aspect of gender equality relates to gender gaps in the time men and women participating in the labor market devote to childcare and domestic tasks (e.g., cooking, cleaning, …). This measure has a low average in the EU, suggesting that on average care inequalities remain high in today’s European countries and that those societies often retain traditional divisions of household labor, even when women participate in the labor market. A score of ‘0’ signifies total inequality and ‘100’, total equality. There is considerable cross-national variation: Denmark demonstrates the greatest gender equality regarding time used for care in 2012 with a score of 79.3 (EIGE, 2015: 161); Bulgaria has the lowest score of 20.1 (see Table 6-1 for other countries’ GEI scores).

Although based on ‘objective’ indicators such as female labor market participation instead of (gender role) attitudes, GEI may function as a proxy for gender role stereotypes. Indeed, making a distinction between the structural and cultural dimensions of gender equality is somewhat arbitrary because both dimensions are fundamentally intertwined; the opportunity
structure (e.g., the (un)availability of public childcare) is not only affected by a country’s prevailing gender norms, but also validates existing cultural beliefs.

The HDI is an instrument developed by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP, 2014, 2016) to measure a country’s level of human development. The HDI’s advantage is that it is embedded in the broader (cross-national comparative) literature on human development (Gerhards et al., 2009; Inglehart and Norris, 2003), and is based on ‘objective’ indicators that are highly comparable across EU countries because of consistent data collection. Ivanova and colleagues (1999) and Booysen (2002) positively evaluated the validity and usefulness of the HDI to measure human development processes. This indicator is based on life expectancy at birth, educational achievement indicated by mean years of schooling for adults 25 years and older and expected years of education for children entering school, and standard of living as measured by GNI per capita. As reported in Table 6-1, Bulgaria (HDI: 0.776) is the EU country with the lowest level of human development in 2012 (UNDP, 2014: 160); the country with the highest human development is the Netherlands (HDI: 0.915).

The country-level indicators have correlations ranging between 0.43 and 0.56 ($r_{HDI-GEI:work} = 0.53; r_{HDI-GEI:care} = 0.43; r_{GEI:care-GEI:work} = 0.56$). However, we are convinced that multicollinearity does not bias the presented estimates. Additional analyses indicate that generally, estimates for the country-level indicators in models with and models without the other country-level predictors are highly similar. Furthermore, comparison of both analyses showed that there is no inflation of standard errors, which typically signals multicollinearity problems and results in wider confidence intervals (Clark, 2003; Shieh and Fouladi, 2003: 982). Because the country-level predictors may function as a proxy for each other, the models presented use them as controls.

6.3.4 Individual-level indicators
The most important indicator on the individual level is gender ($0 = $man$, 1 = woman$). We also include the following controls: having or not having (a) child(ren) younger than 15 in the household, marital status, occupational status, educational attainment, financial strain, community size and age group. Table 6-2 shows descriptive statistics for individual-level variables.
6.3.5 Methods
To study the effect of contextual characteristics on women’s and men’s highbrow cultural participation, we use multilevel analyses (Hox, 2010). This technique acknowledges the hierarchical structure of the data: individuals are nested in countries. We employ a two-level Poisson model (with logit link function, 2nd order PQL) to simultaneously estimate individual- and country-level predictors of the frequency of participation in the three highbrow cultural activities (see Hox, 2010 on the analysis of categorical and count data: 103-122). In line with Bryan and Jenkins’ (2016) recommendations for multilevel analyses based on a limited number of countries, the models are estimated using Bayesian MCMC estimation methods as well, and the results of the 2nd order PQL estimation presented in Table 6-3 are robust (with the random parts slightly underestimated). Moreover, there is no reason to believe that the assumption of the Poisson distribution (i.e., mean equals the variance) is violated in ways that would influence our results. Finally, if the analyses exclude single countries, the results hold.

In Results, we present random slope models in which not only the overall level of participation (regardless of gender) varies across countries (i.e., intercept variation) but the effect of gender also varies across countries (i.e., slope variation). We use cross-level interactions between the country-level predictors and gender to assess whether these country characteristics have differential effects for men and women and explain cross-country variation in the gender gap. It is not possible to estimate all cross-level interactions at the same time as this would lead to multicollinearity problems. Therefore, we present a separate model for every cross-level interaction for each dependent variable (resulting in 9 models). The multilevel models are estimated in MLwiN.

6.4 Results
6.4.1 Description of men’s and women’s cultural consumption across EU countries
First, to explore gender differences in highbrow participation across EU countries and their association with the country-level indicators, we plot GEI and HDI against gender differences in participation (vs. non-participation) in the three cultural practices (see Figure 6-2, Figure 6-3, and Figure 6-4). For each country, we measure gender differences (on the Y-axis) by dividing the proportion of all women who participated at least once in the activity by the proportion of
all men who participated in the activity. In each country, a ratio of female to male participation rates higher than ‘1’ indicates that women participate more; a ratio smaller than ‘1’ indicates that men participate more. Thus, applied to theatre attendance (see Figure 6-2) results show that gender differences vary from non-existent in France (a score of 1) to a female participation rate that is 75 percent higher than the male participation rate in Bulgaria (a score of 1.75) to a higher male participation rate in Spain (a score below 1).

Comparing the figures of the three cultural practices leads to the following observations: First, the comparison of female to male highbrow participation rates varies considerably across EU countries, ranging from (slightly) higher male participation rates to equal participation to much higher female participation rates. Second, men’s participation rates in museum and art gallery visits are higher than women’s in several EU countries in contrast with the other activities, in which female participation rates are generally (much) higher. Third, although there are inconsistencies between practices, higher female to male highbrow participation rates are generally found in many Eastern European countries (e.g., Bulgaria, Croatia, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia,), while female and male participation rates are more or less equal in a diverse group of – mainly Western – European countries (e.g., Belgium, Denmark, France, Ireland, Luxembourg, Slovenia, Spain and the Netherlands).

Moreover, the bivariate results suggest that there is a negative relationship between gender differences in cultural participation and work-related GEI, care-related GEI and HDI. Even though countries differ, in general men and women seem to participate more equally in countries with higher scores on HDI and GEI (work and care). These bivariate results obviously ignore frequency of participation and do not consider the differential composition of countries on socioeconomic and family-related indicators.
Figure 6-2: Theatre attendance — Ratio of the proportions of participating women and men by HDI, GEI: work-related equality and GEI: care-related equality
Figure 6-3: Ballet, dance performance and opera attendance — Ratio of the proportions of participating women and men by HDI, GEI: work-related equality and GEI: care-related equality
Figure 6-4: Museum and art gallery visits — Ratio of the proportions of participating women and men by HDI, GEI: work-related equality and GEI: care-related equality
Table 6-3: Multilevel Poisson models of theatre attendance; ballet, dance performance and opera attendance; and museum and art gallery visits for 23,028 respondents in 28 EU countries, including Poisson regression coefficients and standard errors.\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Ballet, dance performance &amp; opera</th>
<th>Museum and art gallery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Model 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-0.127*</td>
<td>-0.130*</td>
<td>-0.133*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Man = ref)</td>
<td>(0.057)</td>
<td>(0.057)</td>
<td>(0.057)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>0.322***</td>
<td>0.325***</td>
<td>0.327***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Man = ref)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country-level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEI: work</td>
<td>-0.009 ns.</td>
<td>-0.006 ns.</td>
<td>-0.006 ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEI: care</td>
<td>0.011***</td>
<td>0.009**</td>
<td>0.011***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td>5.130***</td>
<td>5.311***</td>
<td>4.167**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.220)</td>
<td>(1.222)</td>
<td>(1.292)</td>
<td>(1.544)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross-level interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman x GEI: work</td>
<td>-0.006 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.009 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.002 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman x GEI: care</td>
<td>-0.004*</td>
<td>-0.005*</td>
<td>-0.001 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman x HDI</td>
<td>-1.899*</td>
<td>-2.102°</td>
<td>-1.189*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.760)</td>
<td>(1.161)</td>
<td>(0.494)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Random part</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Eurobarometer 79.2, 2013 (European Commission, 2013a); *** \( p < 0.001 \); ** \( p < 0.01 \); * \( p < 0.05 \); ° \( p < 0.1 \); n.s.: not significant.

\(^a\) Models are controlled for socioeconomic and family-related indicators, age group and community size. Full tables are available in Appendix on pages 295, 297 and 299.
6.4.2 Random slope models
Table 6-3 presents the results from our multilevel analyses. Models 1, 2 and 3 present, respectively, the differential effects of work-related GEI, care-related GEI and HDI on men’s and women’s cultural consumption for each cultural practice.\(^6\) One can read the following things from this table (example below applies to Model 3 which shows the effects of HDI on men’s and women’s theatre attendance): (1) the average effect of gender (or gender gap, or – in this case – the effect of being a woman), which is represented by the coefficient next to ‘Woman’ \((b_{\text{Woman}} = 0.327^{***})\), (2) the effect of the country-level indicator under study on the participation of men \((b_{\text{HDI}} = 4.167^{**})\), and (3) the cross-level interaction coefficient \((b_{\text{Woman} \times \text{HDI}} = -1.899^{*})\) which indicates the differential effect of this country-level indicator on women (compared to men). Negative coefficients indicate that the effects of the country-level indicators are lower for women than for men, thus partly explaining the gender gap. We observe that, on average, European women participate more frequently in the three highbrow cultural practices than men.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Figure 6-5: The effects of gender equality in the organization of care and of human development on the frequency of theatre attendance, by gender}
\end{align*}\]
In Table 6-3, Model 1 under each dependent variable shows the effect of gender equality in the organization of work on the cultural consumption of men and women in Europe. The pattern is consistent across the three cultural practices: neither the effect of GEI: work nor the effect of the cross-level interaction (Woman x GEI: work) is significant. This means that the frequency of highbrow cultural participation of both men and women is not higher in countries with a more gender-equal organization of work. Moreover, the size of the gender gap in a country is unrelated to country-level gender equality in the realm of work. Therefore, Hypotheses 1a and 1b are rejected.
Each dependent variable’s Model 2 shows the effect of gender equality in the organization of family care on highbrow cultural participation of both men and women across Europe (see Table 6-3). We find that the patterns across different cultural practices are fairly consistent. Gender equality in care (GEI: care-related equality) has a positive effect on frequency of theatre attendance (depicted on the left-hand side of Figure 6-5) and ballet, dance performance and opera attendance (depicted on the left-hand side of Figure 6-6) for both men and women, but this effect is smaller for women than for men (as the cross-level interaction terms are negative). For museum and art gallery visits, care-related gender equality has the same positive effect for men and women ($b_{\text{GEI: care}} = 0.013^{***}$ and $b_{\text{woman} \times \text{GEI: care}} = -0.001 \text{ n.s.}$). Therefore, across EU countries, higher gender equality in the organization of care is associated with higher levels of participation in the three highbrow cultural practices for both men and women; this accords with Hypothesis 2a. Moreover, for the female-typed activities theatre, ballet, dance performance and opera attendance the effect of gender equality in the organization of care (i.e., men engaging in the feminine sphere of care) is larger for men and thus, the gender gap is smaller in countries with greater equality and larger in countries with less equality. This is in line with Hypothesis 2b.

As shown in each dependent variable’s Model 3, the effect of HDI on the cultural consumption of men and women in Europe is similar across the three cultural practices (depicted in Figure 6-5, Figure 6-6, and Figure 6-7). Human development has a positive effect on the frequency of participation in highbrow cultural activities for both women and men, but this effect is smaller for women than for men (as the interaction terms between gender (being a woman) and HDI are negative for all three activities). Thus, across EU countries, higher human development is associated with higher levels of participation in these three highbrow cultural activities for both men and women; this agrees with Hypothesis 3a. Moreover, the effect of HDI is stronger for men than for women, so gender differences in frequency of highbrow cultural participation are smaller in EU countries with higher human development levels and larger in EU countries with lower human development. This is consistent with Hypothesis 3b.
6.5 Discussion and conclusion

6.5.1 Findings and contribution
Because highbrow cultural participation is an important status marker in Western societies (Lamont and Lareau, 1988), women’s preference for highbrow culture is considered puzzling (cf. Lizardo, 2006). Existing individual-level research focuses on women’s position in the work and family spheres to explain this gender gap in participation in highbrow cultural activities. This article highlights the feminine connotation of these leisure activities next to their exclusive character and recognizes that unequal opportunities and expectations across societies affect not only women’s but also men’s cultural consumption.

Specifically, this cross-national comparative study examined how (1) gender equality in the societal division of labor, measured by female labor market participation and low segregation in the work sphere and by the division of housework and childcare in the family sphere, and (2) human development affect the frequency of both women’s and men’s theatre attendance, museum and art gallery visits, and ballet, dance performance and opera attendance. While gender equality would explain cross-national differences in men’s and women’s cultural participation because of the gendered nature of artistic leisure activities, societal development captures the high-status, exclusive and inequality-related aspects of leisure-time highbrow consumption. In line with our expectations, multilevel analyses of the Eurobarometer 79.2 data (2013) on 28 EU countries indicated that, overall, gender equality in the organization of family care and human development positively affect the frequency of both women’s and men’s highbrow participation, but the effects are stronger for men than for women. So, gender gaps are smaller in EU countries where men engage more in the feminine sphere of care and in societies with higher levels of development.

Two unexpected findings need further attention. First, an exception to the overall pattern is that gender equality in the organization of care did not explain the gender gap in frequency of museum and art gallery visits, even though it explained the gender gaps in the other activities and women’s and men’s overall museum visits. A first explanation relates to the fact that museum offerings are less clearly gender-typed (which is also reflected in the smaller gender gaps compared to the other two activities). For example, attending an art museum has a feminine
connotation, while science and technology museums may have a masculine connotation (Nosek et al., 2002; Zinkhan et al., 2004). Therefore, museum visits are less closely linked to the idea of separate spheres and traditional gender role expectations that are at the core of gender differences in artistic participation (Tepper, 2000; Zinkhan et al., 2004). Consequently, gender equality in the organization of care, which indicates the crossing of critical gender boundaries, may be less important. Other explanations are that museum visits do not require specific starting times, can occur throughout the day (instead of only in the evening), and can involve children.

Second, country-level gender equality in the organization of work did not explain cross-country variation in (the gender gap in) highbrow cultural consumption, contrary to our initial expectations. Considering that we proposed a leisure-related explanation for gender equality’s effect on both men’s and women’s cultural consumption, it is likely that the organization of care, which is measured by gender equality in time used for housework and child care by working adults, better captures a country’s opportunities for outsourcing domestic tasks to the public and service sector (see Craig and Mullan, 2013; Marx and Vandelannoote, 2015; Nyberg, 2015). This explanation is supported by the finding that work-related equality affects cultural participation in models that do not control for care-related equality.

Moreover, in this study the closing gender gap in cultural participation is expected to be the result of equality’s larger effects on men than on women which may explain the insignificant effects of work-related inequality on the gender gap in cultural participation. Indeed, policies generally aim to increase female labor market participation, not to decrease men’s and the norm that men should be the primary breadwinner is very resilient (Bettio, 2017; Ciccia and Bleijenbergh, 2014). As a consequence, female labor market participation and segregation may in the first place express expectations towards women, so men would be less affected.

Lastly, the finding that gender differences are smaller when men enter the feminine sphere of care and not when women enter the masculine sphere of work is in line with the idea that people first and foremost “behaviorally ‘mark’, or signify the boundary between the sexes, by doing or not doing the feminine (caregiving) [rather] than by doing or not doing the masculine (providing)” (Ridgeway, 2011, p. 130). Our findings indicate that gender beliefs
regarding feminine-typed artistic participation are only really put into question as men enter the feminine sphere. Moreover, this resonates with Michael Messner’s argument that in modern societies ‘soft essentialist discourses’ are becoming dominant which maintain strict essentialist ideas about men and boys, while giving women and girls more social latitude to cross gender boundaries (Messner, 2011).

Thus, our findings underline the importance of the gendered approach used in this study, which signals that not only women have a gender and that men’s role in the gender gap in feminine-typed cultural participation is underestimated (Lagaert et al., 2017; Lehman and Dumais, 2017). Indeed, while existing research refers to the “puzzle of women’s highbrow culture consumption” (see Lizardo, 2006), this study indicates that societal gender equality and gender norms affect men’s cultural consumption as well, and in some respects, affect it even more than women’s, a finding similar to that of earlier studies (Lagaert et al., 2017; Lehman and Dumais, 2017).

While current cross-national comparative research on inequalities in cultural consumption mainly focuses on structural social class-related inequalities (see for instance, Falk and Katz-Gerro, 2016; Katz-Gerro, 2002; Gerhards et al., 2013; van Hek and Kraaykamp, 2013), this paper demonstrates the importance of the position of men and women in society and societal development in understanding inequalities in men’s and women’s cross-national cultural participation. Because we place men’s and women’s highbrow cultural consumption in its broader, societal family- and work-related context, this study complements existing research that seeks the origin of women’s higher participation in individual-level differences in the spheres of work and family (Christin, 2012).

6.5.2 Further research and limitations
The results invite us to consider how the gender gap in cultural taste evolves over time and how this relates to a country’s level of gender equality and development. Based on the findings in this article, one would expect to find that over time, the gender gap in highbrow cultural tastes in EU countries would decrease and decrease at a faster rate among younger cohorts because these cohorts were socialized in a more gender equal and developed context. Thus, future
research on longitudinal changes in the gender gap in highbrow cultural consumption could give additional insight into how living in gender-equal contexts influences participation.

This research also has some limitations; however, these could provide impetus for new research. First, we studied a specific group of European countries that on average score high on development and gender equality. Further research should evaluate whether these macro-level mechanisms are relevant across a more diverse group of countries. So, comparable and high-quality data in other (non-Western) countries needs to be collected.

Second, our focus was on highbrow cultural activities that appeal to a select group of participants. We expect that gender equality and human development stimulate men’s and women’s participation in non-exclusive gender-typed cultural activities as well because the time availability arguments used would hold for other leisure activities as well (Craig and Mullan, 2013; Webster et al., 2015) and because contemporary, urban cultural practices increasingly function as cultural capital, i.e., ‘emerging forms of cultural capital’ (Prieur and Savage, 2013; Roose, 2015). A study on sport event attendance, which is cited as such an emerging form of capital (Roose, 2015), indicates that human development positively affects men’s and women’s attendance (Lagaert and Roose, in press). Moreover, the gender gap in this masculine-typed activity is –similar to the feminine cultural activities studied here– smaller in gender equal contexts (Lagaert and Roose, in press).

Thirdly, the multilevel approach used reveals general patterns, but did not allow to consider the idiosyncratic historical evolutions of specific countries and the effect these developments might have on men’s and women’s cultural participation. These country-specific trajectories could be important as well (see for instance Fishman and Lizardo, 2013). Thus, this study should be seen as an open invitation to further engender cultural taste.
6.6 Notes

1 This leisure explanation would explain why in the US women participate more because they are less likely to work full-time (Christin, 2012), while female labor market participation is associated with higher participation in Belgium (Willekens and Lievens, 2016), because the Belgian government does large investments to make the marketization of housework cheaper (Marx and Vandelannoote, 2015).

2 In times of new or 'emerging forms of cultural capital' (Prieur and Savage, 2013; Roose, 2015), we cannot assume that highbrow cultural participation would be the only marker of cultural capital. We elaborate on this in the discussion.

3 Because the dependent variables distinguishing categories of frequency of participation are not really count variables in itself (which goes against the assumptions of Poisson regression), other estimation methods, such as (negative) binomial and multinomial estimation methods have been performed as a check. These analyses indicated that we can have confidence in the results and interpretation of the estimated Poisson models.

4 The exceptions are the ‘GEI: work’ coefficients for theatre attendance and museum and art gallery visits, which are significant (in line with Hypothesis 1a) only in the uncontrolled models.

5 Marital status distinguishes married respondents (reference category) from cohabiting, single, divorced and widowed respondents. The variable ‘occupational status’ is partly based on Goldthorpe’s three-class schema (see Erikson and Goldthorpe, 1992). Among working respondents, it distinguishes between those working in a service class job (reference category), an intermediate class job and a working class job. The other variable categories are homemakers, unemployed respondents and respondents who are retired or unable to work. Educational attainment has three categories: full-time education until age 15, from age 16–19 and age 20 or older (reference category). Financial strain indicates how frequently respondents had difficulty paying bills at the end of the month, from occasionally or most of the time (reference category: almost never or never). Size of community indicates whether respondents live in a rural area or village, in a small or middle-sized town or in a large town (reference category). We also distinguish six age groups: 25–34 (reference category), 35–44, 45–54, 55–64, 65–74 and 75 or older.

6 Models with the main effects of the macro-level indicators (without the cross-level interaction effects) are available in Appendix on pages 295, 297 and 299.
6.7 References


7 The gender gap in sport event attendance in Europe: The impact of macro-level gender equality

Chapter adapted from an article in press in International Review for the Sociology of Sport (available online since October 4th, 2016):


This paper studies the gender gap in sport event attendance – characterized by higher male and lower female participation – using a macro-sociological and cross-national comparative approach. We argue that because gender is produced and justified in the realm of sport, gender gaps in sport event attendance may be more pronounced in some societies than others, depending on the position women and men have in the particular context in which someone ‘does’ his/her gender. So, in addition to individual attributes, one has to consider the societal, macro-level gender equality in order to understand the individual-level gender inequalities in sport event attendance. Using multilevel analyses on Eurobarometer data (2007), we evaluate whether the size of the gender gap in sport event attendance varies across EU countries and how this variation relates to societal gender equality as measured by the Gender Equality Index of the European Institute for Gender Equality. We find higher male than female attendance in all EU countries but also conclude that higher levels of macro-level gender equality are associated with smaller gender gaps in sport event attendance.
7.1 Introduction

Sport spectatorship is known to be a practice that is strongly intertwined with gendered meanings (Adams et al., 2010; Dufur, 1999; Hoeber & Kerwin, 2013; Jones, 2008; Meân, 2001; Messner, 2000). Empirical quantitative research often ‘controls’ for gender, finding that men are more likely than women to attend sport events in various countries, for instance Canada (White & Wilson, 1999), Denmark, Norway and Sweden (Thrane, 2001) and the US (Wilson, 2002). However, quantitative sociological research offering theoretical reflections on the origin of these gender differences in sport spectatorship and sport event attendance is scarce. Existing studies on women’s sport event attendance mainly use a qualitative approach and concentrate on the experiences of female sport fans and their confrontation with gender inequality and hegemonic masculinity in the (local) context of the sports arena where male athletes compete (Crawford & Gosling, 2004; Farrell et al., 2011; Hoeber & Kerwin, 2013; Jones, 2008; Pope, 2011; Pope & Williams, 2011). Generally, research on gender differences in sport event attendance is limited to one country, often the US, and mostly studies local gendered processes and norms.

Because gender is ‘done’ or produced and justified via sportive activities (Hoeber & Kerwin, 2013; West & Zimmerman, 1987) and because ‘sport’ is an arena for the display of hegemonic masculinity (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005), gender gaps in sport event attendance may be more pronounced in some contexts than others, depending on the position women and men have in these contexts in which someone ‘does’ his or her gender. So, in addition to individual attributes, one has to consider the societal, macro-level gender equality in order to understand the individual-level gender inequalities in sport event attendance. Only when comparing different contexts with varying structural opportunities and barriers and divergent normative expectations of acceptable female and male behavior, we can estimate the effect of societal gender equality on (wo)men’s sport event attendance. Thus, this paper contributes to current research because it applies a cross-national comparative perspective that shows that individual gender differences in sport event attendance are embedded in the broader societal context in which men and women consume sports.
More specifically, using multilevel analyses on Eurobarometer 67.1 data (2007) on 27 EU countries, we will address the following questions: we evaluate whether a gender gap in sport event attendance is present in all EU countries, whether this gap varies across countries and whether this gender gap variation can be explained by the macro-level gender equality of the European countries. To date, no cross-national comparative research exists that assesses the stability of the gender differences in sport event attendance across a large number of countries, in contrast to research on the gender gap in physical (in)activity and sport participation (Pfister & Hartmann-Tews, 2003; Van Tuyckom et al., 2010; Van Tuyckom et al., 2013).

