

‘Anything but heavy meal’ – Culinary dislikes and patterned intolerance among the young urban Finns / Lindblom, Taru; Mustonen, Pekka

Abstract

Perceiving various lifestyles as unpleasant is considered as an indicator of symbolic boundaries distinguishing between social groups. This article examines culinary dislikes covering various cuisine types. Using Finnish data collected among young urban adults (n = 1706), we find that disliking various cuisine types (19 in total) is particularly patterned and somewhat determined by socio-demographic factors. Dislikes are clustered according to legitimacy and exoticness in four components: ‘Culinary canon’, ‘Fast and Convenient’, ‘Ethnic’ and ‘Familiar’. Furthermore, a large group of categorical tolerant people is observed. As expected, socially more ‘well-to-do’ groups show less dislike towards various cuisines types. However, higher statuses are selective and very specific in terms of certain dislikes thus showing signs of patterned intolerance (à la Bryson). The highly educated dislike particularly less cuisine types belonging to ‘Culinary canon’, whereas ‘Fast and Convenient’ are clearly less tolerated. Categorical tolerance towards food is more a sign of cultural goodwill than new form of omnivorousness.

Keywords

food taste, culinary dislike, cultural capital, distinction, Finland, patterned intolerance, categorical tolerance

Résumé

Concevoir certains modes de vie comme étant désagréables est perçu comme pouvant être un indicateur des barrières symboliques distinguant les groupes sociaux. Cet article étudie les aversions culinaires à partir d’une multitude de types de cuisine. Utilisant des données finlandaises collectées auprès de jeunes adultes urbains (n = 1706), nous constatons que le fait de ne pas aimer tel ou tel type de cuisine (19 au total) obéit à un schéma particulier et quelque peu déterminé par des facteurs socio-démographiques. Les aversions sont rassemblées en fonction de leur légitimité et de leur exotisme en quatre composants : ‘le canon culinaire’, ‘rapide et pratique’, ‘ethnique’ et ‘familier’. Par ailleurs, un groupe important de personnes étant systématiquement tolérantes a pu être observé. Comme il était attendu, les groupes socialement plus aisés montrent moins d’aversion envers différents types de cuisine. Toutefois, les individus appartenant aux statuts sociaux les plus élevés sont aussi sélectifs et très spécifiques lorsqu’ils n’apprécient pas un type de cuisine en particulier, montrant dès lors des

signes d'intolérance spécifique / fragmentée (à la Bryson). Plus particulièrement, les plus éduqués n'aime pas un nombre réduit de types de cuisine appartenant aux 'canons culinaires', tandis que ceux faisant partie de la catégorie 'rapide et pratique' sont de façon évidente moins tolérés. La tolérance absolue envers tout type de nourriture constitue plus un signe de bonne volonté culturelle qu'une nouvelle forme d'omnivorerie.

Mots-clés

goût culinaire, aversion culinaire, capital culturel, distinction, Finlande, intolérance spécifique, tolérance absolue

Introduction

Individuals posit themselves into society by adapting their consumption behaviour, both intentionally or unintentionally (e.g. Bocoock, 1993; Miles, 1998). Social groups tend to emulate valued preferences, generally those held by people in higher social positions. Even if the values are not reflected in their realised behaviour, it is still very likely that they affect the expressed preferences of those individuals. This has become clearly visible in studies asking people about their cultural consumption, healthy living habits, and many other accounts regarding everyday consumption (e.g. Mick, 1996). People tend to make choices according to what they regard to be socially desirable or appropriate for their status. These consumption choices reflect taste patterns, attitudes and values, which in turn translate into different positions in social hierarchy, as Pierre Bourdieu (1984) observed decades ago.

Accordingly, people tend to express positive attitude (i.e. liking) in a relatively indiscriminate manner. Although preferences have been the main focus under scrutiny in literature regarding taste, sociological scholarship has recurrently affirmed that negative taste (i.e. disliking) creates distinctions to at least the same degree as liking (e.g. Bryson, 1996; see also Purhonen, 2011). Bourdieu (1984: 56) has noted that for individuals of higher status, the exclusion from other fractions is made primarily through negation, by expressing *dislike* towards the preferences for lower level tastes. Elaborating on this, in a study on symbolic boundaries, Bethany Bryson (1996) claimed that by embracing a wide variety of cultural genres the modern elite fractions tend to show 'patterned tolerance'. Her research (1996) showed, however, that despite of being open to diversity, the elite classes still draw strict symbolic boundaries by excluding some particular (often only one or two) genres by expressing

dislike or suspicion. Consequently, having negative attitudes towards something is clearly more of a rigid statement.

The preferences and dislikes reflect the symbolic boundaries that are drawn between status groups from different echelons of society. Symbolic boundaries are capable of maintaining social differences between various relevant social cleavages. They are ‘conceptual distinctions’ and ‘objectified forms of social differences’ (Lamont & Molnár, 2002: 168) that portray social realities in very different light according to gender, class, ethnicity or place of residence. The social boundaries come about in form of unequal access to and unequal distribution of resources. Good examples of this are repeatedly found in studies regarding cultural consumption, taste and knowledge (e.g. Daenekindt, 2018; Purhonen & Heikkilä, 2017).

Here, we study various cuisine types, as we regard food as representing a cultural realm that is ostensibly democratic and is accessible to all (at least in affluent highly developed countries), while still providing cultural versatility through its numerous forms. In spite of the fact that certain structural elements will, of course, affect one’s choices and preferences (e.g. Räsänen, 2003), even the most legitimate food products are available to almost everyone (Lindblom & Mustonen, 2015).

Variety and openness: cultural capital and taste

In *Distinction*, Bourdieu (1984) portrayed a variety of lifestyles, ranging from the spheres of cultural practices to fashion choices and diet preferences. He found clear differences between social fractions, and he also discovered that the execution of taste seemed to be hierarchically structured across the spheres and along the same social cleavages. This *homology* was found to be fuelled by two things: the amount and composition of economic and cultural capital. Through their capacity to employ aesthetic distinctions, the dominant classes were seen to be able to reproduce unequal cultural resources between the classes, even in such subtle matters as food choices or bodily posture.

Those with the optimal combination of capitals form the highest classes (Bourdieu, 1985; Allington, 2011). These elite groups have the ability to determine the legitimate forms of preference and thus their ‘culture helps them both to dominate and to legitimate their domination’ (Erickson, 1996: 218). As Bourdieu explains, taste is ‘the faculty of perceiving flavours’ and ‘the capacity to discern aesthetic values,’ which are directly ‘linked to a sense of the social structure’ (Bourdieu, 1984: 474). People with average taste and cultural goodwill maintain interest in more common goods and other

goods they consider worth exploring in a social sense, whilst those with popular (vulgar) taste choose only the necessary. Bourdieu (1985) sees the status struggle becoming the most evident between and within the middle and dominant classes. Through cultural goodwill the classes are aiming to climb up the social hierarchy by emulating the tastes of their upper fractions. In other words, preferences are moulded according to the direction that is seen favourable in given social context.

When identity, status and cultural capital are examined, it has been noticed that food-related consumption is probably one of the best indicators (Warde & Martens, 2000; Johnston & Baumann, 2010; Cappeliez & Johnston, 2013; Karsten, Kamphuis & Remeijnse, 2015). Interpreting Bourdieu (1985), taste for food and music are the most fundamental tastes there are. He asserts that it is possible to determine an individual's social class and status through interpreting their food taste (1985: 138) and, by examining tastes, it is possible to go deeper beyond stereotypical elite versus the common people comparisons.

These notions suggest that food taste serves as a relevant object in the examination of symbolic boundaries. A wide palate that embraces various tastes, cuisines and foodstuffs from several cultures is usually seen as a socially favourable feature (see Peterson, 2004 for a further discussion of cultural taste in general). This kind of cosmopolitan 'ethos', which highlights cultural diversity and openness, becomes very concrete in food taste and consumption (Hannerz, 2005: 200; Ollivier, 2008; Cappeliez & Johnston, 2013). Most studies attach tolerant attitudes, wide acceptance towards different cultural forms (*omnivorousness*) or the origin of cultural forms (*cosmopolitanism*) to elite or upper social statuses with education being the central determinant (Hannerz, 1990; Van Eijck, 2000; Lamont & Aksartova, 2002; Peterson, 2004; Willekens & Lievens, 2015). Those who can tolerate and be at ease with diversity are the ones who have the best knowledge on what the new hierarchies are and on what they can be based (Bourdieu, 1984; see also Lash, 1995: 289; Michael, 2015). They are also able to make aesthetic judgments because of their accumulated cultural capital.

