Warde, A., Whillans, J. A., & Paddock, J. (2019). The allure of variety: Eating out in three English cities, 2015. *Poetics*, 72, 17-31.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2018.09.001>

Peer reviewed version

License (if available):
CC BY-NC-ND

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1016/j.poetic.2018.09.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2018.09.001)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Elsevier at <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304422X17301626> . Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

The allure of variety: eating out in three English cities, 2015

Abstract

This paper examines social differentiation of tastes for meals out of the home in contemporary Britain. It reports results from a study of eating out based on a survey and interviews in London, Preston and Bristol in 2015. It focuses on the breadth of exposure to variety of restaurant cuisine styles in order to address debates about distinction, cultural omnivorousness and cosmopolitanism. The paper uses regression analysis of survey results to reveal social differentiation, with special reference to the effects of gender, age, ethnicity and class on culinary taste. The data reveal the social and symbolic significance of variety of experience in visits to commercial venues for meals and degrees of familiarity with diverse cuisines. The data show a consistent relationship between higher socio-economic position, frequency of eating out, and the experiencing of a wide variety of cuisines. Culinary preferences cluster into three bundles: popular, uncommon and exclusive. Significant social characteristics of their bearers include age, class trajectory, education and ethnic identification. Tendencies associated with cultural omnivorousness can be observed among the professional and managerial middle class. While it is important not to conflate internal goods deriving from enthusiastic engagement in this particular cultural field with achievement of social advantage, culinary tastes are a mark of social distinction. Diverse culinary experience of variety is a prerequisite for full membership of the professional and managerial class.

Keywords: class trajectory; cuisine style; culinary capital; cultural variety; cultural omnivorousness; eating out; restaurant meals; social divisions.

1 Introduction

Buying meals out in restaurants, hotels and cafes has become increasingly common over the last 40 years in Europe and North America (Cheng et al, 2007; Cabiedes-Miragaya, 2017; Holm et al, 2012; Kjaernes; 2001, Levenstein, 2003). In the process the commercial options available have multiplied enormously, driven by forces of globalisation, commodification and aestheticisation (Warde, 2016). Venues have diversified, specialising in provision for different types of occasion and serving a wide range of foods and cuisines, rendering the market increasingly large and variegated (Berris and Sutton, 2007; Paddock et al., 2017; Díaz-Méndez and García-Espejo, 2014; Finkelstein, 1991; Johnston and Baumann, 2010; Julier, 2013; Ray, 2016; Scholliers, 2001; Warde and Martens, 2000; Warde et al., 1999; Wood, 1995).

Very few restaurants turn away potential customers because of their observed or imputed social attributes. Yet different types of restaurant have systematically different clienteles, their customers clustering astride divides of age, gender, ethnicity, education, income and class. Two questions confront the sociology of consumption. First, how do structural social divisions incline people to patronise different types of venue? Second, given that many people now eat out often, is there a structural basis for the pattern of combination of places that they visit? Do some social groups sequentially attend a particular mixture of places, systematically taking in some and avoiding others? Are the combinations of venue types favoured by different social groups evidence of social distinction and social exclusion?

The simplest answer to the first question is that it is a matter of supply and demand. A diverse catering trade, aided and abetted by the supermarket supply of prepared chilled and frozen meals, has generated widespread innovation in what is cooked and consumed in Britain. In the process a hierarchy of venues emerged – some expensive and socially exclusive, others cheap and socially more heterogeneous – such that how much and what a person eats continues to be structured by their social position. A relationship between social position and eating out behaviour is well documented in UK, North America, and France where people of higher social rank still eat out more often than most members of the working class (Atkinson, 2017; Bennett et al., 2009; Johnston and Baumann, 2010; Julier, 2013, Lhuissier, 2003; McPhail et al., 2011; Warde and Martens, 2000; Warde et al., 1999). The extent to which this constitutes a vehicle for social distinction is contested.

Current orthodoxy maintains that people of high socioeconomic status adopt an omnivorous orientation towards cultural items and activities (Gayo, 2016; Lizardo and Skiles, 2016). The omnivore thesis predicts that some groups in the population will enjoy greater variety of experience than others. It anticipates that, if eating out is a field where symbolic messages about cultural taste and social rank circulate, those exhibiting high status will embrace exceptional breadth in cultural goods and practices. Crucially, the activities of cultural omnivores visibly cross a once firm

boundary between high and popular culture (Peterson and Kern, 1996). Some interpretations postulate that a taste for variety marks an openness and tolerance of cultural tastes. Others, often following the logic of Bourdieu (1984), see an omnivorous orientation as just a more complex expression of distinction; a demonstrable capacity to bridge cultural boundaries is a key property of cultural capital which applauds fine aesthetic judgment, signals social rank to others, and provides a passport to connections with networks of people in elevated positions. Agreeing with Lizardo and Skiles (2016) we pursue the latter route, seeing no inconsistency in aligning Bourdieu's concerns with cultural and symbolic power with evidence of breadth of tastes.

The omnivorousness thesis has been criticised on theoretical, methodological and substantive grounds (see, e.g., Hanquinet and Savage, 2016: 77-131). We focus on its adequacy in the light of empirical challenges. Now receding, postmodernist arguments contend that neither cultural items nor populations can be meaningfully and reliably ranked, hence the thesis can never be demonstrated true (Firat, Fuat and Ventakesh, 1995). Others problematize the boundary between the legitimate and the popular by identifying new forms of cultural capital, observing that genres like opera and classical music convey limited prestige among younger generations for whom video gaming, world music and gym membership are now more valuable as cultural currency (e.g. Prieur and Savage, 2013). Others see having personal tastes for cultural forms other than those of their communities of origin as a major mode of expression of contemporary cultural capital; the uneven distribution of cosmopolitan sympathy and commitment is associated with tastes for extra-European cultural forms like world music and international literature and film (Bellavance, 2017; Cappeliez and Johnston, 2013; Prieur and Savage, 2013; Weenink, 2008). All, however, discount the profits to be made from mastery of legitimate culture, introducing instead other ways of negotiating and appropriating variety among cultural products and practices. This paper engages with these issues by re-affirming the relevance of the omnivore thesis, identifying a cultural hierarchy of style and social differentiation in taste through the examination of the relatively neglected field of eating out.

In the field of food, one key source of variety derives from cultivation of a taste for foreign cuisines. As foods began to be ascribed to national traditions in the post-war period (Moehrer, 2008; Panayi 2008; Warde, 1997) more opportunities were created for symbolic communication through the appreciation of the variety of culinary styles. Warde and Martens (2000) showed that in the 1990s in England cultivation of a taste for 'foreign' or 'ethnic' cuisines was a principal source of distinction. Johnston and Baumann (2010) corroborate this through interviews with self-professed foodies, people who present themselves as accomplished adjudicators of the quality of food and the experience of dining. These arbiters of fine foods and good taste celebrate a wide range of styles and types of cuisine, the simple and rustic as well as the refined and innovative. They especially value proximity to traditional practice, 'authenticity',

and/or unusualness, 'exoticism'. Johnston and Baumann argue that an apparently benevolent, open, democratic and omnivorous engagement with diverse food cultures actually serves to conceal processes which confer status and reproduce privilege.¹ This paper explores whether similar proclivities can be found outside of North America and to what proportion of a population it might be attributed.