7.2 Theoretical framework

7.2.1 Doing gender, hegemonic masculinity and the gender gap in sport event attendance

Scholars agree that the domain of sports functions as a ‘gender construction site’ (Messner, 2007: 3). From a young age onwards, people construct their identity as a girl/woman or a boy/man through sport-related activities and experiences (e.g., Messner, 2000). Following West and Zimmerman (1987), we can say that children and adults ‘do’ their gender in and through sportive activities: they actively construct, reproduce and justify their gender in their relations with others (and their expectations) via practices that have certain (feminine or) masculine attributes and values associated with them. While traditionally passive, private, non-aggressive and non-competitive activities are deemed appropriate for girls (see Tepper, 2000), sport fandom and sport event attendance are generally considered more acceptable leisure activities for men and boys (see Hoeber & Kerwin, 2013). Both male athletes and male spectators (of male athletes) use sport to express so-called ‘hegemonic masculinity’, because in sport ‘typically’ masculine attributes such as physical prowess, competitiveness, aggression and impassivity are highly valued (Connell, 1995, 1997; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Dufur, 1999; Laitinen & Tiihonen, 1990; Light & Kirk, 2000). In fact, sport spectatorship and hegemonic masculinity are intrinsically intertwined as this type of masculinity works in part through the production of role models of masculinity, such as professional sports stars (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; see for instance Trujillo, 1991 on American baseball pitcher Nolan Ryan). Historically, these male connotations to sport and sporting venues are rooted in the Victorian period, when a separate-spheres ideology caused a sexual division of roles, tasks and
spaces, which restricted women to the privacy of the home—responsible for child care and household tasks—while men could lead a public life (Tepper, 2000; Vertinsky, 1994). This gendered division of leisure (in terms of how and where leisure time is enjoyed) underpinned the gendering of sport consumption, which means that in the sports arena predominantly male spectators see predominantly male teams or male athletes compete in what are considered masculine sports. Female athleticism on the contrary, often challenges traditional conceptions of femininity (Messner, 1988). In this light, it is not surprising that watching women’s sports on TV or attending sport events where women compete against each other are much less popular than ‘male sport events’, among male sports fans but often also among female sports fans (Pope, 2010, Whiteside & Hardin, 2011).

In this context, women have to justify their participation in sport events, also because some sport events (e.g., football matches) are perceived as unsafe environments (for instance Crawford & Gosling, 2004: 482-483). Women’s presence in stadiums is often ‘only’ acceptable when they are simultaneously assuming their ‘role’ as a mother or a partner, for instance by taking care of the children during games (Crawford & Gosling, 2004). Furthermore, husbands, brothers and fathers often control women’s access to sport events and leisure time (Farrell et al., 2011; Pope & Williams, 2011). Generally, female sport fans are considered ‘inauthentic’ or ‘outsiders’ who have to prove to male sport fans that they are more than just “puck bunnies”: female fans who are only interested in physical attractiveness of the male athletes (Crawford & Gosling, 2004; Hoeber & Kerwin, 2013; Jones, 2008). Not surprisingly, Danish research shows that female fans of male football teams use various strategies for constructing and negotiating their gender performance in the sports arena (Lenneis & Pfister, 2015). Notwithstanding these counteractive forces, scholars suppose there is an increasing ‘feminization’ of the sport crowds in many European countries (Mintert & Pfister, 2015; Pope, 2011; Pope & Williams, 2011), which according to German research by Meier and colleagues (2017) is related to changing gender roles in society.

7.2.2 Micro and macro: gender and sport in the broader societal context?
Gender, masculinity and femininity are always defined and constructed within cultural and institutional contexts (Lorber, 1994; Messner, 2000, 2002). According to Connell and
Messerschmidt (2005), regional hegemonic masculinities, constructed at the country-level, form the framework of everyday interactions and practices. Moreover, West and Zimmerman (1987) stipulate that the way gender is ‘done’ or enacted corresponds with the normative expectations prevailing in the broader societal context. Through the ‘doing’ and ‘undoing’ of gender in the realm of sport and other gendered spheres, individuals reproduce and maintain (but sometimes also contest) gendered cultural expectations, gendered social structures and power relations between men and women (Lorber, 1994; Messner, 2000). As such, the realm of sport is intrinsically linked with both the structures and the cultural norms of a society: individual gender inequalities are influenced by the broader gender order, i.e., the macro-level organization of gender relations and gender (in)equality of a country \(^2\) (Pfister & Hartmann-Tews, 2003: 1-12). Or in simpler words, gender differences in sport spectatorship may be more pronounced in some societies than others, depending on the (un)equal position women and men have in the context in which one ‘does’ his or her gender.

From a separate-spheres perspective which situates the origin of societal gender inequality in the unequal organization of the private and the public sphere, it is theorized that men’s positions in important social institutions in the public sphere, such as the economy and politics, give them access to decision-making positions and resources (Blumberg, 1984; Chafetz, 1990, 1991). Because the male dominance at the macro-level of social organization reduces or ‘discounts’ the power and resources women may have at the micro-level in the household (Blumberg, 1984), individual behavior and choices are constrained by the opportunity structure. In other words, the macro-level constitutes the structural opportunities and constraints for women’s and men’s sports consumption, especially through access to resources, such as leisure time or financial resources (Chafetz, 1991; Hook, 2010; Messner, 2000). For example, the unavailability of public child care or financially disadvantaged job opportunities for women in a country may be barriers to women’s access to leisure time activities such as attending sport events. Moreover, because men have better access to power resources at the macro-level of social organization, they can produce gender norms that attach higher value to men’s attributes, identify women’s proper place in society as being related to the domestic sphere (Chafetz, 1990) and stimulate female passivity (see Tepper, 2000). Thus,
gender (in)equality at the macro-level of social organization conveys normative expectations of acceptable female and male behavior and indicates the tolerance towards gender incongruent behavior (Chafetz, 1990; Ridgeway, 2011). For example, cultural norms based on separate-spheres ideas that define women’s proper place as being in the family and home can negatively affect women’s out-door cultural participation.

So, we argue that—in addition to individual attributes—one has to consider characteristics of the society in which an individual lives in order to fully understand gender inequalities in sports consumption. Therefore, it is crucial to empirically study sport event attendance in different (country-)contexts: only when comparing different contexts with different levels of societal gender equality, we can assess the effect of the gender order on gender differences in sport spectatorship.

7.2.3 Expectations
Based on this theoretical framework, we have the following expectations. Because the sphere of sport remains important in the construction of gender and hegemonic masculinity, we expect to find higher male than female participation in sport event attendance in all EU countries (hypothesis 1). However, we expect variation in the size of the gender gap across country-contexts (hypothesis 2). We expect that macro-level gender equality in a country (partly) explains the (variation in the) gender gap. We hypothesize that gender gaps in sport event attendance are smaller in gender equal countries and larger in gender unequal countries (hypothesis 3). In gender equal countries there are less structural constraints to female participation (for instance, financial barriers) and the norms of appropriate female behavior are less stringent (for instance, spending leisure time out-door is not considered conflicting with women’s role as a mother or partner). Also men’s sport event attendance is influenced by the normative context in which they are embedded: sport event attendance will be less central to the performance of socially acceptable masculinity in these contexts (see Connell, 1995; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005).
7.3 Data and methods

7.3.1 Binary multilevel analysis on Eurobarometer data
We use data of the Eurobarometer 67.1 (n=26,746), a survey that was conducted in the 27 member states of the European Union in 2007, which are listed in Table 7-1 (European Commission, 2007). Representative stratified probability samples of about 1000 respondents per country are interviewed in a face-to-face and computer assisted mode. More detailed methodological information can be found elsewhere (European Commission, 2014). All Eurobarometer data are publicly available via GESIS, Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences (2016). For the analyses presented we omitted students and respondents younger than 25 years old (a reduction of 3656 respondents). Respondents of 25 years old or over are likely to have finished their education and to have left the parental home. Respondents with missing values on one of the variables were excluded from the dataset (reduction of another 893 respondents). The analyses were performed on 22,197 respondents nested in 27 countries which is an average of about 820 respondents per country (see Table 7-1 for the number of respondents per country). Of all respondents in the sample 42.7% is male.

To address the research questions, we use multilevel random slope models including cross-level interactions (Hox, 2010). Multilevel modeling has the advantage of taking into account the hierarchal structure of the data: individuals are nested within countries (Hox, 2010). Random slope models in which the coefficient or effect of gender is allowed to vary between European countries, indicate whether the effect of gender has the same size in every EU country. Cross-level interactions between gender and macro-level gender equality are estimated to evaluate whether macro-level gender equality can explain cross-country variation in the gender gap and whether the countries’ level of gender equality has a differential effect for men’s and women’s sport consumption. All variables at the country-level are grand mean centered.

7.3.2 Dependent variable: sport event attendance
For the dependent variable we use information on sport event attendance. Unfortunately, in the Eurobarometer survey there is no information on the kind of sport event that was attended (which sport, whether it was at a professional or an amateur level or whether the players were men or women). So, this variable indicates general, overall attendance of sport events of all
kinds of sports, which should be kept in mind when interpreting the results. In the survey, respondents indicated how many times in the last 12 months they had been to a sport event. Possible answers were ‘not in the last 12 months’, ‘1-2 times’, ‘3-5 times’ and ‘more than 5 times’. Because multilevel cumulative logit analyses using this information on frequency of participation gave almost exactly the same coefficients as multilevel analyses using a binary variable (participation versus no participation), we decided to use this latter, simplest technique. So, the original variable was re-coded into a binary variable where 0 indicates ‘no sport event attendance in the last 12 months’ and 1 indicates ‘sport event attendance in the last 12 months’. Binary logistic multilevel analyses (with logit transformation and 2nd order PQL-estimation) are used. Table 7-1 indicates the proportion of respondents attending sport events for each country.

7.3.3 Macro-level indicators: Gender Equality Index and Human Development Index
In the last decade, several attempts have been made to construct multidimensional measures that meaningfully capture the concept of macro-level gender (in)equality (Permanyer, 2010; Plantenga et al., 2009), of which the Gender Equality Index (GEI) of the European Institute of Gender Equality or EIGE (2013, 2016) is a very important one. The 2005 Gender Equality Index captures the important dimensions of gender equality and is a composition of gender inequalities in the domains of work (including participation and segregation), money (financial resources and economic situation), knowledge (including participation and segregation), time (leisure time and time for child care and domestic tasks), power (political and economic representation) and health (health status and access to health structures). All information regarding the development of the GEI is available in the report on the website of the EIGE (see EIGE, 2013). This measure was specially developed for the European countries and excludes aspects of inequality that are less relevant and varying in the European context (such as the maternal mortality ratio or longevity on which many other measures of gender equality are based); instead it takes into account elements of gender equality with meaningful differences between EU countries, such as gender inequalities in the time used for household tasks and care (Plantenga et al., 2009). The GEI with all dimensions can theoretically range from ‘0’, total gender inequality to ‘100’, total gender equality. The obtained score of the countries reflects the societal gender equality both in terms of structural opportunities/constraints and (the
institutional impact of) gendered normative expectations. In the European Union anno 2005, Sweden is the most gender equal country, scoring 72.8. Italy is the most unequal country, scoring 34.6. On average, EU countries score 51.3 on the Gender Equality Index in 2005 (European Institute for Gender Equality, 2013; 2016).

Moreover, we take the countries’ scores on the Human Development Index into account (United Nations Development Programme, 2016a, 2016b). Human development refers to the extent to which people in a country can live long, healthy, educated lives and have access to resources for a decent standard of living (United Nations Nations Development Programme, 2016a). Societies where increasing human development guarantees existential security for all, witness changing world views and lifestyles (such as post-materialist values) (Inglehart, 1997). Indeed, following a Maslowian logic, societies will only invest in the fulfillment of advanced needs such as self-actualization, leisure time and recreation, and the rejection of ascribed social status and roles assigned at birth for all when basic needs such as food, safety and health are fulfilled. Thus, as already shown by Gerhards et al. (2013) for highbrow cultural participation, participation in cultural activities tends to be higher in countries with high levels of human development because in those contexts self-expression, individual autonomy, quality of life and meaningful leisure time are highly valued (Inglehart, 1997; Inglehart and Norris, 2003). These contextual effects are also larger for those groups that traditionally had a difficult access to these leisure activities, such as women in the case of sport events attendance. Because human development and gender equal norms are strongly linked –societies with higher levels of human development tend to be more gender equal–, we need to avoid that the studied effect of macro-level gender equality on (wo)men’s sport event attendance actually reflects effects of human development. Therefore, we hold HDI constant in the final model. In Table 7-1, the GEI- and HDI-scores for the countries in the analysis are presented.
Table 7-1: Sample description and country-level characteristics, by country (n = 22 197)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>GEI</th>
<th>HDI</th>
<th>Sport event attendance rate: TOTAL+</th>
<th>Sport event attendance rate: WOMEN++°</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria (AT)</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>0.546</td>
<td>0.378***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (BE)</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.306***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria (BG)</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.088***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus (CY)</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.103***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic (CZ)</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.301***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark (DK)</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>0.404**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia (EE)</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>0.241***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland (FI)</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>0.313***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France (FR)</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.235***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany (DE)</td>
<td>1335</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>0.290***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece (GR)</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.130***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary (HU)</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>0.194***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland (IE)</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>0.489***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy (IT)</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.276***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia (LV)</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0.311***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania (LT)</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.127***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg (LU)</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.317***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta (MT)</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>0.205***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland (PL)</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.138***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal (PT)</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>0.176***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania (RO)</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.168***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia (SK)</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>0.420***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia (SI)</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.279***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain (ES)</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>0.200***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden (SE)</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>0.441***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands (NL)</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.261***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Proportion of all respondents who have attended a sport event in the country-sample.
** Proportion of all female respondents who have attended a sport event in the country-sample.
° χ²- difference test of women’s and men’s sport event attendance, by country: *** p < 0.001; ** p < 0.01; * p < 0.05
Table 7-2: Descriptive statistics for the individual level control variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child(ren) aged 14 or younger in the household</td>
<td>No (ref)</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Married and cohabiting (ref)</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td>Service class job (ref)</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate class job</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working class job</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retired or unable to work</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td>Full-time education until age 15</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time education until age 16-19</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time education until age 20 or over (ref)</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial strain (difficulties in paying the bills at the end of the month)</td>
<td>Almost never or never difficulties (ref)</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From time to time difficulties</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most of the time difficulties</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of community</td>
<td>Rural or village</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small or middle-sized town</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large town (ref)</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>25-34 years old (ref)</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-44 years old</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-54 years old</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55-64 years old</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65-74 years old</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75 years old or over</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3.4 Micro-level indicators
Next to gender, we take other socio-economic and family-related variables into account: having child(ren) aged 14 or younger or not, marital status, occupational status, educational attainment, financial strain, size of community and age. Descriptive statistics are available in Table 7-2.
Figure 7-1: Sport event attendance - Odds ratio men versus women controlled for individual characteristics by GEI for 27 EU countries (0 = women; 1 = men)

7.4 Results

In Table 7-1, descriptive total and female sport event attendance rates in the 27 EU countries are shown. These attendance rates indicate the proportion of –respectively– all respondents and all female respondents who have attended a sport event. In some Eastern and Southern European countries (i.e., Bulgaria, Cyprus, Greece, Lithuania and Poland) female participation is very low: less than 14% of the female respondents have attended a sport event in those countries. However, comparison with the total attendance rates indicates that in these countries sport event attendance is low in general (i.e., for both men and women). On the contrary, in Denmark, Ireland, Slovakia, Sweden and The Netherlands more than 40% of the female respondents have attended a sport event. Despite high female attendance rates in some EU countries however, these rates are slightly to considerably lower than the total national attendance rates in all EU countries because women’s sport event attendance rates are significantly lower than men’s in all EU countries.
As can be seen in Figure 7-1, these gender gaps in attendance across the EU persist when controlling for individual characteristics (socio-economic and family-related characteristics, age and community size). The Y-axis of this figure represents the odds ratios of male versus female sport event attendance controlled for individual characteristics for each EU country. The Netherlands is the country with lowest odds ratio and scores about 1.5, which means that the odds to have attended a sport event is 1.5 times higher for Dutch men than for Dutch women. The country with the highest odds ratio is Cyprus where the odds to have attended a sport event is 9 times higher for men than for women. In line with hypothesis 1, men have higher participation in all EU countries. However, even though there are no countries where men and women participate equally (this would be an odds-ratio of 1) or where women are more likely to participate (this would be an odds-ratio below 1), Figure 7-1 also suggests that the size of the gap between men and women varies considerably across countries. Large gender differences are found in Southern Europe (Cyprus, Greece and Portugal), Eastern Europe (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Poland and Slovakia) and in Austria and Ireland. Countries with smaller gender differences include Denmark, Estonia, Luxembourg, Sweden and The Netherlands. The relationship between the odds-ratio of gender in a country and the country’s score on the Gender Equality Index (on the X-axis) depicted in Figure 7-1 suggests that the size of the gender gap covaries with the macro-level gender equality in a country: in countries with higher gender equality such as the Scandinavian countries there is a smaller gender gap in sport event attendance than in countries with lower gender equality such as Portugal and Greece.

In Table 7-3, the results of the binary logistic multilevel analysis are presented. Model 1 is a random slope model. In this model, the intercept and the effect of gender (here: the effect of being a woman) are allowed to vary across countries: the model allows for cross-national variation in the overall level of sport event attendance and for cross-national variation in the gender differences in sport event attendance. Model 1 indicates that the overall levels of sport event attendance \((\nu_{0j} = 0.262^{***})\) and that the gender gap in sport event attendance varies across countries as well \((\nu_{1j} = 0.087^{**})\). This finding is in line with hypothesis 2 that the effect of gender differs across countries. Model 1 also shows that on average women are less likely to have attended a sport event than men in
the European Union. The odds-ratio of gender (which can be obtained by calculating the exponent of the reported logistic regression coefficient, \(b_{\text{Woman}} = -1.151^{***}\)) equals 0.316 (\(= e^{-1.151}\)), which means that the odds to have attended a sport event the last 12 months is, all other things equal, 0.316 times higher for women than for men. Or in other words, the odds to have attended a sport event is 3.161 times higher for men than for women (\(1/e^{-1.151} = 3.161\)). However, this gender gap is larger in some countries and smaller in others.

Table 7-3: Binary logistic multilevel analysis (with logit link function) of sport event attendance for 22,197 respondents in 27 EU countries: Logistic regression coefficients and standard errors (in brackets)°

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed part</th>
<th>Individual level°</th>
<th>Macro level</th>
<th>Cross-level interaction</th>
<th>Random part+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.919***</td>
<td>0.928***</td>
<td>0.935***</td>
<td>0.262***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.120)</td>
<td>(0.115)</td>
<td>(0.109)</td>
<td>(0.075)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>-1.151***</td>
<td>-1.148***</td>
<td>-1.148***</td>
<td>0.087**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.067)</td>
<td>(0.054)</td>
<td>(0.054)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.013 ns.</td>
<td>-0.004 ns.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.017***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td>6.220*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.896)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEI X Woman</td>
<td>0.017***</td>
<td>0.017***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < 0.001; *** p < 0.01; * p < 0.05; “ p < 0.10; ns. not significant: for the fixed parts we used a t-test, for the random parts a Wald-test.
° Models are controlled for the socio-economic and family-related indicators, age group and community size. Full tables are available in Appendix (see page 301).
+ The covariance between random slope and random intercept is fixed at zero.

Compared to the article, I have changed the reference category of the variable ‘gender’ to ‘man’ instead of ‘woman’ in order to obtain comparability across the empirical chapters of this dissertation, as in all other chapters gender was coded as man (0) – woman (1).
In model 2, we add macro-level gender equality as measured by the ‘Gender Equality Index’ and a cross-level interaction term between gender (woman) and GEI in order to test hypothesis 3, which predicts that gender gaps in sport event attendance are smaller in gender equal countries and larger in gender unequal countries. We notice that including this cross-level interaction in the model has explained away a substantial part of the cross-national variation in the effect of gender ($v_{ij} = 0.087^{**}$ in model 1 versus $v_{ij} = 0.047^{*}$ in model 2). This means that the differences in the size of the gender gap in sport event attendance across EU countries are to an important extent explained by the contextual gender equality of these countries. Figure 7-2, which depicts the relationship between GEI, gender and sport event attendance, facilitates the interpretation of the significant cross-level interaction effect ($b_{GEI\_Woman} = 0.017^{***}$). In line with hypothesis 3, the difference between men’s (higher) sport event attendance and women’s (lower) sport event attendance is smaller in gender equal countries than in gender unequal countries. So, higher levels of societal gender equality are associated with smaller gender gaps in sport event attendance. In Figure 7-3, we notice that there appears to be a positive effect of gender equality for both men and women. However, the non-significant coefficient of GEI ($b_{GEI} = 0.013^{ns.}$) indicates that there is no evidence that this positive effect is significantly different from 0 for men.

In model 3, we control for human development (HDI). Because we can theoretically expect that higher development is associated with higher sport event attendance and because HDI and GEI are correlated, the gendered effect of GEI in model 2 may be to some extent biased. Including HDI in the model 3 changes the relationship between GEI, gender and sport event attendance as depicted in Figure 7-3. Before controlling for HDI (see Figure 7-2 for comparison), it seems as if both men and women are more likely to attend sport events in gender equal countries compared to unequal countries but that this positive effect of macro-level gender equality on sport event attendance is less pronounced for men, as a consequence of which the gender gap is smaller in equal countries. When controlling for the country’s level of human development, we see in Figure 7-3 that actually, the difference in sport event attendance between men and women is smaller in gender equal countries because in these countries women are more likely to attend sport events than in unequal countries, in contrast to men, who are
slightly less likely to attend sport events than in unequal countries. However, the non-significant coefficient of GEI ($b_{GEI} = -0.004^{ns}$) again indicates that there is no evidence that this negative effect for men is significantly different from 0.

Figure 7-2: The relationship between gender, gender equality and sport event attendance (based on model 2 in Table 7-3)

7.5 Discussion and conclusion

In this article we make a case for the macro-sociological and cross-national comparative study of gender differences in sport event attendance and we show what this approach may add to existing research that mainly focuses on the level of the individual, using qualitative data in the study of a single country, often the US. More specifically, using binary multilevel analyses on Eurobarometer data we studied whether a gender gap in sport event attendance is present in all EU countries, whether this gap varies across countries and whether this gender gap variation can be explained by the level of macro-level gender equality of 27 European countries. As expected from a ‘doing gender’ and ‘hegemonic masculinity’ perspective (Connell, 1995; West & Zimmerman, 1987) and in line with existing research (e.g., Thrane, 2011), we find that men are more likely than women to have attended a sport event in all EU countries. However, the size of the gap between men’s (higher) sport event attendance and women’s (lower) sport event
attendance varies across EU countries. Southern and Eastern European countries generally show larger gender gaps in sport event attendance. So, if there indeed is an (increasing) feminization of the sports crowds as some scholars argue (Mintert & Pfister, 2015; Pope, 2011), it is expected to be more pronounced in some EU countries than others.

Figure 7-3: The relationship between gender, gender equality and sport event attendance (based on model 3 in Table 7-3)

Moreover, this cross-country variation in the gender gap in sport event attendance in the EU can be partly explained by macro-level gender equality: gender gaps in sport event attendance are generally smaller in countries with higher levels of gender equality and larger in countries with low levels of gender equality. Thus, as a response to the theoretical debate on the effect of the societal gender order on individual behavior (e.g., Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Lorber, 1994), we can confirm that differential access to sport events for men and women in Europe is partially context-related and affected by macro-level gender equality. Gender differences in sport event attendance are smaller in more gender equal countries, than in countries with higher levels of gender inequality. Because people always do their gender in relation to the norms and opportunities available in the context in which they live, single-country studies have to acknowledge the effect of the broader societal context in which (fe)male
sports consumption took place and a reflection on how this specific context may have impacted on the results is necessary. Furthermore, the fact that societal gender equality affects seemingly individual choices is also relevant for policy makers who need to bear in mind that gender equality is a complex, multidimensional phenomenon that is deeply embedded in the entire organization of society: making tickets cheaper will not have the expected effect if potential female spectators live in a highly unequal context with little access to leisure time for instance.

While this paper makes an important contribution to the debate on the effects of the gender order on sports consumption, certain aspects should receive more attention in future research. An important limitation is that we do not know what kind of sport events the respondents attended. To get a more thorough understanding of the general processes described in this paper, future research should pay attention to the specific characteristics of sport events, in particular whether it was an event with professional or amateur athletes, with male or female athletes and the kind of sport played. Indeed, women may ‘do’ rather than ‘undo’ their gender when visiting amateur sport events as part of their role as a mother or partner, see for instance Little League Moms in Chafetz and Kotarba (1999). Furthermore, it would be interesting to compare the effects of societal gender equality on men’s and women’s attendance of events where female athletes compete versus events where male athletes compete and study how this is related to attention for women’s sports in the media, schools, etc. Moreover, not only do different sports have different gendered connotations, sport-specific gender divisions or unequal policies in sports federations in certain countries may also prevent that living in a gender equal context stimulates female participation in a sport and reduces the gender gap (see for instance Meier et al., 2013). What all these examples show is that the macro-level approach used in this paper needs to be complemented with qualitative and quantitative research on how meso-level institutions such as sports federations and sports clubs, families, the media, schools and peer groups function as gatekeepers and mediate or moderate the effect of macro-level gender equality on (wo)men’s sport event attendance. Once the specific processes by which macro-level (in)equality influences micro-level (in)equality are clear, researchers will be able to designate the relevant dimensions of gender equality (e.g., knowledge and education, leisure time and unpaid work, …) that can be addressed to improve female access to sport events.
7.6 Notes

1 Compared to the article, I have changed the reference category of the variable ‘gender’ to ‘man’ instead of ‘woman’ in order to obtain comparability across the empirical chapters of this dissertation, as in all other chapters gender was coded as man (0) – woman (1).