In general, it seems that people who are better educated tend to show signs of omnivorous taste, meaning that they are very open to a variety of cuisines and gourmet tastes (e.g. Cappeliez & Johnston, 2013: 437). Traditionally these omnivores have been regarded as being capable of evaluating nuances based on their own legitimate taste (Peterson & Kern, 1996). In the same vein, people with a lower level of education or those in less favourable social positions often report not liking or even loathing some, or many types, of food (Warde, 2011; see also Lindblom & Mustonen, 2015 for a discussion on legitimate cuisines).

The role of income is also crucial and becomes concrete when considering the obstacles between preferences and real consumption choices. In this way, economic capital simply determines a great deal of the distance from necessity (Bourdieu (1985: 177), whereas combinations of capitals determine the nuances.

According to Gerry Veenstra (2005: 248) taste reflects class divisions, but education and income are not necessarily the only determinants that create the distinctions. Thus, in addition to traditional divisions based on education, profession, and other central socio-demographic factors, the formation of cultural and symbolic capital must be seen as being part of a more complicated process. In today's world, the possibilities and abilities to gain knowledge and receive information are the most important symbols of social status (Van Eijck & Bargeman, 2004). Distinctive consumption is possible only if a person has enough knowledge to recognise these distinctions (Berghman & Van Eijck, 2009: 351). In this sense, it is the balance between different types of capital that enable individuals to achieve the most powerful taste pattern. This power is emphasised in the consumer society due to the high abundance of choices.

Dislike, cultural hostility and patterned tolerance

'It is no accident that, when they [tastes] have to be justified, they are asserted purely negatively, by the refusal of other tastes. In the matters of taste, more than anywhere else, all determination is negation; and tastes are perhaps first and foremost distastes.' (Bourdieu, 1984: 56)

Bourdieu (1985:138) considers that perceiving various lifestyles as unpleasant is the most evident construction behind boundaries that distinguish the classes from each other. It is easier to say what is not liked –usually preferences of the 'others' (1985: 146). Findings regarding musical tolerance concur with this assertion: what people report not liking is in fact more revealing and socially discriminating than the things they prefer. Bryson (1996) argues that distinctions are more grounded and empirically detectable through the examination of dislikes than likes. In her study on musical genre preference among social classes, Bryson found that middle class individuals with high education tend to shun a certain, although only one, music genre (that is, heavy metal). This was seen to be due to the values the genre seemed to be inscribed with. According to the study, the classes which expressed the most tolerant attitude towards a wide variety of musical genres were also the

ones with most intolerant or averted stances towards the preferences of the social groups below or far from them in the cultural context. Thus, general tolerance also includes an embedded exclusiveness, although a very carefully targeted one (Bryson, 1996).

Earlier studies report on the reluctance to express dislikes, particularly among the upper class (Wright, Purhonen & Heikkilä, 2013). However, recent studies propose that openness is a feature that reflects the attitudes valued more generally by citizens in Western societies (Daenekind & Roose, 2014). In addition, research on the forms of openness to cultural variety shows that distinctions are built on top of existing hierarchies, and openness is by no means ‘politically innocent’ nor free from social determination (Ollivier, 2008). Roose and colleagues (2012: 497) suggest that openness ‘is a new status marker and, therefore, may function as a means of distinction’. Tolerance and openness may be in fact ‘carefully cultivated status symbols’ (like suggested by Bryson, 1996: 887), which are strategically chosen to comply with the attitudinal atmosphere of the society.

Tolerance can thus be regarded as a value per se. ‘Categorical tolerance’ is essentially related to the discussion on dislikes (Lizardo & Skiles, 2016). Being a general penchant for not refusing any cultural form, categorical tolerance is regarded as becoming a base for a new ethos and new aesthetics of the upper social strata, whose values are based on the openness to cultural diversity (Ollivier, 2008: 122; Roose et al., 2012: 497). Some might even consider the categorical tolerants as heirs of the cultural omnivores. The discussion on categorical tolerance has its roots in Bethany Bryson’s study ‘Anything but Heavy Metal’ (1996). Using the same longitudinal data, Omar Lizardo and Sara Skiles (2016) found that the number of dislikes has decreased steeply over the past three decades, an ever-growing part of the population expressing their taste by categorically refusing to dislike any form of culture. They argued that symbolic exclusion à la Bryson has been replaced by categorical tolerance and that this finding was not only associated with high status; the tendency had increased notably among the non-white non-elite from 1990’s to 2010’s.

In a sense, categorical tolerant people are omnivorous and open to anything. However, the apparent tolerance potentially denotes weak investment in culture or mere indifference, as Ollivier (2008) found, interviewing Canadian omnivores. The interviewees told they liked ‘a bit of everything’ (Ollivier, 2008: 140) and were not keen on elaborating on their preferences. This tendency can also be attributed to insecurity or not having very strong taste (c.f. Sonnett, 2004, about omnivores, quasi-omnivores and indecisives) as they do not ‘stoutly defend’ their tastes but are more insecure and indecisive and thus they resort to having zero dislikes.

Furthermore, it has been suggested that less educated people tend to be culturally hostile, i.e. being suspicious towards products that are derivative of foreign cultures (Douglas, 1996; Warde, 2011). Therefore, in the sphere of food and eating, cultural hostility can become very apparent. In his research, Alan Warde (2011) examined expressed dislikes towards food across social classes. Dislikes for foreign cuisines were assumed to reveal a clear class distinction, and thus create cultural hostility among those who possess less cultural capital or cultural competence. The empirical findings, however, showed no strong dislike patterns. Instead, people with degrees had a smaller number of dislikes, which lent support, to some extent, to the omnivorousness thesis. Existing results on the small or non-existent amount of dislikes have not yet established the relationship between and resemblance to the cultural omnivores.

Following Bourdieu (1984, 1985) and Bryson (1996), we can tentatively claim that taste is actually distaste. Also, what is relevant to our study covering a wide variety of cuisine types, some cuisines being relatively unknown to most of the population, people base their preferences and dislikes on prejudice; on what they think the object represents and symbolizes (Bourdieu, 1985: 144-145).

The Finnish context

In Finland, food culture has evolved rapidly in recent times and, consequently, food-related lifestyle consumption has become very popular. Therefore, discussion about the role of food as a vehicle of social distinction is very topical at the moment (Purhonen & Gronow, 2014; Lindblom & Mustonen, 2015). Sidney Mintz and Christine Du Bois (2002) see that a growing interest in food covering a wide spectrum is due to people being more affluent and mobile than ever. The development of a local, as well as national Finnish gourmet scene is still rather young. In addition to this, the consumer culture in general is, in a way, still taking shape in Finland (Heinonen, 1999; Sarpila, 2013). Furthermore, Finnish cultural identity has a very broad common base, regardless of class –or at least the elite culture is not, in this respect, very visible. Finnish society is not very hierarchical, and despite the growing economic (and social) inequality over the past few decades, the country is still among the most equal in the world with its universal social welfare maintaining good quality of life (OECD, 2018). Education is free of charge from elementary school up to university graduate schools, and the school system has been acclaimed widely by past success in PISA test measuring excellence of teaching (OPH, 2018). Thus, the boundaries of access to economic and cultural capital are generally rather low in Finland and equal opportunities are widely recognised.

There is a lack of literature concerning culinary tastes in Finland. Only a few recent studies scratch the surface of this interesting topic (Purhonen & Heikkilä, 2017; Wright et al., 2013; Purhonen & Gronow, 2014; Lindblom & Mustonen, 2015). In general, studies on cuisine type preferences have been quite scarce for decades in social sciences, yet recently they have witnessed growing interest (Flemmen, Hjellbrekke & Jarness, 2018; Willekens & Lievens, 2015; Atkinson & Deeming, 2015; Warde, Martens & Olsen, 1999; Olsen, Warde & Martens, 2000; Warde & Martens, 2000). Even though research concerning taste patterns and structures has often scrutinised almost anything but food –scholars leaning on distinction theory have mostly addressed taste matters in the field of arts and culture– culinary taste has, however, been considered an important topic.

Research objectives

In this study, the focus is on culinary dislikes. Previous research has recurrently shown that taste preferences are not merely subjective but to a large extent embedded in social determinants. Furthermore, as consumption behaviour is continuously and pervasively inspired by cultural hostility (e.g. Warde, 2011; Bourdieu, 1985) (which in daily life translates into disliking), we want to explore to what extent reporting dislike for some, or even many, cuisine types is socially stratified. Matters of intolerance intertwine with the debates caused by political turmoil too, since there is a reason to assume apparent consequences in attitudinal climate propelled by political developments. Globally, the popularity of national populist right-wing parties have set about the question on the proneness to intolerance and withdrawnness which tend to act as a counter-force to cosmopolitan values (c.f. Purhonen & Heikkilä, 2017).