In the contemporary market-place, restaurants conventionally advertise their cooking by way of identification with a particular type of cuisine, as Chinese, Greek, Mexican, British, etc. In the UK, foods from other nations, with the exception of French, are usually called 'ethnic'.² The term encompasses a mixture of meanings including unusual, unfamiliar, not-British, challenging, associated with minority populations, and exotic.³ Terminology is problematic for linguistic, political and historical reasons. Dominant discourse tends to assume that, in a given country, the practices of the ethnic majority population define a mainstream or national cuisine and that others present, associated with minorities, can be called ethnic. It is then too easy to assume symmetry between the availability of ethnic cuisine and the local presence of an eponymous ethnic group, which is not necessarily the case in the current phase of globalisation when not only people but goods and ideas circulate extensively (Appadurai, 1996; Park, 2017).

Cuisines are distinguishable partly by their typical combinations of ingredients, cooking techniques, equipment, pairings and favoured combinations of flavours (Ahn et al, 2011; Rozen, 1983) and partly because of their discursive construction as distinct entities (e.g. Ferguson, 2004). In these terms, British cuisine is difficult to define because the distinctive positive attributes of the mainstream are hazy; all national cuisines have hybrid features, but some have more than others. Nevertheless, most people still recognise a British style, for example, typical meals such as 'roast dinners' and 'fish and chips', which distinguish it from alternative culinary traditions. We examine these challenger cuisines, investigating how common they are and whether some are more prized for their exceptional characteristics of novelty, rarity, distance or flavour principle.⁴ We measure social-demographic variation in use of restaurants advertised as selling particular cuisines as a proxy for a taste for the unfamiliar or uncommon.

¹ Authenticity involves appeal to geographic specificity of ingredients, simplicity of preparation, and personal connection and historicism. Exotic foods, by contrast, are framed as exciting and unusual, presenting opportunities to break food norms and experience alien flavours. Our data cannot throw light on authenticity but it does permit some insight into the latter as an element of variety-seeking behaviour.

² See Ray (2016) on the distinction between foreign and ethnic cuisine in the USA; for him, ethnic is sustained by substantial immigrant communities whereas foreign requires only mobile professional chefs.

³ The term 'exotic' is sometimes found especially problematic (Ray, 2016; Oleschuck, 2017; Heldke, 2003; Harper, 2011) because of its associations with discourses of Orientalism (Said, 1978)

⁴ Most Britons would see Lebanese as more rare than Greek, Ethiopian stranger than Lebanese, Polish more unfamiliar than Italian, Mexican more unusual than Chinese. However, it is a matter of perspective and migrant groups, and perhaps also different cohorts, will employ different standards.

After describing the data and the methods employed for their analysis, we demonstrate social differentiation within the practice of eating in restaurants. We consider briefly the social determinants of frequency of eating meals in restaurants but the main focus is social variation in the experience of different cuisine styles. We ask which of eleven styles of cuisine each survey respondent had experienced during the last twelve months and the cuisine style of the restaurant in which they ate their last meal. We examine who experiences which cuisines, how people combine different styles, whether there are patterns, and whether those patterns correspond to social position and orientations towards eating out. We use the data to address several debates in the sociology of food and culture including the pursuit of novelty and variety, the prevalence of cultural omnivorousness, its function in signalling distinction, the role of class, and the character of enthusiasm for food and eating.

2 Method

This paper is based on survey data about eating out in three English cities, Preston, Bristol and London.⁵ The cities allow comparison of metropolitan and provincial conditions, in the north and the south, and experience of greater and lesser prosperity. Conducted in the Spring of 2015, the survey asked questions including frequency of eating out at different commercial establishments.⁶ The design involved random location quota sampling of selected addresses for face to face interviews. Census Output Areas (OAs), typically comprising around 150 households, were selected at random in proportion to size and stratified by Census estimates of the proportion of residents in social grade AB. Quotas based on age and working status interlocked with sex were selected to reflect the demographic profile of each OA.⁷ The social characteristics of the sample of respondents are summarised in Appendix 1.⁸

The survey recorded many features of the eating habits of respondents including those surrounding both eating out and domestic arrangements. Respondents (n=1101) were asked to estimate the frequency of eating out in restaurants, pubs, cafes or similar establishments over the last 12 months and the range of cuisine

⁵ We study cities because of the inherent spatial connection between provision and consumption. People mostly eat in restaurants somewhere near where they live. The range of choice is, for example, much greater in London than in the provinces. One aim of the research project was to estimate change over time so the same cities studied by Warde and Martens (2000) were selected. No three cities could be representative of England, but their diverse populations give a serviceable picture of urban practice.

⁶ The survey was carried out by the National Centre for Social Research (NatCen) between March and May 2015. Most questions were identical to the earlier study of Warde and Martens (2000).

⁷ The quota fitted the proportion of men working full-time, men not working full-time, women employed and women not working to the composition of each OA population.

⁸ In addition, 31 follow-up, in-depth, semi-structured interviews were conducted with respondents to the survey in each of the three cities.

styles experienced when eating out in the last year.⁹ They were also asked to describe in detail the last occasion upon which they ate a 'main meal' away from home in such a venue.¹⁰ The terms 'main meal' and 'eating out' leave room for ambiguity, but interview data suggest that neither is confusing and that answers to the survey questions are based on common understandings.¹¹

The dependent variables of interest in this paper are frequency of eating out in the last 12 months, and variety of styles of cuisine encountered. Scales were constructed to estimate the volume and pattern of attendance at restaurants of different style. Principal Components Analysis was employed to determine whether cuisine styles clustered together to form patterns of taste.

Data were subjected to regression analysis using as independent variables sex, age, ethnic identification, whether there were any children under 16 years of age in the household, educational level, class trajectory, household income and city of residence. Ethnic identification is a binary variable, White British or Other. Education is also binary based on having a university degree or not. Class trajectory, a measure of social mobility, was constructed on the basis of answers to a question about the occupation of the primary earner in the household when the respondent was aged 16 and the respondent's current occupational class according to the NS-SEC schema. We consider meaningful only mobility transitions which cross the boundary between the service class (i.e. professional and managerial occupations)¹² and the rest (i.e. all intermediate and working class occupations). Combining the occupational class of respondents and parents yields a five category variable: stable service class, upwardly mobile into the service class, the downwardly mobile from it, an 'other mobile' group experiencing sideways mobility between intermediate and working classes, and the stable working class (see further, Li et al, 2015).¹³ Household income is equivalised to take account of household size and composition

⁹ The wording of the questions were: 'Overall how often have you eaten out in a restaurant, pub, café, or similar establishment during the last 12 months, excluding times when you were away on holiday (in the UK or abroad)' and 'Thinking now about restaurants specialising in specific food styles, during the last 12 months, in which of the restaurant types and places listed on this card have you eaten on the premises?'. Note that this question refers to the cuisine style associated with restaurant and not necessarily of the style of the dishes served.

¹⁰ 822 relevant occasions were described. The remaining 279 meals described were eaten as guests in the homes of friends or non-resident kin.

¹¹ Eating away from home includes potentially many different types of events from take away food eaten in the street to a picnic. However, the term 'eating out' usually refers to a meal eaten, usually for pleasure, in commercial outlets like a restaurant or pub, where people sit down to eat at least one substantial dish usually selected from a menu. A 'main meal out' has equivalent status to what in the domestic sphere is usually called dinner.