2 As highlighted by a reviewer, meso-level institutions, such as sports federations and clubs, schools, and media, may function as gatekeepers in the translation of macro-level gender (in)equalities in individual-level gender (in)equalities in sport event attendance.

3 The GEI does not allow to disentangle structural and cultural influences on individual-level gender differences in sport event attendance. Adequate measures to do this do not yet exist. However, while unravelling these cultural and structural processes could offer a more nuanced picture, this would be a bit arbitrary as well because actually structure and culture are fundamentally intertwined: the opportunity structure (e.g., the availability of public child care) is affected by the cultural gender norms prevalent in a country, but also corroborates existing gender norms.

4 The analyses indicate that human development has a positive effect on the sport event attendance of both men and women across EU countries. Human development only partly explains cross-national variation in overall levels of sport event attendance, which indicates that additional cross-national comparative research is needed that explains why there is higher participation in some countries than others.
7.7 References


Wilson, T. C. (2002). The paradox of social class and sports involvement: The roles of cultural and economic capital. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 37*(1), 5-16.
8 Gender and generation: trends in Dutch men’s and women’s cultural consumption

Working paper in collaboration with Katrijn Delaruelle, Henk Roose and Piet Bracke

Research on trends in cultural consumption generally overlooks how men's and women’s cultural participation evolves over time. Considering the gendered connotations of and participation in many leisure activities, the supposed changing value of arts participation as cultural capital to which men and women may respond differently, and in light of the improvements in women’s societal position and the increasingly egalitarian attitudes of subsequent cohorts born in the 20th century, attention to changes in the gender gap in cultural taste is long overdue. Using Dutch data on the cultural involvement of men and women born between 1919 and 1982 and Hierarchical Age-Period-Cohort models, this chapter shows how the gender gap in professional theatre attendance, ballet attendance, museum visits, art gallery visits and football match attendance diminishes in subsequent cohorts. The uncovered patterns are most in line with gender-related explanations and highlight the importance of changing gender norms.
8.1 Introduction

The last decades, there is increasing interest in generational trends in highbrow cultural participation, such as theatre and ballet attendance and museum visits (e.g., DiMaggio & Mukhtar, 2004; Reeves, 2016; Roose & Daenekindt, 2015). By evaluating trends in cultural participation researchers want to better understand the (potential) changing importance of highbrow culture. Researchers assume that a changed cultural socialization of the birth cohorts born in the second part of the 20th century, that is more focused on popular cultural tastes, has resulted in large declines in highbrow participation (DiMaggio & Mukhtar, 2004; van Eijck & Knulst, 2005). Despite this interest, research on generational trends in cultural participation is relatively scarce because suitable longitudinal data is often lacking. Moreover, it is methodologically challenging to distinguish cohort effects, which relate to differential socialization and attitudes among subsequent generations, from age effects, which pertain to changes within a person’s life course (Reeves, 2016; Roose & Daenekindt, 2015; van den Broek, 2013).

To what extent generational trends in cultural consumption differ by gender is almost completely overlooked (exceptions are DiMaggio & Mukhtar, 2004; Katz-Gerro & Sullivan, 2004; Knulst & Kraaykamp, 1998). This reflects a general tendency in research on cultural tastes to highlight the distinction between legitimate and non-legitimate cultural practices, neglecting the gendered connotations to many cultural activities (cf. DiMaggio, 2004; Zinkhan, Prenshaw, & Close, 2004). Indeed, arts-related cultural activities are traditionally gender-typed as feminine, while sport-related activities often have masculine connotations (Zinkhan et al., 2004). We argue that a better understanding of the evolution of gender differences in cultural participation across generations is long overdue considering the gendered connotations of and participation in many leisure activities (Athenstaedt, Mikula, & Bredt, 2009; Christin, 2012; Zinkhan et al., 2004); the supposed changing value of arts participation as cultural capital to which men and women may respond differently (DiMaggio & Mukhtar, 2004); and in light of the improvements in women’s societal position and the increasingly egalitarian attitudes of subsequent cohorts born in the 20th century (Cotter, Hermsen, & Vanneman, 2011; Ridgeway, 2009, 2011).
This study provides a renewed effort to disentangle cohort- and age effects in the study of cultural tastes, employing Hierarchical Age-Period-Cohort (HAPC) models (Yang & Land, 2013) and recent improvements to the technique (Bell & Jones, 2014a, 2014b, 2015; Bell & Jones, 2018) on data from the Dutch AVO-survey that was administered four-yearly between 1983 and 2007 (Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau (SCP) & Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (CBS)). We examine gendered generational trends in participation in a variety of out-door feminine- or masculine-typed cultural activities, including theatre and ballet attendance, which are exclusive cultural activities with feminine connotations, museum and art gallery visits, which are feminine-typed, more time-flexible cultural practices with relatively high participation rates, and football match attendance, which is a traditionally non-legitimate, very masculine-typed activity that is argued to be increasingly feminizing (cf. Meier, Strauss, & Riedl, 2017; Pope, 2017).

The Netherlands is an interesting case for the analysis of generational trends in the gender gap in cultural taste because gender role attitudes and women’s status have changed considerably throughout the 20th century in the Dutch society (Braun & Scott, 2009; Pott-Buter, 1993). Today, the Netherlands is considered a relatively gender equal country (EIGE, 2013) and gender differences in highbrow cultural participation and sport event attendance are among the smallest in Europe (Lagaert & Roose, 2018, In press). By describing how the gender gap in participation in gendered cultural activities has evolved across birth cohorts in the Netherlands, this study offers one of the first accounts of how the effect of gender on cultural involvement varies across time.

8.2 Theoretical framework

8.2.1 Trends in cultural participation and generational taste differences: What do we know?

Scholars are interested in highbrow cultural consumption, such as theatre, ballet and opera attendance, because it functions as ‘cultural capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986), which refers to “institutionalized, i.e., widely shared, high status cultural signals [...] used for social and cultural exclusion” (Lamont & Lareau, 1988, p. 156). Since the 1990s, scholars argue that traditional elite, legitimate tastes appear to lose their unique position as a status marker
(DiMaggio & Mukhtar, 2004; Prieur & Savage, 2013). Research demonstrates that cultural competence is increasingly expressed through an openness in tastes, with as a classical exponent of this thinking research on ‘omnivore’ taste patterns (Peterson & Kern, 1996). More recently, the idea that traditional cultural capital is replaced by new or ‘emerging’ forms of cultural capital is gaining ground (Friedman, Savage, Hanquinet, & Miles, 2015; Prieur & Savage, 2013; Roose, 2015; Savage et al., 2013). Emerging capital refers to popular, contemporary, mostly urban, screen-based cultural practices such as sport- and media-related tastes.

This changing importance of highbrow and more popular culture would be reflected in a downward trend in arts participation and an upward trend in consumption of non-legitimate cultural practices as a result of taste differences between birth cohorts (cf. DiMaggio & Mukhtar, 2004). Researchers hypothesize that highbrow cultural consumption is declining because younger birth cohorts have increasingly different, more popular tastes (DiMaggio & Mukhtar, 2004; Roose, 2015; van den Broek, 2013; van Eijck & Knulst, 2005). Scholars generally situate this shift in cultural taste and the decline in highbrow consumption around the early baby boom generation, which was born between 1946 and 1955 (Balfe & Meyersohn, 1995; DiMaggio & Mukhtar, 2004; Peterson & Darren, 1995). This downward trend would then continue in subsequent generations. Instead, younger cohorts would participate in more popular, non-exclusive activities, such as going to the cinema (Jaeger & Katz-Gerro, 2010; Katz-Gerro & Jæger, 2011; Roose & Daenekindt, 2015). Despite these consistent expectations, empirical evidence is somewhat equivocal. There are changes in cultural consumption, such as an increase in participation in popular culture (which may or may not reflect a devaluation of traditional cultural capital), but the decline in highbrow participation does not appear to be as dramatic as many scholars expect (DiMaggio & Mukhtar, 2004; Knulst & Kraaykamp, 1998; Roose & Daenekindt, 2015; van Eijck & Knulst, 2005).

### 8.2.2 Men’s and women’s cultural consumption across generations

What research on trends in cultural participation tends to ignore is that cultural activities are not only more or less legitimate, but in many cases also have specific gendered connotations. While arts-related activities are gender-typed as feminine, sport-related activities often have masculine connotations (Zinkhan et al., 2004). Not surprisingly, research indicates that women
are more likely than men to participate in highbrow cultural activities (Christin, 2012), while men are more involved in sports and sport spectatorship (Bennett et al., 2009; Pope, 2017). Because scholars argue that both gender role socialization, gendered expectations and cultural socialization have changed considerably across birth cohorts (DiMaggio & Mukhtar, 2004; Featherstone, 2007; Ridgeway, 2011), the study of generational trends in men’s and women’s cultural participation is an important next step in the understanding of gender differences in cultural tastes. Because these gender-specific trends are currently often empirically overlooked and theoretically underdeveloped, we propose two possible scenarios of how the gender gap may have evolved among Dutch cohorts born in the 20th century.

A first possible scenario is that gender differences in highbrow and other cultural participation become smaller in more recent cohorts (Christin, 2012; DiMaggio & Mukhtar, 2004; van Eijck & Bargeman, 2004). Theoretically, the mechanisms behind this closing gender gap can be related to the changing value of arts as a status marker or to the changing societal position of women. DiMaggio and Mukhtar (2004, p. 189) argue that when there is a deflation of the value of arts as cultural capital, declines in participation will be most pronounced among groups who invest most in cultural capital1, such as women and the highly educated. This decrease would be especially visible among younger cohorts. So, this would lead to expect a diminishing gender gap across generations.

Moreover, in the last century women’s societal position has improved considerably and the feminist movement criticized the traditional division of paid and unpaid labor (Christin, 2012; DiMaggio & Mukhtar, 2004; van Eijck & Bargeman, 2004). The growing female labor market participation among younger generations is a manifestation of women’s increasing opportunities in the public sphere. However, women’s involvement in paid work is expected to cause time constraints, that are an obstacle for women to fulfill their ‘cultural housekeeping’ responsibilities, which refers to their traditional role in the cultural reproduction in the family2 (Collins, 1988; DiMaggio & Mukhtar, 2004). Moreover, because women participating in the labor market often remain responsible for the majority of household tasks and do a ‘second shift’ after work (Hochschild, 2003[1989]), women have less leisure time (Sayer, 2005; Thrane, 2000), and leisure time that is of lower quality because it is more frequently interrupted, in the
presence of children and involves the combination of in-home cultural activities with other activities such as child care or housework (Bittman & Wajcman, 2000; Katz-Gerro & Sullivan, 2010, p. 195; Sullivan, 1997). These gendered leisure constraints may form an obstacle for outdoor cultural participation, especially for cultural activities that are not time-flexible. So, these structural effects of growing gender equality may explain why the gender gap in highbrow participation would diminish in subsequent cohorts.

Moreover, also the cultural aspects of gender equality could be important. Traditional gender norms have been losing their importance throughout the last century, which has consequences for the gender role socialization of younger cohorts (Cotter et al., 2011; Thornton, Alwin, & Camburn, 1983). Considering the gendered connotations of arts- and sports-related activities (Zinkhan et al., 2004) and the effects of gendered expectations expressed in social interaction on cultural interests (Lagaert, Van Houtte, & Roose, 2017, under review), we can expect that younger cohorts, raised in more gender equal contexts, have less stereotypical participatory behavior. This last mechanism is also applicable to football match attendance: Meier and colleagues (2017) suppose that the (alleged) increasing feminization of sport fandom is the result of changing gender role attitudes (see also Pope, 2017). Empirically, van Eijck and Bargeman (2004) find that gender has a diminishing effect on cultural participation between 1980 and 2000 in the Netherlands.

A second scenario would be that gender differences increase in younger cohorts. While scholars generally do not theoretically expect an increasing gender gap, two studies on trends in cultural participation suggest that gender differences may be growing. Work by DiMaggio and Mukhtar (2004) in the US suggests that women’s highbrow participation rates decline more slowly than men’s. Moreover, in the Netherlands, men’s leisure reading showed a steeper decline between 1955 and 1995 than women’s as a consequence of which an initial male ‘advantage’ changed into a gap in which men participate less than women (Knulst & Kraaykamp, 1998). An increasing gender gap may seem counter-intuitive, but we should not forget that also women’s level of educational attainment has increased drastically among younger generations and has started to surpass men’s (Buchmann, DiPrete, & McDaniel, 2008;
van Hek, Kraaykamp, & Wolbers, 2016). This currently results in growing, not diminishing gender gaps in institutionalized cultural capital.

There are some culture- and gender-related mechanisms that could explain a possible increasing gender gap in highbrow cultural participation among subsequent cohorts. The improved societal position of women over time may give women more structural opportunities to invest in cultural capital, for instance because of their higher qualifications. Moreover, the increase in female labor market participation may stimulate women’s highbrow cultural consumption because women can expect a higher return on investment in contexts where they can employ their cultural capital at the workplace (see Collins, 1988). Moreover, it is not because women and men have more equal opportunities that gender stereotypes about ‘typical’ female behavior suddenly disappear (Charles & Bradley, 2009). This relates to Ridgeway’s (2011) ‘cultural lag’, which means that perceptions of what is appropriate (cultural) behavior for women (and men) tend to lag behind their actual opportunities and resources. Thus, women would continue to participate in female-typed highbrow cultural activities much longer than their societal position would lead to expect. Lastly, as the value of legitimate highbrow tastes as a status marker declines, men may also start to invest in new forms of cultural capital (Prieur & Savage, 2013; Roose, 2015), in particular in light of the feminine connotation of many arts-related activities (Zinkhan et al., 2004). When highbrow participation no longer leads to social benefits, men from birth cohorts that are not socialized in the arts may withdraw from arts-related cultural activities at a fast rate as the field is feminine, and, thus, devalued (cf. Katz-Gerro & Sullivan, 2004).

8.3 Methods

8.3.1 Data and sample
Suitable data that allows to disentangle age and cohort effects is scarce and is often biased toward legitimate, highbrow genres, especially in the first waves (Roose & Daenekindt, 2015). In this study, we use data from the Dutch AVO-survey (Amenities and Social Services Utilization Survey) which was collected every four years between 1983 and 2007 by The Netherlands Institute for Social Research and Statistics Netherlands and is used by others to describe trends in cultural participation (Roose & Daenekindt, 2015; van Eijck & Knulst, 2005).
The Netherlands is an interesting case to study when it comes to generational trends in the gender gap in cultural taste. Research indicates that anno 2013, overall highbrow cultural participation is high in the Netherlands compared to other European countries and the gender differences are relatively small (Lagaert & Roose, 2018). Also in sport event attendance, gender differences are lower in the Netherlands than in other European countries (Lagaert & Roose, In press). Today, the Netherlands scores generally high on measures of gender equality (EIGE, 2013). However, historically, the position of women in public and private life in the Netherlands has not always been so favorable (Pott-Buter, 1993). Moreover, gender role attitudes have become more egalitarian across cohorts in the Netherlands (Braun & Scott, 2009).

The AVO-survey has a repeated cross-sectional design and offers information on cultural consumption for a representative sample of Dutch households, including all household members aged six and over. In the first waves, roughly 6000 households per wave were selected, which are about 11,500 respondents per wave. In 2007, households were randomly administered to one of the two versions of the questionnaire, one with the old question battery on cultural consumption and one with an adapted version. For reasons of comparability, we only used information on respondents that had received the same questions as in the previous waves.

In the analyses, we use information on the respondents that are between 25 and 64. At the age of 25, people are likely to have left the parental home and reached their highest level of education. Moreover, at this age, individuals’ cultural tastes are likely to be more or less solidified (even though cultural socialization later in life is of course possible). We decided to leave out people of 65 or older to avoid that health issues encountered in old age would bias the results and, thus, our understanding of changing cultural tastes across generations. Declining health and mobility are important impediments to out-door cultural participation (Agahi, Ahacic, & Parker, 2006; Reeves, 2016; Scherger, 2009; Scherger, Nazroo, & Higgs, 2011). An additional complicating factor is that the detrimental effects of old age are closely related to a person’s birth cohort and gender. Elderly women are more likely to report chronic illnesses and functional disabilities, such as not being able to take the stairs or walk longer than a few minutes (Arber & Ginn, 1993; Rueda & Artazcoz, 2009). The healthy life expectancy of people over 60
has risen considerably in the last decades of the 20th century, especially for women (Doblhammer & Kytir, 2001). So, to avoid that the uncovered generational differences could actually reflect health differences and gendered effects of old age instead of changing tastes, it is best to leave the oldest age groups out of the analyses. Preliminary analyses on all respondents of 25 years old and over confirmed this fundamental intertwining of cohort effects and old age. The reported analyses are performed on 51151 respondents; 25526 (49.9%) are men. The oldest respondents are born in 1919, the youngest respondents were born in 1982.

8.3.2 Variables
8.3.2.1 Dependent variables
In the analyses, we focus on participation in the last 12 months (or non-participation) in four high-status and feminine cultural activities, which are theatre attendance (of plays performed by professional actors), ballet attendance (not of performances of own children), museum visits and art gallery visits, and participation in one non-legitimate, masculine cultural activity, i.e., paid football match attendance. The choice for these activities was guided by theoretical considerations, but of course constrained by what was available in the data set. For the selected activities, the phrasing of the questions was highly similar across the waves. Moreover, the activities are all out-door cultural activities, as for in-door cultural activities other gendered mechanisms could be at play (e.g., Sullivan, 1997). Within these constraints, we wanted to achieve a variety in the studied practices in terms of gender-typing, exclusivity and time-flexibility of participation. First, the gender-typing of these activities is clear: arts-related activities are generally gender-typed as feminine, sport-related activities have masculine connotations (Zinkhan et al., 2004). Thus, they could be affected by changing gendered beliefs across generations. Second, the extent to which the activities are legitimate or not is rather clear. The arts-related activities studied are traditionally legitimate forms of cultural participation, while football match attendance is a traditionally non-legitimate activity. However, sport spectatorship may increasingly count as a new or emerging form of cultural capital and is expected to be increasingly popular among younger generations (Prieur & Savage, 2013; Savage et al., 2013). Moreover, also within the arts-related activities there is quite some variation: while ballet attendance is an exclusive cultural practice, museum visits are quite common. Third, while ballet, theatre and football match attendance are more time-fixed as they
start at a specific moment of the day, often in the evening, museum visits are more time-flexible. We study the trends in the cultural practices separately (instead of using a compositional scale for highbrow participation) because research indicates that evolutions in participation may depend on the particular cultural genre or domain studied (Roose & Daenekindt, 2015).

In the analyses, we use binary dependent variables distinguishing ‘no participation in the last 12 months’ from ‘participation in the last 12 months’. We choose a dichotomous variable for several reasons. First, while all respondents were asked whether they had participated in the last 12 months or not, the subsequent question about frequency of participation had a different response format for the arts-related activities than for football match attendance. Second, modeling the frequency of participation is problematic because frequent participation in some of the activities (especially ballet and football match attendance) is very rare, especially in certain generations, which leads to empty cell problems and power issues. Third, for all highbrow activities men are more likely to indicate that they had never participated, while women are overrepresented in all other categories of participation. On the contrary, women are more likely to indicate that they did not attend a football match, while men are overrepresented in all other categories of participation. So, we are confident that the binary variable captures the crucial gap in participation. Table 8-1 represents the percentage of the male and female respondents that reported to have participated at least once in the last 12 months.

Table 8-1: Percentage of the male and female respondents reporting participation (N = 51,151)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural practice</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>$\chi^2$-difference test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theatre attendance</td>
<td>11,8%</td>
<td>16,2%</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballet attendance</td>
<td>2,9%</td>
<td>5,1%</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum visits</td>
<td>32,7%</td>
<td>36,4%</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art gallery visits</td>
<td>18,7%</td>
<td>21,9%</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football match attendance</td>
<td>16,6%</td>
<td>3,3%</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

° $p < .10$. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$
8.3.2.2 **Independent variables**

Central variables are gender and birth cohort. *Gender* is a binary variable that differentiates men (0) from women (1). About half of the sample are women and half of the sample are men (49.9%). *Birth cohort* refers to the birth year of the respondent. In order to have enough observations in each cohort, we group three birth years per cohort (with the exception of the earliest cohort). The measure ranges from cohorts born a long time ago to more recent cohorts. The oldest birth cohort consists of respondents born in 1919, and the most recent of respondents born between 1980 and 1982. Cohort is used as a (mean-centered) metric variable in the analyses. The mean cohort is situated in the early baby boom generation (ca. 1952). A quadratic cohort term (= cohort²) was included to allow for non-linear effects of cohort on participation.

**Table 8-2: Descriptive statistics for the independent variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorical variables</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>49.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>50.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young child(ren)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>65.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Married or registered partnership (ref)</td>
<td>76.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>4.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>2.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>16.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td>Primary education or less</td>
<td>18.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-vocational / junior secondary education</td>
<td>32.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior secondary education – professional (ref)</td>
<td>19.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior secondary education – general or scientific</td>
<td>8.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher (tertiary) professional education</td>
<td>14.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher (tertiary) scientific education (university (college))</td>
<td>6.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td>Working</td>
<td>65.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housewife/man</td>
<td>15.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retired/unable to work</td>
<td>8.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>9.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1.1 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric variables</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>St. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>1-22</td>
<td>12.20 (4.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>25-64</td>
<td>42.22 (10.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community size</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.12 (1.36)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

°All metric variables are grand-mean centered in the analysis;
°* For cohort and age, both a linear and a quadratic term were used in the analysis.
Furthermore, we take the following variables into account: having young children, age, marital status, educational attainment and the occupational status of the respondent and the community size. We distinguish respondents who live with their young child(ren) (younger than 12) from respondents who do not have children. A respondents’ age was used as a (mean-centered) metric variable in the analyses. We use both linear and quadratic age terms. Marital status indicates whether respondents are married (or have a registered partnership, which means they are officially living together), divorced, widowed or never married. Educational attainment indicates the highest level of schooling a person finished, distinguishing ‘primary education or less’, ‘pre-vocational / junior secondary education’, ‘senior secondary education – professional’, ‘senior secondary education – general or scientific’, ‘higher (tertiary) professional education’ and ‘higher (tertiary) scientific education (university (college))’. We used the scheme developed by Nagel and de Haan (2003, pp. 115-116) to guarantee comparability across the different waves. The reference category of this categorical variable is: ‘senior secondary education – professional’. Occupational status distinguishes working respondents from housewives/men, people that are retired or unable to work, people that are unemployed and students. Moreover, we control for the community size of the place the respondent lives as this is a proxy for the access to cultural activities. This measure ranges from least urban to most urban environments. Descriptive statistics are provided in Table 8-2.

8.3.3 Statistical method: Hierarchical Age-Period-Cohort-analysis (HAPC)
To investigate whether gender inequalities in cultural consumption differ across cohorts, we conduct a hierarchical age-period-cohort analysis (HAPC). This model was developed by Yang and Land (2006, 2013) as a solution to the well-known ‘identification problem’, induced by the exact linear dependency among age, period, and cohort (Period = Age + Cohort; in such an equation we are always able to know the value of one of the three terms, as soon as we know the value of the other two). The HAPC model claims to break the perfect collinearity between the three time-related variables in three ways: (1) by adding a quadratic function for the age effect; (2) by using unequal APC intervals; (3) by treating the three temporal components at different, non-additive levels: age is specified as an individual-level (or level-1) fixed effect, while period and cohort effects are regarded as cross-classified contextual-level (or higher-level) random effects.
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Although HAPC analysis has gained popularity among social researchers in recent years (e.g., Christin, Coulangeon, & Donnat, 2016; Clarke, O’Malley, Johnston, & Schulenberg, 2008; Reither, Hauser, & Yang, 2009; Tawfik, Sciarini, & Horber, 2012), serious criticism has been leveled against the validity of some of the underlying assumptions. Experimental evaluations (Bell & Jones, 2014a; Bell & Jones, 2018; O’Brien, 2017) show that HAPC models would only solve the identification problem and produce meaningful estimations of the effect of age, period or cohort when certain assumptions hold. So, considering the critiques on the technique and adapting the model specification accordingly is important to guarantee the validity of the results.

