

## STATUS INCONSISTENCY AND LIFESTYLE AMONG STATUS GROUPS: FOCUSING ON CULTURAL CAPITAL AND SOCIAL CAPITAL\*

NAM EUN-YOUNG

*Seoul National University*

*This paper examines the relationship between status inconsistency and lifestyle in terms of cultural capital and social capital. Each status group is divided according to combination of achieved factors such as education and income. Four groups, 'high education-high income,' 'high education -low income,' 'low education-high income' and 'low education-low income' are established. The results show that each group has a distinctive lifestyle. The 'high education-low income' group participates more in cultural activities. 'Low education-high income' distinguishes itself with expensive and prestigious material possessions and participation in pseudo-familial groups and voluntary associations. These results indicate that the status inconsistency influences a lifestyle in terms of some aspects of cultural capital and social capital.*

**Key Words:** *Status Inconsistency, Lifestyle, Cultural Capital, Social Capital, Status Groups*

### INTRODUCTION

In analyses of social stratification, groups had been conceptualized in terms of a vertical structure until Gerhard E. Lenski suggested the idea of status crystallization, a non-vertical dimension of social status. Most social philosophers and social scientists have described the vertical structure of human groups in terms of a single hierarchy wherein each member occupies a single position. However, critics maintain that the structure of human groups normally involves the coexistence of a number of parallel vertical hierarchies that are usually imperfectly correlated with one another (Lenski, 1954).

In essence, the theory of status crystallization can be stated as follows. The social status is multidimensional and hierarchical. Individuals are located in social space in terms of their position on a variety of dimension such as status-occupation, education, income, ethnicity, etc. Each person occupies a particular status configuration, determined by his or her location on each of the component dimensions. Particular values and expectations are

---

\* The author's e-mail address is neylee@hanmail.net.

associated with each level on each of the component dimensions. Thus, some status sets will be "crystallized" in the sense that all of the component statuses give rise to similar values and expectation, while others are not. The theory argues that those individuals whose positions on the different dimensions are not crystallized- those whose status membership gives rise to conflict values and expectations-are likely to experience more strain and tension than people whose status sets are crystallized (Treiman, 1966).

According to Lenski, certain persons may be located in a high or low position consistently, while others may combine high standing in terms of a certain status variable with low standing. Especially when a society has experienced industrialization and the functions of society have diversified, the individual's rank position in important societal status hierarchies is not always at a consistent level. This strain that evokes structural inconsistency is manifested as psychological frustration. Generally, people tend to define their status and environments in favorable terms. When people are in a position of inconsistency, they are inclined to see themselves at the highest position and wish others to recognize them in the same manner. However, because others usually estimate them at the lowest position, they undergo the psychological stress (Lenski, 1954).

Lenski made use of the four indicators, occupation hierarchy, education hierarchy, income hierarchy and ethnic hierarchy, to represent the status inconsistency, and he attempted to explain status inconsistency and unpleasant social relations. He suggested that a person whose status is poorly crystallized occupies an ambiguous position in society. Hence persons with a low degree of status crystallization are more likely to be subject to disturbing experiences in the interaction process and have greater difficulty in establishing rewarding patterns of social interaction than others. A tendency to withdraw or avoid from social relations is regarded as a reaction to the unpleasant social relation. Lenski posited that low crystallization respondents are more frequently non-participants in voluntary relationships than are high crystallization respondents (Lenski, 1956).

A number of researchers have attempted to test this proposition on political change empirically, using a variety of conceptual approaches and analytic techniques. The result have been contradictory and confusing: Kenkel's (1956) early study found no relationship between status inconsistency and desires for political change, while Goffman's (1957) research did. A few years later, two re-analyses of Lenski's data by Jackson (1962) and by Treiman (1966) revealed that Lenski's proposition should have been limited to a few social forms of status inconsistency. At roughly the

same time, Brandmeyer (1965) and Kelly and Chambliss (1966) published new data that did not substantiate the proposition; however, the results of Lenski's (1967) study of four western nations did. Next a series of studies came at University of Michigan by Segal and Knoke (1969) provided findings that fairly consistently supported the proposition, but only for certain forms of status inconsistency and only the dependent variable of preference for the Democratic Party. Meanwhile several studies reported finding no significant relationships between occupational-educational-income inconsistencies and preference for political change (Laumann and Segal, 1971; Olsen and Tully, 1972).

