



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

Europeanisation and Globalisation

Laurie Hanquinet and Mike Savage

EUCROSS Working Paper # 6

July 2013

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 on April 1, 2011 and is scheduled to end on March 31, 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: Laurie Hanquinet);
- 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 D9.9 of Workpackage 9 (Dissemination and exploitation strategies)

Release date: July 31, 2013

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Introduction | 5 |
| Theoretical discussion..... | 6 |
| <i>The European question</i> | 7 |
| <i>Information flows</i> | 7 |
| <i>Domestication of global flows</i> | 8 |
| <i>The remaking of cultural hierarchies</i> | 9 |
| Methodology..... | 10 |
| <i>Sample</i> | 10 |
| <i>Dependent variables</i> | 10 |
| <i>Independent variables</i> | 11 |
| Results..... | 14 |
| Conclusions | 18 |
| References | 19 |

Executive Summary

Our paper will show preliminary results of the FP7 EUCROSS project to examine the scope and nature of cross-border practices within six European nations (Germany, Italy, Spain, UK, Denmark and Romania), based on a quantitative survey undertaken on a random telephone sample of more than 6,000 EU residents. The paper presents the results of two hierarchical logistic regressions assessing the extent to which cross-border practices (mobility and consumption practices) can be associated with both European and global identities (feeling European - feeling citizen of the world). We show that transnational consumption practices are crucially associated with both European and global identities, and indeed are more important than socio-demographic variables and personal experiences of mobility. The systematic comparison of the results of both regressions helps us disentangle processes of cosmopolitanisation and europeanisation of daily lives in the context of globalisation. Are the most mobile the most European? Or is it only some specific practices that trigger a higher affinity with the idea of Europe? Can cross-border practices be related to a greater cosmopolitan attitude defined as openness to diversity? We show that specific cross-border practices related to Europe (e.g. purchase in the EU – and not outside the EU, preferences for European cuisines, familiarity with specifically European countries) are associated with a stronger European identity. Other practices are associated with a global identity, such as listening to global music, indicating a certain degree of differentiation between the two processes.

Europeanisation and Globalisation

Laurie Hanquinet and Mike Savage

Introduction

This working paper will use evidence from the EUCROSS survey to examine the scope and nature of cross-border practices within six European nations and considering their implications on European and global identification. This will therefore be a pilot analysis to explore how certain dimensions of 'cosmopolitanism' (which we define further below) may be affiliated with practical experiences of crossing borders. Our work thus seeks to deploy a more sociological account of identities, one which places them within the specific contexts by which individuals experience boundary crossing in their daily lives, through their work, leisure, social networks, and consumption. In this respect, the questions used in the EUCROSS survey are highly innovative and offer great potential for informing future research (see also Salamońska et al 2013).

We take up the now familiar debate about how far we can detect the 'cosmopolitanisation of daily life', as embedded in people's activities (e.g. Szersynski and Urry 2002; Wise and Velayutham 2009; Woodward et al 2008). We are interested in considering how cosmopolitan and transnational practices are not only associated with attitudes and values but are also embedded in mundane social and cultural practices. Our work takes up the challenge that the proliferation of global flows and the rapid and frequent transmission of symbols, media and artefacts across national boundaries (Appadurai 1996) need not lead to straightforward global or cosmopolitan identities but might permit more entrenched 'localist' perspectives. Rather than imputing a broad sweeping character to cosmopolitanisation, we need to understand whether there are particular experiences which are conducive to particular manifestations of it, and the EUCROSS survey data provides an unusually sophisticated tool to do this.

We also take up the recognition that concerns with cosmopolitanism are also bound up with uncertainties about the European project itself. Here, we should not conflate the partial emergence of a European 'field' (see Fligstein 2008) with a more general trend towards cosmopolitanism, and instead we need to disentangle these two processes. The possible rise of certain kinds of European identities – which might be taken in some respects as marking the eclipse of nationalism within Europe – may actually be consistent with a Eurocentric cultural politics in which European integration involves a political, social and cultural differentiation from the rest of the world. This point is further underscored through the debate on European boundaries themselves, and notably the concern with whether Eastern European countries should be admitted to the EU, and the contested issue of whether Islamic nations (and people) can be claimed as 'European'.

Our working paper therefore seeks to bring an unusually detailed data set to bear on key questions in the contemporary analysis of globalisation, cosmopolitanism and identity. Accordingly, our paper next discusses a number of theoretical issues which have not been adequately addressed in previous research and which we operationalize in the EUCROSS project using innovative survey questions. We

explain our choice of analytical focus on examining the forces leading to European and global identities in order to pin down how far concrete material practices are implicated in these identities. In the third section we discuss our methodology, including the sampling and operationalization of questions for our regression analysis. The fourth section reports our regression on European identity, and the fifth on feeling a citizen of the world. In both cases we show that transnational cultural practices and social networks are crucially associated with both European and global identities, and indeed are more important than socio-demographic variables and personal experiences of mobility. This leads on to our concluding remarks.

Theoretical discussion

There continues to be a fundamental analytical tension between theorists of global cultural cosmopolitanism on the one hand, and those of national differentiation on the other. The former were initially associated with theories of post-modernism in the later 1980s (Jameson 1984; Harvey 1987; Featherstone 1991), with their insistence on the rapid transmission of cultural signifiers across boundaries. From the 1990s, these arguments were rapidly incorporated into debates about globalisation (see e.g. Robertson 1992; Franklin et al 1995), and after Manuel Castells' (1996/97) influential *Network Society* trilogy were then articulated into accounts of how information and communication networks spell the erosion of local cultures. Such perspectives became commonplace in theories of 'Macdonaldisation' or 'Disneyisation', and were implicit in the accounts of 'risk society' elaborated by Beck (1992) and of late modernity by Giddens (1991).