According to Bell and Jones (2014a, 2014b), an important issue of the original HAPC-model specification by Yang and Land (2006, 2013) is that cohort effects are modeled as if they are random. However, we know that this is not the case. Quite the contrary, we would theoretically expect that there is a diminishing trend in highbrow cultural tastes across birth cohorts reflecting differential cultural socialization of generations (DiMaggio & Mukhtar, 2004; Roose & Daenekindt, 2015; van Eijck & Knulst, 2005). Because this assumption does not hold, we have to include additional constraints in order to obtain meaningful APC parameters (Bell & Jones, 2014a). More specifically, we have to include the cohort term also as a fixed effect in the model, not only in the random part (Bell & Jones, 2015). However, doing this implies the theoretical assumption that there are no systematic period trends (random period trends are not problematic). Period effects refer to those time-related mechanisms, often connected to changes in the social or economic environment, that affect all age groups and cohorts simultaneously (Yang & Land, 2006). Typical examples are wars or economic crises that have a similar effect on individuals, independent of how old they are.

We think the assumption is theoretically justifiable for the following reasons. Scarce existing research on the topic finds only limited evidence for the existence of period effects on cultural taste (Bille, 2008; Reeves, 2014). The small period effects that are found are situated after the mid-1990’s, while the dataset used in this study contains data points before this moment in time, so it is not likely that there would be period effects that impact on all the different ages in our sample systematically and simultaneously. Nevertheless, one could argue
that an increase in cultural offerings, both popular and legitimate, leads to period effects on cultural tastes. However, van Eijck and Knulst (2005, p. 527) argue that “highbrow culture has always been subject to the competition of other, less legitimate, types of culture. There is little reason to believe that this competition, either in the home or outdoors, has suddenly intensified at the end of the twentieth century. Therefore, changes in the supply of culture cannot account for [the declining interest in highbrow culture in younger generations] either. On the contrary: we found positive effects of popular culture participation on highbrow activities.” Also work by Van Steen, Vlegels, and Lievens (2015) suggests that it is not because there is an increasing supply of non-legitimate cultural practices, that this means that there is per definition competition with highbrow cultural activities, quite the contrary.

Moreover, the consistent generational patterns across the highbrow activities (that are in line with theoretical expectations (cf. DiMaggio & Mukhtar, 2004)) cast further doubt on the possibility that the uncovered patterns actually reflect period effects: can we reasonably expect that changing cultural offerings would compete in the same way with very exclusive practices such as ballet attendance and with quite common activities such as museum visits? Moreover, we do not deem it likely that an effect of cultural supply would be systematic across birth cohorts. Finally, it is improbable that such an effect would bias the estimation of the gender gap, which is the focus of this study. Considering these arguments, we are confident that the assumption holds and that the HAPC-technique produces, in this case, meaningful estimations of the cohort effect.
Table 8-3: HAPC-models predicting the gendered effects of cohort on cultural participation (N= 51.151; source: AVO survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural practices</th>
<th>Professional theatre</th>
<th>Ballet</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Art gallery</th>
<th>Football match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-4.943***</td>
<td>(0.147)</td>
<td>-8.598***</td>
<td>(0.331)</td>
<td>-1.438***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman (Man = ref)</td>
<td>1.547***</td>
<td>(0.071)</td>
<td>1.839***</td>
<td>(0.120)</td>
<td>0.831***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>-0.076**</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>(0.048)</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort²</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>-0.024***</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>-0.017***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman X Cohort</td>
<td>-0.050***</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>-0.066**</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
<td>-0.041***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman X Cohort²</td>
<td>-0.006**</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young child (No = ref)</td>
<td>-0.571***</td>
<td>(0.093)</td>
<td>-0.417**</td>
<td>(0.138)</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>0.046***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age²</td>
<td>-0.001*</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced (Married = ref)</td>
<td>0.605***</td>
<td>(0.137)</td>
<td>0.954***</td>
<td>(0.190)</td>
<td>0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed (Married = ref)</td>
<td>0.552**</td>
<td>(0.213)</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>(0.326)</td>
<td>-0.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married (Married = ref) (Education, senior sec. education - professional = ref)</td>
<td>0.902***</td>
<td>(0.103)</td>
<td>1.133***</td>
<td>(0.147)</td>
<td>0.960***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary education or less</td>
<td>-2.327***</td>
<td>(0.118)</td>
<td>-2.031***</td>
<td>(0.209)</td>
<td>-2.111***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-voc./junior sec. educ.</td>
<td>-1.060***</td>
<td>(0.084)</td>
<td>-0.843***</td>
<td>(0.149)</td>
<td>-0.979***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior sec. educ.-general or scientific</td>
<td>0.927***</td>
<td>(0.105)</td>
<td>1.275***</td>
<td>(0.168)</td>
<td>0.798***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher (tertiary) professional education</td>
<td>1.363***</td>
<td>(0.089)</td>
<td>1.788***</td>
<td>(0.147)</td>
<td>1.395***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher (tertiary) scientific educ. (university (college)) (Employed = ref)</td>
<td>2.228***</td>
<td>(0.115)</td>
<td>2.692***</td>
<td>(0.176)</td>
<td>2.567***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife/man</td>
<td>-0.756***</td>
<td>(0.095)</td>
<td>-0.773***</td>
<td>(0.155)</td>
<td>-0.143*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired/unable to work</td>
<td>-0.533***</td>
<td>(0.124)</td>
<td>-0.714***</td>
<td>(0.205)</td>
<td>-0.194*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>-0.557***</td>
<td>(0.107)</td>
<td>-0.416*</td>
<td>(0.165)</td>
<td>-0.221**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>(0.234)</td>
<td>-0.115</td>
<td>(0.330)</td>
<td>0.368*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community size</td>
<td>0.285***</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>0.517***</td>
<td>(0.045)</td>
<td>0.213***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random Part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>(0.041)</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>(0.126)</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td>14.134</td>
<td>(0.677)</td>
<td>13.888</td>
<td>(1.142)</td>
<td>9.200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10, *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001; All metric variables are grand-mean centered in the analysis.
8.4 Results

Table 8-3 presents the HAPC analyses predicting gendered effects of birth cohort on men’s and women’s cultural participation. The model for each cultural activity contains linear and quadratic cohort terms and interaction terms of cohort and cohort² with gender. The models are controlled for having young children, marital status, occupational status, educational attainment, age (and age²) and community size. The significant effects of the linear and/or the quadratic cohort term and the interaction term(s) with gender indicate that a respondent’s birth cohort is related to a person’s cultural participation but that this effect differs for men and women. To facilitate interpretation, the effect of birth cohort and gender on theatre attendance, ballet attendance, museum visits, art gallery visits and football match attendance are presented in Figure 8-1, Figure 8-2, Figure 8-3, Figure 8-4 and Figure 8-5.

Figure 8-1: The effect of birth cohort on professional theatre attendance, by gender (based on the logistic regression coefficients of the HAPC analysis reported in Table 8-3).
Figure 8-2: The effect of birth cohort on ballet attendance, by gender (based on the logistic regression coefficients of the HAPC analysis reported in Table 8-3).

Figure 8-3: The effect of birth cohort on museum visits, by gender (based on the logistic regression coefficients of the HAPC analysis reported in Table 8-3).
For ballet attendance, museum visits and art gallery visits, we find significant negative quadratic cohort terms, which means that the relationship between cohort and cultural consumption for men is inverse U-shaped. We also find negative ‘woman X cohort’ interactions which means that the cohort effect is more negative for women than for men. In Figure 8-2, Figure 8-3 and Figure 8-4, we see for both men and women a slightly rising generational trend line among pre-WWII birth cohorts, that reaches its highest point and tilts
towards a downward trend in cohorts born around WWII and starts to decline with the early baby boom generation. This decline continues in subsequent birth cohorts. Despite the overall similar (rising and then declining) generational pattern for men and women, the difference in participation between men and women varies across cohorts. The figures show that for women the generational trend in participation is more negative, in other words, it declines more than for men, which is in line with the significant negative ‘woman X cohort’ terms. So, the gender gap is reduced as younger cohorts replace older cohorts. As an illustration, in the average cohort (which is situated in the early baby boom generation) the odds to have attended a ballet in the year before the interview is, other things being equal, about 6.3 times higher for women than for men \( e^{1.839} = 6.3 \), which is a sizable gender gap. For the youngest cohort in the sample, which are people born between 1980 and 1982, the odds of ballet attendance is, ceteris paribus, about 3.6 times higher for women than for men. For museum visits and art gallery visits, the odds of participation is –respectively– about 2.3 and 2.5 times higher for women than for men in the average cohort (born in the beginning of the 1950’s), while the gender gap virtually disappears in the most recent cohorts in the sample.

For professional theatre attendance and football match attendance, we find inversed patterns (see Figure 8-1 and Figure 8-5). The significant –respectively– negative and positive linear cohort terms but non-significant quadratic cohort terms indicate that cohort has a linear negative effect on theatre attendance and a linear positive effect on football match attendance for men. However, the cohort effect differs for women and men. We find significant negative interaction effects between gender and the linear cohort and cohort² terms for theatre attendance and significant positive interaction effects between ‘being a woman’ and the linear cohort and cohort² terms for football match attendance. As is clear from Figure 8-1 and Figure 8-5, this means that gender differences in professional theatre attendance and football match attendance are becoming increasingly smaller in subsequent generations. The odds for professional theatre attendance is, other things being equal, about 4.7 times higher for women than for men \( e^{1.547} = 4.7 \) for the average cohort, but only 1.6 times higher in the generation born in 1980-1982. The odds for football match attendance are 0.05 times higher for women than for men in the average cohort \( e^{3.3072} = 0.05 \), or in other words, the odds for football match attendance is 21.6
times lower for women than for men in the average cohort \((1/ e^{3.3072} = 21.6)\). For the youngest cohorts in the analyses (1980-1982), the odds to have attended a football match is ‘only’ 8.1 times lower for women than for men\(^{11}\).

8.5 Discussion

8.5.1 Aim and findings
In this study, we focused on generational trends in men’s and women’s participation in gender-typed cultural practices in the Netherlands. This topic is particularly relevant as (cultural beliefs about) women’s societal position have changed considerably across birth cohorts in the 20\(^{th}\) century (Braun & Scott, 2009; Cotter et al., 2011; Pott-Buter, 1993), and because scholars argue that the position of highbrow culture as a marker of cultural capital may have changed (DiMaggio & Mukhtar, 2004). Because other Western countries witnessed similar societal transformations, the patterns described in this study are relevant for scholars in other countries as well.

We sketched possible theoretical mechanisms behind two scenarios: a diminishing gender gap and an intensifying gender gap across cohorts. Empirically, we disentangled age and cohort effects using Hierarchical Age-, Period-, Cohort-models (Yang & Land, 2013), recognizing the revisions to the model specification proposed by other scholars (Bell & Jones, 2014a, 2014b, 2015; Bell & Jones, 2018; O’Brien, 2017) and thus, this study offers a more reliable estimation of cohort effects than is generally achieved using cross-sectional data. We described gender-specific generational trends in a variety of cultural practices, i.e., theatre, ballet and football match attendance, and museum and art gallery visits. Thus, this study offers one of the first accounts of how the gender gap in cultural participation has evolved across time (an exception is Katz-Gerro & Sullivan, 2004), and contributes to the scientific understanding of trends in cultural participation and of gender differences in cultural taste.

For all studied activities, we find that gender differences vary with the cohort in which a person is born. Specifically, in all cultural practices gender differences get smaller in younger cohorts. For those activities where the gender gap was already relatively small, such as museum and art gallery visits, gender differences have virtually disappeared among the most recent
cohorts. So, the diminishing gender gap across cohorts is a consistent pattern as it is apparent across a large variety of activities: in feminine-typed, arts-related (evening) activities (ballet and theatre attendance), in more time-flexible cultural activities (art gallery and museum visits), and in a masculine-typed, non-legitimate activity (sport event attendance), that is—in contrast to the arts-related activities—increasingly popular in younger generations.

8.5.2 A reflection on the mechanisms behind reduced gender differences in cultural consumption across generations

Despite the consistent generational trend towards smaller gender differences, it is far from easy to identify the specific mechanisms and social processes behind this reduction in the gender gap in cultural participation using secondary data. Theoretically, the diminishing gender gap can be due to both culture-related and gender-related mechanisms. However, if we take a closer look into the proposed mechanisms and the uncovered patterns, the gender-related explanations seem more valid than the culture-related explanation proposed by DiMaggio and Muhktar (2004) and reiterated by Christin (2012, pp. 436-437). DiMaggio and Mukhtar (2004) argue that the social groups for whom cultural capital is most important, such as women and college educated individuals, will reduce their highbrow cultural participation most when there is a deflation of the value of arts as cultural capital. Indeed, some explanations of the consistent gender gap in highbrow taste are based on the status-enhancing aspects of highbrow cultural consumption, for instance that women invest in cultural capital to have a better position in the marriage market or to compensate for their lack of economic capital (DiMaggio, 2004; DiMaggio & Mohr, 1985). So, if highbrow consumption no longer counts as cultural capital, we would expect diminishing gender differences in younger generations (Christin, 2012, pp. 436-437).

However, the idea that in times of the devaluation of cultural capital women withdraw most from highbrow cultural participation rests on two potentially problematic assumptions. The first assumption is that the value of traditionally highbrow cultural tastes as a form of cultural capital is indeed changing. The extent to which highbrow cultural consumption still counts as capital is difficult to assess using data on participation as you easily get stuck in circular reasoning: the devaluation of cultural capital will lead to reduced participation and we (do not) find reduced participation so there is (no) devaluation. Another element central to Bourdieu’s thinking on cultural capital is the legitimation and consecration of certain forms of
culture by central societal institutions, such as the educational system (Warde, 2016, p. 134). Generally, there is no strong evidence that highbrow cultural activities are no longer legitimated and consecrated forms of culture and, as a consequence, that they are really losing their status as cultural capital. Even though there is an increasing recognition of non-exclusive cultural expressions, such as pop music, in secondary school curricula (Daenekindt & Roose, 2015) and culture sections in quality newspapers (Janssen, 1999; Purhonen, Heikkilä, & Hazir, 2017), which to some extent would undermine the ‘hierarchy’ of cultural practices, these studies find no evidence that highbrow forms of culture are no longer legitimate or that they are really losing their distinctive value (see also Verboord & van Rees, 2008).

The second assumption is that highbrow cultural tastes actually function as cultural capital for women. An important characteristic of cultural capital is that it is transposable in other social advantages, but the question is whether highbrow involvement is equally beneficial for women as for men. Evidence is somewhat equivocal (cf. Dumais, 2002), but there are studies that suggest that women may reap less rewards from high-status cultural preferences in the educational and work-related sphere (Kaufman & Gabler, 2004; Rivera & Tíelsik, 2016). Considering these two problematic assumptions, it is not likely that the changing value of highbrow tastes as cultural capital is the primary mechanism behind diminishing gender differences in taste across generations.

Next to the culture-related explanations, there are gender-related explanations, which have structural and cultural elements. A reduced gender gap in cultural consumption in recent generations can be explained by – on the one hand – more egalitarian gender norms and decreasing gendered connotations of certain cultural domains and – on the other hand – structural improvements in women’s societal position, such as female access to the labor market (Christin, 2012). Women’s leisure time may be more and more constrained as women from younger generations are increasingly involved in the labor force but often remain responsible for the larger share of housework and, thus, do a ‘second shift’ at home after work (Hochschild, 2003[1989]; Jacobs & Gerson, 2001, 2004). As women are expected to put their family first even when they participate in the labor market (cf. the scheme of family devotion by Blair-Loy, 2003; and intensive mothering by Hays, 1996), women experience more and more time
pressures as they do not compensate an increase in paid work time with an equal decrease in time for family care (Gauthier, Smeeding, & Furstenberg, 2004; Sayer, Bianchi, & Robinson, 2004). While women’s diminishing participation in theatre and ballet attendance and even in somewhat more time-flexible activities such as museum and art gallery visits could be explained by these structural time-constraints, women’s exponentially increasing football match attendance seems to disprove that gender-specific time constraints are the explanation for the consistent pattern of diminishing gender differences in cultural participation uncovered in this study. Moreover, it is likely that time obstacles are a better explanation for frequency of participation than for having participated or not (cf. Willekens & Lievens, 2016). Nevertheless, in light of the poor quality of women’s leisure time (for instance, fragmented or in the presence of children), it can be expected that time obstacles differentiate between cultural activities (Bittman & Wajcman, 2000; Katz-Gerro & Sullivan, 2010, p. 195; Sullivan, 1997). Extending the focus to gender differences in in-door and time-flexible activities may bring out the importance of time-constraints better.

The uncovered patterns showing a clear reduction of gender differences across generations in the various activities with feminine and masculine connotations suggest that changing gender norms and gender stereotypes could be an important mechanism behind generational trends in men’s and women’s cultural consumption. However, it is not possible to empirically test and prove the importance of gender ideology. This highlights an important limitation of this study that is related to the fact that we have to use secondary and administrative data to describe trends in participation: there is limited background information on the respondents that helps us to really explain the uncovered trends. Because gender role attitudes are closely related to the gender-typing of cultural activities (Zinkhan et al., 2004) and because they have changed drastically through time (Cotter et al., 2011), information on the gender role attitudes of respondents would allow to differentiate better between the culture- and gender-related explanations. Thus, future research should focus more on the link between gender stereotypes and cultural tastes across generations.

Future research on the normative mechanisms underlying trends in gender differences is also necessary because studies indicate that since the mid-1990’s, the trend towards more
progressive gender role attitudes is stagnating (Brooks & Bolzendahl, 2004; Cotter et al., 2011; Van Egmond, Baxter, Buchler, & Western, 2010). There is increasing evidence that gender-essentialist beliefs, which are cultural beliefs in fundamental and innate gender differences, are regaining support (Charles & Bradley, 2009; Cotter et al., 2011; Pepin & Cotter, in press). Because the idea that men and women are innately different is closely related to the gendered connotations of leisure activities (Tepper, 2000), increasingly essentialist gender discourses may eventually reverse the trend towards diminishing gender gaps we discovered. We cannot detect these processes in this study because the respondents in the sample were socialized before the end of the past century.

8.5.3 **Suggestions for future research**

This study provides empirical evidence for the – mostly theoretical and intuitive – expectation in research on sport spectatorship that sport fandom and as a consequence the sports crowds are feminizing (Meier et al., 2017; Pope, 2017). Considering the growing literature on new forms of cultural capital of which sport spectatorship could be an example (Prieur & Savage, 2013; Savage et al., 2013), an interesting next step could be to look closer into the link that research sees between the feminization of sport spectatorship and what is identified in the (qualitative) literature on sport spectatorship as the ‘bourgeoisification’ or ‘gentrification’ of the activity, which refers to the (supposed) growing numbers of middle class sports fans (Crawford & Gosling, 2004, p. 478; Pope, 2017, pp. 78-82).

This study could also be an incentive for future research on overall trends in cultural consumption. Research on this topic is seriously limited by the fact that it is very difficult to disentangle age-, period-, and cohort effects. The HAPC-models used in this study could be a solution, but only when the assumptions the technique imposes on the data hold (cf. Bell & Jones, 2014a; Bell & Jones, 2018). While the focus in this study was on the gender gap, not on overall trends in participation, the uncovered patterns indicate similar, declining trends (starting in the early baby boom generation) across the highbrow activities that are in line with theoretical expectations. So, once the controversy on the HAPC-technique has settled and once we have better insight in what we can reasonably know and what is beyond the scope of this technique, future research could employ this technique to have a better understanding of general trends in
participation. Future research should consider the role of increasingly diverse offerings of both traditionally highbrow and more popular forms of culture, that may impact on overall trends of cultural consumption.

Lastly, it would be interesting for future research to focus on how gender differences in cultural tastes change within the lives of individuals, instead of across the lives of individuals as studied here. An interesting avenue for research would be a focus on the transition to parenthood and the gendered effects of having young children. Some scholars argue that gender differences in highbrow taste relate to mothers’ important role in the cultural socialization of the next generation (Bourdieu, 1984; Collins, 1988; Silva, 2005), while others highlight the time obstacles having young children may bring about (Kraaykamp, van Gils, & Ultee, 2008; Kraaykamp, van Gils, & van der Lippe, 2009; Willekens & Lievens, 2016). A generational perspective on the effects of motherhood and fatherhood would allow to study whether and how cultural reproduction in the family has changed across generations. Thus, we would obtain a more nuanced understanding of cultural socialization in the family and women’s role in it.
8.6 Notes

1 For instance, some scholars argue that women invest in cultural capital to have a better position on the marriage market or because they have difficult access to economic capital (DiMaggio, 2004; DiMaggio & Mohr, 1985). If this explanation is valid, we can expect diminishing gender differences in younger generations when the role of arts as cultural capital changes (Christin, 2012, pp. 436-437).

2 Women’s role in the cultural reproduction in the family is one of the explanations of women’s higher highbrow consumption (Bourdieu, 1984; Collins, 1988).

3 The survey was first administered in 1979, but most of the activities studied in this research were only included in the questionnaire from 1983 onwards, so the data of 1979 was not included in the sample.

4 It was clarified in the question that respondents were asked about attendance as an on-site spectator, not on TV. Moreover, the questions concerns paid football, not watching your own children play for instance.

5 In contrast, visits to popular music concerts, for instance, are much less clearly feminine or masculine as this would depend on the genre. Also the gender-typing of cinema attendance is difficult as there are feminine genres and masculine genres.

6 In contrast, cinema attendance, for instance, can range from watching very commercial movies to artistic movies.

7 This means that a respondent is at the same time nested within his or her birth cohort and within the survey wave.

8 Because cohort and cohort² are in an interaction with gender (here: being a woman) in the model, the coefficients next to cohort and cohort² represent the effect for men.

9 \[ e^{1.839+(9.80\times -0.066)+(96.00\times 0.001)} = 3.6 \]

10 \[ e^{1.547+(9.80\times -0.050)+(96.00\times 0.006)} = 1.6 \]

11 \[ 1/ e^{-3.072+(9.80\times 0.031)+(96.00\times 0.007)} = 8.1 \]
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9 Discussion and conclusion

9.1 Contribution of the dissertation: from problematic assumptions towards a broader perspective on gender

This dissertation contributes to the literature on gender differences in cultural tastes by examining the gender-related processes associated with the differential tastes of men and women in the –respectively feminine and masculine gender-typed– cultural domains of Arts and Sports. I recognize that ‘gender’ is more than a binary distinction between men and women, and instead refers to socially constructed ideas of masculinity and femininity and to the social opportunities and constraints associated with one’s sex category. This dissertation provides a better understanding of the gap in cultural tastes between men and women by evaluating how these differences relate to the societal expectations and constraints that are connected to being a man or a woman. I employed a gender-theoretical perspective to explore the intrapersonal, interpersonal and contextual processes through which gender can shape cultural tastes for arts-related activities and passive sports consumption (referring to sports spectatorship). This alternative, gendered perspective – which complements current literature that is more indebted to Bourdieu’s cultural-capital paradigm – allowed to ask new questions and to overcome the sometimes problematic theoretical assumptions about gender as a concept that dominant explanations make. Thus, this dissertation contributes to a more theoretically sound, differentiated and contextual understanding of the gender gap in cultural taste.

9.2 Main findings and implications

9.2.1 Gender as a multidimensional system: intrapersonal, interpersonal and contextual mechanisms

As a way to structure my research endeavors and to provide a better understanding of the various ways gender, reflecting the social notion of masculinity and femininity, relates to men’s and women’s cultural tastes, I used Barbara Risman’s argument that gender functions as a multidimensional system that (potentially) shapes people’s gendered behavior, preferences and expression in three ways (Risman, 2004; Risman & Davis, 2013). These are: (1) via identity-related processes at the individual, intrapersonal level of analysis, (2) via cultural expectations
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expressed in social interaction at the interpersonal level, and (3) via structural opportunities and constraints and gender ideologies residing at the institutional and contextual level of analysis. So, gender is not a mere individual characteristic, but it is also embedded in social encounters and in the structural and cultural aspects of social organization. This means that to understand cultural taste differences between men and women, all dimensions on which gender can impact on peoples' daily life should be considered. Overall, my dissertation demonstrates that all three dimensions of the gender system matter. So, in order to obtain a better understanding of the gender gap in cultural tastes, scholars have to recognize that the gender gap in cultural tastes is connected to mechanisms operating on these levels. Prioritizing one dimension of the gender system over another results in an incomplete picture of the diverse gendered processes related to differences in men’s and women’s cultural tastes.