¹² This adopts the terminology of Goldthorpe (1980) whose concept of the service class we use as a concise label for those in higher and lower professional and managerial occupations.

¹³ As a check we re-ran all regression models with *only* present occupational class, again ran models entering present occupation and parental occupation as *separate* variables, than compared findings with our constructed class trajectory variable that *combines* parental and present occupational class. Class trajectory improves the overall fit of the model over using present position alone, and is more parsimonious than entering present and parental position separately. It does not obscure substantively significant findings.

and calculated as tertiles.¹⁴ In addition, factors created by Principal Components Analysis from a bank of 26 attitude questions generated nine factors (See Appendix 2), are used occasionally as independent variables. A small number of respondents were dropped from the sample due to missing data on our key dependent variables (n=20), producing a sample of 1081 respondents (See Appendix 1).

3 Frequency of eating out

The survey contains two different means to estimate the frequency of eating out among the sample – a retrospective estimate about behaviour in the last year and a report of the last occasion when the respondent ate a main meal away from home. Figure 1 implies some discrepancy between retrospective recall and more recent experience.¹⁵ If we extrapolate from the reported last meal the mean frequency of eating out in Spring 2015 was probably at least once in ten days, whereas the retrospective estimate would suggest approximately once every 17 days.¹⁶ However, the patterns of social differentiation underlying the two alternative measures are almost identical and thus equivalent for the purposes of this paper.

Figure 1. Frequency of eating out: instance of most recent occasion and annual estimate (percent).

The 8-item variable of responses to the question of how often a person eats out on commercial premises (see Table 1, column 1) was subjected to linear regression analysis to see what types of people eat out most frequently. The model explains 14 percent of the variance. The most powerful factors increasing the propensity to eat out frequently are being younger (aged especially under-35), having no children at

¹⁴ Total household income is divided by the number of household members converted into equivalised adults, made equivalent by following the modified-OECD equivalence scale.

¹⁵ Only respondents whose last meal was in a restaurant are included when plotting when the last main meal was eaten out (n=813); to create a comparable estimate, respondents who never ate out were not included when plotting frequency of eating out, the resultant n=1034.

¹⁶ Thus the mean, median and modal response to the retrospective estimate of frequency of eating at a restaurant was 'monthly', whereas last occasion registered 'fortnightly' as mean and median, and 'within the last seven days' being the modal response. Forty six per cent of respondents reported that their last meal out was within the last seven days. There are several possible reasons why these estimates vary, the most probable being that respondents recall smaller and less significant occasions when asked about their last main meal away from home whilst their longer term memory alights on more significant events.

home, having experience of the service class, and having a high household income. The age effect is monolithic – the younger the respondent the more frequently she eats out. Respondents who have service class connections, either having parents in that class or having themselves experienced upward mobility, eat out more frequently, with those stable within the service class the most regular customers of restaurants. The measure of household income indicates that eating out increases with level of income, with the top third of earnings eating out most. Those in the middle tertile also ate out significantly more often than those who were still poorer. Identifying as White British is associated with eating out more frequently at the 99 percent level of confidence. Another, less powerful, effect is living in London. Sex and education are not statistically significant.

Table 1. Regressions of frequency of eating out and style of restaurant

	Frequency of eating out	Style of cuisine (volume)
<i>Sex</i>		
Male	-0.073	0.229
<i>Age</i>		
Age	-0.053**	0.056*
Age ²	0.000	-0.001***
<i>Ethnicity</i>		
White British	0.357**	0.512***
<i>Children</i>		
Child(ren) in household	-0.466***	-0.455***
<i>Education</i>		
Has a degree	0.18	0.675***
<i>Class trajectory</i>		
Stable service class	0.703***	1.437***
Upwardly mobile into service	0.517**	0.825***
Downwardly mobile from service	0.439*	0.728**
Other (Side-way mobile)	0.213	0.331
Stable working class	.	.
Unknown	0.022	0.212
<i>Equivalised household income (tertiles)</i>		
Highest	0.856***	0.763***
Middle	0.435**	0.335
Lowest	.	.
Unknown	0.397**	0.448**
<i>City</i>		
London	0.269*	0.757***
Bristol	0.195	0.536***
Preston	.	.
<i>Frequency of eating out</i>		
Frequency		0.568***
Constant	4.573***	-1.662**
Adjusted R ²	0.144	0.428

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

4 Styles of cuisine and culinary adventurousness

The relative power of the models described in Table 1 might suggest that where people go has greater symbolic significance than how often, with tastes for different cuisines and visiting restaurants cooking in different traditions being a signal marker. Distinction may be derived from specialised tastes and breadth of taste for different cuisines. Figure 2 shows exposure of respondents to different styles of cuisine in 2015, the proportion of the respondents who had been to the various types in the previous year and the site of the last occasion when the respondent had eaten a main meal.

Figure 2. Percentage of respondents visiting each cuisine style within the last year and on the last occasion

Almost 60 percent of the population had eaten Traditional British cuisine in a restaurant setting (10% had eaten no other) and over half had eaten Italian. Indian is the next most widely experienced (44%). 33% report at least one 'other' type of ethnic cuisine not specifically nominated by the survey questionnaire, likely to include Mexican, Spanish, Greek and Middle Eastern. About a third of the population has eaten a Chinese meal. Some of the styles pre-identified in the survey were

visited infrequently: Vegetarian, modern British, French, Japanese and Thai had been visited by a fifth or fewer respondents.

The *retrospective* question of cuisine styles visited in the last 12 months tells simply of the breadth of taste; it gives no indication of whether or which cuisines were patronised more often than others. The report of the *last* occasion best indicates relative popularity as cuisines that are experienced more often are more likely to feature as their last experience. 'Traditional British' predominates. Over 40 percent of respondents classified their last restaurant meal as traditional British. The next most popular (each 13% of last occasions) are Italian and 'Other kinds of cuisine'. The latter bear witness to the increasingly wide range of styles appealing to Britons.¹⁷ The last meal was Indian cuisine for 9 percent of respondents, and both American-style and Modern British for 6 percent. Another way to sum up these results is that 47 percent of meals were in British style, and 46 percent were designated as other than British,¹⁸ implying a more or less even attachment to British and to 'foreign' cuisines.¹⁹

Considered overall, the annual data suggest that a significant proportion of the sample are conversant with a wide range of different culinary styles, a feature which must impact upon the overall tastes and diets of contemporary Britons. As a point of comparison, 48 percent of respondents reported in 1995 that they had not eaten in an ethnic restaurant of any kind in the last twelve months, but by 2015 that proportion had fallen to 22 percent.²⁰ In 1995, the propensity to visit restaurants defined by their selling of ethnic cuisine was a strong indicator of social position; people with high levels of cultural and economic capital were more likely during the previous year to have visited several different types of ethnic restaurant than those with less education and working class occupations (Warde and Martens, 2000:81ff). It was argued that having a broad familiarity with ethnic cuisines was evidence of culinary curiosity and adventurousness and, hence, probably also a mark of distinction. However, to the extent that visits to foreign or ethnic restaurants have become more common, their capacity to act as marker of social distinction might be reduced, since the rarity of items consumed often confers honour. To investigate, we summed up the number of different styles of cuisine that each respondent reported in the previous twelve months.²¹

¹⁷ 'Other kinds of cuisine' was a final option in the survey question and include Spanish, Mexican, Lebanese and Turkish.

¹⁸ Neither 'American-style' nor vegetarian are included in this calculation.