The aim of this article is to explore the patterned tolerance, or rather intolerance, towards cuisines. This is done, first, by scrutinising the amount of dislikes. Intolerance is considered in the breadth of cuisine dislikes. Second, the patterned intolerance is explored by concentrating on the ways cuisine types form assemblages. Through this, we wish to find various social reasonings for the expressed dislikes. Last, the cuisine dislikes are modelled in order to reveal relevant cleavages and to find out whether different social determinants lead to disliking particular cuisine types.

Based on the existing literature we can assume that the amount of dislikes is greater among the less educated and those in lower income groups, while being lower among those living in urban areas and belonging to creative class. Furthermore, we expect the amount of disliked cuisine types to increase with age.

Furthermore, cuisine dislikes are expected to showcase patterned intolerance. In other words, the cuisine types are disliked differently according to their social appreciation or ‘legitimacy’, and in various ways depending on an individual’s characteristics. Earlier study on cuisine legitimacy proposes that both rare ethnic cuisines (e.g. Korean and African) and cuisines belonging to the ‘Culinary canon’ (fine dining and French) are among the most legitimate types (Lindblom & Mustonen, 2015). American, Scandinavian, and Thai fares belong to the culinary mainstream, whereas fast food was considered both socially undesirable and illegitimate.

It can be assumed, for example, that cuisines considered legitimate (such as fine dining, cf. Lindblom & Mustonen, 2015) have a negative association between disliking and education, income level, and the higher rungs of creative class membership, and inner-city residence. Positive association is expected with these cuisine type dislikes and age. However, in cases where cuisine types are not considered prestigious or legitimate (fast food, pizza etc., see Fig. 1), the association is assumed to be the opposite of what is presented above, in other words associated positively with lower education and income, outside-of-the-city residence and service class membership. Moreover, some cuisine types are assumed to carry other relevant characteristics that may appeal to particular socio-demographics, such as light and ethnic fare to females (cf. Purhonen & Gronow, 2014). In addition, previous literature provides limited assumptions of the conditions explaining the inclination to be ‘categorical tolerants’ (those who have no dislikes at all, cf. Lizardo & Skiles, 2016). However, they are expected to an extent to resemble cultural omnivores, who generally are well off in terms of their cultural and economic capital. The categorical tolerants are thus expected to deviate on many accounts from the other dislike patterns analysed.

Method

Data

In this article we utilise a quantitative data set collected in Helsinki, Finland, during January and February 2013. The data set was gathered using a postal survey, which was also provided as a web-survey for those who preferred to fill-in the questionnaire online. The sample of 4000 people was drawn randomly from among young residents of Helsinki (aged 25 to 44) from the city’s official census. The age range and the emphasis in the sample drawn to inner city residents were determined

by the project objectives the survey was part of. The project explored the lifestyles of young urban families, and thus the respondents were probed among the age group who would most likely have small children (preschool aged and elementary school pupils). The sample was regionally stratified, emphasising inner city neighbourhoods: 37.5% of the sample was from the central inner-city district and another 37.5% from the southern inner-city district. The suburban parts of Helsinki were covered with the remaining 25% of the sample. This allowed the concentration of city-dweller families and their lifestyles. With this uneven emphasis in the sample we wished to gather large enough data on inner city residents. This procedure was known to produce a tilted socioeconomic structure of the respondents, which was intentional and regarded beneficial for the project's aims. However, due to this intentional bias, the results drawn from the data cannot be generalised to all residents of Helsinki (let alone Finland), as the respondents are somewhat better educated than the average.

In addition to the official random sample, the survey was also shared on Facebook and some official sites of the city of Helsinki, and was practically open for anyone interested in taking part. The final sample consists of 1706 respondents, with 1100 of those respondents belonging to the original sample, leading to a final response rate of 27.5%. The demographics of the respondents outside the original sample was, however, very similar to the data obtained through sampling. Thus it was possible to expand the final sample. This was important due to the relatively low original response rate. To correct the bias weigh was used that balanced the unequal distribution of education. The distributions of non-weighed and weighed data are presented in Appendix table A.

Dependent variables: cuisine types

In the questionnaire the respondents were asked to report which types of cuisine they like or dislike. We presented 19 different kinds of cuisine types, ranging from typical home cooking to fine dining, and a variety of ethnic cuisines. These 19 cuisine types are used as our dependent variables. Furthermore, a sum of dislikes is used as a dependent variable as well.

The cuisine types were included in the study based on the representativeness of the following aspects: *region, tradition, convenience, and exotic*. We find that this wide range of cuisines enables us to make assumptions on several social and cultural divisions. For example, home cooking and Scandinavian cooking represent familiar and traditional qualities. They are well known to everyone and encountered on a daily basis in the form of school meals and workplace luncheons. In Finland, despite the latest development in the field (see e.g. Helsinki Streets of Food, 2015), fast food restaurants serve

typical hamburgers and fries, but moreover, there are several kebab places that usually serve inexpensive and rather locally flavoured pizza. Hence, we have two categories with which to represent typical fast food i.e. ‘hamburgers and other fast food’ as well as ‘pizza and kebab’. To add further nuance to the data we collected, we chose to add a category for Italian food, as that also allows for more authentic Italian dishes to be included in palate preferences.

The ethnic and exotic cuisines from the Finnish perspective are the cuisines from Asia (Indian/Nepalese, Chinese, Thai, Korean and sushi/other Japanese) and Africa. Nepalese, Chinese, Thai restaurants and restaurants serving sushi are well represented in the Helsinki food scene, whereas Korean and African fares are less common. These reflect both a varying degree of exoticism and unfamiliarity. The Russian kitchen stands for Slavic cuisine, and American/Tex-Mex represents a rather standardised and convenient family chain restaurant type. To distinguish more authentic fare we added a Mexican or South American kitchen to create a counterpart to American/Tex-Mex cuisine. The Finnish staple cooking method, grilling, was also added as a stand-alone category. We chose not to include ‘vegetarian’ as a cuisine type as it is often found in many of the provided cuisine alternatives. However, in a different set of questions, we did ask whether respondents were vegetarians. Figure 1 illustrates a categorisation from a study (Lindblom & Mustonen, 2015) conducted in Finland regarding the legitimacy of cuisines by classifying the present cuisine types in three categories: legitimate, mainstream and illegitimate. In the referred study, legitimacy ratios were calculated based on likes, which is an established method in the field (see also Warde et al., 2008; Warde & Gayo-Cal, 2009; Purhonen et al., 2010). In the subsequent analyses, the findings will refer to legitimacy categorisation shown in Figure 1.

Independent variables

In order to see which factors account most for the variation in dislikes, we have selected six independent variables: education, age, income, gender, area of residence, and creative class membership. These all have been found to have an important impact on taste and food preference in previous literature.

Education is our primary independent variable, as discussed in the beginning of this piece. The feasibility and importance of education has been demonstrated on several occasions in the studies regarding taste. The variable measuring education has four categories: *Comprehensive*, which corresponds to a nine-year compulsory comprehensive school; *Secondary*, which refers to lower secondary and vocational education; *Lower Tertiary*, which refers to lower academic diplomas achieved from polytechnic universities or universities of applied science, and *University*, referring to

higher academic education, aimed at obtaining a university diploma (M.Sc. or equivalent) or doctorate.

Age is categorised into four five-year brackets. We assume that age brackets reflect different stages of life, as well as potentially various household structures.

We measure *income* as a categorical variable based on monthly income quartiles (euros) of the data. The monthly mean income in our data was rather high, 3837 euros per month (median income was 2600 euros per month). In the population of Helsinki, regardless of age, the mean is a little more than 2500 euros (Helsinki region statistics, 2015. Numbers from 2012), and the following brackets for the quartiles are applied: 1950 euros and less (1st quartile), 1951-2600 euros (2nd quartile), 2601-3700 euros (3rd quartile) and the monthly income above 3700 euros (4th quartile).

Gender is used as a control variable, since it has many times been in association with several cultural cleavages. In addition, in food studies, women and men have found to have differing patterns of preference in terms of healthy, heavy and ethnic dishes (Purhonen & Gronow, 2014).

Area of residence is defined based on the tramline service. This measure has previously proved to capture the essence of 'urban' in the Finnish context (Lindblom & Mustonen, 2015). The variable has two categories: the inner city category for those who dwell in the areas that are operated by the tram network; and the suburban category for those who are out of reach of the tram network. The area covered by the tram network in Helsinki is often regarded in the common speech as the truly inner city. The tram-based measure of inner city roughly coincides with the sampling strategy that emphasizes city-centre dwellers (37.5% plus 37.5% of the inner city sub-samples described above). In Helsinki, and also in the other large cities of Finland, living in the city centre is considered valuable, which is also reflected in the local housing prices. In Finland, city centres provide proper urban life possibilities and differ fundamentally from the suburbs. In Finland, the city centres are a mixture of commercial establishments and residential apartment building blocks. We see that this measure for urbanity can account for a more inclusive attitude and tolerance for foreign cultures, and thus it might prove to be a feasible source for variation when studying dislikes.