9.2.1.1 Adolescents’ leisure interests and the intrapersonal, interpersonal and contextual dimensions of the gender system

The studies on Flemish adolescents in the first year of secondary education presented in Chapters 4 and 5 indicate that gender differences in tastes for arts-related activities and sport spectatorship are closely linked to identity-related processes and interactional gendered expectations. Gender differences in cultural tastes are less pronounced when boys and girls identify themselves as less typical for their gender and when boys and girls experience less pressure for gender-conforming behavior from themselves and from peers. Moreover, when it comes to interest in sport spectatorship, I found that the gender gap is closely related to the gender ideology or gender role attitudes pupils have: the more egalitarian views boys and girls have, the more similar their taste for passive sports consumption is. So, the difference between boys’ and girls’ interest in watching sport depends on the extent to which traditional gender norms that prevail in the social context of these youth have become part of a their personal belief system.

The finding that the size of the gender gap in tastes in the domains of Arts and Sports is strongly related to variation in gender typicality, pressure for gender-conforming behavior and gender ideology between and within the groups of boys and girls signals that identity-related, interactional and contextual gendered processes are far more important than current research in Sociology of Culture recognizes (with Lehman & Dumais, 2017 as a notable exception). The
attention to these mechanisms that is paid in research on sports participation is clearly justified, but should be extended to passive sports consumption or sport spectatorship. So, the social notions of masculinity and femininity shape cultural behavior through processes at the intrapersonal, interpersonal and contextual level of the gender structure.

Moreover, this empirical evidence corroborates my theoretical critiques on some common but problematic assumptions about what gender is as a concept that are related to gender role socialization perspectives. Most importantly, the studies presented in Chapters 4 and 5 demonstrate that treating gender as strictly binary, i.e., as a rigid opposition between men and women, impedes our understanding of the subtle ways in which social conceptions of masculinity and femininity affect cultural tastes. The large within-gender variation in terms of gender typicality, experienced pressures for gender-conforming behavior, gender role attitudes and cultural taste shows that we cannot assume that there is a one-on-one correspondence between sex, gender identification and gender expression. Recognition of gender fluidity, which is “an umbrella term to describe possibilities for gender identity beyond the binary ‘man’ or ‘woman’” (Parker, 2016, p. 166) and the variation within the groups of young men and women is necessary to understand why gender inequalities in taste persist.

The studies on Flemish adolescents also suggest that a broader perspective on socialization leads to a better understanding of gender differences in tastes. An important critique on the gender role socialization perspective is that it tends to overemphasize parental socialization in early childhood as the crucial mechanism behind gender differences in behavior. Also when it comes to socialization in highbrow cultural tastes, research focuses in the first place on the effects of parental example and guidance (e.g., van Hek & Kraaykamp, 2015; Wollscheid, 2014). In research on active sports participation and general leisure participation, however, more attention is paid to the role of peers (e.g., Patrick et al., 1999; Zeijl, te Poel, du Bois-Reymond, Ravesloot, & Meulman, 2000) and media (e.g., Johnson & Schiappa, 2010; Kennedy, 2007; Whannel, 2007). Nevertheless, Chapters 4 and 5 demonstrate that research on both arts-related tastes and passive sports consumption can benefit from the integration of the new, more child-centered approach advocated in Sociology of Childhood and Socialization Research (James, 2009; Maccoby, 2007; Qvortrup, Corsaro, & Honig, 2009). This
perspective recognizes children’s agency and the role they have in their own socialization and in the socialization of their peers. Children are more than passive receptors of socialization by adults such as parents or teachers, they are more than just ‘future adults’: they actively interact with their environment. In the studies on Flemish adolescents, it becomes clear that children experience socializing pressures from peers and from themselves and that for boys higher pressures for gender-conforming behavior are related to lower interest in the arts, while for girls these pressures have a negative effect on interest in sport spectatorship. While internalized pressures could, of course, originate in part in the family (but see Katz-Gerro & Jaeger, 2015), it is important to acknowledge that children are actors in this process and that these socializing forces will influence self-perceptions and monitoring of own behavior for some children and for others this will be less so.

9.2.1.2 The contextual level of the gender system in cross-national comparative and longitudinal research

The cross-national comparative and longitudinal studies show that gender differences in cultural tastes vary across countries and across generations. This means that structural and normative contextual factors need to be considered when explaining gender differences in cultural tastes. Chapters 6 and 7 indicate that the size of the gender gap in theatre attendance, opera, dance performance and ballet attendance and sport event attendance across European societies is associated with countries’ levels of societal gender (in)equality. Not surprisingly, men’s and women’s gender-typed arts- and sport-related cultural tastes diverge more in countries with high levels of gender inequality than in egalitarian contexts. Moreover, the longitudinal analyses reported in Chapter 8 provide evidence for intergenerational variation in the gender gap in professional theatre attendance, ballet attendance, museum visits, art gallery visits and paid football match attendance. Gender differences in cultural tastes are smaller for men and women born later in the 20th century. These trends in men’s and women’s cultural participation are most likely related to changing gender norms, which again highlights the importance of considering gender-related contextual mechanisms.

The findings in this dissertation indicate that how gender affects cultural tastes depends on where and when men and women live. This means that scholars have to avoid the static vision on gender that is implicit in many studies on gender and cultural tastes; the assumption
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that gender has the same effect on people’s behavior and attitudes across time, space and cultures is not tenable. Gender does not have a universal essence, it only has true significance within a specific historical, cultural, institutional context, that should be recognized in the analysis of gender differences in cultural taste. In other words, future work should consider the structural and normative mechanisms at play (Hook, 2006, 2010). Structural opportunities and constraints refer to differential access to resources in a societal context, such as employment, education, time, …etc. Normative mechanisms relate to cultural beliefs about men and women that prevail in a certain context. Structural opportunities and gender norms are intertwined: on the one hand social norms shape the constraints (e.g., in the labor market, educational system, family, …) women and men face, but on the other hand, the structural opportunities men and women have corroborate or change existing gender norms. With the data available, I was unable to disentangle both in this dissertation, but future research should definitely look into this.

The variability of the effect of gender across time and space also means that current reflections on gender and taste –that often still refer to ideas developed in the 1970’s– need an update, in particular when it comes to ideas about women’s and men’s role in cultural reproduction and the provision of care-related tasks in the family (see Chapter 6). We know that the position of women and men in the household and in the workplace has changed considerably in the last 50 years in many Western societies and the analyses presented in this dissertation suggest that this may have led to important changes in men’s and women’s cultural tastes. These changes should be further analyzed, using an updated perspective that critically reassesses theoretical conceptions, such as Bourdieu’s and Collin’s ideas on women as ‘cultural housekeepers’ (Lovell, 2001) that date back from decades when male-breadwinner models were dominant. The specific processes underlying the gender gap in cultural tastes may have shifted through time.

9.2.2 Gender: more than a women’s problem!
Implicitly or explicitly, quite some studies in Sociology of Culture treat gender differences in highbrow cultural taste as a ‘women’s thing’ (an issue that has been encountered in Sports Sociology in the past as well (cf. Hall, 1988)). So, in practice, the definition of gender is often restricted to ‘being a woman’. As a consequence, scholars have tried to identify specific
characteristics of women that explain why they are more likely to express highbrow tastes. However, the extent to which these characteristics, such as education, income, family status, occupational status etc., were able to explain gender differences in cultural taste was fairly limited (Bihagen & Katz-Gerro, 2000; Lizardo, 2006). This is not entirely surprising: if one reduces the concept ‘gender’ to ‘women’, one forgets that a gender gap may also be the consequence of processes affecting men. Indeed, simply turning the question upside-down: “Why do men participate less than women in highbrow cultural activities”, opens up new avenues for research in terms of the mechanisms and cultural practices studied. Because social notions of masculinity and femininity are central to my gender perspective, attention to the processes behind men’s cultural preferences and participation is crucial. Also the focus on passive sports consumption in this dissertation contributes to a less woman-centered approach to gender differences in cultural tastes.

The empirical chapters of the dissertation demonstrate that reflecting on the role of men in the production of gender differences in cultural taste in the domains of Arts and Sports is a worthwhile effort. The mechanisms behind women’s higher preference for highbrow culture and lower involvement in sport spectatorship on the one hand and men’s lower interest in highbrow culture, but more pronounced taste for sports consumption on the other hand are not necessarily exactly the same. Moreover, even when similar processes affect men and women, the extent to which men and women are affected can vary considerably (e.g., societal gender equality in Chapter 6). The empirical chapters indicate that many of the studied intrapersonal, interpersonal and contextual mechanisms related to the gender gap in (especially highbrow) cultural tastes affect men more than women. Thus, this dissertation provides empirical evidence that the gender gap in cultural tastes is as much about men, as it is about women. For instance, gender typicality is closely related to boys’ arts-related cultural taste and interest in sport spectatorship, but not really to girls’ preferences. Pressure to conform to gender stereotypes and traditional gender role attitudes are closely associated with, respectively, male adolescents’ distaste for the arts and their interest in sport spectatorship. Moreover, the study reported in Chapter 6 indicates that the effect of societal gender equality appears to affect men’s highbrow cultural consumption more than women’s. Especially when men engage in the feminine sphere
of care, gender equality is associated with smaller gender differences in participation. On the contrary, women’s sport event attendance in EU countries is more affected by macro-level gender equality than men’s. Moreover, gender differences in cultural involvement in the Netherlands have diminished in subsequent generations because women’s participation in arts-related activities has declined more than men’s and because women’s paid football match attendance has increased more than men’s. Lastly, girls’ (but not boys’) interest in watching sport as a spectator is negatively related to pressures for gender-conforming behavior. These results indicate that both women’s and men’s cultural tastes are affected by the social norms and opportunities associated with gender in current societies, but patterns differ depending on whether the intrapersonal, interpersonal or contextual level of the gender structure is studied. This dissertation shows that if one only considers predictors of women’s taste, one can never completely understand the gender gap.

The large effects of gender-related factors situated at the intrapersonal and interpersonal level of the gender system on boys’ and men’s gender-typed cultural consumption is not surprising. Many scholars argue that it is far more difficult for boys and men to disobey gender norms and expectations than it is for girls to do so (Cann, 2014, 2015; Coltrane, 2006; Leaper, 2002; Messner, 2011; Palan, Areni, & Kiecker, 1999; Risman, 2009). Similar to the findings in Chapter 4 in this dissertation, Lehman and Dumais (2017) for instance find that especially boys risk increased bullying victimization when they engage in arts-related extra-curricular activities. Generally, it is theorized that there is more social latitude for girls to behave in a ‘masculine’ way, because masculine characteristics receive higher social value, while boys risk to lose prestige when engaging in feminine behavior. This resonates with sport sociologist Michael Messner’s ideas on soft essentialism (Messner, 2011). According to Messner, soft essentialist discourses accord free sport-related choices to girls, especially in upper-middle classes, but lead to essentialist views on what boys should do and like. In this view, girls and boys should receive equal opportunities, but boys are just ‘naturally’ inclined to like wild and active activities.

Considering the more stringent gendered expectations for boys uncovered in Chapters 4 and 5, it is possible that in current societies gender boundaries are to an important extent
guarded and policed by avoiding that men engage in feminine behavior, instead of the other way around⁴. According to Cecilia Ridgeway (2011, p. 130) people first and foremost “behaviorally ‘mark’, or signify the boundary between the sexes, by doing or not doing the feminine [... rather] than by doing or not doing the masculine”. This corresponds with the conclusion of chapter 6 that gender differences in highbrow cultural taste are smaller in countries where men enter the feminine sphere of care. The consequence of this heavy gender policing of men’s and boys’ behavior is that they start to over-do gender. Research indicates that men overcompensate, using more extreme displays of ‘masculinity’ as a reaction to masculine insecurity (Willer, Rogalin, Conlon, & Wojnowicz, 2013), which could result in men rejecting feminine forms of culture, while women would not necessarily express a distaste for masculine cultural practices (Lizardo & Skiles, 2016, p. 5). This is a potential explanation for the strong connection between men’s cultural tastes and identity-related processes and interactional pressures. The integration of theoretical perspectives on different masculinities and on how men are affected by gendered expectations would lead to a richer and more developed theoretical argumentation in research on gender differences in (highbrow) cultural participation (cf. Connell, 1995; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Willer et al., 2013). Research on sports consumption already pays more attention to this literature (cf. Adams, Anderson, & McCormack, 2010; Bryson, 1987; Laitinen & Tiitonen, 1990; Messner, 2002; Musto, 2014; Schmalz & Kerstetter, 2006; Spaaij, 2008).

9.2.3 **A complementary perspective on gender and cultural taste...**

The gender perspective developed in this PhD thesis complements dominant approaches to gender differences in cultural tastes in Sociology of Culture. While current research defines women’s higher highbrow tastes in ‘cultural capital’-related terms and is, as a consequence, intrigued by the observation that a socially dominated group appears to score better on a socially rewarded resource, this dissertation provides an alternative approach because it highlights the feminine and masculine connotations of cultural practices. Indeed, the gendered connotations to arts-related cultural activities are an important piece of the “puzzle of women’s highbrow cultural consumption” (cf. Lizardo, 2006). Thus, the gender approach improves on the ‘cultural-capital perspective' on two of the latter perspective’s weak points: the overemphasis of the
legitimacy of cultural practices overlooking the masculine and feminine gender-typing of cultural domains, and its undifferentiated view on gender.

First, this dissertation highlights that Arts and Sports are gender-typed cultural domains because these are central spheres in and through which cultural expectations about femininity and masculinity are expressed (Bermingham, 1993; Lorber, 1994; Pascoe, 2007; Zinkhan, Prenshaw, & Close, 2004). The studies in this dissertation indicate that despite the feminine connotations to the Arts and the masculine connotations to the domain of Sports, similar gendered mechanisms are associated with involvement in both arts-related cultural activities and passive sports consumption. Even though the way and extent to which intrapersonal, interpersonal and contextual gendered mechanisms influence tastes differ somewhat between the activities (also within the studied arts-related activities), this dissertation provides evidence that the processes underlying differential participation in different cultural practices are similar. So, the multi-layered perspective on gender used in this study could be employed to obtain a better insight in the gendering of other leisure-time activities, in particular amateur arts participation and active sports participation.

Second, this perspective complements current research in Sociology of Culture that has a very nuanced vision on social class and the reproduction of social inequality, but an undifferentiated view when it comes to gender. My broader approach to the study of gender provides an alternative to the common research strategy that reduces gender differences to the mere opposition between women and men, by acknowledging the inherently fluid, variable, social and contextual nature of gender. By focusing on how the effect of gender on people’s cultural preferences and behaviors is multi-layered, this gender perspective allows to identify lacunae in scientific research that need to be filled to obtain a more complete understanding of how gender affects cultural taste. The approach allows to open the black box and uncover the operating mechanisms. I want to formulate some specific suggestions on how the gender perspective could be used to refine existing research.

For instance, for research that argues that men’s and women’s differential tastes relate to educational and occupational choices and contexts (Christin, 2012; Collins, 1992; Lizardo,
2006), such as Lizardo’s argument that the gender gap is much smaller in occupational sectors where cultural capital dominates (Lizardo, 2006), the perspective developed in this dissertation allows to reflect on the gendered processes behind the findings. Do men who do not strongly identify as masculine self-select into feminine-typed educational options and occupational sectors, such as humanities and culture production (e.g., Forsman & Barth, 2017; Leaper & Van, 2008)? And do men who perceive themselves as typically masculine choose for educational and occupational contexts that are positioned closer toward the economic pole in the social space, that are male-dominated and where ‘masculine’ traits such as competitiveness are highly valued (cf. Erickson, 1996; Lizardo, 2006)? Or do men in these latter contexts experience more gender conformity pressures and do they have to obey to these social rules that are part of business cultures to legitimize their presence in this institutional context? Or is the explanation to be found in the structural and normative context? To what extent do institutional contexts offer differential opportunities to men and women to convert tastes in advantages such as enlarged social networks (cf. Rivera & Tilcsik, 2016)? Do the normative gender beliefs expressed in the work context influence interactions and do these norms become part of an individual’s belief system? Or do all these mechanisms operate at the same time?

Other explanations in Sociology of Culture highlight society-wide cultural norms that define highbrow culture as belonging to the feminine sphere and suggest that these would affect youngsters through parental socialization in gender norms (e.g., Christin, 2012; Tepper, 2000). My perspective proposes some of the mechanisms through which cultural beliefs become internalized and could affect behavior, such as identification processes, conformity pressures, gender role attitudes, … etc. Moreover, the approach highlights the importance of studying other socializing agents such as peers and youngsters themselves (i.e., self-socialization). Relatedly, other socializing contexts than the family should be under investigation; scholars could examine how socialization in gendered cultural tastes takes place later in life, at work, at university, in leisure, culture and sports associations and volunteer work. To summarize, looking through a gendered lens opens a variety of possibilities for new research on gender and cultural taste that allows to open the black box and to understand the processes at play. In this
respect, this PhD thesis makes an important and complementary contribution to the scientific understanding of gender differences in cultural taste.

This dissertation illustrates that the mainly quantitative tradition in research on (highbrow) cultural tastes does not rule out a nuanced analysis of the mechanisms behind gender differences in taste. While qualitative research is clearly necessary to better understand the meaning men and women, and boys and girls attach to their cultural consumption (e.g., Cann, 2013, 2014, 2015), this dissertation indicates that survey data can be used to probe some of the gendered processes through which gender as a multidimensional social system affects taste. For future quantitative evaluation of gender differences in taste, it is important to critically examine measures of typicality, gender-related pressure, gender ideology and gender equality and to update these with recent developments when needed (see for instance Halimi, Consuegra, Struyven, & Engels, 2018 for an evaluation of how to measure gender role attitudes). Considering the changing position of women in society, the work place and the family, the measurement of gender inequality and gender norms will need to be more and more fine-grained to capture the increasingly subtle ways through which gender impacts on a person’s preferences (cf. the multidimensional measurement of gender equality in European societies developed by the European Institute for Gender Equality, EIGE, 2013). For instance, it is not because very bold statements that women should not participate in the labor market receive only limited support in current societies, that women and men have equal opportunities and are subject to equal expectations when it comes to labor market participation. For instance, the way gender affects people’s work lives may have become more subtle in terms of the occupational sectors that are considered appropriate for men and women (cf. Charles, 2011).

9.3 Suggestions for future research

9.3.1 On what counts as cultural capital…
Research in Sociology of Culture often implicitly or explicitly uses ‘highbrow cultural tastes’ and ‘cultural capital’ as synonyms. While cultural tastes refer to manifested cultural preferences (Bourdieu, 1984), cultural capital refers to “institutionalized, i.e., widely shared, high status cultural signals [...] used for social and cultural exclusion” (Lamont & Lareau, 1988, p. 156). So, an important difference between ‘highbrow cultural taste’ and ‘cultural capital’ is that the
latter is connected to social benefits, while for the former, this is not automatically the case. I argue that the extent to which women can translate cultural tastes into cultural capital and the associated social advantages is something that has to empirically verified instead of a priori assumed. Considering the generally disadvantaged position of women in society, it is not at all self-evident that women have the same opportunities to transpose legitimate tastes into social benefits, for instance in the job market, in terms of social networks, … etc. Quite the contrary actually: empirical evidence is equivocal (e.g., Dumais, 2002), but there are indeed studies that indicate that it is more difficult for women than for men to convert cultural tastes into a form of capital that has value in the access to prestigious educational and occupational fields (Kaufman & Gabler, 2004; Rivera & Tilcsik, 2016; Zimdars, Sullivan, & Heath, 2009). More research is needed to uncover to what extent women are able to use their cultural tastes as a resource to advance in domains that really matter, such as the educational system and the economy. Future studies need to recognize the possibility that women’s legitimate tastes may not count as cultural capital because their ‘conversion rate’ is much lower than men’s. Such a perspective would allow for the integration of theoretical reflections on gender inequality, gender norms and ‘male connoisseurship’ (Bermingham, 1993). By examining whether tastes count as capital for women, this field of research would acknowledge what ‘gender’ actually refers to, i.e., the social construction of masculinity and femininity and the constraints associated with sex categories. Moreover, it allows to consider the power and privilege dimensions, that are intrinsically related to gender as a stratification mechanism, which were largely absent from the studies presented in this dissertation.

Furthermore, important to keep in mind is that what counts as cultural capital can change through time. In research on cultural tastes, the importance of ‘openness’ in tastes is increasingly recognized (Coulangeon, 2017; Peterson & Kern, 1996; Prieur & Savage, 2013; Roose, 2015; Roose, van Eijck, & Lievens, 2012). Being open towards a wide range of traditionally legitimate and non-legitimate cultural practices is more and more considered as a marker of social status. An important exponent of this thinking is the concept of ‘omnivorousness’ (Peterson & Kern, 1996). Recently, scholars have started to examine so-called ‘emerging forms of cultural capital’ (Coulangeon, 2017; Prieur & Savage, 2013; Roose,
2015), referring to contemporary, urban, often screen-based cultural practices related to sports and information technology (Friedman, Savage, Hanquinet, & Miles, 2015). Sport spectatorship, a cultural practice studied in this dissertation, is considered to be such an emerging form of cultural capital (Savage et al., 2013). Interestingly, the changing value of sport spectatorship is also recognized in research on sports fandom. Scholars in this field refer to a ‘bourgeoisification’ or ‘gentrification’ of the activity to describe the growing influx of middle class fans, which, according to some scholars, could push out the ‘genuine working’ class fan basis (even though there is not that much evidence for this) (Crawford & Gosling, 2004, p. 478; Pope, 2017, pp. 78-82). The supposed increasing middle-class-ness and ‘softening’ of the sports crowds is in the literature inherently linked to the ‘feminization’ of the activity. It is argued that increasing female attendance makes sports events ‘civilized’ contexts. The associations between the feminization of sport spectatorship, the ‘bourgeoisification’ of sport fandom and the changing value of sport as an emerging form of cultural capital should be further examined, for the benefit of thinking in Sociology of Culture and Sports Sociology.

In light of the changing definition of what counts as cultural capital and the growing social significance of traditionally non-legitimate tastes, scholars should look into gender differences in participation in these emerging forms of cultural capital. Considering that it often concerns sport-related and technology-related activities, it is probable that men are more likely to express a taste for them, as the domains of Sports and Technology are generally gender-typed as masculine (Dufur, 1999; Pechtelidis, Kosma, & Chronaki, 2015). Moreover, it should be assessed to what extent these cultural practices count as cultural capital for women. When it comes to sport spectatorship, for instance, we know that women’s sports knowledge is often not recognized as such (e.g., Hoeber & Kerwin, 2013), very similar to the ‘male connoisseurship’ in the Arts (Bermingham, 1993). Women have to know a lot more about sport and have to be more involved to be considered an authentic fan (if it is even possible to be recognized as an authentic sports fan as a woman) (Esmonde, Cooky, & Andrews, 2015; Hoeber & Kerwin, 2013; Pope, 2017). In this perspective, it is quite likely that women are disadvantaged in terms of the value their sport-related taste has as a marker of status. This could be confirmed by extending Erickson’s (1996) work on the ‘sports talk’ that is part of business-
cultures in new research focusing on the role of sports tastes in accessing certain occupations and in interactions in the work place using a gendered lens. Furthermore, as an extension of the longitudinal research that is part of this dissertation, another important question is how participation in emerging forms of cultural capital relates to generation and age (Friedman et al., 2015).

9.3.2 Feminine and masculine cultural activities: an important distinction?
Inspired by Bourdieu’s seminal work on how highbrow tastes can function as cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1984, 1986), research in Sociology of Culture has for a long time perceived the distinction between highbrow and lowbrow cultural activities as the fundamental divide that cuts across cultural practices. Considering the increasing importance of openness in tastes as an indicator of social status, this highbrow/lowbrow distinction has become less relevant (e.g., Bellavance, 2008). So, research should consider other forms of differentiation between various cultural practices. I argue that the masculinity and femininity of activities is such an important divide in cultural practices that needs further scientific investigation. Indeed, this dissertation indicates that the differentiation between feminine and masculine cultural practices, which often coincides with the distinction between highbrow and lowbrow or, related, between elite and popular, is mistakenly overlooked in the literature. Cultural activities cannot only range from highbrow to lowbrow, they can also be more or less feminine/masculine. Interestingly, these dimensions are also intertwined. Legitimate cultural activities, such as ballet and theatre attendance, reading, art museum visits etc., often have feminine connotations, while (formerly) non-legitimate cultural activities such as watching sports, doing sports, playing video games, certain musical genres such as rap or metal, are often gender-typed as masculine (Zinkhan et al., 2004).