To sum up, most early research on status inconsistency dealt with consequences for the individual. Two such consequences are social isolation and political liberalism (Lenski, 1956). Later study examined the development of psycho-physiological symptoms as a third possible consequence of the stress engendered by status inconsistency (Jackson, 1962). The Political consequences of status inconsistency remain unsolved. Past writers have suggested that status inconsistency operates under a variety of difficulties: unsatisfactory social relationships, unstable self-image, reward out of line with aspirations, and social ambiguity. It may be that the basic problem underling all of these factors is one of conflicting expectations (Jackson, 1962). Notably, the relation between status inconsistency and various lifestyles has not yet been explored.

Weber in his treatment of "status group" classically formulated theory about culture and stratification. "Status means an effective claim to social esteem in terms of positive or negative privileges; it is typically founded style of life, formal education, hereditary or occupational prestige ..." (Weber, 1978). He described a status order as "the way in which social honor is distributed in a community between typical groups participating in this distribution." Weber also held that, in a market-oriented economy, people may claim esteem in ways that do not depend on group membership (Weber, 1978). This supposition was also explored by Bourdieu in his study *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Tastes*.

Bourdieu has argued for the existence of a cultural boundary between classes treating class as the fundamental and encompassing basis of status group distinctions, and Bourdieu integrates status group and market phenomena through the medium of cultural capital. Bourdieu knows that not all culture is economically determined: As the objective distance from necessity grows, life-style increasingly becomes the product of what Weber calls a 'stylization of life,' a systemic commitment that orients and organizes the most diverse practices (Bourdieu, 1984). This suggests other criteria than

social class indicator come into play in the distinction of pure leisure and consumption. Much leisure consumption can be located in class differences, yet another possibility also warrants consideration: distinction of lifestyle may form boundaries that do not depend on social class (Hall, 1992).

Lamont suggests that the power-culture links vary with the social contexts with respect to cultural exclusion. Lamont divides it into the tightly-bounded power-culture link and the loosely-bounded power-culture link. Under the tightly-bounded power-culture situation, the cultural tastes operate definitely to estimate social economic status. In France, the cultural differences are emphasized much more as a device for status elevation than in America (Lamont, 1989).

With rapid Industrialization and compressive economic development, economic capital has been surpassed and dominated over cultural capital in Korea. Hence, owing to the weakness of culture-centered power, the imitative consuming behaviors for elevation social status have been spread widely from upper class to middle class (Kim, 2008).

In this paper, we suggest that status inconsistency across social class can be related to distinctive lifestyles among status groups in Korea. In the course of rapid industrialization and economic growth, most social classes experience upward mobility especially through intergenerational mobility. Social mobility means a change of social position or status among individuals and groups. The status aspiration related to motivation in social mobility brings about some pressure to maximize the status rank. The status aspiration is sufficient to become motivation for social mobility. When an individual experiences social mobility in the dimension of status, the status equilibrium is destroyed. Generally, a shift in an aspect of status hierarchy occurs far in advance of others, and the remaining aspects of status hierarchy appear to change subsequently. Hence, each dimension of status hierarchies reaches a similar position. Thus, the faster industrialization or economic development occurs in a certain society, the more difficult it is to maintain the status equilibrium among the members in the society. Social mobility tends to result in status inconsistency (Yang, 2005).

As such, status consistency and inconsistency do not have straightforward implications in understanding the dimension of social status. Imbalance or inconsistency in the vertical dimension of status hierarchies seems to explain the differences in diverse attitudes and behaviors (Lenski, 1954; Jackson, 1962; Fauman, 1968; Segal, 1969). However, the findings of empirical studies on the status inconsistency are not always coherent. Moreover, the usefulness of the concept of status inconsistency itself has been questioned (Meyer and Hammond, 1971). Nevertheless, difficulties related to researches

on status inconsistency are integrated into the methodological problems, which should be separated from the theoretical advantage (Wilson, 1979). If the conditions under which the dimension of status inconsistency results in certain attitudes and behaviors in a specific context were explored, the concept of status inconsistency would have explanatory force (Yang, 2005).

The present paper examines the relationship between status inconsistency and lifestyle focusing on cultural capital and social capital. This paper attempts to answer the following questions. First, does each group categorized by socio-economic hierarchies practice a distinctive lifestyle? Second, does status inconsistency affect a lifestyle in terms of social capital and cultural capital?