Last, to measure *occupational class*, we use a measure of creative class membership. The categorisation takes into account an individual's work position, the level of independence and the job description's relation to cultural, financial or creative industry. The categories are *Creative class*, *Manual class*, *Service class*, and *Undiscerned class*. The original formulation of Richard Florida (2002) has been adapted to make our variable more applicable in the Finnish setting. The official

classification of occupations of Statistics Finland (Statistics Finland, 2018) was used as a reference when the hand coding of the occupation was done. Highest occupation classes (1-2 executives and skilled professionals) were generally categorised in the creative class. In addition, some artisanal occupations (which, in the official typology, fall into the 'lower categories', such as manual workers) were also included in the creative class where these jobs were essentially creative in nature. Typical occupations among the creative class include: researchers, managers, consultants, professionals and artistic occupations (musicians, film, and design industry), and medical doctors. In the service class, the most frequent occupations were sales persons, assisting jobs in large firms and workers in the health and service sector such as nurses or hairdressers. In the official classification these occupations are typically positioned to categories 3-5. Manual class respondents included job titles such as: workers in factories, bus drivers, and storage workers (in the official classification categories 6-9). Very few respondents had an agricultural occupation, so they were classified to manual workers. The undiscerned class consists mainly of students, unemployed or respondents who instead of their occupation reported a university diploma or another status that did not reveal their current occupation.

Analytic technique

The analysis proceeds as follows: first, the distribution and the amount of disliked cuisine types are observed to find out to what extent cuisines are disliked in the first place, and whether some cuisine types stand out more than others. Then, in order to find out the potential patterning of the cuisine dislikes CATPCA modelling is conducted. This method takes into account the categorical (dichotomous) nature of our dependent variable (dislike of cuisine type = 1, liking or ambivalence towards the cuisine type = 0). The method clusters 'similar types of dislikes' which helps us to assess the various modes of and potentially 'reasons' for dislikes. Of the solutions that had Eigenvalues over 1 for each component, we select the four-component solution due to its relevant theoretical interpretability.

Finally, we proceed to examine which attributes explain the dislike patterns in regard to different cuisine types. This is done by logistic regression analysis where relevant cuisine types arising from the CATPCA modelling are scrutinised. Due to the dichotomous operationalization of the dependent variables ('dislike cuisine X' = 1, 'like' or 'do not know' = 0) the last analyses are conducted for selected cuisine types by using logistic regression. We estimate models to predict the 'likelihood,' or

'risk' of disliking individual cuisine types from a set of independent variables. Tables 4 (cuisine dislikes) and 5 (categorical tolerance) present the adjusted effects of the independent variables (IV) with the odds ratios (OR), so in other words, the models control for all the six IV simultaneously. We also report the chi-squares (χ^2) for each independent variable, and the full model. The variances accounted for in the models are interpreted using Nagelkerke's pseudo-coefficients of the determination. A pseudo-coefficient of the determination provides an approximation of the strengths of associations between variables.

Results: Patterned intolerance of cuisines types

Table 1 presents cuisine types in descending order based on dislike. The proportions of like and ambivalence ('I am not able to decide between liking or disliking') are also portrayed. Overall, the proportions of dislikes remained generally quite low. The percentages ranged from 3% of home cooking to 30% of fast food. Fast food, sushi and Russian cuisine are the most disliked. These are followed by fine dining, American, African and Korean cuisine. Interestingly, the most disliked cuisine types represent quite a large spectrum, and their level of legitimacy varies notably (c.f. Lindblom & Mustonen, 2015, note also Figure 1 above). Home cooking, Scandinavian cuisine and Italian cuisine are the least disliked. The order of dislikes is not identical with the (least) legitimacy nor is it a pure mirror image of the likes. Some of the most legitimate cuisines are also among the ones most widely disliked (such as sushi). Also, African and Korean cuisines have the lowest proportions in terms of popularity (likes) yet they are not nearly the most disliked cuisines, either. Rather, they are not quite widely known in Finland, and thus perceived in an ambivalent or ignorant manner. Hence, the examination of dislikes is bound to yield dissimilar results rather than the examination of likes would. This strengthens the justification of the article's aim to concentrate particularly on culinary *dislikes*, rather than likes.

<Table 1 here>

The respondents are rather multi-liking in their food preferences and they tend not to show very much aversion towards most of the cuisine types presented in the questionnaire. Of 19 different cuisine types, respondents liked, on average, 13.8 cuisine types while, on average, only 2.6 cuisine types were disliked.

What explains the breadth of cuisines dislikes then? This can be answered with an analysis of variance (ANOVA). The method helps us to find out what factors determine the overall level of dislike. Table

2 presents the unadjusted effects of each independent variable for the amounts of dislike.

<Table 2 here >

To summarize the results presented in Table 2, disliking increases with age. In general, also, the higher the income the fewer culinary dislikes. People living in the city centre have fewer dislikes. The difference between genders is also clearly significant, and female respondents dislike more cuisine types. Occupational class is also clearly associated with the number of dislikes, creative class members having the smallest amount of disliked cuisine types. Among service class respondents, the number of disliked cuisine types is accordingly greater. The effect of education is less straightforward though. Respondents with secondary level degree have clearly the most dislikes. What is potentially of more interest, however, is that more than 29% of the respondents *do not dislike any cuisine type*. This pattern was first identified by Omar Lizardo and Sara Skiles (2016), who named it ‘categorical tolerance’. It will be scrutinised further, together with patterned intolerance in the next section.

Next, to unfold the potential patterned intolerance, we explore the cuisine dislikes with principal component analysis (for categorical variables: CATPCA). Four principal components are observed from the set of culinary dislikes (Table 3, components shown as bolded loadings). The first component, ‘Culinary canon/classics’, is clearly distinctive in terms of representing the ‘highbrow of the culinary world’. The cuisines loaded to this component are mainly the same that form the basis of the formal chef training. The component consists of fine dining, and several European national cuisines (French, Italian, Mediterranean that can include both the former plus most likely Greek and Spanish cuisines, and Russian) and a classic of a sort, Japanese cuisine. Many restaurants representing these cuisines might possess ‘particularities of a cultural context’, such as acquired knowledge of etiquette or other proper ways of conduct, that may suggest some social exclusion as they ‘allow some to identify others as outsiders’ (Daenekindt, 2018: 2).

<Table 3 >

The second component includes a myriad of cuisines that can be labelled under one, a rather dismissive term: ‘ethnic’. However, the component is a continuum of exoticness and ethnicity in the Finnish foodscape with representatives that were established several decades ago (such as Chinese) and relative new comers in the field (such as Korean, and even more recently, African cuisines). Of all the components, cuisines in the ‘Ethnic component’ vary most in terms of their legitimacy. Earlier

studies on polarisation of food tastes typically present ‘exotic’ as one of the axis along which tastes are clustered (e.g. Atkinson & Deeming, 2015; Purhonen & Heikkilä, 2017).

The third component is composed of items that cannot necessarily all be regarded as cuisines types in their own right (but rather cooking methods or dishes). What they have in common though, is their convenience; the ease of acquisition of these types of foods, and the relative looseness of social etiquette governing the eating of these foods. The component is thus labelled ‘Fast and Convenient’. This component includes pizza, grilled food, fast food, and American/Tex-Mex. These cuisine types are positioned in the lowest rungs of the cuisine legitimacy hierarchy. Some earlier studies have found somewhat a comparable dimension, having typically emphasised ‘heaviness’ and traditional, with often meat-based elements (e.g. Purhonen & Heikkilä, 2017.)

The fourth component, ‘Familiar’, has only two cuisines, Scandinavian and home cooking. Rather surprisingly, Scandinavian cuisine is not included in the ‘Culinary canon’ component, although it is one of the most prominent forms of acclaimed haute cuisine (cf. the ‘Nordic’ or ‘New Nordic’ cuisine style represented most outstandingly by the former three Michelin star restaurant, the Danish ‘Noma’). Instead, it forms its own component together with the very down to earth, mundane and everyday cuisine of home cooking. This component is seen to reflect qualities such as familiar and close, which evidently explains the exclusion of Scandinavian cuisine from the ‘Culinary canon’ component, as it is disliked by practically no one. Earlier research often clusters traditional and familiar dimension with heavy meats (c.f. Purhonen & Gronow, 2014).