The close connection between brow-level and gendered connotations often goes unrecognized in research (an exception is Atkinson, 2016, In press). This means that the structuration of cultural tastes that is currently theorized to reflect social inequalities (linked to the highbrow-lowbrow distinction), may actually (in part) reflect gender inequalities (related to the femininity and masculinity of activities). While it was never the aim of this dissertation to disentangle both axes of differentiation, I wanted to acknowledge possible variation between
(highbrow) cultural practices by using them as separate foci of analysis instead of in a compositional scale. The cross-national comparative study in Chapter 6 suggests that variation in the effect of societal gender equality within the group of highbrow activities is partially related to the gendered connotation of the activity. Moreover, Atkinson’s (2016, p. 261) work on literary taste shows that “gender is fundamental in differentiating preferred genres along binaries of affect/instrumental reason, inner/outer and private/public, but we also see within each gender clear differences by both capital volume and capital composition”. Therefore, I argue that further research should try to disentangle these two axes of differentiation, i.e., highbrow vs. lowbrow and masculine vs. feminine, by looking into the predictors of participation in highbrow masculine cultural practices, highbrow feminine practices, lowbrow masculine cultural activities and lowbrow feminine cultural activities. Sports participation, musical genres, literary genres, film genres, museums of different kinds, etc. could be interesting domains of study to do this (see for instance Atkinson, 2016 on reading preferences).

9.3.3 Intersectionality
The intertwining of two axes of differentiation, i.e., highbrow-lowbrow and masculine-feminine, brings us quite nicely to the popular theory in Gender Studies that different social statuses (such as class and gender) intersect (Anthias, 2004). The aim of this dissertation was to reveal the variety of gendered processes behind men’s and women’s differential cultural tastes. Thus, my work served a different purpose than an important research tradition in Sociology of Culture that evaluates how the effect of gender depends on someone’s social class, educational attainment, work status, etc. This does not mean that I think that gender inequality and class inequality are unrelated. Quite the contrary, in line with the intersectional approach (see Anthias, 2004), I am convinced that class is a major stratification mechanism that can add to inequality based on gender which is in itself a fundamental source of social differentiation. Using the insights in the various gendered mechanisms that connect gender and cultural taste provided by this dissertation, the next step is to consider how these relate to other forms of inequality, such as social class, but also ethnicity, age or disability for instance.

An interesting question that pertains to Chapters 4 and 5 is whether the effects of gender, gender identity, pressure for gender-conforming behavior and gender role attitudes on arts- and
Sport-related tastes are larger or smaller for working class youth, middle class youth or upper class youth. Additional analyses on the data on Flemish adolescents used in these chapters indicated that there is no significant interaction effect between gender and class on arts-related tastes, but there were significant interaction effects between the studied gendered mechanisms, i.e., gender typicality and pressure for gender conformity, and class. This means that the effects of gendered identity-processes and interactional expectations to some extent depend on the social background of a student. For interest in sport spectatorship, there was a significant interaction effect between gender and social class, but the effects of gender typicality, pressure for gender-conforming behavior and gender role attitudes did not differ by class. So, it would be very interesting to study these effects in depth, for instance using Michael Messner ideas about soft-essentialist beliefs that vary by class (Messner, 2011).

However, next to class, another aspect to consider is the pupil’s age. What holds value in the adult world, such as highbrow cultural tastes, is not necessarily worthy in adolescents’ life-worlds. Research suggests that younger generations differentiate themselves from the cultural preferences of elder generations (Friedman et al., 2015; Lizardo & Skiles, 2015). Moreover, what is considered important for adults may be considered particularly uncool for youngsters (cf. De Groof et al., 2015). Being ‘cool’ is an important part of identity construction among youngsters (Pedrozo, 2011). The fact that pressures for gender-conforming behavior and gender typicality are not related to significantly higher interest in arts-related leisure activities for girls, even though these activities have feminine connotations (see chapter 4), may in particular be related to the place of the Arts in current youth cultures. The unexpected positive but insignificant effect of gender typicality on interest sport spectatorship for female adolescents may similarly reflect the role of sport-related cultural practices in youth culture. Paying attention to youth-cultural values, peer pressure, popularity among peers and how these factors relate to adolescents’ leisure interests and gender is an interesting opportunity for future research (see also Cann, 2013, 2014, 2015; Lehman & Dumais, 2017). Further research that acknowledges that different inequalities are intertwined should also consider how the effect of gender on cultural tastes depends on someone’s ethnic background.
9.3.4 The role of education
Future research should also obtain a better insight in the relationship between gender, cultural tastes and education. Because educational attainment is known to be an important predictor of cultural tastes (Hallmann, Muñiz, Breuer, Dallmeyer, & Metz, 2017) and because nowadays women are more highly educated than men in many Western societies (Buchmann, DiPrete, & McDaniel, 2008; Van Hek, Kraaykamp, & Wolbers, 2016), it seems plausible that the gender gap in highbrow cultural tastes is explained by differential educational attainment by men and women. However, research does not support this hypothesis (Bihagen & Katz-Gerro, 2000; Christin, 2012). This lack of evidence for educational attainment as a crucial predictor of the gender gap in cultural taste is not surprising if you consider that the gender gap in cultural taste preceded women’s increased opportunities in the educational system. For instance, the analyses for the longitudinal study in this dissertation indicated that the gender gap in highbrow cultural taste is present in all generations studied, while only in the youngest generations women had better opportunities to educate themselves. And of course, in terms of causality, something that happens later cannot explain something that happened before. Moreover, considering that research finds positive effects of education on highbrow consumption, it is actually not plausible that women’s increasing educational attainment across time would cause the diminishing gender differences in cultural taste across generations uncovered in Chapter 8.

These examples highlight that using ‘education’ as a central mechanism to understand gender differences in cultural tastes easily make things less clear instead of more clear. Because educational attainment is at the same time a form of institutionalized cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986), and related to a person’s gender role attitudes (Thornton, Alwin, & Camburn, 1983), you are unable to pinpoint the exact mechanisms at play when you would find that gender differences in cultural tastes are smaller as people are more highly educated. This finding could at the same time corroborate Bourdieu’s (1984) argument that gendered dispositions are more similar among those who are (relatively) high in cultural capital, or it could reflect the progressive gender beliefs of the highly educated. Furthermore, education could function as a power resource in the family that makes women more independent from their male partners. So, the relationship between gender, tastes and education should be addressed in future research to gain more insight in the extent to which educational attainment measures cultural capital and
to what extent it captures normative or structural gendered processes before it can function as an explanatory mechanism in gender approaches to cultural tastes.

9.3.5 Culture and leisure time
Another element that requires further investigation is the relation between gender, cultural participation and leisure time, which already received some attention in Chapter 6. Research on cultural tastes sometimes seems to forget that cultural participation is a leisure activity and that time restrictions are a serious obstacle for participation (Kraaykamp, van Gils, & Ultee, 2008). Further research should evaluate how time-related aspects of cultural participation affect the gender gap. Indeed, time-use studies generally indicate that in contemporary societies women struggle with the combination of work and household tasks—especially when they have children (Craig, 2007; Craig & Mullan, 2013)—and after work they do most of the traditionally ‘feminine’ household tasks and child care, or their ‘second shift’ (Hochschild, 2003[1989]). Men do take over household chores, but most of these tasks are time-flexible tasks, while women remain responsible for most time-inflexible tasks, which have to be done at a specific moment of the day, such as cooking (Craig, 2006; Hook, 2010). As a consequence, women have less time-flexible free time that can be used for leisure participation (Sayer, 2005; Thrane, 2000). Moreover, the leisure time women have is of lower quality because it is frequently interrupted, in the presence of children and involves the combination of in-home cultural activities with other activities such as child care or housework (Bittman & Wajcman, 2000; Katz-Gerro & Sullivan, 2010, p. 195; Sullivan, 1997). Future research should address how gender differences in cultural participation relate to leisure time restrictions, the quality of people’s leisure time and inequalities in the time partners devote to child care and housework. Preliminary analyses not reported in this dissertation suggested that the effect of time constraints related to child care differs between in-door cultural activities and out-door cultural activities. So, the difference between public and private consumption of culture could be central to the discussion of gender, time and cultural participation.

9.3.6 Time-related variation in the gender gap
An important critique on the gender role socialization perspective is that the gender gap is treated as invariable over time. In this PhD thesis, I recognized the time-related variation in the gender gap and studied generational trends in men’s and women’s cultural consumption. A
dimension of time-related variation that I did not address is change within the life course of men and women. Indeed, differences in men’s and women’s cultural tastes may depend on how old people are and the life stage they are in. To understand this changing effect of gender within the life of an individual, a life course perspective using longitudinal panel data is most suitable.

As this data is currently lacking, for now, I can only reflect on topics that future research should examine. I will focus on (1) the gender-specific relation between age and the accumulation of cultural competence, (2) the gendered effects of old age and (3) the effect of becoming a mother or father and having young children, which is a life stage effect.

9.3.6.1 Age, the accumulation of cultural competence and cumulative advantage

The idea that cultural competence can build up through the life course is at the core of Bourdieu’s (1984) thinking on cultural tastes. Cultural participation is always the result of cultural capital that was accumulated earlier in life (van Eijck & Knulst, 2005). People who invest in cultural capital through highbrow participation become more culturally active as their cultural capital grows, while individuals who do not invest in cultural capital can be expected to show a declining interest in these highbrow activities as they grow older (Bourdieu, 1984, pp. 283-291; van Eijck & Knulst, 2005). The idea that there is some sort of ‘interest’ on investments in cultural capital, just like in financial capital, is closely related to the literature that identifies cumulative advantage and disadvantage processes as mechanisms behind inequalities (DiPrete & Eirich, 2006; McClelland, 1990). Based on the Matthew effect described by Merton (1988), which states that those who have a lot will be given more, cumulative advantage means that an individual’s or group’s advantage on a key resource in the stratification process (here: (new forms of) cultural capital) grows or accumulates over time. Thus, inequality becomes larger throughout people’s lives (DiPrete & Eirich, 2006). Therefore, in light of men’s lower highbrow participation and higher football match attendance (which may be an emerging form of capital), accumulation of cultural competence through the life course may work out differently for men and women. We can expect that these age-related cumulative advantage processes are at play when it comes to gender differences in cultural participation. Considering that girls are more likely to express highbrow tastes than boys from a young age onwards (Dumais, 2002; Lagaert, Van Houtte, & Roose, 2017; Lehman & Dumais,
2017) and that boys show more interest in sport-related activities (see Chapter 5), gender differences may become larger as men and women grow older.

9.3.6.2 The gendered effects of health in old age
Closely related to growing older are health issues. Declining health and mobility are important impediments to out-door cultural participation (Reeves, 2016; Scherger, 2009). Not surprisingly, men’s and women’s out-door leisure consumption declines as they enter old age (Agahi, Ahacic, & Parker, 2006; Reeves, 2016; Scherger, 2009; Scherger, Nazroo, & Higgs, 2011). The effects of health on cultural participation are likely to differ by gender: even though women have a higher life expectancy than men, their healthy life expectancy may be lower (Case & Paxson, 2005). Elderly women are more likely to report chronic illnesses and functional disabilities, such as not being able to take the stairs or walk longer than a few minutes (Arber & Ginn, 1993; Rueda & Artazcoz, 2009). As women are more likely to face health-related obstacles than men in later life, the gender gap in cultural participation among the elderly could become smaller again in old age. Moreover, as work by Doblhammer and Kytir (2001) indicates that in the last decades of the 20th century, women’s (lower) healthy life-expectancy has improved more than men’s, we can also expect a generational element to these gendered effects of old age.

9.3.6.3 The transition to motherhood and fatherhood
Considering the scholarly attention for women’s role in the cultural reproduction process within the family (Bourdieu, 1984; Collins, 1992), it is interesting to examine how men’s and women’s cultural participation is influenced by family status, having (young children) and the transition to parenthood. Research indicates that being responsible for young children is often an obstacle for out-door cultural participation because the activity has to be planned in advance and a babysitter is needed (Kraaykamp et al., 2008; Kraaykamp, van Gils, & van der Lippe, 2009). Some scholars argue that time constraints related to child care responsibilities are a larger obstacle for women’s out-door cultural participation than for men’s (Bihagen & Katz-Gerro, 2000; Willekens & Lievens, 2016). Because women generally carry the main child care and domestic responsibilities even when they have a paid job, their leisure time is more fragmented and of lower quality (Bittman & Wajcman, 2000; Katz-Gerro & Sullivan, 2010; Sullivan, 1997). While recent Belgian research supports this line of thinking that having young children
has a stronger negative effect on women’s highbrow cultural participation than on men’s 
(Willekens & Lievens, 2016), a Dutch study indicates that having children younger than 12 years old seems to affect male cultural participation more than female cultural participation 
(Kraaykamp et al., 2008).

So, another mechanism could be at play as well. According to Collins (1988) and in line with Bourdieu’s work (1984, 2001), women consume more highbrow culture because they are responsible for the family’s public image and for the cultural reproduction, i.e., the socialization of the next generation into legitimate cultural tastes. Dutch and Belgian research demonstrates that it is indeed the mother’s cultural consumption that has the largest influence on the embodied cultural capital of their offspring (van Eijck, 1997; Voorpostel & van der Lippe, 2001; Willekens & Lievens, 2014). The effect of mothers on the cultural participation of their children is estimated to be up to two times as large as the effect of fathers (Nagel, 2002). On the contrary, when it comes to sport event attendance and sports fandom, fathers may function as crucial socializing agents and role models for their children, especially their sons (Farrell, Fink, & Fields, 2011; Pope, 2017, p. 120; Theodorakis & Wann, 2008). Moreover, research indicates that men’s and (especially) women’s gender role attitudes and behaviors become more stereotypical when becoming parents (Baxter, Buchler, Perales, & Western, 2014; Grinza, Devicienti, Rossi, & Vannoni, 2017). This way, gender differences in cultural tastes could also intensify when couples start a family. Future research should evaluate how the transition to parenthood affects the gender gap in cultural participation, whether the effects of motherhood and fatherhood depend on the age of the child(ren) and whether the gendered effects of having children differ by generation, work status, etc…

9.4 Limitations

9.4.1 The use of secondary quantitative data
A shortcoming of this study of gender differences in cultural taste that specifically applies to Chapters 6, 7 and 8 is the use of secondary data. The use of secondary data substantially limited the questions I was able to ask and affected the extent to which I was able to ‘unpack’ the gendered and cultural processes influencing cultural participation. For instance, the available cross-national comparative and longitudinal secondary data did not allow to uncover the
dispositional mechanisms behind taste differences. Extending the study of what men and women prefer/participate in to the way they prefer it would enrich the scientific understanding of the gender gap in taste (cf. Daenekindt & Roose, 2017; Jarness, 2015). The gendered patterns in manifested cultural preferences may or may not relate to how people appropriate works of art and to their artistic dispositions. From previous research I know that patterns in the dispositions underlying cultural tastes in body-related cultural practices (food, clothing and sport) are gendered (Lagaert & Roose, 2013).

Moreover, the number of cultural activities studied in current cross-national comparative and longitudinal data sets is often restricted and most of the time limited to highbrow cultural activities, neglecting many relevant cultural and sport-related practices. Paying more attention to non-legitimate cultural activities and to genres within a cultural domain (e.g., music, literature, sport ...) is necessary to have a full comprehension of the gendering of cultural tastes. More specifically, a limitation of this dissertation is that in Chapters 5 and 7 information on the kind of sports that were watched was lacking which is a consequence of the use of secondary data. Information on the sort of sport event that was attended and the gender-typing of the sport watched would have allowed a more in-depth and nuanced analysis of the gendered processes behind differences in men’s and women’s cultural tastes than was possible now. Moreover, it would be interesting to have a better insight in the relationship between gender and the mode of participation, e.g., gender differences in live or on-site participation and mediated cultural consumption, for instance, via TV, radio, internet etc. The gender gap in public or frontstage cultural behavior may be larger than the gender gap in private or backstage behavior, as social control is lacking in the last case and there is less pressure to conform to cultural ideals (cf. Daenekindt & Roose, 2013).

Furthermore, the cross-national comparative and longitudinal secondary data on cultural taste that is available generally does not give insight in a person’s gender role ideology, in inequalities in time used for child care and housework among male and female partners, in gender differences in familial decision-making, etc. So, there is a clear need for high-quality cross-national comparative and longitudinal data that addresses the dispositions behind
participation in a variety of cultural practices and at the same time pays attention to gender-related processes.

9.4.2 The question of biology

Pure sex-differences, associated with biological processes (which are related to genes, exposure to hormones, brain functioning etc.), were not discussed in this dissertation. Even though some argue that also the idea of biological differences is a social construct and part of a discourse (see Butler, 2006 [1999]), there are undeniably biological differences between men and women, boys and girls. So, a relevant question is to what extent men and women are biologically predisposed to have different cultural tastes. While it is not very likely that women are naturally more ‘cultivated’ than men, it could be the case that girls (and women) can more easily sit still or be quiet than boys (and men), which are behaviors necessary to participate in many highbrow cultural activities. As a sports fan, however, being loud and active is more valued. So, if boys are innately predisposed to show this kind of behavior, it would make sense that they are naturally drawn to sport spectatorship as a leisure activity\(^8\). Moreover, the uncovered gender identity-related mechanisms could partially be rooted in biological differences between men and women (see for instance Steensma, Kreukels, de Vries, & Cohen-Kettenis, 2013). Especially in chapters 4 and 5, focusing on youngsters, biological elements could be relevant because in adolescence processes of biological maturation take place (e.g., Cumming, Standage, Gillison, & Malina, 2008).

What is nature and what is nurture is a notoriously difficult question that scientists try to answer for decades (Fausto-Sterling, 2012). However, more and more research suggests that the real question is whether it is even possible to disentangle biological, psychological and social processes that make up the differences we find between boys and girls and men and women (Fausto-Sterling, 2012; Vermeersch, T'sjoen, Kaufman, Vincke, & Van Houtte, 2010). Biology and culture appear fundamentally intertwined; genetic predispositions and hormonal processes interact with environmental factors. Experiences boys and girls have from birth onwards shape the effects of hormones and the way in which brains function (Blakemore, Berenbaum, & Liben, 2009, p. 169; Fausto-Sterling, 2012). In some respects, parents interact differently with boys and girls in their infancy and early childhood (for a review see Leaper,
2002). For instance, mothers communicate more with their daughters and are a little more directive in their communication with girls, while interactions are somewhat more physical with boys. Boys are allowed to be more independent (e.g., crawling further away from the mother). So, through different early childhood experiences, sex differences in behavior can result in sex differences in the brain. In short, the social also leaves its imprints in the biological, not only the other way around.

Because biological and social processes are intertwined (Fausto-Sterling, 2012), because it is very difficult to measure relevant biological and social processes and confirm causality, and because there are generally little efforts to really integrate both disciplines (see Steensma et al., 2013), it is difficult to estimate to what extent the cultural taste differences we find are really gender differences and not sex differences (if such a dichotomous vision on sex and gender is really tenable of course (see Butler, 2006 [1999]; Fausto-Sterling, 2012)). Nevertheless, overall research suggests that sex-related, i.e., biological, differences exist, but are generally small, and that these differences are magnified by social mechanisms, especially when biological trends correspond to cultural gender beliefs (Leaper & Friedman, 2007, p. 564). For instance, a meta-review indicates that boys generally score higher than girls in motor activity level, but this small difference in infancy increases with age (Eaton & Enns, 1986). Socialization processes would inflate this small difference into a moderate difference because gender norms define “being active” as a masculine trait (Leaper & Friedman, 2007). So, while the biological basis of gendered leisure preferences cannot be ignored and should be the subject of further research, social aspects are undeniably important.

Important to stress is that also in this dissertation there is evidence for the social origin of taste differences. The finding that gender differences in sport- and art-related participation vary across societies and across time indicates that the social context in which men and women live and participate in culture matters. This contextual variation cannot be attributed to biological variation between men and women: it is very unlikely that the purely biological differences between men and women depend on the national context or on men’s and women’s birth cohort. Moreover, the finding that the gender gap in arts- and sport-related tastes is related to boys’ and girls’ experienced gender conformity pressures and gender role attitudes (for sport
spectatorship) when keeping gender typicality constant, is another indication that men's and women's differential cultural tastes have to an important extent social origins. Moreover, there is little scientific evidence that even gender identity (measured by gender typicality in this work) would be purely biological (Fausto-Sterling, 2012; Steensma et al., 2013).

9.4.3 The question of causality
Establishing causality is a notoriously difficult question in empirical research. In order to ‘prove’ causality, three conditions must be met: (1) there has to be a certain statistical association between A and B, (2) A has to be earlier in time than B and (3) the association between A and B is not the consequence of C (Roose & Meuleman, 2014). Not surprisingly, using cross-sectional data, it is impossible to make causality claims because the temporality (referring to the second condition) cannot be assessed. Moreover, even when using longitudinal data it is difficult to assess causality claims as there are often too few measuring points and the possibility that non-measured factors interfere cannot be excluded.

While it seems plausible that the gender development chronologically takes place before the development of cultural tastes, because the gendering of individuals starts from birth (or even before) (Blakemore et al., 2009), the focus on gender identity, pressure for gender conformity and gender role attitudes makes the picture more complicated as these gender-related mechanisms vary over time. It is quite likely that gender identification processes, interactional expectations and gender beliefs shape men’s and women’s cultural tastes and that, next, cultural experiences influence the way people perceive themselves, the pressures they encounter and the normative gender beliefs they further develop. These kind of feedback effects would make it extremely difficult to establish causality, even when longitudinal data would be available.

In this dissertation, generally, no real causality claims can be made. However, this was never the intention. The aim of this work was to show how differences in cultural taste (as a form of gender expression) are connected to gender, which refers to socially constructed ideals of femininity and masculinity. This was done by examining how the gap in cultural taste between men and women intensifies as people perceive themselves as more typical for their gender, experience more gender conformity pressures, have more traditional gender role
attitudes, and live and were raised in contexts with more gender inequality. So, the aim was to identify intrapersonal, interpersonal and contextual processes, not to establish causality.

It is also important to note that both in Bourdieu’s thinking and in Risman’s gender system theory that structured my reflections on the relationship between gender and taste, the causality question receives limited attention. Establishing causality is not really relevant and finding a monocausal explanation is impossible because the different levels of the gender structure are intrinsically intertwined, and because they interact to sustain the gender inequality we see today. This means that the question of why these gender differences initially occurred is not the only important question. For instance, even when we would be sure that gender differences in cultural behavior have their roots in Victorian separate spheres ideologies that normatively and structurally confined women to the private sphere (Bermingham, 1993; Tepper, 2000), this does not mean that these contextual processes remain the primary reason why cultural tastes differences between men and women persist in current societies. For instance, Cecilia Ridgeway (2009, 2011) illustrates how even when the structural position of women improves fundamentally and even when individuals personally have gender egalitarian attitudes, gender differences endure because in social interaction people reproduce traditional notions of femininity and masculinity because they think that this is the universal norm that everybody endorses (whether this is true or not). In this sense, we should be aware of the fact that ‘gender’ is so fundamentally engrained in our way of thinking and acting on so many levels that looking for a monocausal explanation will never lead to a true understanding of gendered behavior.

9.4.4 Minor limitations
There are also some minor limitations that I would like to mention. Firstly, I have not been able to specifically address how power inequalities relate to gender differences in cultural taste. While the idea of power was implicit in the cross-national comparative studies as gender inequality and structural constraints at the macro-level of societal organization are closely intertwined with power processes, I have to acknowledge that the power dimension of the gender structure played only a minor role in this dissertation. It would be very interesting to look into power inequalities within couples using household data (cf. Silva & Le Roux, 2011).
By focusing on inequalities between partners in, for instance, income, household work and decision-making, we could tap power inequalities within families that may explain who has the largest effect on joint leisure participation. Also in research on the position of women in the professional production of culture and on the extent to which women translate cultural competence into cultural capital, power inequalities should be central.

Secondly, this dissertation has an exclusively European focus. So, it remains unclear whether the findings can be generalized to other parts of the world. While it is conceivable that similar processes are at play in countries such as Canada, the USA or Australia, where gendered connotations to cultural activities are similar, it is possible that in non-Western countries patterns in gender differences in cultural taste are different. Further research should explicitly address this variation across cultures, but high-quality cross-national comparative data on a wider variety of countries will be needed to do this (Katz-Gerro, 2011).

9.5 Policy implications

Before addressing the policy implications of the research that is part of this dissertation, I want to make two cautionary remarks. First, considering that gender is linked to people’s cultural taste via mechanisms on different levels, it is not certain that recommended policy changes will automatically lead to changes in the gender gap in cultural taste because change on one level of the gender structure can be slowed down or even impeded by continuing gender inequality on other levels. As indicated before, Ridgeway (2011) has shown that gender inequalities can persist despite improvements in women’s access to structural resources on the macro-level of social organization when people continue to express traditional cultural beliefs about gender in social interaction. This appears to happen even when people personally have egalitarian gender beliefs.

