

EUCROSS

Crossing borders making Europe

a research project financed by the EC 7th Framework Programme



**The Europeanisation of Everyday Life:
Cross-Border Practices and Transnational Identifications
Among EU and Third-Country Citizens**

Operationalisation of European Identity,
Cosmopolitanism and Cross-Border Practices

Laurie Hanquinet and Mike Savage

EUCROSS Working Paper # 2

December 2011

This series of working papers originates from the research project *The Europeanisation of Everyday Life: Cross-Border Practices and Transnational Identities among EU and Third-Country Citizens* (acronym: EUCROSS).

The EUCROSS research project is funded as part of the European Commission's 7th Framework Programme ('Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities', activity 8.5: 'The Citizen in the European Union'; call identifier: FP7-SSH-2010-2; Funding scheme: collaborative project – small and medium-scale focused research projects; grant agreement: 266767). The project started in April 2011 and is scheduled to end in March 2014.

The research consortium is formed by:

- Università 'G. d'Annunzio' di Chieti-Pescara, Italy (coordinator: Ettore Recchi);
- GESIS–Leibniz Institut für Sozialwissenschaften, Mannheim, Germany (coordinator: Michael Braun);
- Aarhus Universitet, Denmark (coordinator: Adrian Favell);
- IBEI–Institut Barcelona d'Estudis Internacionals, Spain (coordinator: Juan Díez Medrano);
- University of York, United Kingdom (coordinator: Mike Savage);
- Universitatea din Bucuresti, Romania (coordinator: Dumitru Sandu).

The EUCROSS project and this working paper series are coordinated by Ettore Recchi at the Università 'G. d'Annunzio' di Chieti-Pescara.

For additional information: www.eucross.eu.

This is Deliverable D3.1 of Workpackage 3 (Operationalisation of key concepts).

Release date: December 15, 2011.

Contents

<i>The operationalisation of European identity</i>	5
<i>Limitations of Eurobarometer questions and other cross-national surveys</i>	6
<i>Degree and forms of identification</i>	8
<i>European identity and its components</i>	9
<i>Cognitive, evaluative and affective identification</i>	12
<i>Role of symbols and values</i>	13
<i>Proposal for the operationalisation of European identity</i>	13
<i>The operationalisation of cosmopolitanism</i>	20
<i>A need for empirical studies</i>	20
<i>A continuum</i>	22
<i>A multidimensional phenomenon</i>	24
<i>Omnivorousness as openness to cultural diversity</i>	27
<i>Proposal for the operationalisation of “the cosmopolitan disposition of ‘cultural openness’”</i>	31
<i>The operationalisation of cross-border practices</i>	35
<i>Mobilities</i>	35
<i>Cosmopolitan consumption practices</i>	38
<i>Proposal for the operationalisation of cross-border practices</i>	40
<i>Summary: important dimensions of European identity, cosmopolitanism, cross-border practices</i>	43
<i>References</i>	48

Executive summary

In this document we explore how the three key concepts of the EUCROSS project can effectively be operationalised in survey research. We see this step as an essential precondition to the development of the survey instrument itself, and as a contribution to the operationalisation of these concerns by other researchers, including outside the EUCROSS project. On the former point, our survey is only a 20 minute phone interview, and this format will necessarily constrain our question range and depth. However, our pragmatic choices should still be guided by a wider recognition of what questions might ideally be asked in view of experiences and findings from other projects. On the latter point, all three concepts are ones that interest a great many social scientists, yet there remains a stand-off between theorists of these concepts and qualitative researchers on the one hand, and those who use such concepts in survey research. We hope our operationalisation document may usefully bridge this divide, to some extent at least.

**The Europeanisation of Everyday Life:
Cross-Border Practices and Transnational Identifications
among EU and Third-Country Citizens**

Operationalisation of European Identity, Cosmopolitanism and Cross-Border Practices

Laurie Hanquinet and Mike Savage

The operationalisation of European identity

European identity is fundamental to EUCROSS but is a delicate concept to operationalise because there is no consensus about its definition. In part this is linked to theoretical uncertainties about the concept of identity itself¹. We therefore explore various possible ways of operationalising the concept, but we take our lead from the EUCROSS state of the art report (SOA). This privileges a **bottom-up approach** to collective identification, focusing on individual perceptions of group membership. We draw from Risse holding that ‘identities emerge in the very process by which individuals and social groups make sense of who they are and what they want’ (2010, 20). Identities are then socially constructed. This is at least our orientation in this research. Our purpose is to measure **active individual identification** among EU and third-country citizens living in Europe rather than trying to identify common external features among Europeans.

We start with a focus on the existence of collective European identity. Here, along with Tajfel (1981, 255), we might see social identities as defined as both an individual’s conscience of being part of a group and the value and emotional significance attached to that membership. This means that we will investigate if Europeans have a sense of community with regard to Europe and how they emotionally assess it. Is Europe experienced as a political, value, and economic community? And is it positively perceived? When dealing with these issues, Bruter (2005) introduces a distinction between social and political identities. The latter would be an extension of the former,

¹ It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss these different approaches, but it is worth noting the difference between (predominantly) political science approaches which derive identities from attitudes, compared to more sociological and relational perspectives which see identities as performed in specific contexts. One important difference between these is that constructionist perspectives emphasise that different identities can be mobilised according to the setting. Thus, Britons can say they are working or middle class according to whom they are talking to. An important extension of this point is the widely discussed issue that people might give different accounts of ‘where they are from’ depending on whom they interact with, for instance naming their home town with fellow nationals, but naming their nation with citizens of other nations. To extend this point with an example relevant to our study, a British person might be more likely to identify as European when travelling in the United States than in (say) Germany.

coupling the social dimension to a more affective and personal one. This distinction has some conceptual credit but, given its very subtle nature, we prefer to use 'social identity' all the more in the way we have defined it. Following the relational emphasis, we might also see that social identities imply drawing a distinction between the in-group and the out-groups. As a consequence, we might think that a European identity should go along with in-group favouritism (Bruter 2005; Sigalas 2010).

European identity is **not** perceived as **mutually exclusive** from other identities, such as national and local identifications (Münch 1999; Haller 1999; Díez Medrano and Gutiérrez 2001; Risse 2004, 2010; Rother and Nebe 2009). They are thus seen as complementary rather than incompatible (Bruter 2005; Mau and Verwiebe 2009). This has implications not only for the conceptualisation of European identity but also for cosmopolitanism (see below the discussion about the idea of a continuum in Roudometof 2005). Finally, European identity should be **differentiated from the support to European integration**. They are conceptually different, even if it is true that both are often related in the minds of lay people (and in practice difficult to disentangle at the measurement level) (Bruter 2005; Duchesne and Frogner 2002; Grundy and Jamieson 2007; Antonsich 2008; Díez Medrano 2010).

If this gives us the overall direction that will lead our work, the operationalisation of European identity raises a series of issues that we need to discuss.

Limitations of Eurobarometer questions and other cross-national surveys

When it comes to the measurement of European identity, the traditional questions the researchers rely on are those of the Eurobarometer (EB). Sinnott (2005) has compared the different questions on identity available in the cross-national surveys of values and attitudes, such as the European Values Study, the World Values Survey and the Eurobarometer. Sinnott put forward three types of questions:

- 1) **Type A:** identification ranking: *To which one of the following geographical units would you say you belong to first of all: 1) locality, 2) region, 3) country, 4) Europe, 5) the world?* This type of question has been used in the EB from 1975 to 1979. The upper levels were rarely the first chosen, showing a very nationally (and locally)-focused Europe (Kohli 2000). The question was then changed afterwards so as to have a separate question for each level (see type B).
- 2) **Type B:** proximity ranking: *How close do you feel to...* (Very close to not at all close)? This question was used in the ISSP national identity.
- 3) **Type C:** identification rating:
 - a. *Do you ever think of yourself as not only a (country) citizen but also a citizen of Europe (never, sometimes, often)?* This question was in the EB until 1992. The question does not allow an assessment of a possible exclusiveness

between the national and the European levels (Duchesne and Frogner 1995). This question has been replaced by the next question.

b. In the near future, do you see yourself as a) nationality only, b) nationality and European, c) European and nationality or d) European only? Kohli (2000) observes that this question is more realistic, permitting to express identification to different political levels.

c. People may feel different degrees of attachment to their town or village, to their region, to their country or to Europe. Please tell me how attached you feel to ... This question has been asked for a long time in addition to the latter to measure European identity in the Eurobarometer (Risse 2010; see e.g. TNS Opinion & Social 2005).

Sinnott compared these different identity measures and showed that the degree-of-attachment scale (Type C, c.) should be privileged over the other form of identification rating (Type C, b.). Nevertheless, one might wonder whether these questions measure the same dimension of European identity, since Type C c. pertains to emotional feelings (Risse 2010), while Type C b. entails some kind of projection into a future status that might also depend on politico-institutional developments.

All the questions Sinnott considers in his critical review of cross-national surveys are direct reflexive measures and rely on a unidimensional conception of European identity. As we have noted above, identity cannot be measured by such a reductionist approach *only*. Sinnott himself seems to recognise this when he notes that ‘one must wonder whether the paucity of research is due to the weaknesses in the ways in which national and other levels of identity have been operationalised in the surveys in question [i.e. EVS, WVS, ISSP, EB]’ (2005, 211).

He is not the only one who has questioned the operationalisation of identity in the EB. As Duchesne and Frogner put it (1995), relying on Díez Medrano’s research (2003), the meaning of questions might be different from one national or subnational framework to another. Generally speaking, more qualitative approaches highlight the too abstract and decontextualizing nature of quantitative surveys (White 2009; Duchesne et al. 2010). If quantitative research has intrinsic flaws, then adding more concrete and contextualising questions in a survey questionnaire might lead to more reliable findings.

Moreover, as already suggested in the EUCROSS state of the art report, the degree of attachment scale is sketchy to measure self-identification and can prevent the possibility of exploring the emergence of new kinds of social and political consciousness not easily captured by simply asking people whether they feel national, European or both. As a consequence, we prefer a more complex approach, such as the one suggested by Bruter (2005). He developed his own survey to study European identity defined by two components, civic and cultural, and by what he called ‘general identity’ measured by

direct (self-perception) questions (e.g. do I feel European?). On the other hand, it is also true that the inclusion of questions from EB favours cumulateness and permits some benchmarks to compare findings with.

The following points discuss the different elements on which we have built our operationalisation.

Degree and forms of identification

The EB has mainly focused on 'collective identity as experienced and expressed by the individual citizens' (Kohli 2010, 122) using questions pertaining to a civic/political self-consciousness ('in the near future, do you see yourself...') or the degree of territorial attachment. Yet, these questions do not tell us much about the content of people's European identity but rather the extent to which they have integrated the European idea in their biography, thus ignoring the complexity of the concept of European identity. At this stage, it is important to remind ourselves that we are interested in the active identification process at the individual level and then how individuals position themselves with regard to Europe. We will not investigate at the aggregate level the extent to which Europeans share common characteristics. But this should not prevent us from conceiving European identity as a sense of belonging that is not only and not necessarily expressed through a strong civic self-consciousness or a strong territorial attachment. This sense of belonging can be also measured by subtle emergent political, social and economic attitudes. European identity involves political and cultural components (Bruter 2005) that can be more or less integrated into a self-biography, partly because Europe is a large-scale political and cultural construct that can appear very abstract and blurred to individuals. Self-perceptions cannot be conceived as the unique measure of European identity. Such concept is multidimensional and, when one looks at the results over time of the EB, one might seriously wonder whether a firm self-affirmation as European would not be the last step in the identification process. Then, it is not surprising that, 'as these [EB] results demonstrate, the sense of belonging to the community called Europe still lags far behind that of belonging to one's nation state' (Kohli 2000, 126).

Therefore, it is important to investigate *the forms* that European identities take, maybe even before grasping *the degree* of identification reported by individuals. The latter would be hardly interpretable if one does not know the former. This is part of our insistence that identification is a relational, contextual and multidimensional process that cannot be summarized into self-identity and degree-of-attachment scales, even if these seem – at first sight – able to respect the idea of active individual identification. They are unsatisfactory for the simple reason that they do not allow us to know what 'being European' means to people.

European identity and its components

Few are the surveys that have tried to go beyond the one-dimensional approach of the EB, probably because of the need of comparison. In that respect, Bruter (2005) is one of the exceptions. Not satisfied by the self-identity question, he argued, similarly to us, that 'when two individuals claim to 'feel European', they might mean totally different things in terms both of intensity of the feeling they describe and the imagined political community they refer to' (Bruter 2003, 1154). He showed that European identity has two distinct components, one civic/political and one cultural. The first refers to the identification of the political system, and, then, the EU institutions. It concerns to the degree to which people recognize themselves into the political project proposed by the EU and its cultural, political and philosophical values and norms. As Risse puts it, 'the substantive content of the EU's political identity [...] refers to a modern, democratic, secular, and cosmopolitan value community' (2010, 51).