Next, we proceed to model dislikes with logistic regression. Representatives from each component except for ‘familiar’ are included. Familiar component is omitted due to the too small number of dislikes. Instead of analysing the components as a whole, the cuisines are modelled individually as the results were proved to be more meaningful and consistent with individual cuisines. Appendix Tables B1 and B2 present the detailed information of disliked for each cuisine in the questionnaire in each IV category. To exemplify the variation in the resulting effects, two cuisines are selected from ‘Culinary canon’ (fine dining and sushi) to ‘Fast & convenient’ (American and fast food). Indian/Nepalese cuisine represents the ethnic component. In addition, the social bases of the categorical tolerant people are explored here, as it is categorical in nature, and thus not suitable for continuous analyses such as ANOVA.

<Table 4 here>

<Table 5 here>

The models for culinary dislikes are explained by selected independent variables to a relatively modest degree (Nagelkerke coefficient ranging from 8.5 to 14.8. Categorical tolerance had a coefficient of 6.2). This means that in addition to traditional explanations of socio-cultural determinants, there are other dimensions affecting the variance for disliking certain cuisine types. It is very plausible that the small age range and the limited geographical area of our respondents explain the relatively low coefficients: the respondents share several socio-economic conditions due to the selective criterion of the sample. However, the models were able to discern some rather interesting cleavages among the dislikes.

Education is clearly one of the main sources impacting patterned dislikes. The coefficients are the largest in most of the cases (especially throughout the continuum of legitimacy). Education explains dislikes for both cuisines belonging to 'Culinary canon' as well as 'Fast and Convenient' cuisines (Table 3). Also, categorical tolerance is significantly associated with educational level (Table 4). Fast food and American food are disliked far more likely by the highest educated. In Bryson's terms, here is where the upper groups wish to distance themselves most clearly from what is perceived to be part of the lower group taste. For sushi and fine dining, the distinction executed through dislike is less clear. The second tier education dislikes these cuisine types the most, making it seem that the symbolic boundaries for 'class cultures' are set at this level where cultural hostility is the highest. The least dislike of the lowest educated group towards the culinary classics would then be attributed to a sign of cultural goodwill. In the same vein, the lowest educated group is most likely to be categorically tolerant. This suggests that rather than a form of new cultural elite and an 'heir of the omnivore', the categorical tolerant people are more likely those with the most cultural goodwill, i.e. they emulate the socially valuable tastes.

Age is less a source of distinction, and it is clearly shown also that age has an effect only on disliking ethnic and fast food. Individuals in their early 30's dislike Indian cuisine far less than anyone else, whereas fast food is distinctively more disliked the older one gets. Young age also predicts being a categorical tolerant.

Interestingly **income** has an effect on disliking sushi, but not on fine dining. However, the pattern is clear (in both, although with fine dining statistically insignificant): the lower the income, the more likely culinary classics are disliked. Cultural hostility comes about very visibly in these findings. Perhaps, 'Culinary canon' is perceived as being more expensive (which is in most, but not all, cases)

and thus out of reach, and not as pleasant according to lower income individuals. Furthermore, the dislike of American and Tex-Mex cuisine is associated with income, but disliking fast food is not. This suggests that fast and convenient cuisines are perceived in numerous ways. American cuisine is disliked two times more likely by the second income quartile than the fourth quartile. Dislikes towards Indian cuisine are on the contrary lowest in the first and third quartile, and for disliking Indian cuisine, income has the biggest effect in the model (based on χ^2 coefficient). Income has no significant effect on being a categorical tolerant person.

Gender is distinctive in terms of dislikes towards culinary classics and fast and convenient cuisines alike. Just like with education, no clear-cut effects are found between genders regarding ethnic food dislikes. Men dislike far more likely the ‘Culinary canon’, whereas they are less prone to dislike the fast and convenient cuisines. Men are also more likely to be categorical tolerant in their cuisine preferences. Judging by the model χ^2 coefficients, gender’s impact is strongest in disliking fast food and sushi.

Area of residence explains significantly only disliking ethnic cuisine (for which it had a significantly strong effect, based on χ^2 coefficient) and fast food. Indian cuisine was disliked twice as likely by the residents of the suburbs than by inner city dwellers. This lends support to the idea that cosmopolitan values are emphasised in the urban lifestyles (e.g. Karsten et al., 2015) led by people living in city centres. On the contrary, fast food is almost twice as likely disliked by city-dwellers than by suburban respondents. Categorical tolerance is not statistically significantly associated with the area of residence.

Lastly, the effect of **occupational class** is only detected in the dislikes of culinary canon. Based on χ^2 coefficients, occupation’s impact is even stronger than education’s in terms of disliking sushi. The coefficients are the largest in most of the cases (especially across the board of legitimacy). No pronounced distinction is found between occupation and the other cuisines nor categorical tolerance. Creative class members are most likely to dislike least culinary classics. The undiscerned resemble on many accounts the creative class. Service class respondents dislike sushi and fine dining the most, and working class respondents are very similar with them in their dislike patterns.

Conclusions and discussion

This article examined taste through expressed disliking of different cuisine types. Our results indicate that both the amount of respondent’s dislikes and the specific cuisine types dislikes are targeted

towards, and associated with several social conditions. It was assumed that socially more 'well-to-do' groups, particularly those with high education, high income and creative class membership, would be more tolerant regarding their food taste. However, the findings suggest that the higher status groups (especially in terms of education) are selective and very specific in terms of certain dislikes. The occupational class showed less impact than what was expected. In some cases, the upper social status respondents are prone to dislike more than the groups with lesser cultural capital and who have potentially more 'cultural goodwill'. Cultural goodwill, on the other hand, seems to be highlighted in the non-existing dislikes of the lowest educated group, whose dislike towards legitimate cuisines ('Culinary canon') is even half of the dislike for it of the highest educated group. Seemingly in urban Finland among the upper classes (higher education in particular) 'anything but heavy meal', represented by dislikes towards fast and convenient cuisines, is a fitting strategy of taste.

The most disliked cuisines were by far not the least legitimate ones. Cuisines were perceived differently according to socio-demographic features, and what was also found was that dislikes were far less prominent than likes. The studied young urban respondents were in general very tolerant, even to an extreme (accentuated by categorical tolerance). Dislikes are not only based on and patterned along the lines of legitimacy. Social appreciation of cuisines does affect the ways cuisines are disliked, but not exhaustively. CATPCA analysis was conducted in order to find out how the dislikes cluster. An evident pattern emerged. First, some cuisines were perceived in a very neutral manner. Including everyday staple and the cornerstone of the Finnish diet, 'Home cooking' and Scandinavian cuisine, they were cuisines typically liked by the majority, and disliked by only a very few (a cluster which we named 'Familiar'). Second, legitimate cuisines formed their own dimension: 'Culinary canon'. Third, a myriad of exotic cuisines (mainly outside Europe) was clustered into what we called 'Ethnic'. And lastly, cuisines with less legitimacy gravitated towards each other forming a cluster dubbed as 'Fast and Convenient', having fast food as their primary representative.

Although education was not clearly the greatest source of impact on the *amount* of dislikes (but creative class and age were), it explained *patterned intolerance* very neatly along the axis based on legitimacy. 'Culinary canon' was more disliked by low education individuals (not the lowest, though), and convenience foods, on the contrary, by most educated. In this sense, fast food is the 'heavy metal' of culinary world. Education's effect in the models was by far strongest, with some exceptions. To generalise, disliking fast food is clearly gender-related, whereas sushi was mostly associated with occupational class, and fine dining with education.

In the methodological sense the effects remained at a rather low level. However, in each model presented, the statistical significance was observed for some or many social determinants regardless of the fact that our respondents are a very homogenous group to begin with. Should these examinations be at a nationally representative level the effects could surely be expanded. So, the young cohort forming our sample represents what is bubbling under.

The empirical examinations on the categorical tolerant people are still scarce. This article contributes to the understanding of the essence of this, potentially of a new kind of social phenomenon. Juxtaposed to prior knowledge on omnivores and to our findings on culinary dislikes, we argue that, rather than a form of new cultural elite and an 'heir of the omnivore', the categorical tolerant people are more likely those with the most cultural goodwill, i.e. they emulate the socially valuable tastes.

Could our results indicate the existence of social boundaries, social stratification through culinary taste? According to Michèle Lamont and Virág Molnár (2002), the symbolic boundaries are translated into social boundaries after they are widely agreed upon by the social actors, and 'become central in processes of social exclusion' (Daenekindt, 2018: 2). If different social groups differ from each other, and these diverging preferences derive from actual choices (i.e. they dislike what they want to dislike and not what they are expected to dislike), the situation is rather equal. On the contrary however, if preferences differ from actual choices, taste structures maintain inequality and consequently potentially widen the taste gaps and also serve as a basis for polarized lifestyles. To reveal this, information on the reasonings of consumption choices ('*how* is consumed rather than *what* is consumed') is needed, and this shall remain an objective for future studies.