Second, specific social transformations can have unintended consequences and may eventually reproduce the gender inequalities they were expected to undermine. While modernization processes and the structural and normative changes they entail, such as post-industrialization and more egalitarian attitudes, are known to have improved women’s societal position, for instance as a consequence of women’s increased access to employment in modern
economies (Olivetti & Petrongolo, 2016; Stanfors & Goldscheider, 2017), there is increasing evidence that modernization processes could also reproduce unequal gender norms. For instance, post-materialist value systems in modern societies promote self-actualization and the idea that educational and occupational choices should express one’s “true self” (Charles & Bradley, 2002, 2009). The unintended consequence is, however, that the effects of lingering gender essentialist beliefs, i.e., ideas that women and men are innately different and naturally want different things, are strengthened. So, people endorse the egalitarian belief that women should be able to enter the labor market to improve their societal position, but preferably in ‘feminine’ jobs and sectors, leading to unbalanced progress (England, 2010).

The policy implications I would like to formulate relate specifically to adolescents in the school context. I target this group for several reasons. Firstly, the processes studied on the intrapersonal and interactional level were shown to be highly important and the gender gap among adolescents was very large, so it seems important to address these dimensions of the gender structure among youngsters. Secondly, youngsters of today are the adults of the future. If we can achieve that young people take on a reflexive stance when it comes to gender inequality, gender norms, gender-based bullying, etc., they will be able to question unequal gendered norms and expectations in socializing contexts encountered later in life, such as the workplace (cf. Lamb, Bigler, Liben, & Green, 2009). Thirdly, the school context is an important socializing context that explicitly takes on an emancipatory role, in contrast to many other socializing contexts. Fourthly, we know that peers are important socializing agents and affect youngsters’ leisure preferences (Cann, 2014, 2015; Frønes, 2009; Harris, 1995). Peers do so-called ‘gender policing’ and overtly reject leisure-related gender-atypical behavior, often by bulling or using homonegative slurs (Lehman, 2017; Lehman & Dumais, 2017; Martino, 1999; Pascoe, 2007). In schools, these peer effects can be monitored and corrected. Some of the policy implications I will propose are related to the practical recommendations made as part of the Procrustes-project of which data was used in empirical chapters 4 and 5 (Consuegra, Vantieghem, Halimi, & Van Houtte, 2016; De Groof et al., 2015; Van Maele et al., 2015; Vantieghem, 2015; Vantieghem, De Groof, Van Maele, Govaerts, & Van Houtte, 2013; Vantieghem, Van Maele, & Van Houtte, 2016; Vantieghem, Vermeersch, & Van Houtte, 2014).
It is important that schools can be a safe haven when it comes to gender expression, and that the school is perceived as a place where different masculinities and femininities are welcome and accepted. Firstly, attention could be paid to gender-based bullying in school policy and in practice (Van Maele et al., 2015; Vantieghem et al., 2016). Teachers should learn to recognize and deal with gender-based homonegative teasing, name-calling, … etc. Lamb and colleagues (2009) show that developing programs for students to learn them how to challenge peers’ sexist remarks can also be effective. However, their study suggests that these programs would not necessarily affect boys and girls to the same extent. If the patterns found in their work apply to the Flemish context and girls are better able to challenge sexism or feel more entitled to do so, progress towards equality could be imbalanced.

Secondly, curricula, course material and course subjects could be used to address gender issues (Consuegra et al., 2016; Van Maele et al., 2015). Often course material depicts femininity and masculinity in binary and traditional ways. Illustrations in books, math problems, translation exercises, reading lists, examples, etc. could be evaluated on the extent to which they reinforce traditional notions of masculinity and femininity. The umbrella organization for LGBTQ associations in Flanders and Brussels, Çavaria, provides such a check list (Çavaria, 2011a, 2011b). Moreover, teachers can encourage critical reflections on masculinity and femininity among their students by explicitly addressing these topics in their courses (Van Maele et al., 2015; Vantieghem et al., 2013). For instance, gender inequality throughout the history, female artists and their work etc. are subjects that can be discussed in courses such as religion, history, arts and languages. Also, during school activities that fall outside of the regular curriculum, gender issues can be addressed. During ‘project days’ and the ‘day/week of diversity’, for instance, schools and teachers could stimulate male and female adolescents alike to develop their talents in arts and sports, for instance through workshops on music, visual arts, ballet, breakdance, theatre, handicrafts, etc (De Groof et al., 2015; Van Maele et al., 2015). A diverse, non-gendered offering of cultural and sportive activities that youngsters are stimulated to participate in based on interest instead of gender stereotypes could allow boys and girls to have new artistic and sportive experiences.
The further development of the part-time arts education (Deeltijds Kunstonderwijs) that is already available in Flanders could play an important role. The Minister of Education has recently proposed a decree to integrate part-time arts education more into the regular, compulsory education (Vlaams Ministerie van Onderwijs en Vorming, 2015, 2017). She wants to stimulate collaborations between primary and secondary schools on the one hand and music, arts, drama, … teachers working in part-time arts education on the other hand. Thus, pupils from various backgrounds would be able to experience different forms of artistic expression. This way, the Minister hopes to make the access to arts participation in general and part-time arts education in particular easier for those groups that are currently underrepresented in part-time arts education. While the Minister explicitly targets ethnic minority youth and youngsters with lower SES backgrounds, this may benefit boys as well. Boys are currently underrepresented in part-time arts education, especially in ‘feminine’ options such as dance (Onderwijskoepel van Steden en Gemeenten OVSG, 2017). So, teachers in part-time arts education could explicitly address gender stereotypes in leisure activities when they get the chance to collaborate with schools on arts projects. Of course, also collaborations between schools and local sports organizations are recommendable to facilitate young woman’s access to sports. It can be expected that when male and female adolescents discover unexpected talents and when they see that there are female teams in their local football club and there are men in drama classes, it will be easier for them engage in gender-atypical leisure activities. We know that having role models that cross gender boundaries makes it easier for young people to follow their own leisure interest, irrespective of gender norms (De Groof et al., 2015; Van Maele et al., 2015).

9.6 Conclusion

Gender differences in cultural tastes are an often overlooked topic in Sociology of Culture. Existing research makes problematic assumptions about what gender actually is and how it would affect people’s cultural behavior. I argue that gender is more than just an individual characteristic, more than the mere opposition between men and women, but instead relates to socially constructed notions of masculinity and femininity. In this dissertation, I show that gender affects arts-related and sport-related cultural taste through intrapersonal, interpersonal
and contextual gender-related processes. Gender is embedded in gendered selves, in social interaction and in the structural and normative organization of contexts. By examining how variation in gender-related factors, such as gender identity, interactional pressures, attitudes and gender equality, relates to cultural taste differences between men and women, one is able to achieve a deeper and more nuanced understanding of how gender affects cultural tastes. Only when considering all dimensions on which gender affects a person’s life, we are able to really engender culture.
9.7 Notes

1 Nevertheless, one has to keep in mind that empirical chapters 4 and 5 focused on youngsters. Gender is a very salient category of differentiation in adolescence and gender differences tend to intensify in this life stage (Galambos, Almeida, & Petersen, 1990). Whether gender identity-related, interactional and contextual mechanisms are equally important among adults should be empirically verified. While the effects of the individual and interactional dimensions of gender will most likely be more subtle as people grow older, it can be expected that they continue to affect taste as people move on to early adulthood (Leaper & Van, 2008).

2 Exceptions are Jackson and Tinkler (2007); Slater and Tiggemann (2010, 2011).

3 This appears a strange statement in light of the social value of highbrow cultural tastes. However, we should not forget that in the life worlds of adolescents highbrow cultural tastes are not necessarily prestigious, because they belong the ‘adult world’ and are not central to “youth culture”. When girls show masculine leisure behavior (for instance, skate boarding) they often engage in activities that are considered ‘cool’ in youth culture; if boys are involved in artistic activities, they participate in activities that their parents engage in as well, which is per definition ‘uncool’ (e.g., De Groof, Vantieghem, Van Houtte, & Laevers, 2015).

4 This would be a change compared to earlier times when especially women’s behavior was socially restricted (e.g., Bermingham, 1993; Vicinus, 1980).

5 Because we know that gendered arts-and sport-related cultural tastes play a role in the work sphere (Erickson, 1996; Lizardo, 2006), it is important to find out whether these experiences constitute lasting socializing experiences.

6 Further research could also evaluate whether the extent to which women are able to convert cultural tastes in social benefits depends on their class background. Surprisingly, Rivera and Tilcsik (2016) find that for women from upper class backgrounds expressing high interest in cultural activities in a resume decreases the likelihood to be invited for an interview when applying for a job in a law firm, while women from working class background reap a small benefit. Qualitative in-depth interviews show that employers expect women from higher class backgrounds to be less dedicated to their jobs when they become mothers, which is related to ideas on ‘intensive mothering’ (Hays, 1996) and schemes of ‘family devotion’ (Blair-Loy, 2003).

7 However, there are some inconsistencies in the literature, depending on whether healthy life expectancy at birth or at a certain age is used.

8 However, we should not forget that also boys have passive hobbies, such as watching TV or playing video games (Cherney & London, 2006). Moreover, boys’ leisure interests become somewhat more stereotypical when growing older. This already shows the limits of an explanation based on a biological tendency for active versus passive behavior.

9 Probably, we can be more confident in terms of causality with regard to the mechanisms studied in the cross-national comparative and longitudinal studies. It is likely that societal
gender equality and someone’s birth cohort predate cultural consumption. But even in these cases, we should not forget that causality claims require that the uncovered association between gender equality and birth cohort on the one hand and cultural consumption on the other hand is not the result of another variable. This is something that is very difficult to be certain.
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### 10 Appendices

#### 10.1 Appendix to Chapter 3

#### 10.1.1 Measurement of gender typicality

*Table 10-1: Dutch items measuring gender typicality for GIRLS, frequency in percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Helemaal niet akkoord</th>
<th>Niet akkoord</th>
<th>Tussenin</th>
<th>Akkoord</th>
<th>Helemaal akkoord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ik heb het gevoel te zijn zoals alle andere meisjes van mijn leeftijd</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ik heb het gevoel bij de andere meisjes te horen</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ik denk dat ik een goed voorbeeld ben van een –typisch–meisje.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ik heb het gevoel dat de dingen die ik in mijn vrije tijd graag doe, gelijkwaardig zijn aan die van de meeste meisjes</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ik heb het gevoel dat de dingen waar ik goed in ben gelijkwaardig zijn aan die van de meeste meisjes</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ik heb het gevoel dat mijn persoonlijkheid gelijkwaardig is aan de van de meeste meisjes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project: *Teaching in the Bed of Procrustes*

Original scale: Subscale of the Self-perception profile by Egan and Perry (2001)

Dutch translation and answering formats based on Bos and Sandfort (2010)

* Percentages based on the sample used in Chapter 4
Table 10-2: Dutch items measuring gender typicality for BOYS, frequency in percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Helemaal niet akkoord</th>
<th>Niet akkoord</th>
<th>Tussenin</th>
<th>Akkoord</th>
<th>Helemaal akkoord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ik heb het gevoel te zijn zoals alle andere jongens van mijn leeftijd</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ik heb het gevoel bij de andere jongens te horen</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ik denk dat ik een goed voorbeeld ben van een –typische– jongen</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ik heb het gevoel dat de dingen die ik in mijn vrije tijd graag doe, gelijkaardig zijn aan die van de meeste jongens</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ik heb het gevoel dat de dingen waar ik goed in ben gelijkaardig zijn aan die van de meeste jongens</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ik heb het gevoel dat mijn persoonlijkheid gelijkaardig is aan de van de meeste jongens</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project: Teaching in the Bed of Procrustes
Original scale: Subscale of the Self-perception profile by Egan and Perry (2001)
Dutch translation and answering formats based on Bos and Sandfort (2010)
* Percentages based on the sample used in Chapter 4
## 10.1.2 Measurement of pressure for gender conformity

*Table 10-3: Dutch items measuring gender conformity pressure for GIRLS, frequency in percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Helemaal akkoord</th>
<th>Niet akkoord</th>
<th>Akkoord</th>
<th>Helemaal akkoord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ik word boos als iemand zegt dat ik me als een jongen gedraag</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. De meisjes die ik ken zouden het erg vinden als ik hen zou vertellen dat ik zou willen leren voetballen</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ik doe mijn best alle dingen te doen die van een meisje verwacht worden</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. De meisjes die ik ken zouden het erg vinden als ik auto’s of fietsen zou willen herstellen</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ik vind het belangrijk te zijn zoals de andere meisjes die ik ken</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. De meisjes die ik ken zouden het erg vinden als ik iets zou willen leren doen dat meestal alleen jongens doen</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ik vind het belangrijk me te gedragen zoals andere meisjes</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. De meisjes die ik ken zouden boos worden wanneer ik met jongens-speelgoed zou willen spelen</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Project: Teaching in the Bed of Procrustes
Original scale: Subscale of the Self-perception profile by Egan and Perry (2001)
Dutch translation and answering formats based on Bos and Sandfort (2010)
* Percentages based on the sample used in Chapter 4
Table 10-4: Dutch items measuring gender conformity pressure for BOYS, frequency in percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Helemaal akkoord</th>
<th>Niet akkoord</th>
<th>Akkoord</th>
<th>Helemaal akkoord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ik word boos als iemand zegt dat ik me als een meisje gedraag</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. De jongens die ik ken zouden het erg vinden als ik hen zou vertellen dat ik zou willen ballet of turnen</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ik doe mijn best alle dingen te doen die van een jongen verwacht worden</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. De jongens die ik ken zouden het erg vinden als ik zou willen leren naaien of breien</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ik vind het belangrijk te zijn zoals de andere jongens die ik ken</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. De jongens die ik ken zouden het erg vinden als ik iets zou willen leren doen dat meestal alleen meisjes doen</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ik vind het belangrijk me te gedragen zoals andere jongens</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. De jongens die ik ken zouden boos worden wanneer ik met meisjes-speelgoed zou willen spelen</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project: Teaching in the Bed of Procrustes
Original scale: Subscale of the Self-perception profile by Egan and Perry (2001)
Dutch translation and answering formats based on Bos and Sandfort (2010)
* Percentages based on the sample used in Chapter 4
### Measurement of (traditional) gender role ideology

Table 10-5: Dutch items measuring gender role attitudes (same scale for boys and girls), frequency in percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Helemaal niet akkoord</th>
<th>Niet akkoord</th>
<th>Tussenin</th>
<th>Akkoord</th>
<th>Helemaal akkoord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Het stoort me als een jongen zich gedraagt als een meisje</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Het is voor iedereen het best als de man de beslissingen neemt in het gezin</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Een jongen die als hobby naar ballet gaat, daar is iets mis mee</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Het is normaal dat meisjes meer aandacht besteden aan hun uiterlijk dan jongens</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Het stoort me als een meisje zich gedraagt als een jongen</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Meisjes die vuile praat uitslaan, daar is vast en zeker iets mis mee</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Het is het beste als een vrouw thuis blijft en niet gaat werken zodra er kinderen zijn</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Enkel slanke meisjes zijn aantrekkelijk voor jongens</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Als ik hoorde dat een vrouw metser of dakwerker was, zou ik eraan twijfelen of ze wel ‘vrouwelijk’ was</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Het is normaal dat meisjes met hun uiterlijk iets van jongens gedaan proberen te krijgen</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Een vrouw zou in de eerste plaats aan haar kinderen moeten denken, niet aan haar carrière</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Een man moet ervoor zorgen dat hij geen hulp nodig heeft van anderen om zijn doel te bereiken</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Een man zonder zelfvertrouwen is maar een sukkel</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Een man laat zich niet doen; hij vecht terug als hij uitgedaagd wordt, desnoods met de vuist</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Een man houdt van een beetje gevaar, nu en dan</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project: Teaching in the Bed of Procrustes
Scale adapted from Vermeeersch et al. (2010)
* Percentages based on the sample used in Chapter 4
10.1.4 Wording of the questions on participation in the studied cultural practices across the waves of the AVO-survey (1983-2007)

While the aim has been to keep the question wording across the waves of the AVO-survey as consistent as possible, some changes have been made. An overview of the questions in the different waves is shown here. Graphs indicate participation rates for each studied cultural practice among respondents aged 25 or over. I do not see indications that structural changes in the trend line are systematically connected to changing phrasing of the questions.

Table 10-6: Question wording in the AVO-survey (1983-2007): Professional theatre attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Wave</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional theatre attendance</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens naar toneelvoorstellingen van beroepsgezelschappen geweest? (We bedoelen het bezoek aan toneelstukken opgevoerd door beroepsacteurs, dus geen amateurtoneelspelers.) HOE VAAK DOET U DAT ONGEVEER?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens naar toneelvoorstellingen van beroepsgezelschappen geweest? (We bedoelen het bezoek aan toneelstukken opgevoerd door beroepsacteurs, dus geen amateurtoneelspelers.) HOE VAAK DOET U DAT ONGEVEER?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens naar toneelvoorstellingen van beroepsgezelschappen geweest? (We bedoelen het bezoek aan toneelstukken opgevoerd door beroepsacteurs, dus geen amateurtoneelspelers.) HOE VAAK DOET U DAT ONGEVEER?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens naar toneelvoorstellingen van beroepsgezelschappen geweest? (We bedoelen het bezoek aan toneelstukken opgevoerd door beroepsacteurs, dus geen amateurtoneelspelers.) HOE VAAK DOET U DAT ONGEVEER?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens naar toneelvoorstellingen van beroepsgezelschappen geweest? (We bedoelen het bezoek aan toneelstukken opgevoerd door beroepsacteurs, dus geen amateurtoneelspelers.) HOE VAAK DOET U DAT ONGEVEER?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens naar toneelvoorstellingen van beroepsgezelschappen met beroepsacteurs geweest? HOE VAAK DOET U DAT ONGEVEER?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007*</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens naar toneelvoorstellingen van beroepsgezelschappen met beroepsacteurs geweest? HOE VAAK DOET U DAT ONGEVEER?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In 2007, a split questionnaire design was used in which only half of the respondents received the same question as the year before. The other half received a question battery on cultural participation using different question formulations; these respondents were not included in the sample for reasons of comparability.
Figure 10-1: Participation rates professional theatre attendance: At least once in the last 12 months (in percentages)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Wave</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th><em>Note</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ballet attendance</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens naar een balletvoorstelling geweest? (Balletvoorstellingen van eigen kinderen tellen niet mee). HOE VAAK DOET U DAT ONGEVEER?</td>
<td>In 2007, a split questionnaire design was used in which only half of the respondents received the same question as the year before. The other half received a question battery on cultural participation using different question formulations; these respondents were not included in the sample for reasons of comparability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballet attendance</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens naar een balletvoorstelling geweest? (Balletvoorstellingen van eigen kinderen tellen niet mee). HOE VAAK DOET U DAT ONGEVEER?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballet attendance</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens naar een balletvoorstelling van een beroepsgezelschap geweest? (Balletvoorstellingen van eigen kinderen tellen niet mee). HOE VAAK DOET U DAT ONGEVEER?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballet attendance</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens naar een balletvoorstelling van een beroepsgezelschap geweest? (Balletvoorstellingen van eigen kinderen tellen niet mee). HOE VAAK DOET U DAT ONGEVEER?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballet attendance</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens naar een balletvoorstelling van een beroepsgezelschap geweest? (Balletvoorstellingen van eigen kinderen tellen niet mee). HOE VAAK DOET U DAT ONGEVEER?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballet attendance</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens naar een balletvoorstelling van een beroepsgezelschap geweest? HOE VAAK DOET U DAT ONGEVEER?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballet attendance</td>
<td>2007*</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens naar een balletvoorstelling van een beroepsgezelschap geweest? HOE VAAK DOET U DAT ONGEVEER?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 10-2: Participation rates ballet attendance: At least once in the last 12 months (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Wave</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Museum visits</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden in Nederland wel eens naar een museum geweest? (Wij bedoelen hier zowel bezoeken aan de eigen of vaste collectie van de musea als bezoeken aan musea voor tentoonstellingen.) HOE VAAK GAAT U ONGEVEER NAAR EEN MUSEUM IN NEDERLAND?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden in Nederland wel eens naar een museum geweest? (Wij bedoelen hier zowel bezoeken aan de eigen of vaste collectie van de musea als bezoeken aan musea voor tentoonstellingen.) HOE VAAK GAAT U ONGEVEER NAAR EEN MUSEUM IN NEDERLAND?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden in Nederland wel eens naar een museum geweest? (Wij bedoelen hier zowel bezoeken aan de eigen of vaste collectie van de musea als bezoeken aan musea voor tentoonstellingen.) HOE VAAK GAAT U ONGEVEER NAAR EEN MUSEUM IN NEDERLAND?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden in Nederland wel eens naar een museum geweest? (Wij bedoelen hier zowel bezoeken aan de eigen of vaste collectie van de musea als bezoeken aan musea voor tentoonstellingen.) HOE VAAK DOET U DAT ONGEVEER?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden in Nederland wel eens naar een museum geweest? (Wij bedoelen hier zowel bezoeken aan de eigen of vaste collectie van de musea als bezoeken aan musea voor tentoonstellingen.) HOE VAAK DOET U DAT ONGEVEER?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden in Nederland wel eens naar een museum geweest? HOE VAAK DOET U DAT ONGEVEER?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007*</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden in Nederland wel eens naar een museum geweest? HOE VAAK DOET U DAT ONGEVEER?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In 2007, a split questionnaire design was used in which only half of the respondents received the same question as the year before. The other half received a question battery on cultural participation using different question formulations; these respondents were not included in the sample for reasons of comparability.
Figure 10-3: Participation rates museum visits: At least once in the last 12 months (in percentages)
### Table 10-9: Question wording in the AVO-survey (1983-2007): Art gallery visits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Wave</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art gallery visits</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens naar een galerie geweest? Een galerie is een plaats waar men kunstvoorwerpen zowel kan bekijken als kopen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens naar een galerie geweest? Een galerie is een plaats waar men kunstvoorwerpen zowel kan bekijken als kopen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens naar een galerie geweest? Een galerie is een plaats waar men kunstvoorwerpen zowel kan bekijken als kopen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens naar een galerie geweest? Een galerie is een plaats waar men kunstvoorwerpen zowel kan bekijken als kopen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens naar een galerie geweest? Een galerie is een plaats waar men kunstvoorwerpen zowel kan bekijken als kopen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens naar een kunstgalerie geweest?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007*</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens naar een kunstgalerie geweest?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In 2007, a split questionnaire design was used in which only half of the respondents received the same question as the year before. The other half received a question battery on cultural participation using different question formulations; these respondents were not included in the sample for reasons of comparability.
Figure 10-4: Participation rates art gallery visits: At least once in the last 12 months (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Wave</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paid football match attendance</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens naar wedstrijden in het betaald voetbal wezen kijken? Dus als toeschouwer, niet op tv. HOE VAAK DOET U DAT ONGEVEER?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens naar wedstrijden in het betaald voetbal wezen kijken? Dus als toeschouwer, niet op tv. HOE VAAK DOET U DAT ONGEVEER?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens naar wedstrijden in het betaald voetbal gaan kijken? Dus als toeschouwer, niet op tv. HOE VAAK DOET U DAT ONGEVEER?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens naar wedstrijden in het betaald voetbal gaan kijken? Dus als toeschouwer, niet op tv. HOE VAAK DOET U DAT ONGEVEER?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens naar wedstrijden in het betaald voetbal gaan kijken? Dus als toeschouwer, niet op tv. HOE VAAK DOET U DAT ONGEVEER?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens als toeschouwer (niet op tv) naar wedstrijden in het betaald voetbal gaan kijken? HOE VAAK DOET U DAT ONGEVEER?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Bent u de afgelopen 12 maanden wel eens als toeschouwer naar wedstrijden in het betaald voetbal gaan kijken? (niet op tv) HOE VAAK DOET U DAT ONGEVEER?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10-5: Participation rates paid football match attendance: At least once in the last 12 months (in percentages)
10.2 Appendix to Chapter 6