From the later 1990s, it is possible to detect a move towards much more nuanced and critical perspectives towards these accounts of cultural globalisation (e.g. Appadurai 1996) and it is these which frame the concerns of the EUCROSS project to develop a more rigorous and precise analysis of how forms of mobility affect Europeans' values and practices (see Salamonska et al 2013). We consider how attitudes and identities are linked to concrete practices of transnational border crossing. This sociological inflection allows us to understand the particular kind of mechanisms which may be associated with cosmopolitan identities so permitting us to develop a more fine grained and empirically accurate analysis. In the celebrated arguments of Appadurai (1996), global flows do not lead to the homogenisation of location or the erosion of local cultures, but rather they allow a proliferation of spatial signifiers. Global projects are hence simultaneously bound up with the construction of local signifiers often taking a particularistic, possibly national form. These currents are accentuated by the revival of global geo-politics. Notably the increasing relevance of religious tensions has led to increasing stakes and recognition of fundamental divides which global communication might enhance. These certainly include the post 9/11 politics of 'terror'.

This paper picks up on four critical issues in current debates as an introduction to our empirical analysis. These are firstly the specificity of Europe, or more precisely, how the case of Europe is linked to debates about cosmopolitanism; secondly, criticisms of the view that the network society and information flows necessarily create global identification; thirdly the argument that global mobility is nonetheless domesticated into national rhythms and patterns; fourthly the remaking of cultural hierarchies.

The European question

The European case can simultaneously be held out as the most striking example in the world of the emergence of transnational institutions and identities, and as the most potent instance of the persistence of nationalism and the limits to cosmopolitanism. This is because the cosmopolitanism challenge comes from two rather different perspectives. Firstly, from those criticising methodological nationalism and who associate it with a call for transnational governance, and secondly from those criticising Eurocentric and Western centred perspectives, who seek to associate it with post-colonial critique and who are attuned to issues of racism (e.g. Chakrobaty 2000; Appiah 2006; Gilroy 2006; 2010). The latter perspective contrasts with writers such as Beck and Habermas who are more influenced by the prospects of breaking down national boundaries and more wedded to the wider resonances of the European precedent¹. Yet it can also be argued that European integration may be inconsistent with global cosmopolitanism insofar as it might generate a more cohesive and solidaristic European continental bloc with stronger boundaries against other parts of the world. It has thus been argued, for instance by Perry Anderson (2011), that the European project itself is actually an uneasy, conservative, alliance of different nations pursuing their self-interest collectively, without any necessary fundamental transnational break². Furthermore, an emerging sociological consensus points to clear evidence of the limits of transnational cultural integration within Europe, even within a political and institutional framework (the European Union) which encourages this. There is only limited amount of long-term internal cross-state migration (e.g. Andreotti et al 2013; Recchi and Favell 2009; Recchi 2013), and revanchist nationalist forms of political and cultural mobilisation are accentuating throughout Europe. Conceptually, this has sometimes been registered as recognising the continued role of national fields and the only partial success of defining a European field which straddles these different nations (Fligstein 2008; Savage and Silva 2013).

The analytical point here is that we need to distinguish cosmopolitanism as the feeling of being a citizen of the world, which involves a broader sense of a global vision and critique of methodological nationalism, from the 'Europeanisation' of people's identities in the sense that they feel more European. Accordingly, in EUCROSS we have wherever feasible differentiated between transnational practices between nations of all kinds so that we can empirically assess whether movement simply within Europe generates cosmopolitan identities, or whether it might be more consistent with more 'nationalistically' defined, or more parochial Eurocentric framings. We are thus in a position to allow a more refined understanding of cosmopolitanism than previously possible.

Information flows

In the famous arguments of Castells, the 'network society' generates 'the space of flows', forms of global mobility which undercut territory and permit new modes of identity. Since Castells produced his pioneering work, however, the consensus has shifted back towards a focus on the way that digitalisation can domesticate forms of local identity. Woolgar's (2005) 'five rules of virtuality'

¹ For criticisms of Beck's approach to cosmopolitanism insofar as it might apply to Asia, see Calhoun (2010).

² As Anderson reported in a later comment, 'The book is a systematic attack on the European narcissism that reached a crescendo in these years (i.e. the late 2000s): the claim that the Union offers a 'paragon'—in the formula of the late Tony Judt, echoed by so many other pillars of European wisdom—of social and political development to humanity at large' (Anderson 2011).

famously announced that much digital communication reinforces local interactions amongst workmates, neighbours, and the like. The mobilisation of myriad forms of digital data, and the rise of social media may reinforce national patterns of division and demarcation. There is now considerable evidence regarding the way that virtual communication is used to allow migrant communities to keep in touch and sustain modes of internal solidarity (see for instance Mau 2010). The recognition that the past decade has not seen the simple emergence of global cultural homogenisation has led to increasing interest in specifying more particular mechanisms which might generate global communication. Here the interest in the particular ways in which global communication might be driven and shaped. Drawing on network theories of interaction, which demonstrate how increased flows generate 'peaks' and 'troughs' and enhance the potential for intermediaries within social networks, these perspectives highlight the increasing inequalities generated by globalisation and indicate the possibility of decreasing cosmopolitanism being linked to global flows of communication.

In our research project we empirically differentiated how people used forms of virtual communication to examine this issue in greater detail. However, we didn't distinguish between European and non-European virtual mobilities (with the exception of property ownership, shopping and work relations), considering that this kind of communication doesn't necessarily reflect territorial anchoring. In all other instances virtual mobility may depend on the origins of the people one is communicating with or their physical location. In the case of highly mobile individuals the situation becomes even more problematic, as virtual communication media allow reaching a person when he or she travels.

Domestication of global flows

Although there is no doubting the rise of forms of global mobility, there is increasing recognition that such mobility might be structured so that it feeds into more nationalist feelings. Mobility to 'exotic' holiday destinations may serve to reinforce the normality of mundane life in your own nation without symbolically challenging national identities. In a forthcoming book on the urban middle classes in Paris, Milan and Barcelona, Andreotti et al (2013) thus argue that privileged managers in these three cities predominantly spend some time working overseas, to broaden their experience and for career development, but are very likely to return to their home cities which they continue to see as their 'homes'. This is a similar conclusion to that reached by Savage et al (2005) in their study of the middle classes in the North West of England: they showed that many residents talked about their overseas trips as 'liminal' encounters which confirmed their overwhelming 'Britishness'. Similarly Favell's (2008) study of 'Eurostars' shows that intra-EU professional migrants continue to feel embedded in their nation of origin even if they are living successfully in a different European nation.