#### FORMS OF STATUS INCONSISTENCY

Lenski originally argued that status inconsistency is related to political liberalism, without status dimensions or patterns of inconsistency involved. After both Jackson (1962) and Treiman (1966) called attention to the importance of ethnic status in Lenski's analysis (1967), he acknowledged that the association existed primarily with sharp discrepancies between ethnic and socioeconomic statuses, and not with inconsistencies limited to such socioeconomic indicators as occupation, education, and income. To theoretically explain this pattern of socioeconomic-ethnic status inconsistency, most writers distinguish between achieved statuses (such as education, occupation, and income) and ascribed statuses (such as race, religion, or nationality). As first suggested by Goffman (1957), specified more precisely by Jackson (1962), adopted by Lenski (1964), elaborated by Segal and Knoke (1968), and used by all subsequent writers, this paper argues that status inconsistency will have political consequences only when it involves sharply disparate achieved and ascribed statuses. This particular pattern of status inconsistency was emphasized by Treiman (1966), who pointed out that the three statistically significant relationships in Lenski's original data all combined high socioeconomic status with low ethnic status (Olsen and Tully, 1972). However, Korea is relatively ethnic-homogeneous and has experienced rapid industrialization, and it appears that the achieved statuses are more important than ascribed statuses. Thus, in this paper, achieved statuses such as income and education are the main factors in analyzing status inconsistency. Those whose educational level falls below high school graduation are classified into 'low education group' and college graduates and higher into the 'high education group' in terms of the educational dimension. Those whose monthly household income is under 4

		Monthly household income	
		Under 4 million won	Above 4 million won
Education	Below high school graduates	Low education -Low income group	Low education -High income group
	Beyond college graduates	High education -Low income group	High education -High income group

FIGURE 1. HOUSEHOLD GROUPS BY INCOME AND EDUCATION

million won are classified into the 'low income group' and those exceeding 4 million won are placed in the high income group in terms of income level.<sup>1</sup>

Four types of groups distinguished by status are suggested in Figure 1.

#### RELEVANT VARIABLES ON SOCIAL CAPITAL AND CULTURAL CAPITAL

Bourdieu argues that social life can be conceived as a multidimensional status game in which people draw on three different types of resources which he terms economic, cultural, and social capital to compete for status (Bourdieu, 1984). Economic capital describes financial resources. Social capital is related to who you know. It is concerned with the social ties that people can mobilize to their own advantage, that is, relationships, organizational affiliations, networks etc. A well-known example of this is the British "old-boy network," which has assisted in the perpetuation of power among males who attended elite public schools and Oxbridge colleges. These people then go on to become members of the same exclusive "gentleman's club" and gain respective advantages in their peers' spheres of influence such as banking, the church, the military, and the public service. People who have been excluded from these networks find it harder to progress, even though they may be equally talented (Smith, 2001).

Cultural capital consists of a set of socially rare and distinctive tastes, skills, knowledge, and practices. Cultural capital exists in three primary forms: embodied as implicit practical knowledge, skills, and dispositions; objectified in cultural objects; and institutionalized in official degrees and diplomas that certify the existence of the embodied form. Cultural capital is fostered in an over determined manner in the social milieu of the cultural elite: upbringing in families with well-educated parents and formal education at institutions that attract other cultural elites (Holt, 2000).

<sup>1</sup> Four million won somewhat exceeds mean of the monthly income for urban wage earner.

This paper examines the lifestyle in relation to social capital and cultural capital. Social capital consists of personal ties and organizational affiliations such as pseudo-familial groups and voluntary associations. Cultural capital includes participation in high-brow cultural activities, early socialization on art and high-status cultural activities, and prestigious material possessions as a status symbol. In this paper, cultural capital implies more extensive meaning including cultural consumption and consumption for status, such as prestigious material possessions as well as high-brow cultural activities.

(1) Early socialization on art and cultural activities is measured by the following: the experience of watching movies in the cinema with family under 20 years old, the experience of watching theater or live performances of popular music with family under 20 years old, the experience of attending classical music concerts including opera and musical with family under 20 years old, the experience of visiting museums and art exhibitions with family under 20 years old, the possession of the art objects in the home.

(2) Participation in cultural activities consists of the following: the frequency of watching movies in the cinema in the last 12 months, the frequency of watching theater in the last 12 months, the frequency of attending classical music concerts including opera and musicals in the last 12 months, the frequency of visiting museums or art exhibitions in the last 12 months.