The second element does not focus on the sense of belonging to the political structure but rather on people's identification to Europe as a social community with common history, shared social, cultural and religious heritage and traditions. This dimension directly refers to the idea of European civilisation, which has been used to support an exclusionist nationalist vision of Europe as being white and Christians (Risse 2010). The two dimensions may be in tension (Bruter 2005). Bruter merges cultural but also ethnic aspects of the identity into this cultural component. Yet, for other authors, such as Schenkler (2011), they should not be considered as synonyms. The ethnic component refers to ancestry and religious heritage, whereas the cultural component to common history, culture and language. If such a distinction makes sense from a conceptual point of view, the boundaries between the two are so thin that one can really wonder whether they can be empirically discerned.

Moreover, according to Bruter (2005), when people are asked whether they feel European (without being more specific), it is their civic identity that is first expressed.

With regard to the operationalisation of civic identification, Bruter (2005, 103-109) developed some questions whose concrete character is particularly interesting. They will be discussed in what follows.

Civic component

1. *Since 1985, citizens from all the countries of the European Union have had a common 'European' passport on which both the name of their country and 'European Union' is written. Do you think that this is a good thing? (5-point scale)*
2. *What would best describe your reaction if you saw someone burning a European flag?*
 - I would be shocked and hurt
 - I would be shocked but not hurt
 - I would not mind
 - I would be happy
3. [control] *What would best describe your reaction if you saw someone burning the Union Jack?*
 - I would be shocked and hurt
 - I would be shocked but not hurt
 - I would not mind
 - I would be happy
4. *A group of athletes from all the countries of the European Union have proposed that at the Sydney Olympics, whenever an athlete/team from the European Union wins a gold medal, the 'Ode to Joy', the European anthem, should be played after, and in addition to, their national anthem. Do you think that this would be a good idea? (5-point scale)*
5. *When the heads of state/government of a European Union country (such as Queen Elizabeth II, Tony Blair, the French President or the German Chancellor) make a speech on TV, both the national flag and the European one appear behind them. Do you think this is a good idea? (5-point scale)*
6. *Does being a 'Citizen of the European Union' mean anything for you?*
 - Yes, it means a lot
 - Yes, it means something
 - No, it does not mean anything
7. *If you have answered yes to question 13, would you say that, among other things, it means...?*
 - The right to vote in the European Parliament elections
 - Common institutions
 - A common European flag, European anthem, European passport
 - The right to travel to another EU country without passing through customs
 - The right to travel to another EU country without having to show your passport/ID

Cultural component

1. *Here is a list of some of the games that will be featured at the next Women's Volley-Ball World Championship in June. Could you say which team you would rather won each of these games? (Please choose ONE team for each of the four games)*
 - Ghana vs Denmark
 - Italy vs USA
 - Spain vs China
 - Saudi Arabia vs Republic of Ireland

After having run a factor analysis, this question appeared to have a low loading so that ultimately it has not been inserted in the index of cultural identity.

2. *Some say that in spite of their numerous differences, Europeans share a 'common heritage' that makes them slightly closer to one another than they are to, say, Japanese or Chilean people. Do you agree with this view? (5-point scale)*
3. *If you answered yes to the former question, would you say that, among other things, it means...? (choose as many as apply)*
 - A shared European heritage
 - A common European history
 - Some common ideals
 - To be a member of the 'European family'
4. *Would you say that you feel closer to fellow European than, say, Chinese, Russian, or American people? (5-point scale)*

Bruter's approach is inspiring due to its attempt to conceptualise European identity in a more complex way and to design new associated questions. The questions referring to the civic component focus mainly on the attitudes towards European symbols. This prevents the questions from being too abstract (see below). Nevertheless, with such questions, he does not really investigate values advocated by the EU political project, such as democracy, social solidarity or peace. Especially in the current crisis, the need to investigate the attitudes with regard to further interactions or solidarity among EU countries seems all the more important.

The questions related to the cultural component are based on the opposition between the in-and out-groups. If such distinction must be studied, the interpretation of the answers to these questions is not always straightforward. The main problem might be that the other non-European groups mentioned are unlikely to induce the same reaction among all respondents. These 'reference' groups are not neutral. Some British might feel closer to American people but might have a moderate to strong European cultural

identity as well. These questions rely then on an exclusionary principle that might lead to biased findings. As a consequence, if such questions related to an in/out scheme illustrate one of the fundamental aspects of social identity, their wordings have to be carefully crafted. Besides, the operationalisation of cultural identity should focus more on the constitutive elements of this alleged shared civilisation. What could bring Europeans together from a cultural point of view? How can they be represented as a culturally consistent group in Europeans' mind?

Sigalas (2010) developed Bruter's (2005) approach further. He also recognised that European identity could not be only measured by self-categorization. According to him, this social identity has to reflect also in-group favouritism (positive feeling towards other Europeans), a sense of European citizenship (i.e. Bruter's civic dimension) and of commonalities among Europeans (i.e. Bruter's cultural dimension) and territorial attachment. He operationalised European identity in terms of:

1) European self-identification: *In the near future, do you see yourself as* a) nationality only, b) nationality and European, c) European and nationality or d) European only (that is, borrowing from EB);

2) European identity:

- European pride: *Are you proud of being European?* (0-6 scale)
- European attachment: *How attached do you feel to Europe?*
- European citizenship: *Do you ever think yourself as citizen of Europe?*
- European trust: *How much would you say you trust other Europeans?*
- Group solidarity: *How close do you feel to Europeans?*
- Commonalities: *How many things do you feel you have in common with other Europeans?*

His approach is constructivist and, consequently, privileges self-perceptions and subjective attitudes. However, these questions are once again too detached from Europeans' everyday life and can be interpreted in many ways. People may be proud of Europe for differing reasons, for instance. As a consequence, building up a European identity scale based only on these abstract questions is not sufficiently reliable.

Cognitive, evaluative and affective identification

European identity might be composed by different dimensions that can play a more or less important role in it. It is therefore not limited to a self-affirmation as European. In addition, there are several types of identification process: cognitive, evaluative and affective. As Risse puts it, 'social identities not only entail cognitive elements in terms of social knowledge about the properties of the group. They also contain evaluations and emotional attachments that connect' (2010, 22). People have certain knowledge of what being European means. They must have an idea of the common purpose underlying

Europe and of the constitutive norms that define the ingredients of group membership (evaluative dimension). Therefore, knowledge is an important part of the identification process. Because people need to know what being European implies in order to develop an European identity. They have to acquire the social knowledge of what it means to be European to start to identify oneself to Europe (cognitive dimension). As a consequence, the operationalisation of European identity should entail questions on people's knowledge of European institutions but also of European culture(s). Moreover, social identity is defined by a cognitive content but also by emotional or affective aspects. There must be positive feelings towards the in-group (affective dimension). Otherwise, the concept would only measure social role (ibid.).

Role of symbols and values

We have already drawn the attention to the fact that the measures of European identity do not have to be too abstract. One possible way to increase the relevance of the questions for lay people is by examining the relationships between cultural and political/civic values on the one hand and symbols linked to both EU and Europe on the other. Values such as cultural diversity, tolerance, solidarity democracy, peace, freedom are all used by EU decision-makers to legitimize the EU construction and to justify choices that have been made. Therefore, feeling European is also about sharing such values. Moreover, symbols have been created by the EU in order to allow people to get a livelier grip of the abstract idea of Europe. At the same time, they represent privileged tools for social scientists to evaluate the existence of an European identity (see for instance, Cram et al. 2011).

Proposal for the operationalisation of European identity

The following table summarises our approach and proposes some potential questions to unravel European identities. Following Bruter (2005), our operationalisation is multidimensional, coupling a cultural dimension and a political one. The cultural dimension is meant to assess how far people from European countries have the impression to share some commonalities one with another. Do they feel to belong to one cultural group, the Europeans? Or does Europe embody for them values they cherish? People's attitudes towards the possible existence of a shared European heritage and towards cultural and religious diversity in Europe are gauged. The ethnic dimension is not investigated as such, except for the fact that some questions are specifically asked on the European religious heritage. Beyond such distinction, disentangling cultural and ethnic components (i.e. differentiating items on common ancestry from others on common history) may not be very relevant for the operationalisation of European identity. As we have already noticed, the development of a social identity requires having some

knowledge of the properties of the group. Questions about the knowledge of cultural aspects of the other European countries are then addressed.

The political dimension is composed by three factors. The first is strictly linked to political values and symbols of the EU. Is democracy an important element in the constitution of people's European identity? How far have they integrated EU symbols in their social identity? The second factor is associated to civic elements of the political European identity. The roles of solidarity, peace and freedom of travel – some of the constitutive principles of the EU – in the identification to Europe are investigated. Finally, we believe it is also important to consider the weight of economic aspects in the identification to Europe. Many researchers have tried to explain the development of the EU as a merely economic phenomenon somewhat independent from collective identity. However, one can wonder why the construction of a social identity might not rely on some politico-economic values, such as the 'free movement of capital, goods, services and labour'. This could be something people believe in and on which they partly draw their social identity. Therefore, we would suggest to add questions on the 'economic dimension' of European identity. Europe has affected different socioeconomic aspects of people's life, such as the freedom to travel or to work abroad. People's European identity will probably entail to some extent such a 'pragmatic' component (Delanty 2002). It is even possible that, in some cases, it turns out to be the main ingredient.

Our operationalisation proposal differentiates also the two main types of identification required to build up a social identity. In the second column of table 1, we have gathered together the cognitive (self-identification as European) and evaluative (what being European means?) dimensions. Because many questions tend to incorporate both dimensions, we have not found useful to introduce a distinction between them. The third column shows questions pertaining to an emotional or affective form of identification (i.e., being European induces positive feelings). The line between both columns is sometimes really thin.

Finally, we have also added a component about 'general identity'. It entails direct reflexive measures on self-identity and territorial attachment. These questions are the most direct but also the most imprecise. They require an understanding of the other dimensions, cultural and political to be interpreted.

Table 1 suggests different questions as a means to illustrate the interactions between the components and dimensions of European identity.

Table 1. Operationalisation of European identity

Component/ dimension	COGNITIVE/Evaluative	AFFECTIVE/EMOTIONAL
General identity	SELF-IDENTITY	TERRITORIAL ATTACHMENT
	<p>In the near future, will you see yourself as Nationality only, Nationality and European, European and Nationality, European only? (Source: EB)</p> <p>(NATIONALITY) Do you consider yourself as being [home country national] only, [home country national] and European, European and [home country national], European only? (Source: PIONEUR project)</p>	<p>People may feel different degrees of attachment to their town or village, to their region, to their country or to Europe. Please tell me how attached you feel to ... (Source: EB)</p> <p>(TERRITORY & COMMUNITY) On a scale from 1 to 10, where 10 means 'Strongly agree', please describe how well the following statements apply to you: I feel [city membership] I feel [Region/Language Area in countries if relevant] I feel [Country of Residence] I feel [First Country of Nationality, if Different from Country of Residence] I feel [European] I feel a citizen of the world I feel [_____] (Source: EUMARR)</p>
<p>Ethno-cultural</p> <p>Do Europeans feel they belong to a group sharing a certain culture in terms of lifestyles and traditions, values, religion, ethics or ethnicity?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">KNOWLEDGE OF OTHER CULTURE IN EUROPE (1)</p> <p>We can assume that an interest in other European cultures may be a first step in the identification process and in the development of a collective cultural European identity. This should be measured by assessing the knowledge of and affinities with other cultural European forms compared to non-European cultural form.</p>	
	<p>In link with cosmopolitanism (geographical dimension)</p> <p>In general, how interested are you in other parts of the world? (e.g. North America – South America – Asia – North Africa – Russia – East Europe – etc.)</p> <p>How well do you think you know about? (e.g. North America – South America – Asia – North Africa – Russia – East Europe – etc.)</p>	
	<p style="text-align: center;">KNOWLEDGE OF OTHER CULTURES IN EUROPE (2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">CULTURAL FIGURES/WORKS: knowledge and appreciation</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 means 'Not at all' and 5 means 'Very much', about how much do you like to watch the following types of films? Films in general - Films made in the country you live in - Films made in non-English-speaking European countries - Films made in other non-English speaking countries (e.g. Latin America, Africa, Asia) (Source: EUMARR)</p> <p>The next questions ask about things people like to do in their free time. The first ones concern your taste in music. Please check on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 means 'Not at all' and 5 means 'Very much', how much you like the following kinds of music. World/Ethnic Music (e.g. Brazilian, Tango, African, Caribbean, Middle Eastern, North-African) - French/Italian Singer-Songwriters - Classical Music–Schlager -Asian Pop -Local Popular Music (Traditional and Contemporary) – Jazz – Anglo-Saxon Pop/Rock (Source: EUMARR)</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">SHARED CULTURAL TRADITIONS</p> <p>The aim of the three next sections is to assess whether people think that Europe is more than</p>		