¹⁹ Were we, instead, to take 'uncommon' to mean non-European then between 15 and 32 per cent – depending upon the geographical provenance of 'Other' ethnic and 'mix of different cuisines' – might be deemed uncommon. Then British meals outweigh the alternatives by approximately two to one.

²⁰ Warde and Martens, 2000: p.83. The proportion of the sample who had visited an Indian restaurant increased from 33 to 44 per cent, for Chinese and/or Thai the increase was from 29 to 42, and for Italian 31 to 52.

²¹ The maximum was 11 (out of a possible 12), the minimum was 0, the mean was 3.213, the median 3, and the mode 1.

Breadth of experience

Table 1 (column 2) reports the linear regression analysis of this measure of overall exposure to culinary variety. With frequency of eating out included as a control,²² the level of which monotonically increases 'adventurousness', the model explains 43 percent of the variance. It shows that all the independent variables are significant, many of them at the highest confidence interval, including again identifying as White British, belonging to the service class and having the highest level of income. Education is very significant, suggesting that breadth of culinary taste is an expression of cultural capital. Living in Preston reduces adventurousness. Having dependent children in the household also has strongly negative effect, possibly because younger children in Britain have narrow tastes but also for practical and logistical reasons. Middle age bands (frequencies, not shown, indicate those aged 26-45 years) display the broadest range of culinary tastes. There is no effect for sex.

Overall an association between social privilege and adventurous taste pertains. Ethnicity, class and income are all significant contributors to explanation of breadth of experience, confirming the joint operation of class and other types of social division upon a symbolically significant activity. We explore this further by examining how tastes for these multiple styles are patterned.

Patterns of taste

Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was used to reduce the 11 specified cuisine styles into a smaller set of meaningful 'blocs of taste', effectively grouping together preferences for different cuisine styles.²³ The PCA suggested a three component solution, comprising tastes for *uncommon* (Factor 1: Vegetarian, Thai, Japanese, Other ethnic and Indian), *popular* (Factor 2: Traditional British, American, Italian and Chinese), and *exclusive* (Factor 3: Modern British and French) cuisines (see Table 2). A factor score was derived for each individual respondent for the three components identified, which summarised their responses to questions on restaurants visited in the last year. Only respondents reporting eating out at least once in the last year, and therefore having experience of at least one cuisine style, were included in the analysis (n=1034).

²² The exclusion of frequency of eating out from the model renders linear age statistically insignificant.

²³ This produced factors in sequence according to the amount of the total sample variance they account for. To ease interpretation, PCA was followed by oblique promax rotation, which allows for correlation between the different factors identified, using eigenvalues 1 as extraction criteria.

Table 2. Three component solution from PCA of cuisine styles visited in last 12 months (oblique promax rotation)

	Component 1: Uncommon	Component 2: Popular	Component 3: Exclusive
<i>Variance</i>	2.708	1.376	1.209
<i>Proportion</i>	0.246	0.125	0.110
<i>Rotated components</i>			
Traditional British	-0.218	0.677	0.043
Indian	0.368	0.042	-0.174
Chinese	0.224	0.318	-0.230
Japanese	0.431	-0.109	0.119
Thai	0.443	-0.083	0.072
Italian	0.078	0.319	0.294
French	0.211	0.113	0.383
American	0.047	0.501	-0.153
Other ethnic	0.370	0.048	-0.017
Vegetarian	0.483	-0.299	-0.072
Modern British	-0.026	-0.027	0.796

Note: Rho = 0.4916

Bold typeface items indicate highest loadings across factors (<-0.3 & >0.3).

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

The labels for the three blocs of taste reflect our interpretation of the symbolic meanings of cuisine types in contemporary Britain. The first component contains rarer cuisines and the more arcane of the foreign cuisines which, with the exception of Indian, are relatively recent additions to the UK repertoire. The second group, where the style with the strongest loading is Traditional British, includes the most popular styles. These are well known, well established, and in their locally adapted forms supply relatively unchallenging food. Most respondents have eaten in restaurants serving one of more of these cuisines. The third component bears just two items, Modern British and French. These are relatively expensive, often delivered in formal settings and, according to the gastronomic evaluation of British food guides, carry greatest prestige.

We examined the social foundations of the three blocs of taste (see Table 3). Age, household composition, education, class, income, city of residence and frequency of eating out are all predictors of membership of the *uncommon* bloc. Of the core independent variables only ethnic identity is insignificant. The large proportion of variance accounted for (adj $R^2 = 0.37$) emphasises the social symbolic significance of ethnic cuisine. Age is highly significant; the middle aged (neither the youngest nor the oldest) being aficionados of the uncommon. Having a child in the household results in avoidance, probably indication of the undeveloped tastes of children for strong and spicy, but maybe also just unfamiliar, foods. Holding a degree is strongly positive, as is, *a fortiori*, class trajectory. The taste for ethnic cuisine is thus clearly a

function of cultural capital, achieved and inherited. That people with connections to the service class have such strong attachment to ethnic cuisines suggests that such tastes are markers of elevated social position. The model for participation in the *exclusive* grouping was rather different. Current membership of the service class and identifying as White British are the strongest determinants, alongside frequency of eating out which is significant in all three models. Education matters also. At a lower level of significance, being older, having no children at home and being in the highest income category disposes people to visit exclusive restaurants. The *popular* grouping is predicted most strongly by identifying as white British and frequency of eating out. Having highest or middling household income also has a strong effect. Being male and second generation service class have minor effects. Education, age, household composition, and city of residence are all insignificant. As the label would suggest, almost everyone, with the exception of some ethnic minority groups, eats in restaurants of these kinds.

Table 3 confirms a meaningful association between taste and social position. One implication is that attraction to the uncommon and exclusive groupings is mediated by social and cultural capital – education registers as significant, as does class trajectory. Identifying as White British increases the likelihood of eating in popular and exclusive restaurants but has no impact upon preferences for uncommon cuisines. This is partly due to such restaurants being favoured by ethnic minorities, but perhaps also indicates a division in taste within the service class between those who have a cosmopolitan rather than a national identification, dispositions more common in London and Bristol. The models also hint at another line of internal division within the service class. Education is a weaker predictor of affinity to the exclusive bloc and the age-squared measure shows no tendency for engagement to decline among the most elderly cohorts. This suggests the presence of a preference among an older and more established section of the middle class for asserting its distinction by distancing itself from the popular through continued adherence to earlier legitimate markers of distinction rather than by adopting a taste for ethnic cuisines. Indeed, a supplementary investigation of the social prerequisites for membership of each bloc independently demonstrated that the preference for French and Modern British restaurants is most emphatically a matter of current service class membership and identifying as white British, but that there was no statistically significant effect from holding a university degree, presumably because fewer among the oldest cohorts are graduates. The exclusive bloc then bears subsidiary traces of the habits of a white British, service class cohort, whose tastes were established during the third quarter of the 20th century and who remain attached to those two most consecrated cuisines.