(3) Consumption for status is an index composed of the following: preference for famous brands, intention of travel abroad, preference of one's own style over lower price, lavishness expenditures on favorite specific goods, purchasing goods associated with well-being such as organic food or environmental-friendly agricultural products, taking regular exercise at a fitness center, immediate purchasing of commodities without any previous intention to buy.

(4) Prestigious material possession as a status symbol is a measure of expressing the possession of a luxury car (over 3000 cc), possession of a sports center membership, possession of a golf club membership, and possession of a condominium membership in a resort.

(5) Personal ties consists of a range of professional occupations (including senior officials, lawyers, professors, journalists, medical doctors, managers, officers/police officers, artists, legislators) among close acquaintances, friends, and alumni.

(6) Participation in pseudo-familial groups is an index composed of participation in alumni associations, association of members from the same birth place, family councils and mutual assistance societies.

(7) Participation in voluntary associations is a measure based on

**TABLE 1.** FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS AMONG STATUS GROUPS

Status Groups	Frequency	Percent
'High education-High income' group	674	44.5
'High education-Low income' group	292	19.3
'Low education-High income' group	231	15.2
'Low education-Low income' group	307	20.3
Total	1,504	100

participation in hobbies, sports and leisure fellowship, participation in civic groups, voluntary service groups, interest groups, and community associations.

(8) Total affiliation in groups and associations is an index that combines participation in pseudo-familial groups with participation in voluntary associations.

## DATA AND ANALYSIS

The data are taken from national survey conducted by the Korean Sociological Association in 2006. The population is Koreans who are nineteen years old and above and reside in the nation excluding Jeju Island. A Multi-step stratified sampling method according to area, sex, age, a structured questionnaire, and face-to-face interviews were applied. The sampling error is  $\pm 2.5\%$  (95% confidence level) and the total sample size is 1,515. In this paper the valid sample size is 1,504.

Table 1 presents the frequency distribution among the status groups.

## CULTURAL CAPITAL AMONG STATUS GROUPS

Table 2 present the results of a regression on cultural capital. With a 1% significant level, members belonging to all status groups possess significantly much higher cultural capital and social capital compared with members belonging to the 'low education-low income' group.

Every status group has differences in lifestyle with respect to cultural capital. The 'high education-high income group' is richer in early socialization on art and cultural activities. They participate more in cultural activities and have more prestigious material possessions than any other group. The 'high education-high income' group is the most prestigious



**TABLE 2.** RESULTS OF REGRESSION ON CULTURAL CAPITAL AMONG EACH STATUS GROUP

	Early socialization on art and cultural activities	Participation in cultural activities	Consumption for status	High status material possessions
Age	-.023(-.095)***	-.054(-.313)***	-.115(-.311)***	.000(.005)
Sex	.281(.087)***	.209(.043)	.343(.033)	.106(.091)***
HE-LI group	.943(.230)***	1.304(.212)***	2.097(.160)***	.144(.097)**
LE-HI group	.352(.078)**	.749(.111)***	2.625(.182)***	.287(.176)***
HE-HI group	1.024(.254)***	1.901(.315)***	.805(.295)***	.462(.318)***
R <sup>2</sup> (adj)	.165	.280	.253	.091
_cons	1.690***	7.641***	22.106***	-.004
N	1504	1504	1504	1504

Note: \*\* p<.01 \*\*\* p<.001

Base: low education-low income group

HE-HI group denotes high education-high income group.

LE-HI group denotes low education-high income group.

HE-LI group denotes high education-low income group.

LE-LI group denotes low education-low income group.

group in terms of their lifestyle. They practice a distinctive lifestyle based on cultural capital.

The 'high education-low income' group wishes to resemble the 'high education-high income' group by enjoying high-brow cultural activities and distancing themselves from lower groups. The 'high education-low income' group attempts to elevate their status in order to overcome the unpleasant interactions that originate from status inconsistency. This group participates eagerly in highbrow cultural activities. The 'high education-high income' group shows the highest score in the index on participation in highbrow cultural activities, followed by the 'high education-low income' group, the 'low education-high income,' and finally the 'low education-low income' group. The 'high education-low income' group has high disposition toward consumption for status and has considerable experience in early socialization on art and cultural activities. Thus, this group actively participates in artistic consumption and consumption for status. That is, members of this group pursue status through cultural capital, especially based on artistic consumption.