	<p>an artificial political construction and whether Europe is grounded on shared lifestyles, values, traditions and rules on how to live together. And if so, which kind of ethics people privilege? The idea here is to survey the existence of a 'national Europe' (white, Christian, exclusionary) compared to a 'modern Europe' based on secularism, cosmopolitanism, eclecticism, democracy (Risse 2010).</p> <p>Some say that in spite of their numerous differences, Europeans share a 'common heritage' that makes them slightly closer to one another than they are to Non-European people. Do you agree with this view? (Source: Bruter 2005 but slightly changed)</p> <p>If agreed, would you say that, among other things, it means...? A common European history A common European cultural heritage Some common ideals A Christian heritage ... (Source: Bruter 2005 but slightly changed)</p> <p>What does Europe mean to you? (rank or the two most important element) A geographical area Common culture Common history Common religious heritage Democratic values ... (inspired by the EB)</p>	<p>Imagine that, during the World Football Cup, the final is between a European country and a non-European country. Of both teams, to which would you feel closer? <i>We could add, for example, four paired examples (US versus France, etc.) but the problem will be the choice of the mentioned countries: this could influence in different way people's answers according to their national origin.</i> (inspired by Bruter 2005)</p>
CULTURAL DIVERSITY/TOLERANCE		
	<p>Would you say that [country]'s cultural life is generally undermined (0) or enriched by people coming to live here from other European countries (10)?</p> <p>Would you say that [country]'s cultural life is generally undermined (0) or enriched by people coming to live here from poorer countries outside Europe (10)? (inspired by ESS)</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Now, using this card, to what extent do you think [country] should allow other Europeans to come and live here? Allow many to come and live here Allow some Allow a few Allow none</p> <p>What about people from outside Europe but from the same ethnic group as most of [country]'s people?</p> <p>What about people from outside Europe with a different ethnic group from most of [country]'s people? (inspired by ESS)</p> <p>-----</p> <p>The EU currently has 27 member states. What</p>	<p>[Control question linked to cosmopolitanism] On this list are various groups of people. Could you please mention any that you would not like to have as neighbours? People of a different race People of a different religion Immigrant/ foreign workers People who speaks a different language (World Values Survey 2008)</p>

	<p>do you think about the cultural differences between all these countries? Do you think there are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -No cultural differences -Few cultural differences -Some cultural differences (follow-up q°) -A lot of cultural differences (follow-up q°) -Between EU member states <p>Relating to the cultural differences between EU members states: How far do you agree with the following sentence? 'I don't recognise myself in such cultural diversity'. (1-7) (GESIS' suggestion)</p>	
	PHILOSOPHICAL AND RELIGIOUS VALUES	
	<p>FURTHER POLITICAL INTEGRATION Would you in favour or against it becoming part of the European Union in the future? Romania – Turkey (Source: EB)</p> <p>(if not in favour for Turkey) Could you tell me the main reason why you're against it becoming part of the EU in the future?</p>	
Political	DEMOCRACY	
<p>Do people perceive themselves as citizens of a political community with a clear structure composed of different institutions and rules guaranteeing some rights to them?</p>	<p>The EU is meant to guarantee individual rights related to dignity, freedoms, equality, solidarity. How far do you think the EU is able to protect citizens in all the different European countries?</p> <p>Do you think that simple citizens are able to present initiatives to the Union's institutions? <i>N.B. This should reflect people's knowledge on the EU. Other questions on the usages of certain rights are definitively possible (where is based the EU? About the European parliament?).</i></p>	<p>If, during a trip outside Europe, some non-Europeans start to criticize the EU about its non-transparency and its deficit of democracy, how would you react?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would be shocked and hurt • I would be shocked but not hurt • I would not mind • I would agree with them
	EUROPEAN PRIDE	
	<p>A group of athletes from all the countries of the European Union have proposed that at the Sydney Olympics, whenever an athlete/team from the European Union wins a gold medal, the 'Ode to Joy', the European anthem, should be played after, and in addition to, their national anthem. Do you think that this would be a good idea? (Source: Bruter 2005)</p> <p>Imagine that you are in Japan or the United States to receive an important scientific or artistic price and someone introduces you to the audience. How would you like them to refer to you, as a [Regional identity], a [Country identity], as a European, or it would not really matter to you? (Source: EUMARR)</p>	<p>What would best describe your reaction if you saw someone burning a European flag?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would be shocked and hurt • I would be shocked but not hurt • I would not mind • I would be happy <p>(Source: Bruter 2005)</p>
Civic	SOLIDARITY	

	<p>The government in this country proposes higher taxes to assist another [a country's relevant administrative district or region] in your country that is in financial trouble because of bad governance? Experts agree that higher taxes would help improve this other [relevant administrative district]'s financial situation. How much of an increase would you be willing to accept, if any?</p> <p>-No increase -Less than 2% -Between 2% and 5% -Between 5% and 8% (Source: EUMARR)</p> <p>The government in this country proposes higher taxes to assist another European country that is in financial trouble because of bad governance? Experts agree that higher taxes would help improve this other country's financial situation. How much of an increase would you be willing to accept, if any?</p> <p>-No increase -Less than 2% -Between 2% and 5% -Between 5% and 8% (Source: EUMARR)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Among the taxes you already pay, how much should be allocated to your country? To Europe? To other parts of the world in need? 	<p>If a city in another EU member state, where you were not born, have never lived and have no family or friends, were the victim of a terrorist attack from outside the EU, would you feel personally attacked? (GESIS' wording)</p>
<p>PEACE</p> <p>Peace is often mentioned as one of the constitutive elements of the EU. Therefore, it may be an important element of people's political European identity, maybe the most basic one.</p>		
	<p>When you think about the war 1939-45 in Europe, how likely do you think such a war happens again nowadays inside the EU?</p>	
<p>FREEDOM OF TRAVEL</p>		
		<p>As European, if you wanted to go tomorrow on holidays to another European country by car, it would be quite easy given that, in most of the European countries, you would not need any ID to cross the borders. How much do you appreciate this freedom of travel?</p>

<p>Economic</p>	<p>FREEDOM TO WORK IN EUROPE & EUROPEAN MARKET</p> <p>EU rules demand the 'free movement of capital, goods, services and labour'. What do you think about this principle of freedom to work everywhere in the EU?</p> <p>0 This has led to a too great flexibility for workers who are often obliged to leave their own country to find a job.</p> <p>10 This flexibility gives to people more works opportunities and widens their professional scope</p> <p>According to you, is Euro, the single EU currency, a good or a bad thing for the economic stability of European countries?²</p>	<p>How worried are you by the financial situation of Greece? Are you mainly worried for...? (Multiple choices possible)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for the Greeks • for the impact on the rest of the EU • for the impact on the economic situation of my own country • I'm not worried. This does not concern me
------------------------	--	---

² Other questions on EURO are available in the EB67.3 (on the coins) and in the EB60.0, for instance. In the latter, the following questions are asked: 'All things considered, do you personally feel very pleased, fairly pleased, not very pleased, not at all pleased that the euro became your currency?', 'Do you totally agree, tend to agree, tend to disagree or totally disagree with the statement that 'By using euros instead of (former national currency), we feel more European than before'?'.

The operationalisation of cosmopolitanism

Cosmopolitanism is one of the most widely touted concepts in the social sciences, yet it is really hard to pin down empirically because its definition is fluid, not to say evasive. Vertovec and Cohen (2002) identify six different perspectives on cosmopolitanism: 1) a socio-cultural condition, 2) a philosophy or world-view, a political project either in terms of 3) transnational institutions or 4) multiple subjects, 5) a practice or a competence and 6) an attitude or disposition. These different approaches have been described in the SOA report; therefore, we will not go into detail over all these but we will focus on the last one, cosmopolitanism as an ‘empirical measurable attitudinal stance’ (Mau et al. 2008, 4). The operationalisation of cosmopolitanism here is limited to attitudes while cosmopolitan-related behaviours will be considered in the operationalisation of cross-border practices. Our starting point is the widely accepted view that cosmopolitanism should be seen from an individual, micro-level perspective (Pichler, forthcoming), as a ‘willingness to engage with the Other’ (Hannerz 1990, 239). Still following Hannerz, ‘it is an intellectual and aesthetic stance of openness toward divergent cultural experiences, a search for contrasts rather than uniformity’ (ibid.). As Skrbis et al. (2004, 117) rightly put it, ‘cosmopolitanism – as a subjective outlook, attitude or practice – is associated with a conscious openness to the world and to cultural differences’ (see Hannerz 1996; Held 2002; Ollivier 2008; Vertovec and Cohen 2002).

In such a view, cosmopolitanism is conceived as a cultural phenomenon buttressed by new forms of capital, new competencies and specific ethical or moral outlooks (see Woodward et al. 2008). It leads – at a micro-level – to individual cosmopolitan attitudes of ‘openness’ that can be expressed in various cultural, economic, social, political areas. This therefore poses a major analytical divide between those who see cosmopolitanism as a ‘progressive’ project (e.g. Beck) and those who see it, from more Bourdieusian perspectives, as a means of legitimating the liberal worldview of middle class intellectuals and hence an emerging form of cultural capital (e.g. Prieur and Savage 2011). This is a very lively debate, though one which needs more empirical research, and we should try to allow our project to produce relevant findings which bear on it.

A need for empirical studies

As Skrbis et al. (2004) pointed out, the attempts to measure empirically cosmopolitanism are rare and underdeveloped, especially with quantitative tools (see Phillips and Smith 2008). The field has suffered from an ‘excessive theorization’ (Skrbis et al. 2004, 117). Skrbis and his colleagues identified a series of issues with regard to the theorisation of cosmopolitanism. Three are of particular interest here: the problems of indeterminacy, identification and attribution. The first one refers to a lack of concreteness in the use of the term of cosmopolitanism resulting in the fact that any aspiration or reality can be

projected on this largely underspecified notion. 'The fantasy of cosmopolitanism is so appealing and effective that it discourages the attempt to tie down any real cosmopolitans; but we must resist the lure of this fantasy if we wish to make cosmopolitanism a valuable analytical concept' (Skrbis et al. 2004, 119).

The second problem underlines the fact that the cosmopolitan attribute is often associated with several ideal-types, such global business elites, refugees or expatriates (e.g. Kanter 1995; Hannerz 1996; Thompson and Kuan Tambyah 1999). Yet, inspired by the work of Lamont and Aksartova (2002) on 'ordinary cosmopolitanisms', Skrbis et al. (2004) argue that cosmopolitanism is much more plural than it is revealed in his fragmentation in ideal-types, and we need to be open to the prospect that cosmopolitanism can be found amongst different social groups.

And third, to make progress, the debate on cosmopolitanism requires that we break it down into specific measures so that we better understand its composition, and possibly can differentiate between different forms which might be allied to specific social groups or identities. The concept has not been much decomposed in different measurable dimensions. Although a couple of theoretical studies have proposed a multidimensional conceptualisation (e.g. Urry 2000; Held 2002), the attempts to survey cosmopolitanism in a more refined way are rare (see below).

Urry (2000, 7-8) produces a wide ranging list of possible traits, where 'cosmopolitan predispositions or practices involve:

- extensive *mobility* in which people have the right to 'travel' corporeally, imaginatively and virtually and for significant numbers they also have the means to so travel;
- the capacity to *consume* many places and environments en route;
- a *curiosity* about many places, peoples and cultures and at least a rudimentary ability to locate such places and cultures historically, geographically and anthropologically;
- a willingness to take *risks* by virtue of encountering the 'other';
- an ability to '*map*' one's own society and its culture in terms of a historical and geographical knowledge, to have some ability to reflect upon and judge aesthetically between different natures, places and societies;
- *semiotic* skill to be able to interpret images of various others, to see what they are meant to represent, and to know when they are ironic;
- an *openness* to other peoples and cultures and a willingness/ ability to appreciate some elements of the language/ culture of the 'other'.

His definition encompasses three main aspects: 1) cosmopolitan skills and knowledge, 2) cosmopolitan practices and 3) cosmopolitan attitudes. Only the latter is then of importance to us, given the concerns of the EUCROSS project. Cosmopolitan attitudes mainly refer to openness and curiosity towards the others. Beyond the fact that the

distinction between openness and curiosity is not straightforward, the major problem is that one always ends up with this notion of 'openness' that is unspecified. A great deal has been written by qualitative researchers on the limits of 'openness', in which apparently liberal perspectives may nonetheless have some essential limits (for instance regarding how much mixing with ethnic minorities might be seen as appropriate). Therefore, one of the most important challenges standing up in front of those willing to empirically study cosmopolitanism is to provide a clear definition of openness.

In this respect, Held's definition of what he calls 'cultural cosmopolitanism' (2002) can be used to develop a more complex operationalisation. No wonder then that Mau and his colleagues (2008) drew their inspiration from this definition in their article (see below).

Held put forward three dimensions:

1. Recognition of the interconnectedness of political communities in diverse domains, including the social, economic and environmental;
2. Development of an understanding of overlapping collective fortunes that requires collective solutions locally, regionally, and globally;
3. Celebration of difference, diversity and hybridity while being able to reason from the point of view of others and mediate traditions.

His definition represents a step further in the development of a more precise conceptualisation. Yet, each dimension is widely open to interpretation, leaving some freedom to researchers to operationalise them.

Now that we have addressed some of the issues around the way cosmopolitanism has been theorized, we review the existing empirical quantitative work on cosmopolitanism. The first section discusses Roudometof's idea (2005) of a continuum between cosmopolitanism and localism. The second section goes further by investigating the different dimensions of cosmopolitanism. The third section evaluates the potential contribution of cultural sociology and its notion of 'omnivore' (Peterson and Simkus 1992) in the cosmopolitan debate.

A continuum

One way of operationalising cosmopolitanism is in relationship to localism. Roudometof (2005) showed a continuity between these two alternatives. He operationalised the cosmopolitan-local continuum in terms of different degrees of attachment to cultures and places, without actually testing it:

- Degree of attachment to a locality, e.g. neighbourhood or city;
- Degree of attachment to a state or country;
- Degree of attachment to and support of local culture (ethnocentrism);
- Degree of economic, cultural and institutional protectionism.