What does it mean that some cuisine types are disliked? What does cultural hostility indicate in current society? Cuisine types provide exceptional material to study patterned (in)tolerance and symbolic boundaries. The contribution of this article is four-fold: first of all, the results indicate clear patterning of culinary dislikes especially based on cultural origin (cuisines representing national states or geographical and cultural areas). Second, it uncovers the various ways social determinants have a say on the patterned intolerance regarding taste. These findings are especially relevant for research on cosmopolitan values as well as cultural stratification and debates on taste. Third, our research sheds light on the particular context of young urban adults, their lifestyles and 'taste making'. The findings prove interestingly the existence of clear traces of Bourdieusian distinction. Although explored in a very specific group of a specific context in this study, the results can be regarded as indicators of emerging patterns of distinction that may eventually diffuse into society at large. Fourth,

the findings regarding relatively large group of 'categorical tolerant' people add to the current debate on cultural taste and general cultural, social and political attitude. Cultural taste reflects interestingly potential new strategies of distinction, and instead of the much-studied musical preferences or general cultural taste, the study of culinary preferences is in its arbitrariness a fertile ground to explore social and cultural stratification.

References

- Allington D (2011) Distinction, intentions, and the consumption of fiction: Negotiating cultural legitimacy in a gay reading group. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 14(2): 129-145.
- Atkinson W, Deeming C (2015) Class and cuisine in contemporary Britain: The social space, the space of food and their homology. *The Sociological Review* 63(4): 876-896.
- Berghman M, Van Eijck K (2009) Visual arts appreciation patterns: Crossing horizontal and vertical boundaries within the cultural hierarchy. *Poetics* 37(4): 348-365.
- Bocock R (1993) *Consumption*. London: Routledge.
- Bourdieu P (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu P (1985) *Sosiologian kysymyksiä*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Bryson B (1996) 'Anything but heavy metal': Symbolic exclusion and musical dislikes. *American Sociological Review* 61(5): 884-899.
- Cappeliez S, Johnston J (2013) From meat and potatoes to 'real-deal' rotis: Exploring everyday culinary cosmopolitanism. *Poetics* 41(5): 433-455.
- Daenekindt S (2018) Out of tune: How people understand social exclusion at concerts. *Poetics* (online version). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2018.12.002>
- Daenekindt S, Roose H (2014) Social mobility and cultural dissonance. *Poetics* 42(1): 82-97.
- Douglas M (1996) *Thought styles: Critical essays on good taste*. London: Sage.
- Erickson BH (1996) Culture, Class and Connection. *American Journal of Sociology* 102 (1): 217-251.
- Flemmen M, Hjellbrekke J, Jarness V (2018) Class, culture and culinary tastes: Cultural distinctions and social class divisions in contemporary Norway. *Sociology* 52(1): 128-149.
- Florida R (2002) *The Rise of the Creative Class. And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community, and Everyday Life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hannerz U (1990) Cosmopolitans and locals in world culture. *Theory, Culture & Society* 7(2-3): 237-251.

- Hannerz U (2005) Two faces of cosmopolitanism: Culture and politics. *Statsvetenskaplig Tidskrift* 107(3): 199-213.
- Heinonen V (1999) Niukkuuden ja kulutuksen mentaliteetit modernisoituvassa Suomessa (The mentalities of scarceness and consumption in modernising Finland). In: Näre S (ed.) *Tunteiden sosiologiaa II. Historiaa ja säätelyä*. Hämeenlinna: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 75-98.
- Helsinki region statistics (2015) Official statistics of Helsinki. Available at: <http://www.aluesarjat.fi> (accessed 15 January 2015)
- Helsinki Streets of Food (2015) Website for promoting street food movement in Helsinki. Available at: <http://www.helsinkistreetsoffood.com> (accessed 5 February 2015).
- Johnston J, Baumann S (2010) *Foodies. Democracy and Distinction in the Gourmet Foodscape*. New York: Routledge.
- Karsten L, Kamphuis A, Remeijnse C (2015) 'Time-out' with the family: The shaping of family leisure in the new urban consumption spaces of cafes, bars and restaurants. *Leisure Studies* 34(2): 166-181.
- Katz-Gerro T (2006) Comparative evidence of inequality in cultural preferences: Gender, class, and family status. *Sociological Spectrum* 26(1): 63-83.
- Lamont M, Aksartova S (2002) Ordinary cosmopolitanisms: Strategies for bridging racial boundaries among working-class men. *Theory, Culture & Society* 19(4): 1-25.
- Lamont M, Molnár V (2002) The study of boundaries in the social sciences. *Annual Review of Sociology* 28: 167-195.
- Lash S (1995) Asiantuntijajärjestelmät vai sitoutunut tulkinta? Kulttuuri ja instituutiot disorganisoidussa kapitalismissa (Original version Reflexive Modernization. Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order). In: Beck U, Giddens A, Lash S (eds.) *Nykyajan jäljillä*. Tampere: Vastapaino, 268-292.
- Lindblom T, Mustonen P (2015) Culinary taste and the legitimate cuisines. *British Food Journal* 117(2): 651-663.
- Lizardo O, Skiles S (2016) The end of symbolic exclusion? The rise of 'categorical tolerance' in the musical tastes of Americans: 1993-2012. *Sociological Science* 3: 85-108.
- Michael J (2015) It's really not hip to be a hipster: Negotiating trends and authenticity in the cultural field. *Journal of Consumer Culture* 15 (2): 163-182.
- Mick DG (1996) Are studies of dark side variables confounded by socially desirable responding? The case of materialism. *Journal of Consumer Research* 23(2): 106-119.
- Miles S (1998) *Consumerism. As a way of life*. London: SAGE.

- Mintz SW, Du Bois CM (2002) The anthropology of food and eating. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31: 99-119.
- OECD (2018) Income Inequality (indicator). Available at: <https://data.oecd.org/inequality/income-inequality.htm> (accessed 5 November 2018).
- Ollivier M (2008) Modes of openness to cultural diversity: Humanist, populist, practical, and indifferent. *Poetics* 36(2-3): 120-147.
- Olsen WK, Warde A, Martens L (2000) Social differentiation and the market for eating out in the UK. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 19(2): 173-190.
- OPH (2018) Education system: Equal opportunities to high quality education. The Finnish National Agency of Education. Available at: https://www.oph.fi/english/education_system (accessed 5 November 2018).
- Peterson RA (2004) The Shift toward omnivorous taste: Ideas, evidence, and prospects. *Sociologie et Sociétés* 36(1): 145-164.
- Peterson RA, Kern RM (1996) Changing highbrow taste: From snob to omnivore. *American Sociological Review* 61(5): 900-907.
- Purhonen S (2011) Televisio ja kulttuuripääoma. Ohjelmatyyppien ja mielihjelmien sosiaalinen eriytyminen nyky-Suomessa (Television and Cultural Capital: Social Distinction of Program Types and Favourite TV-shows in modern Finland). *Sosiologia* 48(2): 96-116.
- Purhonen S, Gronow J (2014) Polarizing appetites? Stability and change in culinary tastes in Finland, 1995-2007. *Food, Culture & Society* 17(1): 27-47.
- Purhonen S, Gronow J, Rahkonen K (2010) Nordic democracy of taste? Cultural omnivorousness in musical and literary taste preferences in Finland. *Poetics* 38(3): 266-298.
- Purhonen S, Heikkilä R (2017) Food, music and politics: The interweaving of culinary taste patterns, 'highbrow' musical taste and conservative attitudes in Finland. *Social Science Information* 56(1): 74-97.
- Räsänen P (2003) *In the Twilight of Social Structures. A Mechanism-Based Study of Contemporary Consumer Behaviour*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Turku, Finland.
- Roose H, Van Eijck K, Lievens J (2012) Culture of distinction or culture of openness? Using social space to analyze the social structuring of lifestyles. *Poetics* 40(6): 491-513.
- Sarpila O (2013) *Beauty for Sale. An Empirical Study of Appearance-related Consumption in Finland*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Turku, Finland.
- Sonnett J (2004) Musical boundaries: intersections of form and content. *Poetics* 32(3-4): 247-264.