Table 3. Regression of PCA score loadings

	Uncommon	Popular	Exclusive
<i>Sex</i>			
Male	0.140	0.170*	-0.090
<i>Age</i>			
Age	0.059***	-0.007	0.028*
Age ²	-0.001***	0.000	0.000
<i>Ethnicity</i>			
White British	0.099	0.436***	0.288***
<i>Children</i>			
Child(ren) in household	-0.330**	-0.052	-0.186*
<i>Education</i>			
Has a degree	0.520***	0.073	0.210**
<i>Class trajectory</i>			
Stable service class	1.005***	0.432**	0.496***
Upwardly mobile into service	0.563***	0.232	0.409**
Downwardly mobile from service	0.609***	0.140	0.176
Other (Side-way mobile)	0.279	0.025	0.191
Stable working class	.	.	.
Unknown	0.331	-0.163	0.196
<i>Equivalised household income (tertiles)</i>			
Highest	0.443**	0.416***	0.224*
Middle	0.137	0.280**	0.052
Lowest	.	.	.
Unknown	0.322**	0.191	0.162
<i>City</i>			
London	0.770***	0.044	0.140
Bristol	0.546***	-0.014	0.084
Preston	.	.	.
<i>Frequency of eating out</i>			
Frequency (ordinal)	0.335***	0.230***	0.132***
Constant	-3.595***	-1.303***	-1.874***
Adjusted R ²	0.368	0.210	0.137

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

5 Omnivorousness and styles of restaurant cuisine

A further step was taken to explore cultural omnivorousness. To what extent do different social groups traverse the boundaries between these three symbolically significant blocs? Three binary variables were constructed to indicate whether respondents had experienced *at least one* cuisine style within each bloc of taste. Restaurants visited by respondents in the last twelve months could have all fallen within a single category of cuisine style or, alternatively, in any two, or in all three. Inspection of the seven possible combinations revealed that just three contained a large proportion of the total sample. The first group, the *restricted*, contained people who had only eaten popular cuisines (n=284, 28%). The second, the *modal* group, included people who had eaten both popular and uncommon (n=374, 37%). The third group, the *omnivore* group, consisted of those who had eaten in all three categories (n=183, 18%). We then examined the socio-economic characteristics of each these three groups (n=841), excluding the remaining four categories from analysis due to low cell counts.²⁴ The resulting multinomial regression model is shown in Table 4. Sole experience of popular styles is the referent group from which differences are estimated (see columns 2 and 3). The modal group of people who visit both ethnic and popular restaurants are, when compared with the referent group, much more likely to eat out frequently and to hold degree level qualifications, they are also in the middle age range, have experienced social mobility, have middle incomes and live in London. Omnivores, regardless of the extent of their experience, differ from the popular referent group on most dimensions: they are more concentrated in the middle age categories, better educated, especially likely to live in London or Bristol, eat out more frequently, have greater experience of the service class and have the highest level of income. The omnivore group is of higher socio-economic status than either of the others with class trajectory being especially statistically significant.

Aware that the literature says that omnivores are not all the same, we investigated whether the omnivore group is itself homogeneous. We were initially concerned that a respondent could, according to our coding rules, be deemed an omnivore despite having eaten only three styles of cuisine, i.e. only one from each bloc of taste. We also harboured a suspicion that culinary omnivores would include both food enthusiasts and less engaged middle class consumers. So we further divided the sample, partitioning the omnivores into two groups on the basis of the total number of styles experienced, as low volume, 'minor', omnivores ($n \leq 6$ styles) and high volume, 'major', omnivores ($n \geq 7$ styles)²⁵. The division among the omnivores was

²⁴ A fourth group, those with experience of uncommon cuisines only (n=74, 7%), was notably different demographically, comprised largely of non-white British respondents (2 in every 3 people in this group were non-white British). See the Discussion for an elaboration of the patterns of taste of ethnic minorities in Britain.

²⁵ This was the chosen cut off point as half of omnivores reported 6 or fewer cuisine styles and the remaining half reported 7 or more cuisine styles.

designed to explore two potentially separate sources of motivation for experiencing a wide variety of styles, one lying in social distinction, the other in gastronomic enthusiasm. If heavy involvement meant enthusiasm it might be identified by other indicators of their behaviour around food. Also, the social characteristics of those with great and genuine enthusiasm might be different.

Table 4. Multinomial logistic regression of patterns of taste

	Restricted: Popular only (referent)	Modal: Popular & Un-common	Omnivore: Popular, Uncommon & Exclusive
<i>Sex</i>			
Male		0.002	0.270
<i>Age</i>			
Age		0.087*	0.181***
Age ²		-0.001**	-0.002***
<i>Ethnicity</i>			
White British		.	.
<i>Children</i>			
Child(ren) in household		-0.343	-0.566
<i>Education</i>			
Has a degree		0.713***	1.122***
<i>Class trajectory</i>			
Stable service class		0.574	2.909***
Upwardly mobile into service		0.696*	2.850***
Downwardly mobile from service		0.978**	2.514**
Other (Side-way mobile)		0.337	1.640*
Stable working class		.	.
Unknown		0.528	1.847*
<i>Equivalised household income (tertiles)</i>			
Highest		0.347	0.880*
Middle		0.534*	0.586
Lowest		.	.
Unknown		0.635*	1.106**
<i>City</i>			
London		0.532*	1.888***
Bristol		0.084	1.100***
Preston		.	.
<i>Frequency of eating out</i>			
Frequency		0.355***	0.921***
Constant		-3.441***	-12.831***
Pseudo R ²	0.207		

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table 5. Multinomial logistic regression of patterns of taste, distinguishing between low- and high-omnivores.

	Restricted: (Popular only) (referent)	Modal: (Popular & Un- common)	Minor Omnivore	Major Omnivore
<i>Sex</i>				
Male		0.081	0.202	0.653*
<i>Age</i>				
Age		0.088*	0.161*	0.260***
Age ²		-0.001**	-0.002*	-0.003***
<i>Ethnicity</i>				
White British		-0.559*	-0.055	0.260
<i>Children</i>				
Child(ren) in household		-0.268	-0.392	-0.535
<i>Education</i>				
Has a degree or higher		0.620**	1.150***	0.953*
<i>Class trajectory</i>				
Stable service class		0.458	2.484*	2.745*
Upwardly mobile into service		0.531	2.769**	2.009
Downwardly mobile from service		0.983*	2.166	2.416*
Other (Side-way mobile)		0.295	1.811	0.853
Stable working class		.	.	.
Unknown		0.516	1.707	1.589
<i>Equivalised household income (tertiles)</i>				
Highest		0.101	-0.139	1.981*
Middle		0.324	-0.419	1.911*
Lowest		.	.	.
Unknown		0.447	0.071	2.230**
<i>City</i>				
London		0.396	1.386***	2.286***
Bristol		-0.097	0.581	1.182*
Preston		.	.	.
<i>Frequency of eating out</i>				
Frequency		0.274***	0.600***	0.986***
<i>Attitudes</i>				
Learning expansive tastes		0.459***	0.598***	0.686***
Cautious and conservative		-0.220**	-0.387**	-0.582***
Formality as desirable		0.002	0.121	0.369*
Sociability and conviviality		-0.013	-0.045	-0.389*
Constant		-2.618**	-10.560***	-16.310***
Pseudo R ²	0.259			

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table 5 shows that the two omnivore groups differ in both socio-demographic characteristics and attitudes. While being stable in the service class is a feature of both groups, the upwardly mobile are more likely to be minor omnivores, whereas the downwardly mobile are more prominent in the major orientation. Major omnivores are also characterised by their greater age and higher incomes, and are more likely to be male, to live in Bristol as well as London, and to hold other distinctive attitudes. Education is less significant. In addition, four of the nine factors derived from the Principal Components Analysis of a battery of attitude questions mark significant differences between groups (See Appendix 2). All omnivores feel comfortable in any type of restaurant and seek out foods which they would not eat at home. However, major omnivores in addition appreciate eating in formal surroundings, for example by liking to dress up for the occasion and preferring there to be no children present. Furthermore, they are not averse to eating out alone.