As it has been argued for European identity, cosmopolitanism should not be limited to the degree of territorial attachment. Indeed, weaker attachment is here associated with cosmopolitanism. The question of course is whether the association is justified. Does a weaker local attachment necessarily mean cosmopolitanism? The authors recognised the disputable character of their approach but also put forward that '[t]he measurements of attachment represent a means for rendering the otherwise opaque notion of 'openness' into an observable category' (2010, 283). This approach has indeed some advantages in proposing a clear operationalisation of cosmopolitanism and rightly underlines that cosmopolitanism and localism represent trends. However, such a continuum implies that cosmopolitans cannot also have local or national attachment, which is problematic. As Skrbis et al. (2004, 123) argued, 'cosmopolitanism is a lived experience, and one that does not necessarily shy away from particular, local forms'.

Drawing on Roudometof's work, Olofsson and Öhmann (2007), however, argued that the operationalisation of cosmopolitanism should be able to differentiate geographical and non-geographical factors instead of including them in the same dimension. As a consequence, they proposed a two-dimension model: the first dimension measured place-oriented attitudes such as attachment at the local, regional or national level and the second dimension socio-cultural aspect of attachment. From them, four different configurations of people could be identified: 'open globals', 'local protectionists', 'global protectionists' and the 'open locals'.

To develop their operationalisation, they used the following items also coming from the ISSP surveys 1995 and 2003:

- Local-global:
 - o Solidarity with home town
 - o Solidarity with region
 - o Solidarity with country
- Protectionism-openness:
 - o It is impossible for people who do not share Swedish customs to become Swedish
 - o Ethnic minorities ought to get public support to preserve their customs
 - o Imports should be limited in order to protect the economy
 - o Foreigners should not be allowed to buy land in Sweden

Several years later and using – this time – empirical data (ISSP National Identity Modules 1995-2003), Roudometof and Haller (2010) refined this idea of a continuum by distinguishing two distinct variants:

- A place-oriented variant measured by the following items:
 - o How close respondents feel to city/ town (1= very close, 2= close, 3= not very close, 4= not close at all)
 - o How close respondents feel to country

- How close respondents feel to country
- How close respondents feel to continent
- A nation-oriented variant measured by the following items
 - Important to be born in respondent's country (1= very important, 2= important, 3= not very important, 4= not important at all)
 - Important to have citizenship in respondent's country
 - Important to spend most of life in respondent's country
 - Important to feel a member of respondent's country

By recognizing the existence of two different variants, they answered to the criticisms made by Olofsson and Öhmann (2007) on the necessity to take into account non-geographical aspects. However, and contrary to the latter, they did not really investigate the different configurations resulting from the interactions between the two variants. These are supposed to reflect two separate sides of cosmopolitanism (detachment from place and transcendence of the nation-state as a frame of reference).

A multidimensional phenomenon

Empirical research increasingly endorses this approach of cosmopolitanism as a complex and multidimensional phenomenon. This is actually more in line with most of the theoretical work in this field (Urry 2000; Held 2002) that refuses to reduce cosmopolitanism to a one-dimensional framework. Based on Held (2002), Mau et al. (2008, 2) defined cosmopolitanism as 'a particular worldview characterized by the capacity to mediate between different cultures, the recognition of increasing interconnectedness of political communities and the approval of political responsibility at the supranational and global level'. This definition encompasses the classical dimensions of cosmopolitanism, namely openness, tolerance, universal ethics and perception of the world as a whole.

Drawing on representative data from the survey *Transnationalisierung 2006*, they operationalised cosmopolitan attitudes by differentiating two aspects:

1. *Supranational assignment of accountability* measured by the following item: 'Today many problems are not solvable by single states, rather the world community needs to bear responsibility for them' (Totally agree, rather agree, neither agree nor disagree, rather don't agree, don't agree at all);
2. *Attitudes towards foreigners* to grasp the openness towards diversity and empathy measured by three items: a) enrichment ('Foreigners living in Germany enrich the country with new ideas and new cultures'), b) multi-cultural contacts ('I would like to have more contact with people living in other countries'), c) universal equal rights ('Foreigners living in Germany should have the same rights as Germans on ALL levels'). All the items are five-point scale.

In the same line, Pichler (2009b) differentiated between 'subjective/identity' cosmopolitanism – referring to feelings of attachment or belonging to the world as a whole – and 'objective/orientation' cosmopolitanism – expressed through open attitudes towards otherness. In one of his forthcoming articles, he proposed a more complex approach of cosmopolitanism by differentiating three dimensions:

- 1) Ethical cosmopolitan orientations: ideas of trust, tolerance and attitudes towards diversity;
- 2) Political cosmopolitan orientations: national identity and global political decision-making;
- 3) Subjective aspect of identification: self-identification as global citizens.

Drawing on Vertovec and Cohen's outline on cosmopolitanism (2002, see above), his conceptualisation seeks to encompass to a greater extent the different meanings that cosmopolitanism can take in the literature. For instance, his first dimension aims at bringing together the philosophical and attitudinal aspects of cosmopolitanism whereas the second tends to 'merge' together its political and attitudinal aspects. Even if, in the end, these two aspects could be conceived as the attitudinal stance, his outlook represents a first attempt to investigate further what has been called previously the 'non-geographical' aspects of cosmopolitanism.

For his operationalisation of these dimensions, he used the following indicators from the World Values Survey 2008:

Global identity

'People have different views about themselves and how they relate to the world. Using this card, would you tell me how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about how you can see yourself? Strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree

I see myself as a world citizen'.

He creates two types of measures: a strong global identity (strongly agree) and a weak global identity (agree).

Ethical dimension

- TRUST³: 'I would like to ask you how much you trust people from various groups. Could you tell me for each whether you trust people from this group completely, somewhat, not very much or not at all? People of different nationality? People of different religion?' The two variables are transformed into a scale.
- TOLERANCE: 'On this list are various groups of people. Could you please mention any that you would not like to have as neighbours? People of a different race;

³Norris and Inglehart (2009) relied on attitudes towards national belonging and trust in foreigners and different people as distinct dimensions of cosmopolitanism.

Immigrants/ foreign workers; People of a different religion; People who speaks a different language⁴. He creates a count index ranging from 0 to 4 (tolerant).

- OPENNESS: 'Turning to the question of ethnic diversity, with which of the following views do you agree? Please use this scale to indicate your position. Scale of 1 to 10 where 1 is labelled 'Ethnic diversity erodes a country's unity' and 10 'Ethnic diversity enriches life'.

Political dimension

- INTERNATIONAL POLITICS: 'Some people believe that certain kinds of problems could be better handled by the United Nations or regional organizations rather than by each national government separately. Others think that these problems should be left entirely to the national governments. I'm going to mention some problems. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by regional organizations, or by the United Nations? Policies mentioned in the text'.

Five areas are investigated: peacekeeping, protection of the environment, aid to developing countries, refugees, human rights. Pichler derived a count index ranging from 0 to 5 (preference for politics beyond the nation-state).

- ABSENCE OF NATIONALISM: 1) 'People have different views about themselves and how they relate to the world. Using this card, would you tell me how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about how you can see yourself? Strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree

I see myself as part of my local community

I see myself as part of the [nationality] nation'.

2) 'How proud are you to be [national]? Very proud, quite proud, not very proud, not proud at all'

3) 'Of course we all hope that there will not be another war, but if it were to come to that, would you be willing to fight for your country? Yes – No'

His measure is an equally weighted composite measure ranging from 0 to 12 (non-nationalistic) based on the work of Norris and Inglehart (2009);

Pichler's operationalisation is currently one of the most advanced: it combines questions on self-identity and attitudinal items, similar to Bruter's approach (2005) on European identity, and integrates many of the aspects already pinned down by Mau et al. (2008), namely supranational assignment of accountability, enrichment and multi-cultural

⁴ This kind of questions is also used in Philips and Smith (2008). To measure what they call the 'cosmopolitan outlook', they use the total number of times the respondents indicated 'not at all easy' when asked how they would feel if a family from an (a) Indian, (b) Greek, (c) Aboriginal, (d) Lebanese and (e) Vietnamese background were to move in next door and become their new neighbours. The cosmopolitan outlook is differentiated from the cosmopolitan practices (visits other countries, speak by phone to a person living in another country, etc.).

contacts. Interestingly, he showed that the different dimensions of cosmopolitanism, identity, ethics and politics, do not necessarily go together.

Moreover, in his work compared to many others, openness is clearly defined and refers to a positive attitude towards ethnic diversity. By doing so, he tried to circumscribe what openness means in a context in which clarifying openness has been recognised to be 'one of the most pressing problems in progressing sociological investigations of 'actual existing' cosmopolitanism' (Woodward et al. 2008). Nevertheless, one can wonder whether openness should only be related to the attitude towards ethnic diversity since it is likely that this poses specific issues regarding racism and ethnic diversity which might not be found in other arenas. Let us take a brief detour into cultural sociology to see that openness to cultural diversity may encompass other meanings.

Omnivorousness as openness to cultural diversity

Cultural sociologists, under the influence of writers such as Lamont and Peterson, both of whom critically react to Bourdieu's emphasis on cultural boundaries, see openness to cultural diversity as transgressing boundaries. These boundaries can be multiple and do not refer only to ethnic boundaries and to the attitudes towards foreigners. In cultural sociology, openness to cultural diversity is associated to eclecticism in people's tastes and cultural practices (i.e. what people do during their leisure-time). Being eclectic refers here to people's ability of navigating between different cultural genres that tend to be predominantly appreciated by quite distinct social groups. Such eclecticism has been coined as 'omnivorousness' by Peterson in 1992 (Peterson and Simkus 1992; see also Peterson and Kern 1996; Peterson 2005) and has been since then the focus of extensive and instructive discussion in cultural sociology.

The notion of omnivorousness is born in reaction to Bourdieu's work on distinction (1984). According to the latter, the social position of an individual depends on her or his level of cultural, economic and social capital that defines her or his lifestyle, considered as a set of practices, consumed products and tastes that can be classed and that class people. The different lifestyle dimensions play the role of indicators to evaluate the position of people into a symbolic space. Bourdieu proposes a homology principle in which the lifestyle space is one-to-one related to social space. In that respect, highbrow culture is linked to the upper classes (divided themselves in class fractions), the richest in terms of economic and cultural capital. The latter want to distinguish themselves from middle classes and their associated middlebrow tastes but, overall, from the popular classes defined by the 'choice of the necessary', meaning that their social and economic conditions prevent them from having more refined tastes. Such correspondences between social and lifestyle space are due to the 'habitus' which is a set of dispositions defined by the conditions of existence and generative of practices and meanings.

Peterson has questioned Bourdieu's theory by discovering that the upper and middle classes were characterized by a taste for prestigious art forms but were also more and more engaged in popular culture. He claimed that the distinction 'snob versus slob' was losing relevance in favour of a distinction between 'omnivores versus univores'. In such a view, omnivores, interested in a wide range of cultural forms, progressively replace snobs, who become an old fashioned grouping focusing on the high arts alone. The rise of eclecticism challenges the homology thesis because it reports a modification of the link between social stratification and cultural classifications. Of course, the argument is oversimplified here; lots of authors have discussed, nuanced and refined this approach over the years (López Sintas and García Álvarez 2004; Chan and Goldthorpe 2007; Sullivan and Katz-Gerro 2007). Most of them have agreed on the fact that such growing eclecticism should not be interpreted as the sign of a postmodernist 'anything goes' but, instead, should be considered as a new form of distinction, given that it is inscribed in socially valorised significations which depends on access to cultural, social and economic resources (see Bryson 1996; Fridman and Ollivier 2004; Coulangeon and Lemel 2007).

In tapping into the debate of omnivorousness, we saw that '[I]n the social sciences, the rhetoric of openness to cultural diversity takes many different forms, including interest in concepts such as hybridity and bricolage in anthropology; heterogeneity and rhizomes in literary theory; eclecticism in cultural consumption studies; pluralism, multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism in the political field' (Ollivier 2008, 121). Such a polysemy is probably due to the fact that openness to cultural diversity can actually be expressed in many areas of everyday life, and not only in ethical or political considerations (e.g. Pichler, forthcoming). The attempts to reconcile all these approaches – ethical, political and 'consumptive' – are exceptional because 'the relationship between consumptive or commodified forms of cosmopolitanism is frequently understood to be unrelated to genuine or deep forms of cosmopolitan engagement' (Woodward et al. 2008, 212). These authors recognize that it would be far-fetched to consider that somebody who likes world music and ethnic food be necessarily cosmopolitan. Yet, 'such practices [...] may be likely to be associated with those who hold deep or reflexive cosmopolitan values' (ibid.).

Interestingly, Woodward and his colleagues approached the notion of cosmopolitanism using a Bourdieusian framework. They put forward more particularly the concept of 'cosmopolitan disposition' (ibid., 210-212), defined as a part of the habitus as 'a set of dispositions':

'The most important aspect of a disposition is its capacity to enable agents to view events, objects and things in culturally unique but nevertheless structurally grounded ways, bringing to bear a particular set of cultural understandings on the world. Thus, it is a disposition which can allow some agents to think, feel and act in ways that might be called 'cosmopolitan'' (ibid., 211).