- Statistics Finland (2018) The Classification of Occupations 2010. Official Statistics of Finland. Available at: http://tilastokeskus.fi/meta/luokitukset/ammatti/001-2010/index_en.html (accessed 23 November 2018).
- Van Eijck K (2000) Richard A. Peterson and culture of consumption. *Poetics* 28(2-3): 207-224.
- Van Eijck K, Bargeman B (2004) The changing impact of social background on lifestyle: 'Culturalization' instead of individualization? *Poetics* 32(6): 439-461.
- Veenstra G (2005) Can taste illumine class? Cultural knowledge and forms of inequality. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology* 30(3): 247-279.
- Warde A (2011) Cultural hostility re-considered. *Cultural Sociology* 5(3): 341-366.
- Warde A, Gayo-Cal M (2009) The anatomy of cultural omnivorousness: The case of the United Kingdom. *Poetics* 37 (2): 119-145.
- Warde A, Martens L (2000) *Eating out: Social differentiation, consumption and pleasure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Warde A, Martens L, Olsen WK (1999) Consumption and the problem of variety: Cultural omnivorousness, social distinction and dining out. *Sociology* 33(1): 105-127.
- Warde A, Wright D, Gayo-Cal M (2008) The omnivorous orientation in the UK. *Poetics* 36(2-3): 148-165.
- Willekens M, Lievens J (2015) Boundary tastes at work. The gendered effect of authority positions in the workplace on taste in clothing and food. *Sociological Perspectives* 58(1): 78-96.
- Wright D, Purhonen S, Heikkilä R (2013) Comparing 'cosmopolitanism': Taste, nation and global culture in Finland and the UK. *Comparative Sociology* 12(3): 330-360.

Legitimate cuisines (Ratio of legitimacy > 1.3)	Mainstream cuisines (Ratio of legitimacy = 1-1.29)	Illegitimate cuisines (Ratio of legitimacy < 1)
African Fine dining Korean Middle Eastern Mediterranean Sushi or other Japanese French	Indian or Nepalese Italian Mexican or South American Russian Chinese Thai or other SE Asian Scandinavian Pizza	American or Tex-Mex Home cooking Grilled food Fast food

Figure 1. Legitimacy of the cuisine types in Finland according to Lindblom & Mustonen, 2015 (Figure adapted from the 2015 Lindblom & Mustonen study, labels modified to suit article's purposes)

Table 1. Proportions of the culinary dislikes, likes and ambivalences, in percentages (N=1706)

	Dislikes	Likes	Don't know
Fast food	32.9	60.9	6.2
Russian	20.1	60.5	19.4
American/Tex-Mex	19.9	71.8	8.3
African	16.5	45.5	38.0
Sushi/Japanese	19.4	73.5	7.1
Grilled	16.3	77.7	6.0
Chinese	16.0	79.1	4.9
Fine dining	15.9	65.5	18.6
Korean	14.7	44.6	40.6
Middle Eastern	11.9	70.3	17.8
French	11.3	71.0	17.7
Pizza	10.9	86.8	2.3
Mexican/SAmerican	10.1	79.8	10.1
Indian/Nepalese	9.3	85.7	4.9
SE Asian	8.3	85.5	6.3
Mediterranean	6.6	87.9	5.5
Scandinavian	3.8	85.2	10.3
Italian	3.6	93.9 (2)	2.5
Home cooking	3.4	94.4 (1)	2.2

Table 2. The amount of disliked cuisine types (range 0-19), analysis of variance (ANOVA) models

	Number of dislikes, group mean (separate ANOVA models)
Education**	
Comprehensive	2.4
Secondary	3.0
Lower tertiary	2.4
University	2.3
Age***	
25-29	2.4
30-34	2.3
35-39	2.7
40-44	3.2
Income quartile*	
1st (lowest) quart	2.7
2 nd quart	3.0
3 rd quart	2.6
4th (highest) quart	2.3
Gender**	
Male	2.3
Female	2.8
Area of residence*	
Suburb	2.8
Inner city	2.5
Occupational class**	
Creative class	2.4
Manual class	2.7
Service class	3.0
Undiscerned	2.5
TOTAL (all respondents)	2.6

Note: *** = $p < 0.001$; ** = $p < 0.01$; * = $p < 0.05$.

Table 3. Categorical Principal Component Analysis (CATPCA) for cuisine dislikes

	Culinary canon / classics	Ethnic	Fast & convenient	Familiar
French	.725	.154	.112	.146
Mediterranean	.672	.233	.020	.006
Italian	.630	.027	.278	-.146
Russian	.541	.227	.154	.102
Fine dining	.529	.181	-.024	.113
Sushi or other Japanese	.506	.288	-.122	-.014
Thai or other SE Asian	.149	.774	.006	-.008
African	.354	.677	-.001	.011
Indian or Nepalese	.185	.668	.011	-.027
Korean	.409	.662	.007	.058
Middle Eastern	.418	.635	-.032	.005
Chinese	-.032	.566	.262	-.004
Mexican or South American	.202	.474	.464	-.071
American or Tex-Mex	.060	.176	.734	-.023
Fast food	-.093	-.011	.719	.123
Pizza	.085	-.018	.641	.002
Grilled food	.102	.007	.561	.085
Home cooking	-.092	-.007	.129	.865
Scandinavian	.325	.325	.033	.743

NB. Rotation method Varimax. Mexican or South American cuisine types had the highest loadings (yet not very high) on both ethnic and fast & convenient components.

Table 4. Cuisine dislikes, logistic regression models with chi square coefficients (χ^2), odds ratios (OR), Pseudo R²

	Culinary canon		Ethnic	Fast & convenient	
	Sushi ^a	Fine dining	Indian ^b	Fast food ^c	American ^d
% of those who dislike (N)	21.0 (233)	16.4 (181)	9.1 (101)	32.3 (356)	19.0 (210)
Education χ^2	19.04**	52.74***	1.51 (ns)	14.22**	25.81***
<i>Comprehensive</i>	0.53*	0.25**	1.06 (ns)	0.37***	0.16***
<i>Secondary</i>	1.69**	2.50***	1.29 (ns)	0.9 (ns)	0.73 (ns)
<i>Lower tertiary</i>	0.97 (ns)	1.25 (ns)	1.43 (ns)	0.72 (ns)	0.71 (ns)
Age χ^2	3.52 (ns)	3.06 (ns)	11.34**	9.62*	7.63 (ns)
<i>25-29</i>	0.97 (ns)	1.24 (ns)	1.04 (ns)	0.61**	0.57**
<i>30-34</i>	0.69 (ns)	0.83 (ns)	0.40**	0.76 (ns)	0.61*
<i>35-39</i>	0.82 (ns)	0.98 (ns)	0.67 (ns)	1.07(ns)	0.87 (ns)
Income χ^2	10.69**	6.93 (ns)	17.71***	1.58 (ns)	8.13*
<i>1st quart</i>	2.24**	1.98**	0.41 **	0.79 (ns)	1.58 (ns)
<i>2nd quart</i>	2.03*	1.59 (ns)	1.05 (ns)	0.97 (ns)	2.13 **
<i>3rd quart</i>	1.75**	1.62*	0.38**	0.88 (ns)	1.00(ns)
Gender χ^2	13.63***	6.43**	2.20(ns)	34.99***	7.91**
<i>Male</i>	1.90***	1.61**	0.70 (ns)	0.41***	0.61**
Area of residence χ^2	3.20 (ns)	1.79 (ns)	12.72***	8.68**	1.50 (ns)
<i>Suburb</i>	1.34 (ns)	1.27 (ns)	2.21	0.65**	0.81 (ns)
Occupational class χ^2	34.07***	0.34*	6.80 (ns)	6.50 (ns)	4.76 (ns)
<i>Creative</i>	0.38**	0.37*	1.84 (ns)	1.74 (ns)	1.39 (ns)
<i>Working</i>	0.34 (ns)	0.59 (ns)	2.06 (ns)	0.85 (ns)	1.44 (ns)
<i>Other</i>	0.34***	0.64*	0.85 (ns)	1.39(ns)	1.58*
χ^2, model	110.59***	89.10***	60.20***	94.60***	60.00***
-2LL	652.40	553.43	399.23	663.24	528.31
Pseudo R² X100	14.8	13.1	11.6	11.5	8.5

Note: *** = $p < 0.001$; ** = $p < 0.01$; * = $p < 0.05$; (ns) = $p > 0.05$. The reference categories are: female; university diploma; highest income quartile; inner city residency; service class; age 40-44 years. Each reference category has an odds ratio value of 1. Degree of freedom for all models is 14. a) 'Sushi or other Japanese' b) 'Indian or Nepalese' c) 'American or Tex-Mex' d) 'Hamburgers and other fast food'

Table 5. No cuisine dislikes i.e. ‘Categorical tolerance’, logistic regression models with chi square coefficients (χ^2), odds ratios (OR), Pseudo R²