As Recchi (2012) discusses, in EUCROSS we therefore proposed a more conceptually elaborate approach to mobilities, which allows us to distinguish more 'tourist-like' or transient from more enduring forms of cross-border practice. As Salamońska et al (2013) show, the EUCROSS project fully reveals that low permanency mobility within Europe has become the norm with over two thirds of our sample visiting another EU member state either in their youth or in the past 24 months. Over half of our sample have travelled within the EU in the past 24 months alone. Nearly 80% of our sample have received an email from abroad in the past 12 months. We are thus able to distinguish

not only the mere existence of cross-border practices, but also how they might be articulated into broader orientations. This permits us to consider whether they are likely to generate wider ranging identities, or whether by contrast they could be domesticated to more familiar patterns.

The remaking of cultural hierarchies

The past decade has seen extensive inquiries into the changing character of cultural capital, as measured by people's tastes and predispositions towards music, literature, art and the media (see e.g. Bennett et al 2009; Hanquinet et al 2013). The fundamental debate here turns on whether the kind of legitimate or 'highbrow' culture explored by Bourdieu has been replaced by more multi-cultural, diverse or 'omnivorous' modes of consumption (to use the now well-known term of Peterson). This issue is important for our purposes because Bourdieu's highbrow culture was associated with a predominantly European based classical Kantian aesthetic which (implicitly if not explicitly) exalted the supremacy of 'European' (not to say French) culture on a global stage (see Casanova 2002) and which celebrated the aesthetic as a fundamentally European-led project.

It has been argued that this form of highbrow cultural capital is being undermined by increasingly 'omnivorous' cultural tastes which thereby defines European culture as 'staid'. The implications of this trend are various. In part, it allows the potential for more diverse cultural repertoires from without Europe to gain prominence, but it also appears to be associated with the resurgence of national cultural differentiation since interest in 'highbrow' cultural icons who might have straddled specific national audiences may have declined. Evidence for increasing national cultural differentiation within Europe is now considerable. Tensions between people with national orientations and cosmopolitan orientations have deepened (Norris 2005; Norris and Inglehart 2009). Schmutz (2009) shows that the German media continue to focus their interest on classical music, whereas the Dutch now focus on popular music. Berkers (2009) shows that Dutch and German literary journals continue to marginalize ethnic minorities (a notable contrast to the American situation), suggesting that even despite cultural hybridization, there is no simple broadening of the cultural canon of elite culture.

There is evidence in some European countries that specifically national forms of cultural appreciation are becoming increasingly important. There is an upward trend in the popularity of domestic music artists since the late 1980s in many Western countries, regardless of increasing economic interdependencies and growing flows of foreign imports, which provide alternatives to domestically produced goods and culture (Achterberg et al 2011; Frith 2004). In the UK, Savage et al (2010) show that well-educated professionals have a greater knowledge and appreciation of British authors, musicians and painters than other social groups. They also note the increasing appeal of 'quirky' American writers and television programmes and the considerable waning of interest in continental European cultural forms, especially amongst younger age groups. And in the Netherlands, Dutch music has become increasingly popular between 1990 and 2005 and has even replaced Anglo-American (pop) music to some extent (Hitters and Van de Kamp 2010). The Dutch House of Representatives voted in favour of a 35 per cent quota for Dutch-language music on public radio broadcaster (30 June 2011, voting results House of Representatives), an initiative from the Dutch radical right wing Party for Freedom. And Dutch music is increasingly sung in the native tongue (Achterberg et al 2011). We thus need to be attentive to the possible revival of national

fields of taste which might be associated with the broader reshaping of cultural hierarchies and audiences within Europe.

Although we do not have detailed questions on all aspects of cultural taste in EUCROSS, we do have questions on music and cuisine which can give valuable leads into considering the relationship between tastes for national cultural forms and sense of Europeanness and cosmopolitanism.

Methodology

Sample

This paper is based on the quantitative data coming from the EUCROSS survey which provides an up-to-date and detailed picture of physical and virtual mobility practices as reported by nationals of six European countries (Denmark, Germany, Italy, Romania, Spain and the United Kingdom)³. In total 6016 respondents were interviewed by phone in 2012 – that is, around 1000 per country. As outlined in Pötzschke (2012), the EUCROSS survey focused on three dimensions of cross-border practices: physical mobility, virtual mobility and cosmopolitan consumption and competences. This paper looks in detail at physical and virtual cross-border practices taking place within Europe and considers their implication for European and global identification⁴.

Dependent variables

Given the aims of our paper, we focus on the correlates of two different measures of identity, the European and the ‘world’. We have chosen these two because of our reasoning above that these two different identities may be in tension and that it is important to unpick the specific phenomena related to each of these identities.

Accordingly, the first dependent variable has been constructed using the following question: “‘I feel European’: please tell me how much you agree or disagree with the following statement?” (scale from 1 ‘strongly disagree’ to 5 ‘strongly agree’). Given the ordinal nature of this variable and the limited extent of the scale, we have decided to run a logistic regression instead of a linear regression. The assumptions for the latter were violated using this kind of scale. Therefore, we recoded the variable into a dichotomous one in the following way: values 1, 2, 3 were recoded as 0 and values 4, 5 as 1. The idea is to differentiate a strong European identification from a weak to an inexistent one. We did the same for the item ‘I feel as a citizen of the world’.

³ EUCROSS fieldwork took place between June 2012 and January 2013. It was carried out by Sozialwissenschaftliches Umfragezentrum GmbH (SUZ) based in Duisburg (Germany). SUZ conducted survey in all countries examined (Denmark, Germany, Italy, Romania, Spain and the United Kingdom) in order to assure consistency of fieldwork across different national contexts. Computer-assisted telephone interviews (CATI) were carried out by trained interviewers, all of whom were native speakers. Sample selection was based on random digit dialling (RDD).