When compared to other groups, the eating arrangements of the *major omnivores* exhibit some distinctive features. Compared to the other three groups they eat out more frequently in restaurants and with friends (see Table 6). On the last outing reported, more meals were just social occasions and they lasted longer. They judged restaurants more harshly; fewer said that they 'very much enjoyed' the food, the service, value for money or the occasion overall. So only 72 percent very much enjoyed the occasion overall, compared with 78 percent of the restricted group who only eat popular cuisines, and 81 percent of those in the modal and minor omnivore categories. They are much more likely to have learned about the place they visited last from a colleague and very much more likely to have been taken there by someone else. This suggests that their lives are steered by the attraction of the practice of eating out. Responses to some attitude questions also emphasise their special interest in food and eating. They are more likely than the other groups to agree that they complain when dissatisfied, get excited about going to a new place, and 'often talk with others about eating out'. However, they are slightly less likely than the minor omnivores to agree that 'When I eat out, I like to choose things which I don't eat at home', implying that their own repertoire of domestic dishes is itself extensive. Indeed they are more likely than any group except the everyday to say that on the last occasion they have eaten a similar dish before at home. Presumably, given their much greater likelihood of being in restaurants with complex cuisine, this reflects ambition in their domestic cooking.

Table 6. Distinctive features of omnivore eating out behaviour (column percentage)

	Restricted	Modal	Minor Omnivore	Major Omnivore
<i>Frequency of eating out</i>				
Several times a week	3	5	7	23
Once a week	9	17	17	30
<i>Frequency of eating at a friends</i>				
Once a fortnight	5	8	10	22
Once a month	13	25	24	34
<i>Attitudes: Agree</i>				
Choose things I don't eat at home	68	80	91	92
Complain if meal unsatisfactory	71	73	80	84
Get excited about going to eat at a new place	52	74	70	87
Often talk with others about eating out	47	67	64	78
Last occasion				
<i>Reason for last meal out</i>				
Special occasion	28	22	17	14
Just a social occasion	43	50	50	57
<i>Meal duration</i>				
Less than an hour	7	7	0	1
2-3 hours	49	46	50	59
<i>Eaten similar dish before...</i>				
...while eating out	84	86	77	82
...at home	71	63	50	67
<i>Very much enjoyed the...</i>				
Company	87	87	94	86
Conversation	73	81	89	85
Food	76	74	76	65
Décor	52	49	39	46
Service	62	60	59	46
Value for money	63	57	56	47
Overall	78	81	80	72
<i>How receives recommendations</i>				
From friends	62	80	85	88
From colleagues	22	39	35	60
Taken there by someone else	23	33	41	61

Major omnivores also show a distinctive orientation to food and eating within the home (see Table 7). Major omnivores are more likely to: host guests at home (92%, compared with 64% of the popular group), visit independent food stores (61% compared with 23%), shop for groceries several times per week, and to say that they are very interested in reading recipes, using recipes, everyday cooking and, most strikingly, special occasion cooking. 63 percent of major omnivores were very interested in 'special occasion cooking' compared with 42 percent of minor omnivores and 26 percent of the 'popular' group.

Table 7. Distinctive features of omnivore domestic behaviour (column percentage)

	Popular	Uncommon & Popular	Minor Omnivore	Major Omnivore
<i>Hosting</i>				
Hosts guests at home	64	82	85	92
Hosts friends (of % who host)	64	82	85	94
<i>Frequency of grocery shopping</i>				
Several times a week	32	36	41	45
Once a week	49	46	41	32
<i>Visits independent food stores</i>				
Yes	23	37	43	61
<i>Very interested in...</i>				
...reading recipes	14	19	22	28
...using recipes	12	18	21	30
...everyday cooking	26	28	31	39
...special occasion cooking	26	37	42	63

Hence it seems that England harbours a significant number of people described in the literature, sometimes disparagingly, as foodies (Barr and Levy, 1983; Johnston and Baumann, 2010). The major omnivores pursue an enthusiasm for variety and aesthetic quality, suggesting that indeed they might 'live to eat rather than eat to live'. However, enthusiasm does not necessarily coincide with distinction. Some people seek primarily the internal goods that a practice can deliver, irrespective of any external benefit that might accrue from recognition by others. This appears to be true of the major omnivore, for the minor omnivore group, which devotes less concentrated attention to food, has a somewhat more distinguished socio-demographic profile. Table 5 shows that minor omnivores are more highly educated and are more likely to be currently in the service class, although they are also less dependent on high income and are appreciably younger. So, while omnivores of both types are disproportionately drawn from the service class, they vary in their endowments of cultural, social and economic capital.

6 Discussion

Variety and the ranking of tastes

Frequency of eating out is, unsurprisingly, a significant predictor of breadth of contact with different styles of restaurant. Probably appreciation of variety encourages more eating out and more excursions supply unanticipated new experiences, the effect being a self-reinforcing process. Frequency itself is greater among the young, the childless, those with the highest incomes and with service class connections. The youngest cohort eats out more often than any other but, as judged from scores on measures of variety not in an especially distinguished

manner. Middle aged cohorts (between 26 and 55) are the most adventurous, although breadth of experience is diminished when they have dependent children and if they live in Preston. City effects are often significant, with London especially hospitable to omnivorous tendencies, partly because of its comprehensive provision. Gender differences are mostly not significant, although men go to French, Indian, Chinese, and American restaurants more often than women. The social composition of those who had visited a large number of different styles of restaurant (Table 1) suggests that there is some social caché attached to acquiring diverse culinary experience. Variety has appeal.

A contemporary feature of the UK restaurant trade is the increased availability of restaurants of cuisines from around the world. Globalisation and commodification together have had marked and rapid effects on the foodstuffs purveyed in Britain. Despite a sharp reduction in the avoidance of 'ethnic' restaurants since 1995, their capacity to act as a marker of distinction is not impaired. Generally, people of higher socio-economic status consume a greater range of foreign cuisines. The highly educated especially seek out the broadest range and sample the rarer species; the clientele of Japanese and Thai restaurants, for example, are distinguished by their high levels of institutional cultural capital. The social foundations of the uncommon bloc (Table 3) leave little doubt that taste for ethnic cuisine is symbolically significant and a mark of elevated social position. In particular, it is unusual foods, often explicitly denoted as 'ethnic', which provide the means to display arcane knowledge about ingredients, techniques and flavour principles, and potential sources for conversation. Cultural and social capital is derived from the consumption of ethnic foods as part of the social compulsion to pursue variety.

Access to variety is greatest among those identifying as white British, a factor significant in explaining access to many types and styles of restaurant. While there is little difference in the association of ethnic identification and frequency of eating out, patterns of usage are different. The part of the population who are not white British visit more often places selling Indian and Other kinds of cuisines and much less often Traditional British or Modern British food. They are much less likely to be major omnivores or to restrict themselves to eating only popular cuisines, and they are much more likely to eat only in restaurants serving foods unfamiliar from the standpoint of many white British respondents. Such uneven representation of ethnic minorities probably has several causes, ranging from fears of racial antagonism to distaste or indifference to the foods served in popular outlets.