The 'low education-high income' group also tries to seek status through

distinguished lifestyle. They want to distinguish themselves from the 'low education-low income' group and the 'high education-low income' group. Their selected means of accomplishing this is buying prestigious and expensive material possessions such as luxury cars, golf club memberships, condominium memberships, and fitness center memberships. The 'low education-high income' group wants to compensate for frustration resulting from low education by displaying expensive material possessions and through a comfortable lifestyle.

The 'high education-high income' group has plentiful prestigious material possessions compared to other groups and the 'low education-high income' group ranks next to this group for this measure. The 'low education-high income' group lacks cultural capital compared to 'high education' groups. This is indicated by less frequent participation by the 'low education-high income' group in highbrow cultural activities. Thus, this group distinguishes themselves through high-status material possessions.

The 'low education-low income' group is the most culturally deprived group. The members belonging to this group lack early socialization on art and cultural activities and have lower participation in cultural activities compared to the other groups. They also have a low disposition toward consumption for status and few of prestigious material possessions.

When we control the ascribed factors such as age and sex, cultural capital such as early socialization on art and cultural activities, participation in cultural activities is ranked as follows: 'high education-high income' group > 'high education-low income' group > 'low education-high income' group > 'low education-low income' group. While cultural capital such as consumption for status, and high status material possessions as status symbol is ranked as follows: 'high education-high income' group > 'low education-high income' group > 'high education-low income' group > 'low education-low income' group.

Young people experience abundant earlier socialization on art and cultural activities, participate more frequently in cultural activities and have a more favorable disposition toward consumption for status than older. Females exhibit earlier socialization on art and cultural activities than males.

## SOCIAL CAPITAL AMONG STATUS GROUPS

Table 3 presents the results of a regression on social capital. Controlling ascribed factors such as age and sex, social capital such as personal tie and participation in voluntary associations is ranked as follows: 'high

TABLE 3. RESULTS OF REGRESSION ON SOCIAL CAPITAL AMONG EACH STATUS GROUP

	Personal ties	Participation in pseudo-familial groups	Participation in voluntary associations	Total affiliation in groups and associations
Age	.017(.124)***	.023(.301)***	.006(.107)***	.028(.276)***
sex	-.033(-.009)	-.466(-.233)***	-.089(-.061)*	-.555(-.195)***
HE- LI group	.963(.202)***	.066(.025)	.247(.133)***	.313(.087)**
LE- HI group	.804(.154)***	.312(.107)***	.218(.107)***	.530(.134)***
HE-HI group	1.626(.348)***	.195(.075)**	.309(.169)***	.504(.034)***
R <sup>2</sup> (adj)	.092	.135	.031	.109
_cons	.044	.444***	.125	.569***
N	1504	1504	1504	1504

Note: \*\* p< .01 \*\*\* p<.001; Base: LE-LI group.

education-high income’ group > ‘high education-low income’ group > and ‘low education-high income’ group > ‘low education-low income’ group. In a while social capital such as participation in pseudo-familial groups and total affiliation in groups and associations is ranked as follows: ‘low education-high income’ group > ‘high education-high income’ group > ‘high education-low income’ group > ‘low education-low income’ group.

The ‘high education-high income group’ has the most abundant personal ties and most actively participates in voluntary associations. The status inconsistent ‘low education-high income’ group chooses lifestyle characterized by accumulation of social capital by participation in groups and associations especially in pseudo-familial groups, Among the status groups they most eagerly pursue social capital through participation in pseudo-familial groups and voluntary associations. Hence their total affiliation is composed of the largest number of groups and associations. Owing to their lack of educational capital, social capital must be invested profitably.

Past research findings on status inconsistency indicating that status inconsistent groups usually withdraw and isolate from voluntary associations are not applied to Korean society. The ‘high education-low income’ group participates least frequently in pseudo-familial groups among all groups and does not actively take part in voluntary associations in comparison with the ‘high education-high income’ and ‘low education-high income’ groups. However, the ‘high education-low income’ group exhibits a

relative low frequency of participation in groups and associations, and it cannot be said that this group is isolated in the dimension of organizational affiliations.

Considering age and sex, social capital presents an opposite trend relative to cultural capital. The older members have more abundant personal ties and more actively participate in pseudo-familial groups and voluntary associations than the younger members. Meanwhile, males participate more eagerly in pseudo-familial groups and voluntary associations than females.