⁴ This working paper is an initial investigation and is an exploratory exercise which will lay the foundation for future work. The data here are not weighted according to the specific samples in the six nations. After a first examination it is likely that each national dataset should be weighted in the future. The findings here therefore need to be interpreted cautiously.

Table 1 shows that the frequencies of both variables are fairly similar. More than 60% feel European; the same is true for feeling citizen of the world. The two items are quite strongly correlated (Spearman's $Rho=0.443$, $\alpha < 0.05$). However, the correlation is still below 0.5 indicating some differentiation between the two processes.

Table 1 Feeling European – Feeling citizen of the world (%)

| | Feeling European (1) | Feeling citizen of the world (2) |
|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|
| Strongly disagree | 8.36 | 8.78 |
| | 8.75 | 10.11 |
| | 19.84 | 20.85 |
| | 20.92 | 17.98 |
| Strongly agree | 42.13 | 42.29 |

Source: EUCROSS, 2012, $n_1=5979$ and $n_2=5924$

Independent variables

Following our theoretical reflections above, we are trying to assess the impact of cross-border practices on people's European identification. We therefore selected variables that illustrate the different dimensions of these practices across the various measures we have discussed – i.e. digital communication, physical mobility, social networks (see Hanquinet and Savage 2011: 41). We have discriminated wherever possible between transnational practices between different EU countries and in other parts of the world in order to allow us to differentiate specifically European processes from wider ranging global. In addition, in order to unravel the role of these practices and to disentangle it from the impact of attitudes, we also inserted in the model variables measuring people's opinions on the EU and dispositions towards diversity.

1: First block of variables: mobility and network

The first dimension relates to the different aspects of virtual and physical mobility and network. They are represented in the model by the following variables:

*** Virtual mobility within and outside Europe**

We created an aggregated index (Virtual Communication) by summing scores on the variables q.2.16 'How frequently did you talk to family members, in-laws and friends abroad by phone or using your computer?', q.2.17 'And how frequently did you communicate with them by mail or email?', q.2.18 'And how frequently via social networks?'. Each variable is a 5-point scale from 1 'everyday' to 5 'never'; so they have all first been inverted.

*** Physical mobility within and outside Europe**

Six different variables were developed focusing on different ways to be mobile and differentiating each time whether the different trips were undertaken in Europe or not. The first two variables

(Mobility EU 18- and Mobility non EU 18-) assess whether people have lived in another country for more than three consecutive months before they turned 18. For each of them, we first created a sum index with the different European and non-European countries where people used to live (based on q.4.1 'Have you ever lived in another country for three or more consecutive months before you turned 18? In which country or countries?') and then transformed these indexes into a dichotomized indicator given the low number of countries both in Europe or outside (1=have lived in another European country before 18/ have lived in another non-European country before 18; 0= haven't lived elsewhere).

We followed a similar procedure for the mobility after 18. Using q.2.6.1 'Have you lived in another country for three or more consecutive months since you turned 18? In which country or countries?' we constructed two dichotomous variables (Lived EU 18+ and Lived non EU 18+) measuring whether or not people have lived in at least one other European or a non-European country after they turned 18 (1= have lived abroad in Europe/ or somewhere else; 0=haven't lived).

Finally we created two sum indexes (Trip EU and Trip non EU) adding the number of countries in Europe and outside Europe people have made a short trip to using q.2.11.1 'Please think of trips abroad which included at least one overnight stay. How many of these trips have you had in the past 24 months? In which country or countries?'

* Friends within and outside Europe

Two new variables have been developed. They add the different countries people have friends in (apart from their country of residence and the country of birth for those not born elsewhere). As previously we differentiate countries within Europe and outside Europe to differentiate processes of Europeanisation and Globalisation. All the variables associated to the q.2.15 'Please think about those family members, in-laws and friends who live in other countries' have been used (except q.2.15a 'How many are originally from your country of birth and also live there?').

* Money transfer abroad

We have used the dichotomous variable q_2_25 'Do you ever send money abroad for reasons other than purchasing goods or services?' as such (Send money abroad). The variable enables us to evaluate whether people integrated in their everyday life practices money transfers at an international level. It can give us an indication if people are familiar to some extent with the idea of mobility not only of people but also of assets.

2: Second block of variables: cosmopolitan consumption practices

The variables hereafter show people's cross-border practices that may require some extended cultural resources and competence to be performed. Some of them can be considered as superficial and not really reflecting an actual appreciation of cultural diversity, for instance eating foreign cuisines. However, they could also be considered as the first steps in openness (Kendal et al 2009). Like before, we will differentiate practices taking place within Europe from those involving other parts of the world, when it is possible.

* Linguistic competence

Cross-border practices are made easier if people know different languages. It could be considered as part of what Bourdieu's embodied cultural capital (1986), i.e. a set of dispositions people have acquired throughout their life. They can use them to visibly differentiate themselves from others (manners, accent, etc.) and position themselves in the social space. Being cosmopolitan requires to be able to navigate between different national cultural repertoires of which access is facilitated by the knowledge of different languages.

The variable used here (language) is the number of languages that people have learnt besides the main language of the country of residence and the native language for those not born in the country (based on q.2.22: In general, irrespective of the level of your knowledge, have you ever learned any other language besides <<your native language and>> [official language of CoR]? Which one(s)?').

* Media

If the question just mentioned here above assesses people's knowledge of other languages, we also need to know if they use it in their everyday life. We inserted in the model the variable q.2.30 'How often do you watch TV content which is in another language and has not been dubbed, either directly on TV or via the Internet?'. The scale goes from 1 (everyday) to 5 (never) and was therefore inverted for the regression.

In addition, and still with regard to media consumption, we asked people if they followed sports on an international level or in another country (q.2.29.1) and use this information to create a new variable that is dichotomous (0=no, 1=yes).

* Tastes

To evaluate if people's tastes has a territorial anchoring, we inserted in the model tastes in world music (q.2.31a), in traditional and folk music from the country of residence (q.2.31d), and in traditional and folk music from Europe (q.2.31e). We also examined people's tastes in terms of foreign cuisines (q.2.32. 'Please think about foreign cuisine, i.e., all which is originally from outside [CoR]. Which national cuisines do you like best?'). We counted the number of different cuisines people like best and differentiated them between European and non-European cuisines (Foreign cuisine EU and Foreign cuisine non-EU).