Such perspective is helpful to recognise a distinctive power to cosmopolitanism. Interestingly, it has been associated to different elite groups (the global business elite, Kanter 1995; intellectuals, Hannerz 1990). As Ollivier put it, '[i]n articles discussing cultural practices, what is considered open, hybrid, heterogeneous, or cosmopolitan is most often seen in a positive light while what is defined as closed, homogeneous, and static is presented as backwards and undesirable' (2008, 121).

Therefore, their research focuses on the attitudinal components of cosmopolitanism, insisting on the fact that being cosmopolitan is not only a set of practices but also a particular way of thinking. Being cosmopolitan can be expressed through different ethical, political and consumptive attitudes. With regard to the latter, they associated cosmopolitanism with omnivorousness. In cultural sociology, the analogy between the two concepts had already been made (*ibid.*). Like omnivorousness, cosmopolitanism is sometime defined as 'an intellectual and aesthetic stance of openness toward divergent cultural experiences' (Hannerz 1990, 239). It requires the reunion of three qualities. First, it is an attitude — a 'willingness to engage with the other' (Ollivier 2008, 240). Second, it entails a set of competences such as the decontextualized knowledge and knowhow produced by professionals and intellectuals. Third, it necessarily entails choice, in the sense that 'the true cosmopolitan is one whose mobility is the result of a conscious decision rather than necessity' (Ollivier 2008, 125). Omnivorousness and cosmopolitanism share some attributes but one may wonder which kind of omnivorousness is an actual dimension of cosmopolitanism. Omnivorousness can entail many significations: someone can be reckoned to be omnivore because he or she likes many different genres ('omnivorous by volume': Warde and Gayo-Cal 2009) or because he or she cross symbolic boundaries by having at the time highbrow, middlebrow and lowbrow preferences ('omnivorous by composition': Warde and Gayo-Cal 2009). But in the cosmopolitan framework, one may wonder whether omnivorousness may also and perhaps only refer to preferences for 'exotic' genres from all around the world (ethnic food, world music, etc.), next to more local preferences. The idea of omnivorousness is about navigating between different cultural repertoires socially anchored (Lamont 2000): 'openness to cultural diversity entails neither the disappearance of cultural boundaries nor the flattening of social and artistic hierarchies. [...] Omnivores would not exist if there were no boundaries to be crossed between high and low, commercial and authentic, global and local cultures' (Ollivier 2008, 144). But what exactly encompasses these repertoires has not been clearly established (local-global, commercial-authentic, high-low, etc.), making the notion of omnivorousness in the context of cosmopolitanism (and beyond) very fluid and not easily tangible.

This discussion suggests that we have the very exciting prospect in EUCROSS of linking this debate on the cultural omnivore to our concerns to allow a more empirically testable set of questions which allow us to measure cosmopolitanism in more rigorous ways. Let us therefore look at the way Woodward and his colleagues have operationalized

omnivorousness and cosmopolitanism. They identified three attitudinal components of cosmopolitan openness using data from the Australian Election Study 2004:

Do you think globalization is good or bad for the following?

(1 Very good, 2 good, 3 bad, 4 very bad)

- 1) **Consumptive or commodity-based cosmopolitanism:** illustrating the aesthetic stance that requires cultural skills and predispositions
 - your range of choice in things like food, films and TV
 - your ability to sample different cultures
 - your access to goods and services outside Australia
- 2) **Intellectual and ethical dispositions toward cosmopolitanism:** related to a curiosity for other cultures and a positive attitude towards multiculturalism
 - democracy and human rights abroad
 - maintaining cultural diversity in the world
 - the environment
 - Australian culture
- 3) **People's sense of locatedness within global economies:** showing the robustness of the stance of openness when it comes to people's economic interests
 - consumers like you
 - Australian companies
 - The Australian economy
 - Your own standard of living
 - Creating jobs in Australia

They also investigated people's attachment to the world by asking them how much they agreed with the following statement: 'I regard myself as a citizen of the world as well as an Australian citizen' (5-point scale). But they used this question only with a descriptive aim and did not analyse it further afterwards.

The operationalisation they proposed is much elaborated, distinguishing different pertinent dimensions. If one compares their work to Pichler's (forthcoming) or Mau et al. (2008), it has the advantage to take into account a new dimension, the consumption one, but, on the other hand, it has merged political and ethical attitudes of cosmopolitanism into one rather vague dimension (intellectual and ethical dispositions toward cosmopolitanism). The idea of 'supranational assignment of accountability' (Mau et al. 2008), tolerance or trust have been somewhat left out. And this is partly linked to the way questions have been asked. One might indeed wonder how to interpret a negative answer to the question about the impact of globalisation on cultural diversity. For instance, omnivorousness is operationalized in a quite different way as it is usually done in cultural sociology (i.e. assessing the number of different tastes and their nature, lowbrow, middlebrow and highbrow; for an overview, see Peterson 2005; see also Warde

and Gayo-Cal 2009). It is directly asked whether people think that globalisation has an effect on the range of available goods and services available to them and their ability to sample different cultures. But one person could think that globalisation has a flattening effect on our consumption choices by making uniform the different services and goods, whereas he or she has actually very different kinds of preferences and is very much cosmopolitan in that sense. Therefore, the questions, though interesting, do not really assess omnivorous cosmopolitan attitudes but rather people's perceptions on the impact of globalisation. Their operationalisation does not really tell us anything about the width and content of people's cultural consumption. In this sense, we don't know anything about people's preferences and whether they incorporate different kinds of cultural genres. Therefore, we would recommend that the questionnaire directly surveys people's preferences in different fields in order to be able to assess whether new forms of 'cosmopolitan cultural capital' (Bennett et al. 2010) have emerged. Rather than paying attention to the boundaries between high and low culture, on which the notion of omnivorousness is grounded, we should focus on the transgression of local-global boundaries. In other words, do their tastes exhibit sensitivity to other cultures from all around the world?

Proposal for the operationalisation of 'the cosmopolitan disposition of 'cultural openness''

Based on what precedes, we propose to decompose the cosmopolitan disposition of cultural openness into five dimensions:

- **ethno-cultural dimension:** this dimension is meant to measure openness to other people and their culture. The focus is especially on how people perceive the coexistence of groups of people with different religions, cultures and tradition inside the society. Two themes are more particularly investigated, 1) tolerance (would they accept to experience ethno-cultural diversity on a daily basis in their neighbourhood or at work for instance?), 2) cultural enrichment versus cultural assimilation (how much would they value the idea of a society composed of different cultures?). We have decided not to investigate trust because it seems to us to be a different phenomenon from cosmopolitanism.
- **political dimension:** this dimension aims at measuring how far people recognise an interdependence between the different (sub-)national political communities (Supranational political responsibility) and whether the world should be divided by politico-geographical boundaries and restrictions (world as a common property and universal equal rights).
- **consumption dimension:** it is meant to evaluate new forms of cosmopolitan cultural capital by investigating people's tastes. The question is whether cosmopolitanism has affected people's identity and lifestyle, and not 'only' their ethical and political considerations.

- **economic dimension:** this dimension will act as a robustness test of the cosmopolitan disposition when personal economic interests are at stake in the same way as Woodward et al. used it.
- **Self-perception as world citizen.**

Examples coming from different existing surveys are suggested hereafter.

Table 2. Operationalisation of cosmopolitanism

Ethno-cultural dimension	
Tolerance	<p>ALLOWING OTHER PEOPLE TO LIVE AND WORK IN ONE'S COUNTRY Now, using this card, to what extent do you think [country] should allow other Europeans to come and live here? Allow many to come and live here Allow some Allow a few Allow none</p> <p>What about people from outside Europe but from the same ethnic group as most of [country]'s people?</p> <p>What about people from outside Europe with a different ethnic group from most of [country]'s people? (inspired by ESS)</p> <p>NEIGHBOURHOOD On this list are various groups of people. Could you please mention any that you would not like to have as neighbours? People of a different race People of a different religion Immigrant/ foreign workers People who speaks a different language' (World Values Survey 2008)⁵</p>
Enrichment versus cultural assimilation	<p>CULTURAL LIFE Would you say that [country]'s cultural life is generally undermined (0) or enriched by people coming to live here from other European countries (10)?</p> <p>Would you say that [country]'s cultural life is generally undermined (0) or enriched by people coming to live here from poorer countries outside Europe (10)? (inspired by ESS)</p> <p>ATTITUDES TOWARDS DIVERSITY IN GENERAL 'Tend to agree or disagree? o It is a good thing for any society to be made up of people from</p>

⁵Or 'Suppose you were choosing where to live. Which of these types of area would you ideally wish to live in?

In general would you rather live in an area where...

- ...almost nobody was of a different racial or ethnic group to you,
- ... some people were of a different racial or ethnic group to you,
- ... many people were of a different racial or ethnic group to you,
- or, would it not matter to you?'

(Scottish Social Attitudes Survey 2003).

	<p>different races, religions and cultures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o (COUNTRY'S) diversity in terms of race, religion and culture adds to its strengths' o In order to become fully accepted members of (COUNTRY) society, people belonging to these minority groups must give up their own culture. o In order to become fully accepted members of (COUNTRY) society, people belonging to these minority groups must give up such parts of their religion and culture which may be in conflict with (COUNTRY) law. <p>(EB 2000)</p> <p>Some people say that it is better for a country if different racial and ethnic groups maintain their distinct customs and traditions. Others say that it is better if these groups adapt and blend into the larger society. Which of these views comes closer to your own?</p> <p>It is better for society if groups maintain their distinct customs and traditions</p> <p>It is better if groups adapt and blend into the larger society</p> <p>(British Social Attitudes Survey 2003)</p>
Political dimension	
<p>Supranational political responsibility</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Some people believe that certain kinds of problems are not solvable by single states, rather the world community needs to bear responsibility for them. Others think that these problems should be left entirely to the national governments. I'm going to mention some problems. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments or by the international organizations? Policies mentioned in the text. Peacekeeping, protection of the environment, aid to developing countries, refugees, human rights' (Inspired by World Values Survey 2008 and Transnationalisierung survey 2006) • How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o In general, [country] should follow the decisions of international organizations to which it belongs, even if the government does not agree with them. o International organizations are taking away too much power from the [country nationality] government. <p>(Source: ISSP 2003)</p>
<p>World as a common property and universal equal rights</p>	<p>Tend to agree or disagree?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every individual should have the right to settle in any country they choose in the world. (EB 2003) • Foreigners living in [COUNTRY] should have the same rights as [COUNTRY's] citizens on ALL levels. (Transnationalisierung survey 2006)
Consumption dimension	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 means "Not at all" and 5 means "Very much", about how much do you like to watch the following types of films? Films in general - Films made in the country you live in - Films made in non-English-speaking European countries - Films made in other non-English speaking countries (e.g. Latin America, Africa, Asia) (Source: EUMARR) • The next questions ask about things people like to do in their free time. The first ones concern your taste in music. Please check on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 means "Not at all" and 5 means "Very much", how much you like the following kinds of music. World/Ethnic Music (e.g. Brazilian, Tango, African, Caribbean, Middle Eastern, North-African) - French/Italian Singer-Songwriters - Classical Music – Schlager - Asian Pop - Local Popular Music (Traditional and Contemporary) – Jazz – Anglo-Saxon Pop/Rock (Source: EUMARR) 	

Economic dimension

- Do you think globalization is good or bad for the following? (1 Very good, 2 good, 3 bad, 4 very bad)
 - consumers like you
 - [COUNTRY] companies
 - The [COUNTRY] economy
 - Your own standard of living
 - Creating jobs in [COUNTRY](Australian Election Study 2004)
- How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?
 - Large international companies are doing more and more damage to local businesses in [country]
 - Free trade leads to better products becoming available in [country]

(Source: ISSP 2003)

Self-identity

To be linked with European identity

As an example of possible self-identity scale, we mention hereafter the scale from the World Value Survey. It is explicitly asked how much people see themselves as a world citizen but also as a citizen of the European Union, their country, region and local community. The sense of world citizenship could be investigated at the same moment as the European identity, keeping in mind possible comparisons with other surveys such World Values Survey and Eurobarometer.

People have different views about themselves and how they relate to the world. Using this card, would you tell me how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about how you can see yourself? Strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree

I see myself as part of my local community

I see myself as a citizen of [my province or region]

I see myself as part of the [nationality] nation

I see myself as a citizen of [a country other than mine]

I see myself as a citizen of the European Union

I see myself as a world citizen

(World Value Survey 2005)

The operationalisation of cross-border practices

In the SOA report, the concept of 'cross-border practices' is defined as the cross-border physical mobility, the forms of community and networks here and there, the new technologically driven possibilities of communication and business transaction but also the mundane everyday internationalisation of practices, and their translation into new spatial forms, whether cross-border, city-to-city, European, global or virtual.

In developing the operationalisation of this concept, we draw our inspiration from empirical study on transnational mobilities and networks, on one hand, and, on the other hand, on cosmopolitan consumption practices.