Class effects and cultural omnivorousness

Regression analysis indicates the contribution of class to a broader picture of social differentiation. The measure of class trajectory proves statistically significant in explaining style patterns in several of the most symbolic areas of eating out

behaviour. A stable service class trajectory predicts frequent eating out, consumption of a wide variety of cuisine styles, belonging to the groups seeking more uncommon and exclusive styles, and being omnivorous. On these dimensions being upwardly or downwardly mobile also marks a line of distinction between those with some experience of culture and life in service class households and the rest of the population.

Measured access to variety indicates exclusion of the working class. A working class respondent whose parent is also working class is never as well placed as those with service class connections, questioning the extent to which taste is democratising. The service class have increasing access to the dominant experiences of the working class, but the converse is not true. The data show a strong polarity between the stable service class and the stable working class, confirming the continued importance of class for cultural experience.

One specialised sub-group, the 'major' omnivores, engage profusely in activities centring on food and eating. The extent to which this can be transformed into other types of capital is however uncertain, with probably much of the benefit from engagement accruing in terms of intrinsic reward (MacIntyre, 1985). Nevertheless, major omnivores mark their social identity through food. They ate a majority of the cuisines included in the survey during the previous year and show exceptional concern for and interest in symbolically significant aspects of the practice of eating. If shared tastes oil social interaction then a mechanism exists for the reproduction of social differentiation over time. So while we cannot directly infer that measured differentiation is a matter of conscious or strategic operation of strategies of distinction on the part of those well-endowed with capital, we have reason to entertain the sociological suspicion that the taste for variety marks position in a social hierarchy, giving opportunities for disparaging the tastes of those lower in rank and for drawing horizontal boundaries within the service class.

7 Conclusion

Eating out in England provides evidence to support a strong version of the cultural omnivore thesis. There is evidence of a cultural hierarchy of cuisines, social differentiation in the appropriation of restaurant meals, and a propensity for those in more elevated social positions to both encounter a greater variety of cuisines and to exhibit a pattern of consumption which traverses hierarchical cultural boundaries in the anticipated manner. The hierarchy is broadly characterised by gradients of both price and reputation. By combining the exclusive, the uncommon and the popular, cultural omnivores mark possession of cultural capital by consuming many different culinary styles. Variety charms the best established sections of the professional and managerial class. Probably no term better describes their behaviour than 'omnivorous'. Their tastes for new and currently relatively uncommon cuisines, which

might be characterised as emergent or cosmopolitan, are, crucially, appropriated alongside the most exclusive and legitimate styles available.

Eating out is thus another field where an omnivorous orientation, manifest in consumption behaviour, coincides with high socio-economic status. Class position and taste are mutually adjusted. People of higher social rank patronise most heavily restaurants serving the most highly ranked cuisines. The most exclusive restaurants entertain the wealthy, while people with the highest levels of cultural capital have an accentuated taste for uncommon cuisines. Association with foreign cultures marks lines of fracture within the middle class. Taste for the uncommon ostensibly confers and constitutes high levels of cultural capital.

As regards the sociology of food, results demonstrate the existence of a minority of the population of England acting in an ostensibly similar manner to foodies in North America. Food enthusiasts have been isolated within the population and their social positioning systematically identified. Just fewer than one in five of our respondents might be deemed culinary omnivores, about half of whom are especially enthusiastic. The behaviour of the latter implies a developed and broad aesthetic concern with food which finds expression in many other aspects of eating too. Variety of experience is highly valued, requiring not just frequent outings but also discernment about quality and novelty. The social patterning is more nuanced and subtle than suggested by Bourdieu's classic depiction in *Distinction* of the class structuring of French food habits (1984: 177-193). Displaying the socio-economic characteristics expected, being both highly educated and with service class connections, omnivores reveal the stratification of eating.

The examination of eating out adds to general understandings about the dynamics of contemporary cultural processes. It is a distinctive field inflected by the major institutional forces driving cultural consumption. Forces of globalisation, commodification and aestheticisation provide a platform upon which social groups and classes play out strategies of reproduction, recreation and reputation. Fields have their own specificities and eating out is an example par excellence of the omnivorous pattern of behaviour. It is a practice which is socially structured and collectively understood, which evolves over time, and which offers opportunities for social distinction. It offers a useful contrast to musical appreciation – to date the preferred domain for mounting arguments both for and against the omnivore thesis. Eating out suggests a different and more transparent model of the omnivorous condition. It is symbolically potent because it occurs by definition in public space, almost always in company, and requires competent performance, even while access is limited by material resources.

References

- Appadurai A. 1990. Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. *Theory Culture & Society*, 7 (2–3), 295–310.
- Atkinson, W. 2017. *Class in the New Millenium: the structure, homologies and experience of the British social space*. London; Routledge.
- Barr, A. and Levy P. 1983. *The Official Foodie Handbook*. London, Ebury Press.
- Bellavance, G. 2017. The multiplicity of highbrow culture: taste boundaries among the new upper middle class, in L. Hanquinet and M. Savage (eds.) *Routledge International Handbook of the Sociology of Art and Culture*. London, Routledge, pp. 324-336.
- Bennett, T., Savage, M., Silva, E., Warde, A., Gayo-Cal, M. and Wright, D. (2009) *Culture, class, distinction*, London: New York: Routledge.
- Berris, D. and Sutton D. 2007. *The restaurants book: ethnographies of where we eat*, Oxford: Berg.
- Bourdieu P. 1984. *Distinction: a social critique of the judgement of taste*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Buettner, E. 2008. "Going for an Indian": South Asian restaurants and the limits of multiculturalism in Britain. *The Journal of Modern History* 80 865-901.
- Burnett, J. 2004. *England Eats Out: 1830 – present*. Harlow, Pearson.
- Cabiedes-Miragaya, L. 2017. Analysis of the economic structure of the eating-out sector: the case of Spain. *Appetite*. Online First. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2017.01.018>
- Cappeliez, S. & Johnston, J. 2013. From Meat and Potatoes to "Real-Deal" Rotis: Exploring Everyday Culinary Cosmopolitanism. *Poetics* 41(5), 433-455.
- Cheng, S.L., Olsen, W., Southerton, D. and Warde, A. 2007. The changing practice of eating: evidence from UK time diaries, 1975 and 2000. *British Journal of Sociology* 58 (1), 39–61.
- Díaz-Méndez, C. and García-Espejo, I. 2014. Eating practice models in Spain and the United Kingdom: A comparative time-use analysis. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 55 (1), 24–44.
- Ferguson, P. 2004. *Accounting for Taste: the triumph of French cuisine*. Chicago, Il., Chicago University Press.
- Finkelstein, J. 1991. *Dining out: an observation of modern manners*. New York, New York University Press.
- Firat, A., Fuat, A. and Ventakesh, A. 1995. Liberatory postmodernism and the reenchantment of consumption. *Journal of Consumer Research* 22(3), 239-267.
- Gayo, M. 2016. A critique of the omnivore: from the origin of the idea of omnivorousness to the Latin American experience, in L. Hanquinet and M. Savage (eds.) *Routledge International Handbook of the Sociology of Art and Culture*. London, Routledge, pp.104-115.
- Goldthorpe, J.H. 1980. *Social Mobility and Class Structure in Modern Britain*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