* Buying goods from sellers located abroad

Buying goods from sellers or providers located abroad (q.2.28.1) represents an additional step towards Europeanisation or globalization depending on the nationality of the sellers. It requires more effort than simply going to the nearby restaurant or buying music online as people have to look for what they want. We decided then to insert two dichotomous variables (Purchase in EU and Purchase outside EU) coded as 1 (yes) and 0 (no).

* Familiar with areas within and outside Europe

Finally we asked people whether they were very familiar with one or several countries besides their country of residence, that is, that they knew well enough to feel comfortable in (q.2.2.1). We recoded their answer according to whether these countries were located in Europe or not and

developed two new sum index of the number of European and non-European countries people feel comfortable in. They will enable us to assess people's level of spatial competence.

3: Third block of variables: Attitudes towards the EU and diversity

We inserted two new variables to measure people's attitudes towards the EU but also towards diversity more generally. First, we wanted to see if the practices had still an effect on the identification to Europe and to the world once they were included. Do the practices always reflect a self-conscious positive attitude or do they also have an effect on their own? Second, we wanted to investigate if a sense of Europeaness is not a consequence of a wider acceptance of diversity.

The variable 'Attitudes towards the EU' is the averaged sum of the variables q.3.9a 'Solidarity between the peoples in the EU', q.3.9b 'Democracy and human rights in the single EU countries', q.3.9c 'Establishing economic stability in the single EU countries', q.3.9d 'The right to work in any country of the EU', and q.3.9e 'A common currency' (scale from 1 'not at all important' to 5 'very important' – Cronbach's $\alpha > .7$). The variable 'Attitudes towards openness' is the 5-point scale 'It is a good thing for a society to be made up of people from different ethnic groups, religions and cultures' (q.3.8 from 1 'strongly disagree' to 5 'strongly agree').

4: Socio-demographic variables

Finally, we should note that these cross border practices are all contextualized by socio-demographic variables of age, gender, educational level and the Standard International Socio-Economic Index of Occupational Status (ISEI), developed by Ganzeboom and his colleagues (1992), which are known to be associated with these attitudes.

Results

We firstly begin with the hierarchical logistic regression on European identity, presenting our findings with four blocks of independent variables added in turn.

Block 1, which only considers the socio-demographic variables, demonstrates the predicted effects of education, with the poorly qualified being less likely to feel European than those with higher secondary education. Women also appear to be more European oriented than men, as do older people. The ISEI index proves insignificant, however.

It is the second and third blocks of variables which are more distinctive and original to the EUCROSS project. The second block takes account of concrete and virtual forms of mobility, to assess whether these predispose respondents to have a stronger European identity. Personal mobility seems relatively unimportant and has no effect on the strength of European identity, so confirming the arguments of those who claim that the meaning of mobility cannot be derived from its frequency (Savage et al 2005). Here we do find some interesting features, that travelling inside the EU is significantly associated with having a European identity, whilst travelling outside the EU is negatively associated with this. Having European friends is also significantly associated with having a European identity, though the causal direction is not clear here.

Table 2 Feeling European: Binary Logistic Regression

| | B | S.E. | Exp(B) | B | S.E. | Exp(B) | B | S.E. | Exp(B) | B | S.E. | Exp(B) |
|---|-------|------|---------|-------|------|----------|-------|------|----------|--------|------|----------|
| SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHICS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gender (Ref: Male) | .201 | .067 | 1.223** | .226 | .068 | 1.254*** | .231 | .072 | 1.260*** | .243 | .076 | 1.274*** |
| Age | .007 | .002 | 1.007** | .009 | .002 | 1.009*** | .007 | .003 | 1.007** | .013 | .003 | 1.013*** |
| Primary Education (Ref: Higher Secondary) | -.362 | .171 | .696* | -.314 | .172 | .730 | -.113 | .179 | 0.893 | .080 | .192 | 1.083 |
| Lower Secondary | -.350 | .115 | .704** | -.298 | .116 | .742** | -.193 | .119 | 0.824 | .052 | .128 | 1.053 |
| In-between lower and higher secondary | -.034 | .106 | .966 | -.018 | .107 | .982 | -.021 | .110 | 0.979 | .172 | .117 | 1.188 |
| Lower Tertiary | -.084 | .104 | .919 | -.121 | .105 | .886 | -.141 | .107 | 0.868 | -.041 | .113 | .960 |
| Higher Tertiary | .208 | .118 | 1.231 | .136 | .121 | 1.145 | .071 | .124 | 1.073 | .229 | .131 | 1.257 |
| ISEI index | -.002 | .002 | .998 | -.002 | .002 | .998 | -.002 | .002 | 0.998 | -.004 | .002 | .996 |
| CROSS-BORDERS PRACTICES I : VIRTUAL & CONCRETE MOBILITY | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Virtual Communication | | | | -.003 | .011 | .997 | -.007 | .011 | 0.993 | -.014 | .012 | .986 |
| Mobility EU 18- | | | | .005 | .203 | 1.005 | -.079 | .207 | 0.924 | -.203 | .214 | .816 |
| Mobility non EU 18- | | | | -.042 | .217 | .958 | -.033 | .222 | 0.967 | .058 | .233 | 1.059 |
| Lived EU 18+ | | | | .108 | .114 | 1.114 | -.020 | .118 | 0.980 | .002 | .125 | 1.002 |
| Lived non EU 18+ | | | | .085 | .130 | 1.089 | .062 | .137 | 1.064 | .198 | .146 | 1.218 |
| Trips EU | | | | .095 | .024 | 1.100*** | .051 | .026 | 1.052* | .061 | .027 | 1.063* |
| Trip non EU | | | | -.148 | .049 | .863** | -.099 | .053 | 0.906 | -.087 | .056 | .917 |
| Friends EU | | | | .120 | .031 | 1.128*** | .075 | .032 | 1.078* | .033 | .033 | 1.034 |
| Friends non EU | | | | .012 | .036 | 1.012 | .022 | .037 | 1.022 | .032 | .039 | 1.032 |
| Send money abroad | | | | .108 | .111 | 1.114 | .070 | .113 | 1.073 | -.017 | .119 | .983 |
| CROSS-BORDERS PRACTICES II : COSMOPOLITAN & EUROPEAN PRACTICES | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Language | | | | | | | .083 | .039 | 1.087* | .099 | .041 | 1.104* |
| Watch Sport International | | | | | | | .108 | .072 | 1.114 | .011 | .077 | 1.011 |
| Purchase in EU | | | | | | | .221 | .097 | 1.248* | .306 | .102 | 1.358** |
| Purchase outside EU | | | | | | | -.118 | .106 | 0.888 | -.010 | .112 | .990 |
| Foreign cuisine EU | | | | | | | .114 | .046 | 1.121* | .122 | .049 | 1.129* |
| Foreign cuisine non EU | | | | | | | -.098 | .058 | 0.907 | -.106 | .062 | .900 |
| Familiarity with non EU countries | | | | | | | -.040 | .064 | 0.960 | .004 | .069 | 1.004 |
| Familiarity with EU countries | | | | | | | .076 | .030 | 1.079* | .081 | .032 | 1.085* |
| World music | | | | | | | .121 | .030 | 1.129*** | .055 | .032 | 1.056 |
| Traditional music from CoR | | | | | | | -.001 | .029 | 0.999 | -.039 | .031 | .962 |
| European traditional music | | | | | | | .115 | .033 | 1.122*** | .071 | .035 | 1.074* |
| TV other language | | | | | | | .052 | .027 | 1.054 | .088 | .029 | 1.091** |
| ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE EU AND DIVERSITY | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Attitudes towards EU | | | | | | | | | | .965 | .056 | 2.626*** |
| Attitudes towards diversity | | | | | | | | | | .083 | .034 | 1.087* |
| Constant | .267 | .143 | 1.306 | .019 | .155 | 1.019 | -.581 | .232 | 0.559* | -4.700 | .334 | .009*** |
| Nagelkerke R ² | | | .013 | | | .030 | | | .066 | | | 0.193 |