Mobilities

Mobility is a concept with many meanings: social, cultural, spatial or geographical, virtual (Schneider and Meil 2008). For the operationalisation of cross-border practices, the two last meanings are of particular interest. We will have to measure the crossing of nation-state borders either physically in the form of frequent travelling (Calhoun 2002), or virtually in the form of communication with others abroad (Norris and Inglehart 2009). As a matter of fact, Urry (2008, 14) identified the following interdependent forms of mobility:

- 'the corporeal travel of people for work, leisure, family life, pleasure, migration and escape, organised in terms of contrasting time-space modalities (from daily commuting to once-in-a-lifetime exile);
- the physical movement of objects to producers, consumers and retailers; as well as the sending and receiving of presents and souvenirs the imaginative travel effected through the images of places and peoples appearing on and moving across multiple print and visual media;
- virtual travel often in real time, thus transcending geographical and social distance;
- the communicative travel through person-to-person messages via messages, texts, letters, telegraph, telephone, fax and mobile'.

Cross-border practices entail therefore geographic movements and networks that take form either physically or virtually (see Cantzler et al. 2008). Phillips and Smith (2008) provided us with an example of operationalisation of cross-border practices understood as virtual and physical mobility, even if they labelled their items 'cosmopolitan practices' (2008, 395). Drawing on data from the Australian National Identity survey 2001, they created a scale counting the number of criteria met:

- a. Visited 5 or more countries in lifetime

- b. Phone overseas at least once a week
- c. More than 5 friends who are overseas based
- d. Spend at least 1 to 2 hours a day online
- e. Watch programs on SBS television station a lot.

This operationalisation takes into account transnational physical movements and networks but also virtual ones (phone, internet and SBS television) and international networks. Even if this operationalisation encompasses different forms of cross-border mobility, the first item linked to physical movements is not very precise. In this regard, the operationalisation of transnationalism proposed by Kuhn (2011, see also 2012) is much more complete. As mentioned in the SOA report, transnationalism will not be explicitly operationalised in this report, because it does not act as an umbrella term that also entails the mundane everyday internationalisation of practices, and notably consumption practices (see below), as much as the concept of cross-border practices.

Kuhn identified three dimensions to individual transnationalism: (1) transnational background, (2) transnational practices and (3) transnational human capital (2008, 13). Drawing on data from the Eurobarometer, she operationalised the tri-dimensional phenomenon in the following way:

Table 3. Kuhn's operationalisation of individual transnationalism using EB65.1 and EB67.1

<i>Dimension</i>		<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Item in EB65.1</i>	<i>Item in EB67.1</i>
Transnational background		Nationality other than the country of interview	Q1	Q1
		Parent(s) born outside the country of residence	D42	D42
Transnational practices	Long-term stays abroad	Lived in another EU country to work, study, retire, or intention to do so	QD14	
		Moved to another European/non-European country in past 10 years		QD1
	Short-term visits abroad	Visited another EU country in past 12 months	QA5.1	
		Travelled abroad at least 3 times in past 3 years, for work or for leisure		QA10
	Sociable interactions	Socialised w/ people from another EU country in past 12 months	QA5.3	
		Having friends who are from other European countries		QA10
	Goal-oriented interactions	Having friends who are from other non-European countries		QA10
		Shopping trip to another EU country in past 12 months	QB2	
		Consider going to another EU country to buy cheaper/better service / product	QD8	
		Purchase of insurance/mortgage from another EU country	QD15	
		Having a job that involves contact with organisations or people in other countries		QA10
Transnational human capital	Foreign-language skills	Preparedness to buy a product in another EU language	QB21	
	Foreign-language use	Read newspaper, book or magazine in foreign language in past 12 months	QA5.2	
		Often watching TV programmes or movies in foreign languages		QA10
		Sometimes reading newspapers in foreign languages		QA10
		Enjoying reading foreign books in their original language		QA10

Source: Kuhn (2011, 15)

Kuhn's operationalisation presents the advantage to differentiate the diverse stays and visits abroad considering the various reasons to these movements (shopping, work, study, retirement, leisure, etc.). Having said that, the Pioneur survey has investigated further the reasons for intra-EU mobility (Santacreu et al. 2009; see also on the motivations for moving Gustafson 2011; King and Ruiz-Gelices 2003; King 2002) and proposed an exhaustive operationalisation of the different motivations for long stays (Recchi and Favell 2009, 263-264).

Why did you move there?

WORK

To look for a job

To accept a job offer

To start a business

Because of my occupation (already employed)

EDUCATION

To study in secondary school

To participate in a study exchange program (e.g, Erasmus)

To study at university level (undergraduate) (regular, not exchange)

To study at graduate/ post-graduate/ specialization level (regular, not exchange)

To do an internship

To learn the language of the host country

QUALITY OF LIFE

To gain new experiences

To live in a better natural environment, enjoy natural beauty

To live in better/ healthier weather, enjoy climate

FAMILY/ LOVE

To live together with members of family of origin (e.g. parents)

To live together with partner/ spouse/ children

Moreover, we cannot only rely on Kuhn's operationalisation of transnationalism because we aim also at surveying virtual transnational practices to move 'online' and to develop and maintain an international network (through Skype, Facebook, etc.). Such practices have been investigated by Metykova (2010) in her qualitative study of the transnational practices of Eastern European migrants in the UK. She showed the use migrants make of

digital media (online newspapers, magazines and films, Skype, social networking sites, etc.) to stay connected to their home country. More generally, studying the virtual connections people – and not only migrants – make and maintain with other national contexts is crucial now given the development in mobile computing and telecommunications technologies because it opens more immediate (and maybe more accessible) ways to engage with other Europeans and other European cultural traditions and products (like films and music) than physical moves. Indeed, lifestyle based on a chosen concrete physical mobility is mainly endorsed by highly educated people who possess the necessary cultural and economic capital to participate in transnational experiences (such as language skills and high education). As Fligstein put it (2008, 167), ‘only 2-3% of European national currently live across borders’ (see also Recchi and Favell 2009).

Then, contrary to a physical mobility that is rare, one could expect a greater number of ‘at home’ transnational practices that do not entail any physical movements: virtual networking, consumption of foreigner cultural goods online or offline. The increasing availability of foreign products such as food, music, newspapers, cinema or fashion could foster a greater *cosmopolitanisation* of consumption practices.

Cosmopolitan consumption practices

Little is known on cross-border consumption practices. Research has until now mainly focused on the lifestyle of migrants in their host country and on the negotiations and adjustments that take place between their home culture and the host culture (Datta 2009; Metykova 2010). These studies, though very interesting, are less pertinent for people who are not migrant and are not necessarily in contact with unfamiliar contexts. To what extent are these people engaged with the unknown? To answer this question, going back to the idea of cosmopolitanism turns out to be insightful.

In the previous section on cosmopolitanism, we have seen the six different definitions given by Vertovec and Cohen (2002) to cosmopolitanism. Among them, we are particularly interested in cosmopolitanism as attitude and as practice and competence. We have decided to focus on the former in the previous section on cosmopolitanism and to examine the latter in the framework of cross-border practices. In many studies on cosmopolitanism, researchers choose to pay attention to attitudes instead of practices because the question whether such practices reveal a genuine stance of openness is highly controversial. Enjoying exotic food, ethnic clothes or world music has become easier and then more frequent nowadays, especially in urban areas but to what extent can this be the sign of a greater willingness to engage with the others? Calhoun (2002) seriously questioned the link between cosmopolitan consumption and a deep cosmopolitan engagement. Indeed, even if the opposition between global elite and local mass has been recognised as too simplistic (Savage et al. 2005), it is quite legitimate to

ask whether eating ethnic food, for example, reveals a more substantive change in terms of value.

Yet, cosmopolitan consumption practices could be one of the first steps in openness to others: these goods could help people cross symbolic national boundaries. In this respect, Kendal et al. argued that: 'Rather than being mere surface features, and apparently trivial aspects of globalization, they do, in fact, have an important symbolic value and are the harbingers of wider social changes' (2009, 135). The link between cosmopolitan consumption and a greater tolerance and openness has not been much empirically explored. Yet, some empirical evidence tends to support the existence of such a relationship. Peterson and Kern (1996) have from the beginning perceived omnivorousness (often confused with cosmopolitanism) as the sign of a more eclectic and tolerant society, even if the variation in tolerance is socially patterned. Bryson (1996) shows also a clear link between political tolerance and musical tolerance. And more recently, Jackman and Vavreck (2011, 6 downloadable version) showed that having travelled abroad and eaten Japanese or Indian food in the last 10 years turned out to be associated with a greater chance to have voted for Obama during the 2008 US presidential election. In measuring cosmopolitanism, they used the following items (Cooperative Campaign Analysis Project, September 2008 wave):

We are interested in the kinds of things people do for recreation. Tell us a little bit about yourself. In the last 10 years, have you...

- 1 Played softball on an organized team?
- 2 Gone hunting?
- 3 Been to Europe or Australia?
- 4 Travelled to Canada or Mexico?
- 5 Visited Asia, Africa, or South America?
- 6 Gone to an Indian restaurant?
- 7 Had Japanese food?

They focused on practices rather than attitudes because they reckon them to be more powerful to 'get used to one another' (2011, 7). They are not the first to privilege cultural practices to investigate eclecticism. For instance, López Sintas and García Álvarez (2002) have supported the measurement of omnivorousness through practices rather than tastes. Besides, they have chosen to insert two more local practices, hunting and playing softball, to analyse the contrast with the other items of cosmopolitanism. Both practices appear to be typical of the American context.

This study should lead researchers to investigate further the relationship between cosmopolitan practices, as one type of cross-border practices, and progressive and wider

structural changes. Little is known on the latter but the sparse evidence researchers have support the idea that consumption behaviours are not trivial to understand the mechanisms of wider phenomena (such as globalisation).

Proposal for the operationalisation of cross-border practices

Table 4 presents our proposal for the operationalisation of cross-border practices. Cross-border practices have been differentiated into two dimensions: 1) mobility and networks and 2) cosmopolitan consumption practices. With regard to the former, we have distinguished virtual and physical mobility. In this document, virtual mobility mainly focuses on direct contacts people can have with friends or family members abroad by phone and (e)mails but also through online social network sites. More generally, the degree of internationalisation of the friendship network is also covered by our operationalisation but we do not explore whether this network is more online-oriented or offline-oriented. We have also included questions about international money transfers (remittances). Physical mobility is measured by asking people their transnational background and whether they have lived abroad and undertaken short trips abroad. We have decided to link short stay and tourism not only to mobility but also to cosmopolitan consumption practices, given that tourism is often considered as a consumerist activity (e.g. Calhoun 2002). We have also added questions about people's connections with abroad through associational life or a job.

With regard to cosmopolitan consumption practices, we have differentiated 'superficial' practices (meaning they do not require any particular skill) from those that require competence to be done. Among the superficial practices, we have included touristic activities and eating exotic food. As Calhoun put it, they represent 'easy faces of cosmopolitanism' (2002, 889) but we have already argued that they may be heralds of more substantive social changes. We have decided not to suggest any question on music, cinema or reading tastes, given that we have proposed to survey these areas to assess cosmopolitanism and European identity. Asking questions about clothing will be hardly feasible, even though ethnic fashion has been widely spread. Finally, among the 'skilled' practices, we have suggested to survey people's attention to foreign news, their ability to consume cultural goods in another language than their mother tongue as well as their familiarity with other parts of the world.

Table 4. Operationalisation of cross-borders practices

Cross-border practices			
Mobility & network		Cosmopolitan consumption practices	
Virtual	Physical	Superficial	Competence
<p>Use of new telecommunication technologies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How frequently do you communicate with friends and family members living in another European country? (daily, weekly, monthly, yearly or less than yearly) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By email Text Letter Phone Social networking And with friends or family members living outside Europe? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By email Text Letter Phone Social networking <p>(Inspired by PIONEUR)</p>	<p>Short-stay and tourism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the past 12 months, how many trips in another European country of less than 3 months did you make? And outside Europe? Which countries? Reasons to visit? (Source: Mau's questionnaire) <p>Job/ Association</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does your job involve contact with organisations or people in other countries? Which nations? Are you involved in an organisation which has an international membership Are you involved in an organisation which has an international range? In Europe? In another part of the world? 		<p>News</p> <p>To what degree do you read/ listen to/ watch... Local news – regional news – domestic news – foreign news (Source: Swedish Labour Force Survey, Gustafson 2009)</p>
<p>Remittances</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did you send money in the last twelve months to someone in another country? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, relatives Yes, other person Are you intending to buy property Which country was this person in (list of nations) Have you received money in the past twelve months from someone in another country (list of nations) 	<p>Long-stay</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have you lived in another country for 3 or more months? Which one(s)? Why did you move there? (work-education-quality of life-family/love) (Source: PIONEUR) Do you intend for the next two years to work, to retire, to live for other reasons, to buy/ build a new house, or to open a business or buy land in another country <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes in my 	<p>Ethnic food</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Here is a list of countries. For each of them, please check whether you've ever eaten in a restaurant from this country and whether you like this country's food very much, some, or not at all. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indian North-African (e.g. Moroccan, Algerian, Tunisian) Chinese Japanese Mexican U.S Style (e.g. Burger) 	<p>Cultural goods in foreign language</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How many books in another language than your mother tongue have you read in the past 12 months? How often do you watch TV programmes or movies in another language than your mother tongue? Have you in the past twelve months read a website/ article in other than your mother tongue?