Figure 10-6: Ranked EU country effects with 95% confidence interval for theatre attendance
Figure 10-7: Ranked EU country effects with 95% confidence interval for ballet, dance and opera attendance
Figure 10-8: Ranked EU country effects with 95% confidence interval for museum and art gallery visits
Table 10-11: Multilevel Poisson-model of theatre attendance for 23 028 respondents in 28 EU countries: Poisson regression coefficients and standard errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual level</th>
<th>Random slope model, main effects country-variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-0.123*</td>
<td>(0.057)</td>
<td>-0.133*</td>
<td>(0.057)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ref. = man)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>0.317***</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>0.327***</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ref. = no children)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child(ren) aged 15- in the hh</td>
<td>-0.194***</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>-0.194***</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ref. = service class job)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate class job</td>
<td>-0.282***</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
<td>-0.281***</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working class job</td>
<td>-0.730***</td>
<td>(0.047)</td>
<td>-0.729***</td>
<td>(0.047)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>-0.704***</td>
<td>(0.058)</td>
<td>-0.704***</td>
<td>(0.057)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>-0.693***</td>
<td>(0.054)</td>
<td>-0.692***</td>
<td>(0.054)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired/unable to work</td>
<td>-0.474***</td>
<td>(0.039)</td>
<td>-0.472***</td>
<td>(0.039)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ref. = married)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitng</td>
<td>-0.064°</td>
<td>(0.036)</td>
<td>-0.065°</td>
<td>(0.036)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>-0.073*</td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td>-0.073*</td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>-0.117**</td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
<td>-0.117**</td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>-0.145***</td>
<td>(0.042)</td>
<td>-0.146***</td>
<td>(0.042)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ref. = education 20 or over)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education until age 15</td>
<td>-1.090***</td>
<td>(0.044)</td>
<td>-1.091***</td>
<td>(0.044)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education until age 16-19</td>
<td>-0.455***</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
<td>-0.455***</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ref. = never problems)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From time to time financial problems</td>
<td>-0.255***</td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
<td>-0.256***</td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time financial problems</td>
<td>-0.555***</td>
<td>(0.044)</td>
<td>-0.556***</td>
<td>(0.044)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years old</td>
<td>25-34 years old</td>
<td>0.094** (0.036)</td>
<td>45-54 years old</td>
<td>25-34 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years old</td>
<td>25-34 years old</td>
<td>0.118** (0.037)</td>
<td>55-64 years old</td>
<td>25-34 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years old</td>
<td>25-34 years old</td>
<td>0.308*** (0.051)</td>
<td>65-74 years old</td>
<td>25-34 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 years old</td>
<td>25-34 years old</td>
<td>0.094** (0.036)</td>
<td>75 years old or older</td>
<td>25-34 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 years old or older</td>
<td>25-34 years old</td>
<td>0.093** (0.036)</td>
<td>Rural/village</td>
<td>large city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ref. = 25-34 years old)</td>
<td>large city</td>
<td>-0.391*** (0.027)</td>
<td>Small city</td>
<td>large city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macrot level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HDI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEI: work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.167** (1.292)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEI: care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.005 ns. (0.007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-level interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.006 ns. (0.007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman X HDI</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.899* (0.760)</td>
<td>-0.006 ns. (0.004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman X GEI: work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.004* (0.002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman X GEI: care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.039 (0.012)</td>
<td>0.039 (0.012)</td>
<td>0.039 (0.012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.015 (0.007)</td>
<td>0.009 (0.006)</td>
<td>0.0012 (0.006)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < 0.001; ** p < 0.01; * p < 0.05; ° p < 0.1; ns. not significant
Table 10-12: Multilevel Poisson-model of ballet, dance & opera attendance for 23 028 respondents in 28 EU countries: Poisson regression coefficients and standard errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Random slope model, main effects country-variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept (Ref. = man)</td>
<td>-0.736*** (0.081)</td>
<td>-0.739*** (0.080)</td>
<td>-0.740*** (0.080)</td>
<td>-0.743*** (0.080)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman (Ref. = no children)</td>
<td>0.455*** (0.047)</td>
<td>0.462*** (0.044)</td>
<td>0.461*** (0.046)</td>
<td>0.465*** (0.045)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child(ren) aged 15- in the hh (Ref. = service class job)</td>
<td>0.011 ns. (0.040)</td>
<td>0.010 ns. (0.040)</td>
<td>0.011 ns. (0.040)</td>
<td>0.011 ns. (0.040)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate class job</td>
<td>-0.382*** (0.039)</td>
<td>-0.380*** (0.039)</td>
<td>-0.381*** (0.039)</td>
<td>-0.380*** (0.039)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working class job</td>
<td>-0.694*** (0.063)</td>
<td>-0.693*** (0.063)</td>
<td>-0.693*** (0.063)</td>
<td>-0.693*** (0.063)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>-0.632*** (0.073)</td>
<td>-0.632*** (0.073)</td>
<td>-0.635*** (0.073)</td>
<td>-0.633*** (0.073)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>-0.614*** (0.069)</td>
<td>-0.613*** (0.069)</td>
<td>-0.613*** (0.069)</td>
<td>-0.614*** (0.069)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired/unable to work</td>
<td>-0.559*** (0.053)</td>
<td>-0.557*** (0.053)</td>
<td>-0.557*** (0.053)</td>
<td>-0.558*** (0.053)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting (Ref. = married)</td>
<td>-0.068 ns. (0.049)</td>
<td>-0.068 ns. (0.049)</td>
<td>-0.069 ns. (0.049)</td>
<td>-0.069 ns. (0.049)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>-0.001 ns. (0.045)</td>
<td>-0.001 ns. (0.045)</td>
<td>-0.001 ns. (0.045)</td>
<td>0.000 ns. (0.045)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>0.040 ns. (0.048)</td>
<td>0.040 ns. (0.048)</td>
<td>0.040 ns. (0.048)</td>
<td>0.041 ns. (0.048)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>-0.002 ns. (0.054)</td>
<td>-0.003 ns. (0.054)</td>
<td>-0.002 ns. (0.054)</td>
<td>-0.002 ns. (0.054)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education until age 15 (Ref. = education 20 or over)</td>
<td>-1.388*** (0.063)</td>
<td>-1.388*** (0.063)</td>
<td>-1.389*** (0.063)</td>
<td>-1.390*** (0.063)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education until age 16-19 (Ref. = never problems)</td>
<td>-0.632*** (0.033)</td>
<td>-0.631*** (0.033)</td>
<td>-0.632*** (0.033)</td>
<td>-0.633*** (0.033)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From time to time financial problems</td>
<td>-0.242*** (0.036)</td>
<td>-0.242*** (0.036)</td>
<td>-0.242*** (0.036)</td>
<td>-0.242*** (0.036)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time financial problems</td>
<td>-0.351*** (0.056)</td>
<td>-0.351*** (0.056)</td>
<td>-0.351*** (0.056)</td>
<td>-0.351*** (0.056)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>(0.048)</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>(0.049)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years old</td>
<td>-0.022 ns.</td>
<td>(0.048)</td>
<td>-0.023 ns.</td>
<td>(0.048)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years old</td>
<td>0.061 ns.</td>
<td>(0.049)</td>
<td>0.059 ns.</td>
<td>(0.049)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years old</td>
<td>0.160**</td>
<td>(0.055)</td>
<td>0.158**</td>
<td>(0.055)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 years old</td>
<td>0.391***</td>
<td>(0.069)</td>
<td>0.388***</td>
<td>(0.069)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 years old or older</td>
<td>0.217**</td>
<td>(0.083)</td>
<td>0.214**</td>
<td>(0.083)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/village</td>
<td>-0.446***</td>
<td>(0.036)</td>
<td>-0.445***</td>
<td>(0.036)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small city</td>
<td>-0.259***</td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td>-0.258***</td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macro level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td>4.165**</td>
<td>(1.542)</td>
<td>5.940**</td>
<td>(1.832)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEI: work</td>
<td>-0.017°</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>-0.017°</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEI: care</td>
<td>0.010*</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>0.010*</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-level interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman X HDI</td>
<td>-2.102°</td>
<td>(1.161)</td>
<td>-0.009 ns.</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman X GEI: work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman X GEI: care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < 0.001; ** p < 0.01; * p < 0.05; ° p < 0.1; ns. not significant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual level</th>
<th>Random slope model, main effects country-variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.112*</td>
<td>(0.053)</td>
<td>0.103*</td>
<td>(0.053)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ref. = man)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>0.100***</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td>0.114***</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ref. = no children)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child(ren) aged 15- in the hh</td>
<td>-0.039 ns.</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>-0.040 ns.</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ref. = service class job)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate class job</td>
<td>-0.262***</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>-0.260***</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working class job</td>
<td>-0.618***</td>
<td>(0.039)</td>
<td>-0.616***</td>
<td>(0.039)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>-0.542***</td>
<td>(0.049)</td>
<td>-0.542***</td>
<td>(0.049)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>-0.494***</td>
<td>(0.044)</td>
<td>-0.493***</td>
<td>(0.044)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired/unable to work</td>
<td>-0.379***</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
<td>-0.376***</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ref. = married)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitng</td>
<td>0.021 ns.</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>0.021 ns.</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>-0.012 ns.</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>-0.012 ns.</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>-0.023 ns.</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>-0.023 ns.</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>-0.190***</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
<td>-0.191***</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ref. = education 20 or over)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education until age 15</td>
<td>-1.174***</td>
<td>(0.039)</td>
<td>-1.174***</td>
<td>(0.039)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education until age 16-19</td>
<td>-0.522***</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>-0.522***</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ref. = never problems)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From time to time financial problems</td>
<td>-0.183***</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
<td>-0.183***</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time financial problems</td>
<td>-0.354***</td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
<td>-0.356***</td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 35-44 years old

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>0.105***</th>
<th>(0.031)</th>
<th>0.104***</th>
<th>(0.031)</th>
<th>0.105***</th>
<th>(0.031)</th>
<th>0.105***</th>
<th>(0.031)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 45-54 years old

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>0.160***</th>
<th>(0.032)</th>
<th>0.159***</th>
<th>(0.032)</th>
<th>0.160***</th>
<th>(0.032)</th>
<th>0.160***</th>
<th>(0.032)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 55-64 years old

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>0.186***</th>
<th>(0.036)</th>
<th>0.184***</th>
<th>(0.036)</th>
<th>0.186***</th>
<th>(0.036)</th>
<th>0.187***</th>
<th>(0.036)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 65-74 years old

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>0.334***</th>
<th>(0.045)</th>
<th>0.329***</th>
<th>(0.045)</th>
<th>0.333***</th>
<th>(0.045)</th>
<th>0.334***</th>
<th>(0.045)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 75 years old or older

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>0.067 ns.</th>
<th>(0.055)</th>
<th>0.064 ns.</th>
<th>(0.055)</th>
<th>0.067 ns.</th>
<th>(0.055)</th>
<th>0.067 ns.</th>
<th>(0.055)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Rural/village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>-0.384***</th>
<th>(0.023)</th>
<th>-0.383***</th>
<th>(0.023)</th>
<th>-0.384***</th>
<th>(0.023)</th>
<th>-0.384***</th>
<th>(0.023)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Small city

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>-0.202***</th>
<th>(0.021)</th>
<th>-0.202***</th>
<th>(0.021)</th>
<th>-0.203***</th>
<th>(0.021)</th>
<th>-0.202***</th>
<th>(0.021)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Macro level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>4.483***</th>
<th>(1.287)</th>
<th>5.084***</th>
<th>(1.309)</th>
<th>4.469***</th>
<th>(1.285)</th>
<th>4.473***</th>
<th>(1.287)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### HDI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>-0.004 ns.</th>
<th>(0.008)</th>
<th>-0.003 ns.</th>
<th>(0.007)</th>
<th>-0.003 ns.</th>
<th>(0.008)</th>
<th>-0.004 ns.</th>
<th>(0.007)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### GEI: work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>0.012***</th>
<th>(0.003)</th>
<th>0.012***</th>
<th>(0.003)</th>
<th>0.012***</th>
<th>(0.003)</th>
<th>0.013***</th>
<th>(0.003)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### GEI: care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>-1.189*</th>
<th>(0.494)</th>
<th>-0.002 ns.</th>
<th>(0.002)</th>
<th>-0.001 ns.</th>
<th>(0.001)</th>
<th>-0.001 ns.</th>
<th>(0.001)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Cross-level interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>(0.012)</th>
<th>0.041</th>
<th>(0.012)</th>
<th>0.041</th>
<th>(0.012)</th>
<th>0.041</th>
<th>(0.012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Random part

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>(0.012)</th>
<th>0.041</th>
<th>(0.012)</th>
<th>0.041</th>
<th>(0.012)</th>
<th>0.041</th>
<th>(0.012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>(0.002)</th>
<th>0.000</th>
<th>(0.000)</th>
<th>0.001</th>
<th>(0.002)</th>
<th>0.001</th>
<th>(0.002)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*** p < 0.001; ** p < 0.01; * p < 0.05; ° p < 0.1; ns. not significant
### 10.3 Appendix to Chapter 7

**Table 10-14:** Binary logistic multilevel analysis (with logit link function) of sport event attendance for 22,197 respondents in 27 EU countries: Logistic regression coefficients and standard errors (in brackets), full tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1: random slope</th>
<th>Model 2: cross-level interaction</th>
<th>Model 3: control for HDI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.919*** (0.120)</td>
<td>0.928*** (0.115)</td>
<td>0.935*** (0.109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ref. = man)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>-1.151*** (0.067)</td>
<td>-1.148*** (0.054)</td>
<td>-1.148*** (0.054)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ref. = service class job)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate class job</td>
<td>-0.082° (0.050)</td>
<td>-0.086° (0.050)</td>
<td>-0.087° (0.050)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working class job</td>
<td>-0.281*** (0.059)</td>
<td>-0.283*** (0.059)</td>
<td>-0.282*** (0.059)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>-0.332*** (0.073)</td>
<td>-0.333*** (0.072)</td>
<td>-0.334*** (0.072)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>-0.517*** (0.079)</td>
<td>-0.521*** (0.079)</td>
<td>-0.520*** (0.079)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired/unable to work</td>
<td>-0.485*** (0.065)</td>
<td>-0.488*** (0.065)</td>
<td>-0.488*** (0.065)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ref. = no children)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child(ren) aged 15- in the hh</td>
<td>0.153*** (0.043)</td>
<td>0.153*** (0.043)</td>
<td>0.153*** (0.043)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ref. = married or cohabiting)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>-0.167** (0.054)</td>
<td>-0.167** (0.054)</td>
<td>-0.168** (0.054)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>-0.094° (0.055)</td>
<td>-0.093° (0.055)</td>
<td>-0.093° (0.055)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>-0.227*** (0.067)</td>
<td>-0.227*** (0.067)</td>
<td>-0.227*** (0.067)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ref. = education until age 20 or over)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education until age 15</td>
<td>-0.428*** (0.053)</td>
<td>-0.425*** (0.053)</td>
<td>-0.427*** (0.053)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education until age 16-19</td>
<td>-0.091* (0.040)</td>
<td>-0.089* (0.040)</td>
<td>-0.089* (0.040)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ref: 25-34 years old)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years old</td>
<td>-0.134** (0.049)</td>
<td>-0.134** (0.049)</td>
<td>-0.134** (0.049)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years old</td>
<td>-0.431*** (0.053)</td>
<td>-0.432*** (0.054)</td>
<td>-0.432*** (0.054)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years old</td>
<td>-0.777*** (0.063)</td>
<td>-0.780*** (0.063)</td>
<td>-0.780*** (0.063)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 years old</td>
<td>-1.046*** (0.081)</td>
<td>-1.049*** (0.082)</td>
<td>-1.049*** (0.082)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 years old or older</td>
<td>-1.705*** (0.105)</td>
<td>-1.709*** (0.105)</td>
<td>-1.710*** (0.105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Ref.} = \text{Keeping up with the bills})</td>
<td>Keeping up with the bills but struggling</td>
<td>-0.150*** (0.036)</td>
<td>-0.147*** (0.036)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falling behind with the bills</td>
<td>-0.442*** (0.081)</td>
<td>-0.440*** (0.081)</td>
<td>-0.436*** (0.081)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Ref.} = \text{large city})</td>
<td>Rural area or village</td>
<td>0.192*** (0.042)</td>
<td>0.190*** (0.042)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/middle town</td>
<td>0.163*** (0.042)</td>
<td>0.163*** (0.042)</td>
<td>0.163*** (0.042)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Macro level</strong></td>
<td>GEI</td>
<td>0.013 ns. (0.009)</td>
<td>-0.004 ns. (0.011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td>6.220*</td>
<td>(2.896)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross-level interaction</strong></td>
<td>Woman X GEI</td>
<td>0.017*** (0.005)</td>
<td>0.017*** (0.005)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Random Part**

| Intercept  | 0.262 | 0.075 | 0.230 | 0.065 | 0.194 | 0.056 |
| Gender     | 0.087 | 0.031 | 0.047 | 0.020 | 0.046 | 0.020 |

*** p < 0.001; ** p < 0.01; * p < 0.05; ° p < 0.1; ns. not significant

* The covariance between random slope and random intercept is fixed at zero.

Compared to the article, I have changed the reference category of the variable ‘gender’ to ‘man’ instead of ‘woman’ in order to obtain comparability across the empirical chapters of this dissertation, as in all other chapters gender was coded as man (0) – woman (1).
11 Summaries

11.1 English summary

*Gender and cultural tastes: An intrapersonal, interpersonal and contextual approach*

Empirical research indicates that women are more interested in and participate more in ‘legitimate’ cultural activities such as theatre- and opera attendance and arts museum visits than men. However, explanations for this remarkable gap in which a group with a lower social status is more involved in a high-status activity, are not often studied in Sociology of Culture. Existing research focuses empirically on differences in highbrow cultural participation between men and women, and theoretically on popular topics in research on inequalities in cultural tastes, such as cultural reproduction within the family and the effects of educational attainment and socio-economic status. This way, current research reflects the common contention, in line with ideas of Pierre Bourdieu who is the founding father of research on cultural taste, that gender differences are only of secondary importance for cultural taste patterns compared to socio-economic differences.

What current research tends to neglect is that gender is more than a binary and static distinction between men and women, and that cultural activities are not only legitimate or illegitimate, but often have very feminine or masculine connotations. Indeed, arts-related activities are often considered typically feminine activities, while sport-related activities are often labeled as typically masculine activities. So, tastes and distastes in the domains of Arts and Sports do not only reflect socio-economic status differences but also different expectations for men and women in current societies. The latter processes, that are connected to the socially constructed ideals of masculinity and femininity and the different opportunities that one’s sex category brings about, –or in one word– ‘gender’, are central in dissertation. In this thesis, I provide a better understanding of the gender gap in cultural tastes, by evaluating how these differences relate to the societal expectations and constraints that are connected to being a man or a woman.
Inspired by the work of gender sociologist, Barbara Risman, I argue that one can only understand the effect of gender on cultural tastes, if one perceives gender as a multidimensional system that can affect peoples’ behavior on three, related levels: through intrapersonal processes, via interpersonal mechanisms and through contextual factors. The intrapersonal level relates to a person’s gender identity, that is formed through socialization processes. The intrapersonal level deals with gendered expectations expressed in social interaction. Moreover, gender ideologies, norms, opportunities and constraints for men and women differ across contexts. These intrapersonal, interpersonal and contextual processes are central to the empirical part of the dissertation.

To obtain a better understanding of gender inequality in taste for sport event attendance, which is a masculine-typed activity, and involvement in feminine arts-related activities, such as attending theatre- and ballet performances and visiting museums and art galleries, a similar strategy is used in all empirical studies. Using Flemish, Dutch and European data, I evaluate whether and to what extent the gap in cultural interest and participation between men and women is connected to gender-related intrapersonal, interpersonal and contextual factors. More specifically, this PhD thesis demonstrates that cultural taste differences depend on female and –especially– male adolescents’ gender identity, experienced pressure for gender conformity and gender role attitudes in Flanders. Moreover, this dissertation highlights cross-national variation in the gender gap among the EU countries which is connected to societal gender equality, and shows that gender differences in cultural participation have become smaller in more recent generations in the Netherlands, which I link to the relaxing of gender norms. All studies in this work indicate that the gender gap in cultural tastes is closely related to gendered expectations and opportunities via intrapersonal, interpersonal and contextual processes. The differences in cultural tastes in the domains of Arts and Sports between men and women are larger when gendered norms, expectations and constraints are more deeply ingrained in peoples’ identities, social interactions and social contexts. Especially gender identity and pressure for gender-conforming behavior on the intra- and interpersonal level are important mechanisms through which gender shapes cultural taste, often particularly for men.
This dissertation makes an important contribution to the literature on gender and cultural
taste by showing that the gap in cultural tastes between men and women represents a true gender
gap, and in other words, is strongly related to the social notions of masculinity and femininity
and the opportunities and constraints for men and women through specific intrapersonal,
interpersonal and contextual processes. By paying attention to variation in the gender gap across
countries, across time, within the group of men and women and between cultural practices, this
dissertation partially uncovers the social processes through which gender shapes cultural tastes.
I discuss implications for the literature on what counts as marker of socioeconomic status and
I make suggestions for future research, i.a., on gender and leisure time, and on changes in men’s
and women’s cultural participation within the life course. Finally, suggestions on how to
promote gender equal cultural involvement in youngsters are formulated.
11.2 Nederlandstalige samenvatting

*Gender en culturele smaakvoorkeuren: Een intrapersoonlijke, interpersoonlijke en contextuele benadering*


Wat bestaand onderzoek dus lijkt te vergeten is dat dat gender meer is dan een binair onderscheid tussen mannen en vrouwen en dat culturele activiteiten niet enkel legitiem of illegitiem kunnen zijn, maar vaak ook erg feminiene of masculiene connotaties hebben. Inderdaad, kunstgerelateerde activiteiten worden vaak als typisch vrouwelijk beschouwd, terwijl sportgerelateerde activiteiten vaak als typisch mannelijk worden bestempeld. Smaakvoorkeuren en –afkeuren in het kunstdomein en het sportdomein reflecteren dus niet enkel socio-economische statusverschillen maar ook verschillende verwachtingen voor mannen en vrouwen in onze huidige samenleving. Deze laatste processen, die samenhangen met de maatschappelijk geconstrueerde idealen van mannelijkheid en vrouwelijkheid en de verschillende kansen voor mannen en vrouwen, kortweg ‘gender’ genoemd, staan centraal in dit doctoraat. In dit proefschrift bied ik een beter begrip van de genderkloof in culturele smaken door te bestuderen hoe deze verschillen samenhangen met de sociale verwachtingen en beperkingen die verbonden zijn aan het man-zijn of vrouw-zijn.
Geïnspireerd door het werk van gender-sociologe Barbara Risman argumenteer ik dat we het effect van gender op culturele smaken pas echt kunnen begrijpen als we erkennen dat gender als een multidimensionaal systeem functioneert dat het gedrag van mensen kan beïnvloeden op drie, aan elkaar verbonden, niveaus: via intrapersoonlijke processen, via interpersoonlijke mechanismes en via contextuele factoren. Het intrapersoonlijke niveau heeft betrekking op de genderidentiteit, die gevormd wordt via socialisatieprocessen. Op het interpersoonlijk niveau gaat het over gender-gebonden verwachtingen die uitgedrukt wordt in sociale interactie. Daarnaast verschillen genderideologieën en gendernormen en de kansen en de beperkingen voor mannen en vrouwen ook naargelang de sociale context waarin een persoon zich bevindt. Deze intrapersoonlijke, interpersoonlijke en contextuele processen staan centraal in het empirische luik van het doctoraat.
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van mensen. Vooral genderidentificatie en druk tot gender-conformerend gedrag op het intra-
en interpersoonlijke niveau blijken belangrijke mechanismes te zijn waarmee gender de
culturele smaken vormt van vrouwen, maar vooral van mannen.

Dit doctoraat doet een belangrijke bijdrage aan de literatuur over gender en culturele smaken
door aan te tonen dat de kloof in culturele smaken tussen mannen en vrouwen een echte
genderkloof is, en met andere woorden, sterk samenhangt met de maatschappelijke noties van
mannelijkheid en vrouwelijkheid en de kansen en beperkingen voor mannen en vrouwen, via
specifieke intrapersoonlijke, interpersoonlijke en contextuele processen. Door aandacht te
hebben voor variatie in de genderkloof, zowel over landen heen, over de tijd heen, binnen de
groep van mannen en vrouwen en tussen verschillende culturele activiteiten, legt dit doctoraat
een deel van de sociale processen bloot waarmee gender culturele smaken vormgeeft. Ik
bespreek implicaties voor de literatuur over wat geldt als indicator van socio-economische
status en ik doe suggesties voor verder onderzoek, onder meer over gender en vrije tijd en over
veranderingen in de cultuurparticipatie van mannen en vrouwen doorheen de levensloop. Tot
slot worden suggesties gedaan om een gendergelijke culturele betrokkenheid bij jongeren te
stimuleren.