* ≤0.05 ** ≤0.01 ***≤0.001 – N=3944 (missing values=2072)

Table 3 Feeling a Citizen of the World: Binary Logistic Regression

| | B | S.E. | Exp(B) | B | S.E. | Exp(B) | B | S.E. | Exp(B) | B | S.E. | Exp(B) |
|---|-------|------|----------|-------|------|----------|-------|------|----------|--------|------|----------|
| SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHICS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gender (Ref: Male) | .053 | .065 | 1.055 | .056 | .066 | 1.058 | .032 | .070 | 1.033 | .008 | .073 | 1.008 |
| Age | -.001 | .002 | .999 | .001 | .002 | 1.001 | -.003 | .003 | .997 | .000 | .003 | 1.000 |
| Primary Education (Ref: Higher Secondary) | -.113 | .172 | .893 | -.080 | .173 | .923 | -.144 | .181 | .866 | .019 | .189 | 1.019 |
| Lower Secondary | -.317 | .114 | .728** | -.260 | .115 | .771* | -.283 | .119 | .753* | -.100 | .124 | .905 |
| In-between lower and higher secondary | -.346 | .103 | .708*** | -.293 | .105 | .746** | -.253 | .107 | .777* | -.123 | .111 | .884 |
| Lower Tertiary | -.020 | .102 | .980 | -.049 | .104 | .952 | -.036 | .106 | .964 | .029 | .109 | 1.030 |
| Higher Tertiary | .014 | .113 | 1.014 | -.043 | .117 | .958 | .032 | .120 | 1.032 | .125 | .125 | 1.133 |
| ISEI index | -.003 | .002 | .997 | -.003 | .002 | .997 | -.002 | .002 | .998 | -.004 | .002 | .996* |
| CROSS-BORDERS PRACTICES I : VIRTUAL & CONCRETE MOBILITY | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Virtual Communication | | | | .012 | .011 | 1.012 | .007 | .011 | 1.007 | .004 | .011 | 1.004 |
| Mobility EU 18- | | | | .195 | .204 | 1.215 | .188 | .207 | 1.207 | .126 | .212 | 1.134 |
| Mobility non EU 18- | | | | -.113 | .215 | .893 | -.201 | .221 | .818 | -.151 | .226 | .860 |
| Lived EU 18+ | | | | -.020 | .110 | .980 | -.003 | .114 | .997 | -.009 | .119 | .991 |
| Lived non EU 18+ | | | | .143 | .127 | 1.154 | .118 | .134 | 1.125 | .213 | .138 | 1.237 |
| Trips EU | | | | -.029 | .022 | .971 | -.022 | .024 | .978 | -.021 | .025 | .979 |
| Trip non EU | | | | .036 | .049 | 1.037 | .039 | .052 | 1.039 | .050 | .054 | 1.051 |
| Friends EU | | | | .139 | .031 | 1.149*** | .117 | .032 | 1.124*** | .091 | .033 | 1.096** |
| Friends non EU | | | | .078 | .037 | 1.081* | .063 | .038 | 1.065 | .060 | .039 | 1.062 |
| Send money abroad | | | | .279 | .110 | 1.322* | .269 | .112 | 1.308* | .219 | .115 | 1.245 |
| CROSS-BORDERS PRACTICES II : COSMOPOLITAN & EUROPEAN PRACTICES | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Language | | | | | | | -.066 | .038 | .936 | -.056 | .039 | .946 |
| Watch Sport International | | | | | | | .096 | .071 | 1.101 | .029 | .073 | 1.029 |
| Purchase in EU | | | | | | | -.108 | .092 | .897 | -.076 | .095 | .927 |
| Purchase outside EU | | | | | | | .010 | .105 | 1.010 | .062 | .108 | 1.064 |
| Foreign cuisine EU | | | | | | | -.030 | .045 | .970 | -.035 | .046 | .966 |
| Foreign cuisine non EU | | | | | | | .109 | .058 | 1.115 | .100 | .060 | 1.105 |
| Familiarity with non EU countries | | | | | | | .131 | .064 | 1.140* | .170 | .067 | 1.185* |
| Familiarity with EU countries | | | | | | | .061 | .029 | 1.062* | .057 | .030 | 1.058 |
| World music | | | | | | | .161 | .030 | 1.174*** | .109 | .031 | 1.115*** |
| Traditional music from CoR | | | | | | | .096 | .029 | 1.101*** | .086 | .030 | 1.090** |
| European traditional music | | | | | | | .096 | .033 | 1.101** | .051 | .034 | 1.053 |
| TV other language | | | | | | | -.028 | .026 | 0.972 | -.003 | .027 | 0.997 |
| Attitudes towards the EU and diversity | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Attitudes towards EU | | | | | | | | | | .615 | .051 | 1.851*** |
| Attitudes towards diversity | | | | | | | | | | .194 | .033 | 1.214*** |
| Constant | .661 | .142 | 1.937*** | .356 | .153 | 1.428* | -.529 | .227 | .589* | -3.623 | .315 | .027*** |
| Nagelkerke R ² | | | .007 | | | 0.030 | | | 0.070 | | | 0.147 |