	<p>original country</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Another EU country ○ Yes, non EU country 	<p>(Source: EUMARR)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you like foreign food? If so, name your three favourite national cuisines 	<p>(inspired by EB)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you buy goods or services in another language? • Are you able to read or understand newspaper articles in a foreign language • Have you bought online from a foreign website? Which nation was this based on (identify top three)
	Transnational background		
<p>Friendships</p> <p>Having more than five personal friends...</p> <p>In the place where they live</p> <p>In the same part of [country]</p> <p>In other parts of [country]</p> <p>Abroad</p> <p>(Source: Swedish labour Force survey, Gustafson 2009)</p> <p>In the last 12 months have socialised with people from another EU country? (yes, on several occasions, yes, once or twice, no)</p> <p>(Source: EB65.1)</p> <p>Of your circle of friends, we'd like to know how many are from the country where you live, how many from another European country, how many from outside Europe.</p> <p>(Inspired by PIONEUR)</p>		<p>Spatial competence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from the region where you live, is there a region in this country that is very familiar to you? Which? (use list) • Apart from the country where you live, is there a country inside Europe that is very familiar to you? Which (use list) • And is there any country outside Europe that is very familiar to you? Which? (use list) 	

Summary: important dimensions of European identity, cosmopolitanism, cross-border practices

This summary resumes the different dimensions of the concepts ‘European identity’, ‘cosmopolitanism’ and ‘cross-border practices’ extracted from the literature. In order to prepare the construction of the questionnaire, we have mentioned the most pertinent questions linked to the different themes investigated (according to the entire EUCROSS team). When ‘optional’ is mentioned for a dimension, this means that its dimension has been recognised as less important compared to the others.

Self-identity & territorial attachment

- (NATIONALITY) Do you consider yourself as being [home country national] only, [home country national] and European, European and [home country national], European only?
(Source: PIONEUR project)
- (TERRITORY & COMMUNITY) On a scale from 1 to 10, where 10 means “Strongly agree”, please describe how well the following statements apply to you:
I feel [city membership]
I feel [Region/Language Area in countries if relevant]
I feel [Country of Residence]
I feel [First Country of Nationality, if Different from Country of Residence]
I feel [European]
I feel a citizen of the world
I feel [_____]
(Source: EUMARR)

KNOWLEDGE OF OTHER CULTURES IN EUROPE/ GEOGRAPHICAL DIMENSION OF COSMOPOLITANISM

- In general, how interested are you in other parts of the world? (e.g. North America – South America – Asia – North Africa – Russia – East Europe – etc.)
- How well do you think you know about? (e.g. North America – South America – Asia – North Africa – Russia – East Europe – etc.)

→ CONSUMPTION DIMENSION OF COSMOPOLITANISM

- On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 means “Not at all” and 5 means “Very much”, about how much do you like to watch the following types of films? Films in general - Films made in the country you live in - Films made in non-English-speaking European countries - Films made in other non-English speaking countries (e.g. Latin America, Africa, Asia)
(Source: EUMARR)
- The next questions ask about things people like to do in their free time. The first ones concern your taste in music. Please check on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 means “Not at all” and 5 means “Very much”, how much you like the following kinds of music.
World/Ethnic Music (e.g. Brazilian, Tango, African, Caribbean, Middle Eastern, North-African) - French/Italian Singer-Songwriters - Classical Music – Schlager - Asian Pop - Local Popular Music (Traditional and Contemporary) – Jazz – Anglo-Saxon Pop/Rock
(Source: EUMARR)

SHARED CULTURAL TRADITIONS

- What does Europe mean to you?

- (rank or the two most important element)
 - A geographical area
 - Common culture
 - Common history
 - Common religious heritage
 - Democratic values
 - ...
- (inspired by the EB)

CULTURAL DIVERSITY/ TOLERANCE

EUROPEAN PERSPECTIVE

- Would you say that [country]'s cultural life is generally undermined (0) or enriched by people coming to live here from other European countries (10)?
Would you say that [country]'s cultural life is generally undermined (0) or enriched by people coming to live here from poorer countries outside Europe (10)?
(inspired by ESS)
- Now, using this card, to what extent do you think [country] should allow other Europeans to come and live here?
Allow many to come and live here
Allow some
Allow a few
Allow none
What about people from outside Europe but from the same ethnic group as most of [country]'s people?
What about people from outside Europe with a different ethnic group from most of [country]'s people?

(inspired by ESS)

- The EU currently has 27 member states. What do you think about the cultural differences between all these countries? Do you think there are
No cultural differences
Few cultural differences
Some cultural differences (follow-up q°)
A lot of cultural differences (follow-up q°)
Between EU member states

Relating to the cultural differences between EU members states: How far do you agree with the following sentence? "I don't recognise myself in such cultural diversity." (1-7)
(GESIS' suggestion)

GENERAL PERSPECTIVE

- 'Tend to agree or disagree?
○ It is a good thing for any society to be made up of people from different races, religions and cultures.
○ (COUNTRY'S) diversity in terms of race, religion and culture adds to its strengths'

FURTHER POLITICAL INTEGRATION

- How much power should be given to the EU compared to the national states?
More – Less - About the same as now
- Would you be in favour or against it becoming part of the European Union in the future?
Serbia – Turkey
(Source: EB)

EUROPEAN PHILOSOPHICAL AND RELIGIOUS VALUES

(if not in favour for Turkey) Could you tell me the main reason why you're against it becoming part of the EU in the future?

EUROPEAN PRIDE (optional)

PRINCIPLES OF EUROPEAN UNION

DEMOCRACY

FREEDOM TO WORK

FREEDOM TO TRAVEL PEACE

All these principles will be investigated through a battery of questions in the following way: 'What are the aims of the EU you support? How important would they be for you?' Currency, peace, stability, freedom to travel, freedom to work, etc.

EUROPEAN SOLIDARITY

- The government in this country proposes higher taxes to assist another [a country's relevant administrative district or region] in your country that is in financial trouble because of bad governance? Experts agree that higher taxes would help improve this other [relevant administrative district]'s financial situation. How much of an increase would you be willing to accept, if any?
 - No increase
 - Less than 1%
 - Between 1% and 2%
 - Between 2% and 5%

(Source: EUMARR)

- The government in this country proposes higher taxes to assist another European country that is in financial trouble because of bad governance? Experts agree that higher taxes would help improve this other country's financial situation. How much of an increase would you be willing to accept, if any?
 - No increase
 - Less than 1%
 - Between 1% and 2%
 - Between 2% and 5%

(Source: EUMARR)

- Among the taxes you already pay, how much should be allocated to your country? To Europe? To other parts of the world in need?
- If a city in another EU member state, where you were not born, have never lived and have no family or friends, were the victim of a terrorist attack from outside the EU, would you feel personally attacked? (GESIS' wording)

POLITICAL DIMENSION OF COSMOPOLITANISM SUPRANATIONAL POLITICAL RESPONSIBILITY (optional)

WORLD AS A COMMON PROPERTY AND UNIVERSAL EQUAL RIGHTS

- Tend to agree or disagree?
 - Every individual should have the right to settle in any country they choose in the world.

(EB 2003)

ECONOMIC DIMENSION OF COSMOPOLITANISM

- How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?
 - Large international companies are doing more and more damage to local businesses in [country]
 - Free trade leads to better products becoming available in [country]

(Source: ISSP 2003)

VIRTUAL MOBILITY: telecommunications and online social networks

- How frequently do you communicate with friends and family members living in another European country? (daily, weekly, monthly, yearly or less than yearly)
 - By email
 - Text
 - Letter
 - Phone
 - Social networking

- And with friends or family members living outside Europe?

- By email
- Text
- Letter
- Phone
- Social networking

(Inspired by PIONEUR)

PHYSICAL MOBILITY: short and long stay

- In the past 12 years, how many trips in another European country of less than 3 months did you make? And outside Europe?
Which countries?
- Does your job involve contact with organisations or people in other countries? Which nations?
- Are you involved in an organisation which has an international membership?
In Europe? In another part of the world?
- Have you lived in another country for 3 or more months?
Which one(s)?
Why did you move there? (work-education-quality of life-family/love)
(Source: PIONEUR)
- Do you intend for the next two years to work, to retire, to live for other reasons, to buy/ build a new house, or to open a business or buy land in another country
 - Yes in my original county
 - Another EU country
 - Yes, non EU country

REMITTANCES

- Did you send money in the last twelve months to someone in another country?
 - Yes, to relatives
 - Yes, to other persons
 - Yes, to buy property or to family bank account
 - To which country?
- Have you received money in the past twelve months from someone in another country? (list of nations)

TRANSNATIONAL BACKGROUND (socialisation questions)

INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIPS

- Having more than five personal friends...
In the place where they live
In the same part of [country]
In other parts of [country]
Abroad
(Source: Swedish labour Force survey, Gustafson 2009)
- In the last 12 months have you socialised with people from another EU country? (yes, on several occasions, yes, once or twice, no)
(Source: EB65.1)
- Of your circle of friends, we'd like to know how many are from the country where you live, how many from another European country, how many from outside Europe.
(Inspired by PIONEUR)

'SUPERFICIAL' COSMOPOLITAN CONSUMPTION PRACTICES

Do you like foreign food?

If so, name your three favourite national cuisines

COMPETENCE

NEWS (optional)

SKILLED COSMOPOLITAN CONSUMPTION PRACTICES

- How often do you watch TV programmes or movies in another language than your mother tongue?
- Have you in the past twelve months read a website/ article in other than your mother tongue? (inspired by EB)
- Can you buy goods or services in another language?
- Are you able to read or understand newspaper articles in a foreign language?
- Have you bought online from a foreign website? Which nation was this based on (identify top three)?

SPATIAL COMPETENCE

- Apart from the region where you live, is there a region in this country that is very familiar to you? Which? (use list)
- Apart from the country where you live, is there a country inside Europe that is very familiar to you? Which (use list)
- And is there any country outside Europe that is very familiar to you? Which? (use list)

References

- Antonsich, Marco. 2008. "EUropean Attachment and Meanings of EUrope. A Qualitative Study in the EU-15." *Political Geography* 27 (6): 691-710.
- Amit-Talai, Vered. 1997. "In Precarious Motion: From Territorial to Transnational Cultures." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 34 (3): 319-332.
- Bennett Tony, Mike Savage, Elizabeth Silva, Alan Warde, Modesto Gayo-Cal and David Wright 2009. *Culture, Class, Distinction*. London: Routledge.
- Beck, Ulrich. 2006. *Cosmopolitan Vision*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beck, Ulrich and Natan Sznaider. 2006. "Unpacking Cosmopolitanism for the Social Sciences: A Research Agenda." *British Journal of Sociology* 57 (1): 1-23.
- Benson, Michaela and Karen O'Reilly. 2009. "Migration and the Search for a Better Way of Life: A Critical Exploration of Lifestyle Migration." *The Sociological Review* 57 (4): 608-625.
- Bruter, Michael. 2003. "Winning Hearts and Minds for Europe: The Impact of News and Symbols on Civic and Cultural European Identity." *Comparative Political Studies* 36 (10): 1148-1179.
- . 2004. "On What Citizens Mean by Feeling 'European': Perceptions of News, Symbols and Borderless-ness." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 30 (1): 21-39.
- . 2005. *Citizens of Europe? The Emergence of a Mass European Identity*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bryson, Bethany. 1996. "Anything But Heavy Metal." *American Sociological Review* 61 (5): 884-899.
- Calcutt, Lyn, Ian Woodward and Zlatko Skrbis. 2009. "Conceptualizing Otherness: An exploration of the Cosmopolitan Schema." *Journal of Sociology* 45 (2): 169-186.
- Calhoun, Craig. 2002. "The Class Consciousness of Frequent Travelers: Toward a Critique of Actually Existing Cosmopolitanism." *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 101 (4): 869-897.
- Chan Tak W. and John H. Goldthorpe. 2007. "Social Stratification and Cultural Consumption: The Visual Arts in England." *Poetics* 35 (2-3): 168-190.
- Chaney, David. 2002. "Cosmopolitan Art and Cultural Citizenship." *Theory, Culture & Society* 19 (1-2): 157-174.
- Conradson, David and Alan Latham. 2005. "Transnational Urbanism: Attending to Everyday Practices and Mobilities." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 31 (2): 227-233.
- Coulangeon, Philippe and Yannick Lemel. 2007. "Is 'Distinction' Really Outdated? Questioning the Meaning of the Omnivorization of Musical Taste in Contemporary France." *Poetics* 35 (2-3): 93-111.
- Cram, Laura, Stratos Patrikios and James Mitchell. 2011. "What Does the European Union Mean to its Citizens? Implicit Triggers, Identity(ies) and Attitudes to the European Union." Paper presented for presentation at APSA, Seattle, September 2011, downloadable at <http://ewds.strath.ac.uk/Portals/106/APSACramPatrikiosMitchell2011.pdf> (retrieved on the 10th November 2011).
- Datta, Ayona. 2009. "Places of Everyday Cosmopolitanisms: East-European Construction Workers in London." *Environment and Planning A* 41 (2): 353-370.