- Harper, A. B. 2011. Vegans of color, racialized embodiment, and problematics of the "exotic" . in Alkon, A. H. and Agyeman, J. (eds.) *Cultivating food justice: race, class, and sustainability*. Massachusetts, CA: The MIT Press.
- Holm, L., Ekström, M. P., Gronow, J., Kjærnes, U., Lund, T. B., Mäkelä, J., & Niva, M. 2012. The modernisation of Nordic eating: studying changes and stabilities in eating patterns. *Anthropology of Food*, (S7), 2-14.
- Holm, L. 2013. Sociology of Food Consumption in A. Murcott, W. Belasco and P. Jackson (eds.) *Handbook of Food Research*. London, Bloomsbury Academic, pp. 324-337.
- Heldke, L. 2003. *Exotic appetites: ruminations of a food adventurer*. London, Routledge.
- Holt, D. 1998. Does cultural capital structure American consumption? *Journal of Consumer Research*. 25 (1), 1-25.
- Jacobs, M. and Scholliers, P. 2003. *Eating out in Europe: picnics, gourmet dining, and snacks since the late eighteenth century*. Oxford, Berg.
- Johnston, J. and Baumann, S. 2010. *Foodies: democracy and distinction in the gourmet foodscape*. New York, Routledge.
- Julier, A.P. 2013. *Eating together: food, friendship, and inequality*. Chicago, University of Illinois Press.
- Julier, A.P. 2013. Meals: Eating "in" and "Eating Out", in A. Murcott, W. Belasco and P. Jackson (eds.) *Handbook of Food Research*. London, Bloomsbury Academic, pp. 338-351.
- Kjaernes, U. (ed.) 2001. *Eating patterns: A day in the life of Nordic peoples*. Oslo, SIFO Report No.7.
- Levenstein, H. 2003. *Paradox of plenty: A social history of eating in modern America*. Revised edition. Berkeley CA, UCLA Press.
- Lizardo, O. and Skiles, S. 2016. After omnivorousness: is Bourdieu still relevant?, in L. Hanquinet and M. Savage (eds.) *Routledge International Handbook of the Sociology of Art and Culture*. London, Routledge, pp.90-103.
- MacIntyre, A. 1985. *After Virtue: a study in moral theory*. London, Duckworth.
- McPhail, D., Chapman, G.E. and Beagan, B.L. 2014. "Too much of that stuff can't be good": Canadian teens, morality, and fast food consumption." *Social Science & Medicine* 73 (2), 301-307.
- Mennell, S. 1985. *All manners of food: eating and taste in England and France from the Middle Ages to the present*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Oleschuck, M. (2017) Foodies of color: authenticity and exoticism in omnivorous food culture. *Cultural Sociology*. 11 (2) 217-233.
- Paddock, J., Warde, A. and Whillans, J. 2017. The changing meaning of eating out in three English cities 1995-2015. *Appetite*. 119 5-13.
- Panayi, P. 2008. *Spicing up Britain: the multicultural history of British food*. London, Reaktion books.
- Park, K. 2017. Ethnic foodscapes: foreign cuisines in the United States. *Food Culture & Society*, 20(3), 365-394

- Prieur, A. and Savage, M. 2013. Emerging forms of cultural capital. *European Societies* 15 (2), 246-267.
- Ray, K. 2016. *The Ethnic Restaurateur*. London, Bloomsbury.
- Ray, K. 2017. Bringing the immigrant back into the sociology of taste' *Appetite*, Online First. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2016.10.013>
- Rozen, E 1983. *Ethnic cuisine: the flavour principle cookbook*. New York, Stephen Greene Press.
- Said, E. (1979) *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage.
- Trienekens, S. 2002. 'Colourful' distinction: the role of ethnicity and ethnic orientation in cultural consumption. *Poetics* 30, 281-298.
- Warde, A. 2016. *The practice of eating*. Cambridge, Polity.
- Warde, A. and Martens, L. 2000. *Eating out: Social differentiation, consumption and pleasure*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Warde, A., Wright, D. and Gayo-Cal, M. 2008. The omnivorous orientation in the UK. *Poetics* 36, 148-165.
- Weenink D. 2008. Cosmopolitanism as a form of capital, *Sociology* 42 (6), 1089-1106.
- Wood, R. C. 1995. *The Sociology of the meal*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

APPENDIX 1

Table 8. Sample characteristics (n=1081)

	N	percent
<i>Sex</i>		
Male	524	48
Female	557	52
<i>Age</i>		
16-29	282	26
30-39	247	23
40-54	290	27
55 and over	262	24
<i>Ethnicity</i>		
White British	755	70
Other ethnic	326	30
<i>Child(ren) in household</i>		
Adult only household (16 and over)	738	68
Children in household (under 16s)	343	32
<i>Education</i>		
Degree or higher	444	41
Less than degree level	637	59
<i>Social mobility</i>		
Stable service class	195	18
Upwardly mobile into service class	248	23
Downwardly mobile from service class	124	11
Other	229	21
Stable working class	118	11
Unknown	167	15
<i>Equivalentised household income (£gross/capita)</i>		
Highest (£27,501-£130,000).	251	23
Middle (£13,001-27,500)	258	24
Lowest (£300- £13,000)	250	23
Unknown	322	30
<i>City</i>		
London	361	33
Bristol	360	33
Preston	360	33

APPENDIX 2

Principal Component Analysis (PCA) applied to 26 attitudinal questions to identify a smaller set of broader attitudes towards eating out. PCA was followed by oblique promax rotation. Using eigenvalues 1 as extraction criteria, the analysis suggested a nine component solution ($Rho = 0.5585$; See Table 9). Individual respondents were allocated a factor score for each of the nine attitudinal components identified, which were used as independent variables in select regression analyses.

Table 9. Nine component solution from PCA of attitudes to eating out

Components	Loading
1. Eschewing domestic labour	
I like eating out because it means I do not have to prepare the meal myself	0.61
I like eating out because it gets me out of the house	0.55
I would like to eat out more often than I do now	0.46
2. Cultivating expansive tastes	
I eat things now that I learned about on holidays abroad	0.60
I have learned about foods through eating out	0.49
When I eat out, I like to choose things which I don't eat at home	0.42
3. Cautious and conservative	
When I eat out I feel I am on show a little bit	0.61
I am suspicious of foods that I do not know	0.41
I like to eat out because I don't like the meals I have to eat at home	0.32
4. Home-centric	
I only eat out on special occasions	0.54
Eating out is poor value for money	0.51
I often talk with others about eating out	-0.49
5. Formality as welcomed option	
I like to go to places where the other diners are smartly dressed	0.62
I dislike eating out at places that are formal and stuffy	-0.55
I feel comfortable in any type of restaurant	0.50
6. Laddishness	
A vegetarian meal would never be my first choice	0.72
I am not as concerned about the healthiness of the food served when I eat out	0.53
I prefer there to be no children around when I eat out	0.31
7. Indulgence	
When I eat out I tend to finish all parts of the meal	0.69
When I eat out, I like to eat more than I do at home	0.39
8. Service as irritation	
If I was served an unsatisfactory meal I would complain	0.64
Quick service is important to me	0.58
9. Sociability and conviviality	
When I eat out I dislike eating alone	0.79
I prefer there to be no children around when I eat out	-0.37
I like to eat out because I don't like the meals I have to eat at home	-0.34

Note: Only items with loadings >0.3 and <-0.3 are presented.