* ≤0.05 ** ≤0.01 ***≤0.001 – N=3923 (missing values=2093)

When we add block 2, on cosmopolitan and European practices, some more interesting features can be found. We see that the variables from block 1 become less powerful predictors of European identities (and non-European trips loses its significance completely), whereas most of the European practices are associated with having a European identity. These include speaking different languages, eating European cuisine, purchasing European goods, being familiar with European nations and enjoying traditional European music. This is a remarkably crisp pattern indicating that European identities are indeed associated with a range of cultural and social cross-border practices. We can also see that this can be distinguished from cosmopolitanism more broadly defined since the variables for transnational practices with nations outside the EU are not significant, apart from a taste for world music.

Finally in block 4, we add two variables for European identity and cosmopolitanism. These show the expected pattern with a strong relationship whereby those who are more positive towards the EU have a stronger sense of European identity. These patterns are not surprising, but what is more revealing is the changing associations with variables in the previous blocks. Educational attainment now has no significant association with European identity and, apart from EU trips, most of the mobility variables no longer have any importance. This outlines the importance of attitudes in people's sense of being of European compared to mobility practices. However, the role of the transnational practices from block 3 becomes, if anything, more marked with six statistically significant associations. This is clear evidence that these transnational practices do appear to have an important relation with European identity, though the direction of the causality might go in both directions (those with stronger European identities might be more prone to become familiar with European nations).

Can we find the same patterns with those claiming a 'global identity'? Just as with 'feeling European', the educational variables prove significant, where those with poor educational qualifications feel less likely to feel they are 'a citizen of the world'. The only personal mobility variables which are associated with cosmopolitanism are whether respondents have friends outside their country of residence, either European or non-European, and whether they send money abroad. The latter variable is especially interesting as it is likely to be associated with migrants groups.

It is once more the block of variables associated with cross-border practices which turn out to be more significant, though these are mainly different variables to those which affected a feeling of belonging to Europe. Here it is the musical variables which are important as well as those of being familiar with both other European and non-European nations. The significance of music is worth noting in the context of debates regarding its role in straddling cultural and ethnic divides, and we can see that a liking for world music is especially important – being the only variable which is consistently associated with feeling to be a citizen of the world (e.g. Gilroy 1990). More surprisingly, having a taste for folk music of one's own nation is also linked to feeling a citizen of the world.

When we introduce the fourth block of variables, we unsurprisingly see associations with beliefs about diversity but also about feeling European. This time the cosmopolitan practices seem more 'affected' by the insertion of the two attitudinal variables, suggesting that a cosmopolitan identity is more a question of attitude than it is for a European identity.

As we have seen, identities are not zero sum, and those who feel more European are also more likely to see themselves as citizens of the world. Whilst in some respects a positive finding, this can also be interpreted as a possible indicator that Europeans might continue to see themselves as 'central to the world'.

Conclusions

In this working paper we have presented a preliminary analysis of the EUCROSS survey data to consider how far transnational practices might be associated with feeling European and a citizen of the world. We have conducted this exercise in order to unpack the meaning of cosmopolitanism in detail and to reflect critically on its association with European and global identities. Following other quantitative analyses, we share the arguments of Woodward et al (2008: 223) in their Australian analysis that 'social actors, depending on their social and cultural attributes, differentially endorse elements of the cosmopolitan agenda. We cannot therefore imagine that nascent cosmopolitan dispositions are expressed with consistent strength across social fields'.

Our analysis suggests interesting and possibly counter-intuitive findings which call for further investigation. First, one of our most interesting findings is the muted effects of our socio-demographic variables on European and global identities, which somewhat contradicts previous studies which indicate that more well educated and higher class individuals are more pre-disposed to these identities. Second, there also are only limited effects of personal mobility on European and worldly identities whereas we could have expected mobility practices to have a stronger impact. However, one's transnational practices and tastes, including the location of your friends, one's musical tastes, one's purchasing of goods and favourite cuisine are all associated with these identities, and indeed can be seen as the most powerful of the variables we examine (leaving aside attitudes on diversity and the EU which are bound to be affiliated to these identities). If there is any one cultural correlate with both these identities it is a taste for world music, which stands out as a signifier for cosmopolitan attachments and in general, musical taste appears to be strongly associated with these identities. Because of these unexpected outcomes, we need to be cautious in the interpretation we make; our findings should be confirmed by future explorations. For instance, the analysis in this paper is context-free and we will have to assess possible nation-specific influences on European and global identification by adding in a next step the country variables. Similarly, our analysis uses the unweighted data from the six different national surveys and does not take into account any sample skews which may be evident and which will be weighted for in further analyses.