### LIFESTYLES AMONG STATUS GROUPS

Table 4 presents the result of serial regression on cultural capital and social capital among the status groups. The results show the relative ranking with respect to cultural capital and social capital among the status groups.

Each status group presents differentiation of lifestyle with respect to

**TABLE 4.** RELATIVE RANKING ON CULTURAL CAPITAL AND SOCIAL CAPITAL AMONG STATUS GROUPS

	'High education-High income' group	'Low education-High education' group	'High education-Low income' group	'Low education-Low income' group
Early socialization on art and cultural activities	Very much	Somewhat much	Much	Not too much
Participation in cultural activities	Very much	Somewhat much	Much	No too much
Consumption for status	Fairly much	Somewhat much	Somewhat much	Not too much
High-status material possessions	Very much	Much	Somewhat much	Not too much
Personal ties	Much	Somewhat much	Somewhat much	Not too much
Participation in personal connection groups	Somewhat much	Fairly much	Somewhat much	Somewhat much
Participation in voluntary associations	Somewhat much	Somewhat much	Somewhat much	Not too much
Total affiliation in organizations	much	Very much	Somewhat much	Not too much

cultural capital and social capital as follows. The 'high education-high income' group ranks highest in all kinds of cultural capital and certain types of social capital such as personal ties and participation in voluntary associations. They experienced early socialization on art and cultural activities more widely than any other group and at present actively participate in highbrow cultural activities. They present a disposition toward consumption for status such as preference of famous brands, traveling abroad, playing golf, membership in fitness centers and a diet centered on healthful food. They have abundant expensive and prestigious material possessions and affiliations such as luxury cars, golf club memberships, condominium memberships, and fitness center memberships. They also have the richest social capital especially in the personal ties among family members, close friends and alumni engaged in professional occupations. They are inclined to participate eagerly in pseudo-familial groups and to have numerous affiliations in groups and associations. Thus they have the richest cultural capital and social capital among all of the status groups. They pursue an upward directed lifestyle to maintain their higher status and distinguish themselves from other status groups.

The 'high education-low income group' is a status inconsistent group that has relatively high education compared to income and experienced relatively wider early socialization on art and cultural activities than lower education groups. They participate actively in highbrow cultural activities such as attending concerts, the opera, and musicals, and visiting galleries and museums. Although they do not have high income, they have a rather high disposition toward consumption for status. They participate somewhat actively in pseudo-familial group but do not have many affiliations in groups and associations in general. They similarly do not have many personal ties to people engaged in professional occupations among family members or close acquaintances. It appears that they pursue their status largely by cultural capital based on higher education. Hence, participation in highbrow cultural activities and disposition toward consumption for status are essential in distinguishing their lifestyle.

The 'low education-high income' group is another status inconsistent group that has higher income with lower education. They are not well educated and do not have much experience with respect to early socialization on art and cultural activities. Hence, they make use of financial resources to maintain and pursue their status by consumption of prestigious material possessions. In addition, they present differences with regard to social capital from other groups. They do not have abundant personal ties

TABLE 5. LIFESTYLES AMONG STATUS GROUPS

High education- high income group	High education-low income group
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High early socialization on art and cultural activities</li> <li>• Very active in participation in cultural activities</li> <li>• Very active in consumption for status</li> <li>• Abundant prestigious material possessions</li> <li>• Abundant personal ties</li> <li>• Somewhat active in participation in personal connection groups</li> <li>• High total affiliation in groups and associations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High early socialization on art and cultural activities</li> <li>• Active in participation in cultural activities</li> </ul>
Low education- high income group	Low education-low income group
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abundant prestigious material possessions</li> <li>• Very active in participation in personal connection groups</li> <li>• High total affiliations in groups and associations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Somewhat active in participation in pseudo-familial groups</li> </ul>

but more eagerly participate in pseudo-familial groups. They have the highest amount of affiliations in all sorts of groups and associations. Thus high-status expensive material possessions and social capital such as participation in groups and associations are the preferred lifestyle for this status inconsistent group.

The 'low education-low income' group is the most deprived group both in status hierarchies and lifestyle. They are the poorest in cultural capital and social capital. However, this group presents relatively active participation in pseudo-familial groups such as alumni associations, association of members from the same birth place, family councils and mutual assistance societies. They are limited in artistic consumption, consumption for status and prestigious material possessions due to lower education and income. Hence, it is assumed that participation in pseudo-familial group is an alternative lifestyle that they choose to compensate for their inferior status.

## CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

Since Lenski proposed the "non-vertical dimension of status," the theory of status crystallization has been employed in attempts to account for patterns of participation in voluntary associations (Lenski, 1956), variance in psychosomatic symptom levels (Jackson, 1962), choice of religious style

(Demerath, 1965) and suicide rates (Gibbs and Martin, 1959) among other phenomena.

This paper examines the relationship between status inconsistency and lifestyle among the status groups. The results show that each status group, classified by a combination of education and income, has a distinctive lifestyle in terms of cultural capital and social capital. To summarize, the 'high education-high income' group is the richest group in cultural capital. They experienced earlier socialization on art and cultural activities than any other group. They participate most eagerly in cultural activities and they have the most abundant personal ties and prestigious material possessions. The 'high education-low income' group is a status inconsistent group that is richer in cultural capital than the 'low education' group. They try to distance themselves from the lower education group through cultural capital. They are active in artistic consumption such as participating in highbrow cultural activities. Thus artistic consumption is one of the major activities to maintain and pursue status in their lifestyle. The 'low education-high income' group is a status inconsistency group that is poor in cultural capital. They participate less actively in cultural activities than high-education groups. This group exhibits their status through expensive and prestigious material possessions. Social capital is the most important resource to pursue status in their life style. Their personal ties are not vast but they most actively participate in pseudo-familial groups and have the most abundant total affiliations in groups and associations. Thus, they distinguish themselves through high-status material possessions and social capital. The 'low education-low income' group is the poorest in cultural capital and social capital. However, they do not withdraw from the social relations, but they rather eagerly participate in pseudo-familial groups.

Generally the social capital is the preferred alternative resource for 'low education' groups and the cultural capital is the most available resource for 'high education' groups. Hence it assumes that cultural capital and social capital operate as alternative resources to elevate social status among the status groups. Especially artistic consumption, prestigious material possessions for status symbol, affiliations of organizations appear to be the significant factors that represent the distinctive lifestyle among the status inconsistent groups. This result suggests that status inconsistency affects not only individual aspects such as political attitude and psychosomatic symptom but also collective character such as lifestyle.

## REFERENCES

- Bauman, Karl E. 1967. "Status Inconsistency, Unsatisfactory Social Integration and Common Means of Resolution." *Research Reports in Social Sciences*.
- Beteille, Andre. 1996. "The Mismatch between Class and Status." *The British Journal of Sociology* 47(3): 513-525.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Brandmeyer, Gerard. 1965. "Status Inconsistency and Political Behavior: a Replication and Extension of Research." *Sociological Quarterly* 6 (July): 241-256.
- Broom, Leonard and F. Lancaster Jones. 1970. "Status Consistency and Political Preference: the Australian Case." *American Sociological Review* 35 (Dec): 989-1001.
- Demerath N. J. 1965. *Social Class in American Protestantism*. Rand McNally & Co.
- DiMaggio, Paul. 1987. "Classification in Art." *American Sociological Review*, 52(August).
- DiMaggio, Paul and Michael Useem. 1978. "Social Class and Art Consumption: The Origins and Consequences of Class Differences in Exposure to the Art in America." *Theory and Society* 5.
- Fleishman, John and Gerald Marwell. 1977. "Status Congruence and Associativeness: A Test of Galtung's Theory." *Sociometry* 40(1): 1-11.
- Galtung, Johan. 1966. "Rank and Social Integration: A Multi-dimensional Approach." J. Bayer et al., eds., *Sociological Theories in Progress* 1. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Gans, Herbert. 1974. *Popular Culture and High Culture*. New York: Basic.
- Geschwender, James A. 1967. "Continuities in Theories of Status Consistency and Cognitive Dissonance." *Social Forces* 46(2): 160-171.
- Gibbs Jack P. and Walter T. Martin. 1958. "A Theory of Status Integration and Its Relationship to Suicide." *American Sociological Review* 23 (April): 140-47.
- Goffman, Irwin. 1957. "Status Consistency and Preference for Change in Power Distribution." *American Sociological Review* 22 (June): 275-81.
- Hall, John R. 1992. "The capital(s) of Cultures: A Nonholistic approach to Status Situations, Class, Gender, and Ethnicity." M. Lamont and M. Fournier, eds., *Cultivating Differences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hartman, Moshe. 1974. "On the Definition of Status Inconsistency," *The American Journal of Sociology* 80(3).
- Hodge, Robert W. 1962. "The Status Consistency of Occupational Groups." *American Sociological Review* 27(3): 336-343.
- Holt, Douglas. 2000. "Does Cultural Capital Structure American Consumption?" Juliet B. Schor and Douglas B. Holt, eds., *The Consumer Society Reader*. New York: New Press.
- Hong, Doo-Seung. 2005. *The Middle Class in Korea*. Seoul: Seoul National University Press. (in Korean)
- Hong, Doo-Seung and Hagen Koo. 1993. *The Theory of Social Stratification and Class*. Seoul: Dasan. (in Korean)
- Hsiao, Micheal H. 1993. *Discovery of the Middle Classes in East Asia*. Taipei: Academia Sinica.
- Jackson, Elton F. 1962. "Status Consistency and Symptoms of Stress." *American*