- Delanty, Gerard. 2002. "Models of European Identity: Reconciling Universalism and Particularism." *Perspectives on European Politics and Society* 3 (3): 345-359.
- Díez Medrano, Juan and Paula Gutiérrez. 2001. "Nested Identities: National and European Identity in Spain." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24: 753-778.
- Díez Medrano, Juan. 2003. *Framing Europe: Attitudes to European Integration in Germany, Spain, and the United Kingdom*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- . 2010. "Unpacking European Identity." *Politique Européenne* 30 (1): 45-66.
- Duchesne, Sophie, Florence Haegel, Elizabeth Frazer, Virginie Van Ingelgom, Guillaume Garcia and André-Paul Frogner. 2010. "Europe Between Integration and Globalization: Social Differences and National Frames in the Analysis of Focus Groups Conducted in France, Francophone Belgium and the United Kingdom." *Politique Européenne* 30 (1): 67-106.
- Duchesne, Sophie and André-Paul Frogner. 1995. "Is There a European Identity?" In *Public Opinion and Internationalized Governance*, edited by Oskar Niedermeyer and Richard Sinnott, pp. 193-226. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2002. "Sur les dynamiques sociologiques et politiques de l'identification à L'Europe." *Revue Française de Science Politique* 52 (4): 355-373.
- Fligstein, Neil. 2008. *Euroclash: The EU, European Identity, and the Future of Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Green, David Michael. 2007. *The Europeans. Political Identity in an Emerging Polity*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- Green, Nicola. 2002. "On the Move: Technology, Mobility, and the Mediation of Social Time and Space." *The Information Society* 18: 281-292.
- Grundy, Sue and Lynn Jamieson. 2007. "European Identities: From Absent-Minded Citizens to Passionate Europeans." *Sociology* 41 (4): 663-680.
- Gustafson, Per. 2001. "Retirement Migration and Transnational Lifestyles." *Ageing and Society* 21 (4): 371-394.
- . 2009. "More Cosmopolitan, No Less Local - The Orientations of International Travellers." *European Societies* 11 (1): 25-47.
- Fridman Viviana and Michèle Ollivier. 2004. "Ouverture ostentatoire à la diversité et cosmopolitisme: Vers une nouvelle configuration discursive?" *Sociologie et sociétés* 36 (1): 105-126.
- Haller, Max. 1999. "Voiceless Submission or Deliberate Choice? European Integration and the Relation Between National and European Identity." In *Nation and National Identity: The European Experience in Perspective*, edited by Hans-Peter Kriese, Klaus Armingeon, Hannes Siegrist and Andreas Wimmer, pp. 263-296. Zurich: Rüegger.
- Haller, William and Victor Roudometof. 2010. "The Cosmopolitan-Local Continuum in a Cross-National Perspective." *Journal of Sociology* 46 (3): 277-297.
- Hannerz, Ulf. 1990. "Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture." *Theory, Culture & Society* 7: 237-251.
- Holton, Robert and Tim Phillips. 2001. "Popular Attitudes to Globalisation." *Policy, Organisation and Society* 20 (2): 5-21.

- Hooghe, Liesbet and Gary Marks. 2004. "Does Identity or Economic Rationality Drive Public Opinion on European Integration?" *PS-Political Science & Politics*, 37: 415-20.
- Jackman, Simon and Lynn Vavreck. 2011. "Cosmopolitanism" In *Facing the Challenges of Democracy. Explorations in the Analysis of Public Opinion and Political Participation*, edited by Sniderman, Paul and Benjamin Highton, pp. 70-96. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Downloadable at: <http://jackman.stanford.edu/papers/> (retrieved on the 28th November 2011).
- Jung, Jai Kwan. 2008. "Growing Supranational Identities in a Globalising World? A Multilevel Analysis of the World Values Surveys." *European Journal of Political Research* 47 (5): 578-609.
- Kantner, Cathleen. 2006. "Collective Identity as Shared Ethical Self-Understanding. The Case of the Emerging European Identity." *European Journal of Social Theory* 9 (4): 501-523.
- Kendall, Gavin, Ian Woodward and Zlatko Skrabis. 2009. *The Sociology of Cosmopolitanism. Globalization, Identity, Culture and Government*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Kennedy, Paul. 2004. "Making Global Society: Friendship Networks among Transnational Professionals in the Building Design Industry." *Global Networks* 4 (2): 157-179.
- King, Russell. 2002. "Towards a New Map of European Migration." *International Journal of Population Geography* 8 (2): 89-106.
- King, Russell and Enric Ruiz-Gelices. 2003. "International Student Migration and the European 'Year Abroad': Effects on European Identity and Subsequent Migration Behaviour." *International Journal of Population Geography* 9: 229-252.
- Kohli, Martin. 2000. "The Battlegrounds of European Identity." *European Societies* 2 (2): 113-137.
- Kuhn, Theresa. 2011. *Individual Transnationalism and EU Support: An Empirical Test of Deutsch's Transactionalist Theory*. Thesis submitted at the European University Institute.
- . 2012. "Individual Transnationalism, Globalisation and Euroscepticism: An Empirical Test of Deutsch's Transactionalist Theory." *European Journal of Political Research*, forthcoming.
- Lamont, Michèle. 2000. *The Dignity of Working Men: Morality and the Boundaries of Race, Class, and Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lamont, Michèle and Sada Aksartova. 2002. "Ordinary Cosmopolitanisms: Strategies for Bridging Racial Boundaries among Working-class men." *Theory, Culture & Society* 19 (4):1-25.
- López Sintas, Jordi and Ercilia Garcia Álvarez. 2002. "Omnivores Show up Again. The segmentation of Cultural Consumers in Spanish Social Space." *European Sociological Review* 18 (3): 353-368.
- López Sintas, Jordi and Ercilia Garcia Álvarez. 2004. "Omnivore versus Univore Consumption and its Symbolic Properties : Evidence from Spaniards' Performing Art Attendance." *Poetics* 32 (6): 463-483.
- Luckins, Tanja. 2009. "Gentrification and Cosmopolitan Leisure in Inner-Urban Melbourne, Australia, 1960s-1970s." *Urban Policy and Research* 27 (3): 265-275.
- Luedtke, Adam. 2005. "European Integration, Public Opinion and Immigration Policy - Testing the Impact of National Identity." *European Union Politics* 6 (1): 83-112.
- Mau, Steffen. 2005. "Europe from the Bottom: Assessing Personal Gains and Losses and its Effects on EU Support." *Journal of Public Policy* 25 (3): 289-311.

- Mau, Steffen, Jan Mewes, and Ann Zimmermann. 2008. "Cosmopolitan Attitudes Through Transnational Social Practices?" *Global Networks* 8 (1): 1-24.
- Mau, Steffen and Roland Verwiebe. 2009. *Die Sozialstruktur Europas*. Konstanz: UVK Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Meinhof, Ulrike Hanna. 2003. "Migrating Borders: An Introduction to European Identity Construction in Process." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 29 (5): 781-796.
- Metykova, Monika. 2010. "Only a Mouse Click Away From Home: Transnational Practices of Eastern European Migrants in the United Kingdom." *Social Identities* 16 (3): 325-338.
- Münch, Richard. 1999. "Europäischelidentitätsbildung. Zwischen globaler Dynamik, nationaler und regionaler Gegenbewegung." In *Identität und Moderne*, edited by Herbert Willems and Hahn Alois. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Norris, Pippa and Inglehart Ronald. 2009. *Cosmopolitan Communications: Cultural Diversity in a Globalized World*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Olofsson, Anna and Ohman Susanna. 2007. "Cosmopolitans and Locals: An Empirical Investigation of Transnationalism." *Current Sociology* 55 (6): 877-895.
- Ollivier, Michèle. 2008. "Modes of Openness to Cultural Diversity: Humanist, Populist, Practical, and Indifferent." *Poetics* 36: 120-47.
- Peterson, Richard. 2005. "Problems in Comparative Research: The Example of Omnivorousness", *Poetics* 33: 257-282.
- Peterson, Richard and Albert Simkus. 1992. "How Musical Tastes Mark Occupational Status Groups." In *Cultivating Differences. Symbolic boundaries and the making of inequality*, edited by Michèle Lamont and Marcel Fournier, pp. 152-187. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Peterson, Richard and Roger Kern. 1996. "Changing Highbrow Taste: From Snob to Omnivore." *American Sociological Review* 61 (5): 900-907.
- Philips, Tim. 2002. "Imagined Communities and Self-identity: An Exploratory Quantitative Analysis." *Sociology* 36 (3): 597-617.
- Phillips, Timothy and Philip Smith. 2008. "Cosmopolitan Beliefs and Cosmopolitan Practices: An Empirical Investigation." *Journal of Sociology* 44 (4): 391-399.
- Pichler, Florian (forthcoming) "Cosmopolitanism in a Global Perspective: An International Comparison of Open-minded Orientations and Identity in Relation to Globalization." *International Sociology*.
- Recchi, Ettore and Adrian Favell. 2009 (eds). *Pioneers of European Integration: Citizenship and Mobility in the EU*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Risse, Thomas. 2004. "European Institutions and Identity Change: What Have We Learnt?" In *Transnational Identities. Becoming Europeans in the EU.*, edited by Richard K. Herrmann, Thomas Risse and Marilyn B. Brewer, pp. 247-271. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- . 2010. *A Community of Europeans? Transnational Identities and Public Spheres*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Robbins, Bruce. 1998. "Introduction Part I: Actually Existing Cosmopolitanism" In *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, edited by Pheng Cheah and B. Robbins, pp. 1-19. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

- Roose, Jochen. 2010. "How European is European Identity? Extent and Structure of Continental Identification in Global Comparison Using SEM." Working Paper KFG *The Transformative Power of Europe*, Berlin.
- Rother, Nina and Tina M. Nebe. 2009. "More Mobile, More European? Free Movement and EU identity." In *Pioneers of European Integration: Citizenship and Mobility in the EU*, edited by Adrian Favell and Ettore Recchi, pp. 120-155. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Roudometof, Victor. 2005. "Transnationalism, Cosmopolitanism and Glocalization." *Current Sociology* 53 (1): 113-135.
- Savage, Michael, Gaynor Bagnall, and Brian Longhurst. 2005. *Globalization and Belonging*. London: Sage.
- Santacreu, Oscar, Emiliana Baldoni and Maria Carmen Albert. 2009. "Deciding to Move: Migration Projects in an Integrating Europe." In *Pioneers of European Integration: Citizenship and Mobility in the EU*, edited by Ettore Recchi and Adrian Favell, pp. 52-71. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Schlenker Andrea. 2011. "Cosmopolitan Europeans or Partisans of Fortress Europe? Supranational identity patterns in the EU. Paper presented at the ECPR Conference, University of Reykjavik, 26th August, downloadable at: http://euce.org/eusa/2011/papers/5c_schlenker.pdf.
- Schneider, Norbert and Gerardo Meil. 2008. (eds) *Mobile Living Across Europe I: Relevance and Diversity of Job-Related Spatial Mobility in Six European Countries*. Opladen: Barbara Budrich.
- Skrbis, Zlatko, Gavin Kendall and Ian Woodward. 2004. "Locating Cosmopolitanism. Between Humanist Ideal and Grounded Social Category." *Theory, Culture & Society* 21 (6): 115-136.
- Sigalas, Emmanuel. 2010. "Cross-Border Mobility and European Identity: The Effectiveness of Intergroup Contact during the Erasmus Year Abroad." *European Union Politics* 11 (2): 241-265.
- Sinnott, Richard. 2006. "An Evaluation of the Measurement of National, Subnational and Supranational Identity in Cross-national Surveys." *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 18 (2): 211-223.
- Smith, Michael Peter. 2005. "Transnational Urbanism Revisited." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 31 (2): 235-244.
- Sullivan, Oriel and Tally Katz-Gerro. 2007. "The Omnivore Thesis Revisited: Voracious Cultural Consumers" *European Sociological Review* 23 (2): 123-137.
- Szerszynsk, Bronislaw and John Urry. 2002. "Cultures of Cosmopolitanism." *The Sociological Review* 50 (4): 461-81.
- . 2006. "Visuality, Mobility and the Cosmopolitan: Inhabiting the World from Afar." *British Journal of Sociology* 57 (1): 114-131.
- Stevenson, Nick. 2002. "Cosmopolitanism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship." *Sociological Research Online* 7 (1): 1-16.
- Tajfel, Henri. 1981. *Human Groups and Social Categories: Studies in Social Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thompson, Craig J. and Siok Kuan Tambyah. 1999. "Trying to Be Cosmopolitan." *Journal of Consumer Research* 26: 214-241.

- Turgeon, Laurier and Madeleine Pastinelli. 2002. "Eat the World': Postcolonial Encounters in Quebec City's Ethnic Restaurants." *American Folklore Society* 115 (456): 247-268.
- Urry, John. 2000. "The Global Media and Cosmopolitanism." Paper presented at Transnational America Conference, Bavarian American Academy, Munich June 2000, downloadable at <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fass/sociology/papers/urry-global-media.pdf> (retrieved on the 17th November 2011).
- Warde, Alan and Modesto Gayo-Cal. 2009. "The Anatomy of Cultural Omnivorousness: The Case of the United Kingdom." *Poetics* 37 (2): 119-145.
- White, Jonathan. 2009. "Thematization and Collective Positioning in Everyday Political Talk." *British Journal of Political Science* 39 (4): 699-709.
- Woodward Ian, Zlatko Skrbis and Clive Bean. 2008. "Attitudes towards Globalization and Cosmopolitanism: Cultural Diversity, Personal Consumption and the National Economy." *British Journal of Sociology* 59 (2): 207-226.