	Categorical tolerance
% who are categorical tolerant people (N)	28.7 (328)
Education χ^2	19.9***
<i>Comprehensive</i>	2.17
<i>Secondary</i>	0.84
<i>Lower tertiary</i>	1.12
Age χ^2	11.88**
25-29	1.36
30-34	1.39
35-39	0.76
Income χ^2	(6.00) ns
<i>1st quart</i>	0.86
<i>2nd quart</i>	0.572
<i>3rd quart</i>	0.70
Gender χ^2	5.3*
<i>Male</i>	1.40
Area of residence χ^2	(0.75) ns
<i>Suburb</i>	0.88
Occupational class χ^2	(1.10) ns
<i>Creative</i>	1.24
<i>Working</i>	1.17
<i>Other</i>	1.18
χ^2, model	50.77***
-2LL	772.70
Pseudo R² X100	6.2

APPENDICES

Appendix Table A. Distribution of the independent variables, weighted and non-weighted data, in percentages

	% (weighted) (n =1706)	% (non-weighted) (n =1706)
Age (mean, years)	33.8	33.4
<i>25-29</i>	28.7	29.5
<i>30-34</i>	29.0	31.0
<i>35-39</i>	21.5	22.4
<i>40-44</i>	20.9	17.1
Gender		
<i>Female</i>	62.3	65.4
<i>Male</i>	37.7	34.5
Education		
<i>Comprehensive</i>	5.1	2.3
<i>Secondary/College</i>	42.6	19.4
<i>Lower tertiary</i>	14.7	22.0
<i>University</i>	37.6	56.3
Area of residence		
<i>Suburb</i>	36.3	33.5
<i>Inner city</i>	63.7	66.5
Income quartile		
<i>1st (lowest)</i>	31.7	27.0
<i>2nd</i>	18.8	16.4
<i>3rd</i>	24.5	27.1
<i>4th (highest)</i>	24.9	20.5
Creative class membership		
<i>Creative class</i>	53.7	61.5
<i>Manual class</i>	8.3	4.0
<i>Service class</i>	31.4	27.2
<i>Undiscerned</i>	6.6	7.2

Appendix Table B1. Dislikes of cuisine types by independent variables, in percentages

	Home cooking	Scandinavian	Fast food	Pizza	Grilled	Russian	Italian	French	Mediterranean	Middle Eastern
Male	2.1	4.5	22.0 ***	6.8 ***	9.0 ***	18.5 *	4.9	13.7	8.9	12.0
Female	3.6	3.8	34.8 ***	12.7***	18.5 ***	23.4 *	4.7	12.5	8.6	14.4
No education	0.0	2.6	13.9 ***	5.1	5.1 **	13.9 **	11.4 ***	16.7 **	16.7 ***	21.8 ***
Secondary	2.4	5.0	24.8 ***	10.9	12.2 **	25.4 **	6.3 ***	16.3 **	12.8 ***	16.3 ***
College/lower high	3.3	2.9	28.5 ***	11.6	14.0 **	19.8 **	2.9 ***	12.3 **	6.2 ***	13.7 ***
University	3.9	3.7	38.1 ***	10.9	18.8 **	18.3 **	2.8 ***	9.0 **	4.2 ***	9.2 ***
Suburb	3.3	3.3	24.9 **	10.0	10.9 ***	25.9 ***	6.5 *	14.2	12.7 ***	19.6 ***
Inner city	2.8	4.4	32.9 **	10.9	17.2 ***	19.3***	3.7 *	12.3	6.4 ***	10.1 ***
24-29 years	1.4 *	3.3 *	21.5 ***	7.3 **	9.6 ***	22.4	4.8	11.9 *	10.9 *	14.8
30-34 years	2.3 *	2.5 *	31.3 ***	11.5 **	18.0 ***	20.3	4.6	10.5 *	5.6 *	10.3
35-39 years	4.5 *	5.3 *	34.3 ***	10.1 **	18.5 ***	20.7	3.7	13.5 *	9.3 *	13.2
40-44 years	4.1 *	5.9 *	35.9 ***	14.5 **	14.7 ***	23.7	5.8	17.8 *	9.1 *	16.5
1st income quart	3.5	5.5	28.5 **	9.5	16.8	21.6 *	7.5 **	11.5	10.6 **	16.1 **
2nd income quart	2.7	4.8	23.8 **	8.9	13.1	25.9 *	5.1 **	16.0	11.1 **	17.0 **
3rd income quart	2.1	2.9	31.8 **	11.4	16.0	20.5 *	3.6 **	13.4	6.2 **	11.5 **
4th income quart	4.3	3.7	36.5 **	11.5	13.0	17.5 *	2.5 **	10.3	5.8 **	9.1 **
Creative class	3.2	3.2	35.2 ***	10.4	16.2	17.3 ***	3.3 *	10.6	6.5 **	9.2 ***
Manual class	1.7	3.4	14.2 ***	7.6	9.2	24.8***	7.6 *	13.3	16.8 **	17.9 ***
Service class	2.7	5.2	26.5 ***	14.1	14.2	30.9 ***	4.7 *	15.6	9.4 **	17.8 ***
Undiscerned	4.3	6.4	36.6 ***	9.7	19.1	14.0***	8.5 *	11.7	8.6 **	10.8 ***

Note: The independent variable categories marked with asterisks indicate difference in disliking levels regarding the given cuisine type. *** = $p < 0.001$; ** = $p < 0.01$; * = $p < 0.05$. For example, when age categories are marked with * for home cooking, there is a statistically significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between one or several categories in their dislike for this cuisine type.

Appendix Table B2. Dislikes of cuisine types by independent variables, in percentages

	American/ Tex-Mex	Mexican/ SAmerican	Chinese	S E Asian	Korean	Sushi/ Japanese	Indian/ Nepalese	African	Fine dining
Male	15.5 **	10.7	14.7	10.5	15.7	24.6	8.4 *	19.4	22.1 *
Female	20.8 **	11.9	16.0	9.2	16.8	22.3	12.0 *	18.4	17.6 *
No education	8.9 **	13.9	13.9	11.4 **	16.7 **	27.8 ***	13.9 **	27.8 ***	25.3 ***
Secondary	17.3 **	13.5	14.5	12.8 **	20.4 **	31.1 ***	12.8 **	22.9 ***	26.3 ***
College/lower high	17.0 **	8.6	15.7	6.6 **	14.2 **	19.0 ***	10.8 **	15.7 ***	16.7 ***
University	22.4 **	9.5	16.8	7.2 **	12.9 **	15.2 ***	7.3 **	14.1 ***	11.6 ***
Suburb	17.6	12.8	13.3	12.3 **	17.9	29.5 ***	15.8 ***	26.2	21.7
Inner city	19.6	10.4	16.9	8.2 **	15.6	19.6 ***	7.6 ***	14.5	17.9
24-29 years	13.8 **	9.4	13.1	10.7	13.8	22.7 ***	11.7 ***	17.5 *	19.7 *
30-34 years	17.7 **	9.6	15.3	9.2	15.6	19.0 ***	6.5 ***	15.7 *	16.2 *
35-39 years	21.3 **	13.6	18.7	11.0	17.6	21.6 ***	8.8 ***	19.4 *	17.7 *
40-44 years	24.8 **	14.0	16.0	7.9	19.9	31.5 ***	16.7 ***	24.0 *	24.4 *
1st income quart	20.1	12.1	12.6	9.0	13.8 *	27.5 ***	10.0 **	16.9	22.0 ***
2nd income quart	17.5	10.3	17.2	11.7	18.4 *	25.9 ***	14.7 **	22.6	24.6 ***
3rd income quart	18.3	10.7	13.6	8.6	19.0 *	24.7 ***	7.1 **	18.5	19.3 ***
4th income quart	19.0	9.3	17.5	8.0	13.3 *	14.1 ***	9.8 **	16.6	12.5 ***
Creative class	21.6	11.2	17.4	7.7 *	13.0 ***	14.7 ***	9.0	16.3	16.1 ***
Manual class	12.8	15.8	12.8	15.1 *	21.2 ***	37.0 ***	12.0	21.0	29.1 ***
Service class	17.4	11.3	13.7	11.5 *	21.1 ***	32.9 ***	13.0	21.8	23.1 ***
Undiscerned	20.2	11.7	17.2	10.6 *	8.6 ***	18.3 ***	12.8	14.9	9.68 ***

Note: The independent variable categories marked with asterisks indicate difference in disliking levels regarding the given cuisine type. *** = $p < 0.001$; ** = $p < 0.01$; * = $p < 0.05$. For example, when education categories are marked with * for American/Tex-Mex, there is a statistically significant difference ($p < 0.01$) between one or several categories in their dislike for this cuisine type.