- Sociological Review* 27 (August): 469-80.
- Katz-Gerro, Tally. 2002. "Highbrow Cultural Consumption and class Distinction in Italy, Israel, West Germany, Sweden and the United States." *Social Forces* 81(1): 207-229.
- Kelly, K. Dennis and William J. Chambliss. 1966. "Status Consistency and Political Attitudes." *American Sociological Review* 31 (June): 375-82.
- Kim, Moon Jo. 2008. *The Polarization of Korean Society*. Seoul: Jipmoondang. (in Korean)
- Lamont, Michele. 1989. "The Power-Culture Link in a Comparative Perspective." *Comparative Social Research* 11. JAI Press.
- Landecker, Werner S. 1963. "Class Crystallization and Class Consciousness." *American Sociological Review* 28(2): 219-229.
- Laumann, Edward O and David R. Segal. 1971. "Status Inconsistency and Ethnoreligious Group Membership as Determinants of Social Participation and Political Attitude." *American Journal of Sociology* 77 (July): 36-60.
- Lenski, Gerhard E. 1954. "Status Crystallization: a Non-vertical Dimension of Social Status." *American Sociological Review* 19(4).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1956. "Social Participation and Status Crystallization." *American Sociological Review* 21(4).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1967. "Status Inconsistency and the Vote: a Four Nation Test." *American Sociological Review* 32 (April): 298-301.
- Meyer, J. W. and P. E. Hammond. 1971. "Forms of Status Inconsistency." *Social Forces* 50: 91-101.
- Mitchell, Robert Edward. 1964. "Methodological Notes on a Theory of Status Crystallization." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 28(2): 315-325.
- Segal, David R. 1969. "Status Inconsistency, Cross Pressures and American Political Behavior." *American Sociological Review* 34 (June): 352-359.
- Segal, David R. and David Knoke. 1968. "Social Mobility, status inconsistency, and Partisan realignment in the United States." *Social Forces* 47 (Dec): 154-157.
- Smith, Philip. 2001. *Cultural Theory: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Smith, Thomas S. 1969. "Structural Crystallization, Status Inconsistency and Political Partisanship." *American Sociological Review* 34(6).
- Stryker, S. and A. S. Macke. 1978. "Status Inconsistency and Role Conflict." *Annual Review of Sociology* 4: 57-90.
- Treiman, Donald J. 1966. "Status Discrepancy and Prejudice." *American Journal of Sociology* 6 (May): 651-664.
- Weber, Max. 1978. *Economy and Society*, ed. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wilson, K. L. 1979. "Status inconsistency and the Hope technique 1: the Grounds or a Resurrection." *Social Forces* 57: 1229-1247.
- Yang, Chun. 2005. *Introduction to Social Stratification*. Seoul: Min-Young Sa. (in Korean)
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2000. *Structure and Dynamics of Stratification in Korean Society*. Seoul: Korea University Press. (in Korean)
- Zablocki, Benjamin D. and Kanter Rosabeth Moss. 1976. "The Differentiation of Life-Styles." *Annual Review of Sociology* 2: 269-298.

**NAM EUN-YOUNG** is affiliated with the Institute for Social Development and Policy Research, Seoul National University. She received her Ph. D in Sociology from Seoul National University. Her research interests include sociology of consumption, cultural sociology, and social stratification.