We can therefore conclude with a few reflections on the nature of cosmopolitanism in the context of critiques of Eurocentrism. We can see that the two identities are affiliated to each other, indicating that there is some overlap between them, and that those who feel less nationalistic are somewhat inclined to embrace both European and worldly identities. We can also see that those who like world music are also more prone to feel European as well as more 'worldly'. However, although there is no zero sum relationship between them, there is some differentiation as well, which emphasises that European identification is not simply a form of wider ranging cosmopolitanism, but has its own specificity. And we also found the apparent paradox that a taste for traditional music from one's own country of residence is positively associated with worldly attachment. In short, cosmopolitan identities are complex and varied, and far from exhibiting a critique of nationalisms, may actually coincide with them. However, these preliminary findings at least suggest that there is value in further explorations about the intersection between practices and European and worldly identities.

References

- Achterberg P., Heilbron J., Houtman D. and Aupers S. (2011) 'A cultural globalization of popular music? American, Dutch, French, and German popular music charts (1965 to 2006)'. *American Behavioral Scientist* 55: 589–608.
- Anderson, P. (2011) *The New Old World*. London: Verso.
- Andreotti, A., Le Gales, P., Moreno Fuentes, F.J. (forthcoming) *The European urban middle classes*.
- Appadurai, A. (1996) *Modernity at Large*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Appiah, K.A. (2006) *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York: Norton.
- Beck, U. (1992) *Risk Society*. London: Sage.
- Berkers, G. (2009) 'Ethnic boundaries in national literary histories: Classification of ethnic minority fiction authors in American, Dutch and German anthologies and literary history books, 1978–2006'. *Poetics* 39: 419–438.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986) *The Forms of Capital*, in Richardson, J. (ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. New York: Greenwood.
- Castells, M. (2000) *The Rise of the Network Society*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Calhoun, C. (2010) 'Beck, Asia, and second modernity'. *British Journal of Sociology* 61: 597–619.
- Casanova, P. (2008) *The World Republic of Letters*. London: Verso.
- Chakrabarty, D. (2005) *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Delanty, G. (2009) *The Cosmopolitan Imagination: The Renewal of Critical Social Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Favell, A. (2008). *Eurostars and Eurocities*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Favell, A., Recchi, E., Kuhn, T., Solgaard, J. and Klein, J. (2011) *State of the Art Report*. EUCROSS working paper 1. http://www.eucross.eu/cms/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=10&Itemid=110.
- Featherstone, M. (1991) *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism*. London: Sage.
- Franklin, S., Lury, S. and Stacey, J. (1995) *Global Nature, Global Culture*. London: Sage.
- Frith S. (2004) 'Does British music still matter? A reflection on the changing status of British popular music in the global music market'. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 7: 43–58.
- Ganzeboom, H.B.G., De Graaf, P.M. and Treiman, D. (with De Leeuw, J.) (1992) 'A Standard International Socio-Economic Index of Occupational Status'. *Social Science Research* 21: 1-56.
- Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self Identity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gilroy, P. (1990) *The Black Atlantic*. London: Verso.
- Gilroy P. (2005) *Postcolonial Melancholia*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gilroy, P. (2010) 'Planetary and cosmopolitics'. *British Journal of Sociology* 61(3): 620–626.
- Hanquinet, L. and Savage, M. (2011) *Operationalisation of European Identity, Cosmopolitanism and Cross-Border Practices*. EUCROSS Working Paper 2, http://www.eucross.eu/cms/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=10&Itemid=110.

- Hall, S. (2002) *Political Belonging in a World of Multiple Identities*, in S. Vertovec and R. Cohen (eds) *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism – Theory, Context, Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jameson, F. (1984) *Postmodernism, or the cultural logic of late capitalism*. London: Verso.
- Mau, S. (2010) *Social Transnationalism. Lifeworlds Beyond the Nation-State*. London: Routledge.
- Mau, S. and Mewes, J. (2012) 'Horizontal Europeanisation in Contextual Perspective'. *European Societies* 14: 7-34.
- Meuleman, R. and Savage, M. (2013) 'A field analysis of cosmopolitan taste: lessons from the Netherlands'. *Cultural Sociology* 7: 230-256.
- Noble, G. (2009) *Everyday cosmopolitanism and the labour of intercultural community*, in A. Wise and S. Velayutham (eds.) *Everyday Multiculturalism*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Norris, P. (2005) *Radical Right: Voters and Parties in the Electoral Market*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Norris, P. and Inglehart, R. (2009) *Cosmopolitan Communication: Cultural Diversity in a Globalized World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Prieur, A. and Savage, M. (2011) 'Updating cultural capital theory: A discussion based on studies in Denmark and in Britain'. *Poetics* 39: 566–580.
- Recchi, E. (2012) *Transnational Practices and European Identity: From Theoretical to Policy Issues*. EUCROSS working paper 1. http://www.eucross.eu/cms/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=10&Itemid=110.
- Recchi, E. (2013) *Senza frontiere. La libera circolazione delle persone in Europa*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Recchi, E. and Favell, A. (2009) *Pioneers Of European Integration. Citizenship and Mobility in the EU*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Robertson, R. (1992) *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: Sage.
- Savage, M., Bagnall, G. and Longhurst, B.J. (2005) *Globalisation and Belonging*. London: Sage.
- Savage, M. and Silva, E.B. (2013 - forthcoming) 'Field Analysis in Cultural Sociology', special issue of *Cultural Sociology*.
- Salamońska, J., Baglioni, L.G. and Recchi, E. (2013) *Navigating the European Space: Physical and Virtual Forms of Cross-Border Mobility among EU Citizens*. EUCROSS working paper 5. http://www.eucross.eu/cms/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=10&Itemid=110.
- Schmutz, V. (2009) 'Social and symbolic boundaries in newspaper coverage of music, 1955–2005: Gender and genre in the US, France, Germany, and the Netherlands'. *Poetics* 37: 298–314.
- Szerszynski, B. and Urry, J. (2002) 'Cultures of Cosmopolitanism'. *Sociological Review* 50: 462-481.
- Wise, A. and Velayutham, S. (eds.) (2009) *Everyday Multiculturalism*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Woolgar, S., (ed) (2005) *Virtual Society ?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Woodward, I., Skrbis, Z. and Clive, B.S. (2008) 'Attitudes towards globalization and cosmopolitanism: Cultural diversity, personal consumption and the national economy'. *British Journal of Sociology* 59: 207–226.