

EUR Research Information Portal

Cosmopolitanism in contemporary European societies

Published in:

Journal of Contemporary European Studies

Publication status and date:

Published: 01/01/2024

DOI (link to publisher):

[10.1080/14782804.2023.2211531](https://doi.org/10.1080/14782804.2023.2211531)

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Document License/Available under:

CC BY-NC-ND

Citation for the published version (APA):

Katz-Gerro, T., Janssen, S., Yodovich, N., Verboord, M., & Llonch-Andreu, J. (2024). Cosmopolitanism in contemporary European societies: Mapping and comparing different types of openness across Europe. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 32(1), 187-202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14782804.2023.2211531>

[Link to publication on the EUR Research Information Portal](#)

Terms and Conditions of Use

Except as permitted by the applicable copyright law, you may not reproduce or make this material available to any third party without the prior written permission from the copyright holder(s). Copyright law allows the following uses of this material without prior permission:

- you may download, save and print a copy of this material for your personal use only;
- you may share the EUR portal link to this material.

In case the material is published with an open access license (e.g. a Creative Commons (CC) license), other uses may be allowed. Please check the terms and conditions of the specific license.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this material infringes your copyright and/or any other intellectual property rights, you may request its removal by contacting us at the following email address: openaccess.library@eur.nl. Please provide us with all the relevant information, including the reasons why you believe any of your rights have been infringed. In case of a legitimate complaint, we will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website.



Cosmopolitanism in contemporary European societies: mapping and comparing different types of openness across Europe

Tally Katz-Gerro, Susanne Janssen, Neta Yodovich, Marc Verboord & Joan Llonch-Andreu

To cite this article: Tally Katz-Gerro, Susanne Janssen, Neta Yodovich, Marc Verboord & Joan Llonch-Andreu (2023): Cosmopolitanism in contemporary European societies: mapping and comparing different types of openness across Europe, Journal of Contemporary European Studies, DOI: [10.1080/14782804.2023.2211531](https://doi.org/10.1080/14782804.2023.2211531)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14782804.2023.2211531>



© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.



[View supplementary material](#)



Published online: 10 May 2023.



[Submit your article to this journal](#)



Article views: 99








[View related articles](#)



[View Crossmark data](#)

Cosmopolitanism in contemporary European societies: mapping and comparing different types of openness across Europe

Tally Katz-Gerro ^a, Susanne Janssen ^b, Neta Yodovich ^a, Marc Verboord ^b
and Joan Llonch-Andreu ^c

^aDepartment of Sociology, University of Haifa, Israel; ^bDepartment of Media and Communication, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Netherlands; ^cDepartment of Business, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

ABSTRACT



Cosmopolitanism, which is often defined as openness to other cultures and individuals, is significant for understanding processes of stratification in contemporary, globalised societies that are home to increasingly diverse populations. In this paper, we broaden the perspective on cosmopolitanism to include cultural, interpersonal, and political dimensions. We test the associations between these types of cosmopolitanism and three types of correlates: socio-demographic characteristics, personal exposure to other cultures, and exposure to other cultures via various media. We analyse data from nine European countries that differ in the characteristics of their population, cultural traditions, and political models. Results indicate that differences between respondents in the nine countries are better explained by individual characteristics than by country characteristics. Furthermore, it is mainly personal and mediated exposure to other cultures, rather than socio-demographic variables, that play a significant role in influencing respondents' cosmopolitan tendencies.


KEYWORDS

Cosmopolitanism; globalisation; cultural openness; comparative research; Europe

1. Introduction

Cosmopolitanism represents a personal tendency to orient oneself beyond the boundaries of the community one belongs to (Merton 1957). More specifically, the term has been used to refer to a specific set of attitudes, beliefs and traits, most of all, 'an ethos of cultural openness' (Kurasawa 2004, 240). The cultural aspects of cosmopolitanism are theorised as the openness to learning about, participating in, and reflecting on new and foreign cultural practices and experiences (Hannerz 1990; Szerszynski and Urry 2006; Woodward, Skrbis, and Bean 2008; Cleveland et al. 2011). Cultural cosmopolitanism is a consequence of processes of globalisation and of the pervasiveness of global media, which lead to the permanent flow of diverse cultural products and ideas, to increased intercultural contacts, and to greater awareness of and sensitivity to cultural differences (Beck and Grande 2010). The internationalisation of cultural production and consumption have contributed greatly to the creation of shared imaginaries of culture and to familiarity with foreign images (Cicchelli and Octobre 2018) and the accessibility of multiple repertoires of cultural references to a growing number of individuals across the world. Scholars have been interested in the extent to which such accessibility has actually led individuals to adopt greater openness to other cultures, ideas, and places. This is the main interest of our paper.

CONTACT Tally Katz-Gerro  tkatz@soc.haifa.ac.il  Department of Sociology, University of Haifa, 199 Aba Khoushy Ave., Mount Carmel, Haifa 3498838, Israel

 Supplemental data for this article can be accessed online at <https://doi.org/10.1080/14782804.2023.2211531>.

© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

Theorising cosmopolitanism as a stance of openness refers both to cultural experiences with foreign products and meanings and to new social connections and socialising that go beyond territorial borders (Weenink 2007, 2008; Pichler 2009). Along these lines, research on cosmopolitanism has looked into the ways in which individuals negotiate national, social, and racial borders that cut across cultural boundaries (Lamont and Aksartova 2002), a stance that is sometimes associated with the term 'citizen of the world' (Pichler 2009). Openness to other cultures is not merely a mechanical outcome of the increase in the availability of goods (Ollivier 2008; Roose, Van Eijck, and Lievens 2012), but also has to be motivated by the tolerance for aesthetic experiences and for a wide array of tastes, genres, and practices (Lizardo 2005; Chamorro-Premuzic et al. 2009; Cappeliez and Johnston 2013; Meuleman and Savage 2013).

Cosmopolitan cultural preferences create boundaries between groups, shape social relations, and can reproduce or transform the social location of individuals (Igarashi and Saito 2014). Indeed, recent research has begun exploring cultural cosmopolitanism as a new form of cultural capital and cultural distinction (Rössel and Schroedter 2015; Varriale 2016; Cicchelli et al. 2021). Having established the significance of cosmopolitanism and cultural openness, research has also focused on the identification of the types of social groups that are more prone to be cosmopolitan or culturally open. Members of social elites no longer adhere to the traditional highbrow-lowbrow cultural dichotomy as a form of distinction (Thomas 2022), but instead rely on cosmopolitan cultural consumption as a new form of cultural capital that provides benefits (Prieur and Savage 2013; Friedman et al. 2015). Ultimately, the middle class appears to benefit most from a transnational cultural capital and cultural cosmopolitanism, while the lower class is left behind (Carlson, Gerhards, and Hans 2017; Medrano 2016).

But what contributes to the formation of cultural cosmopolitanism? While acknowledging that individuals from certain socio-economic backgrounds (e.g. higher education) tend to embrace cosmopolitan stances (e.g. Pichler, 2012), this paper examines the additional impact of *exposure to different cultural experiences*. More specifically, we study the effects of being regularly exposed to personal versus mediated cultural resources that (potentially) offer 'other' cultural viewpoints. Our attention to exposure builds on literature that points at the positive impact of intergroup contact for understanding individuals from other groups (Pettigrew and Tropp 2006) and on literature showing that in our increasingly mediated society, individuals can encounter numerous slices-of-life from other cultures via the internet, audio-visual entertainment, or translated books (Szerszynski and Urry 2006; Robertson 2010; Petzold 2017).

Following evidence of the multidimensional nature of the concept of cosmopolitanism (e.g. Pichler 2008; Leung, Koh, and Tam 2015; Petzold 2017), we look at three dimensions of cosmopolitanism: *cultural, interpersonal, and political*. Accounting for these different dimensions could shed light on previous findings regarding the contradictory aspects of cosmopolitanism. Examples include enjoying the benefits of a cosmopolitan lifestyle while wishing to limit opportunities for cultural others to do so (Keating 2021) or practicing openness in public and excluding the Other in private (Høy-Petersen 2021).

In addition to focusing on exposure to different cultural experiences and analysing three dimensions of cosmopolitanism, the current paper also contributes to extant research by analysing a dataset pertaining to nine countries. Previous research that looked into mapping the extent of cosmopolitan cultural consumption or cultural openness or examined the prevalence of cosmopolitanism in political orientations has tended to be limited to single countries (Mau, Mewes, and Zimmermann 2008; Woodward, Skrbis, and Bean 2008; Savage, Wright, and Gayo-Cal 2010; Meuleman and Savage 2013; Prieur and Savage 2013; Hedegard 2015; Rössel and Schroedter 2015; Meuleman, Lubbers, and Verkuyten 2016; Marčić, Tonković, and Krolo 2022). Only a few studies have used a comparative framework. Examples include comparisons of France and the United States (Maxwell and DeSoucey 2016) and Seoul, Paris, and Sao Paulo (Cicchelli et al. 2021), studies that compare global media consumption (Pichler 2008; Kuipers and De Kloet 2009); studies that use Eurobarometer (Katz-Gerro 2017; Verboord 2017) or European Values Study data (Pichler 2009); and one comprehensive study on cross-

border practices and transnational identities among EU and Third-country citizens (Recchi, Favell, and the EUCROSS Team 2019). Most studies identify a general trend of an increase in self-reported cosmopolitan orientations, preferences, or tastes and in actual consumption of globally diverse cultural products.

Multi-country studies can provide a generalizable foundation for understanding cosmopolitan orientations (Makrides et al. 2021), which vary considerably across European countries (e.g. Weenink 2008; Recchi, Favell, and the EUCROSS Team 2019). If we can identify the most important drivers of cosmopolitanism, we could anticipate the level of cosmopolitanism of a specific population and learn how we these might be influenced. This should be of interest to academics as well as cultural practitioners and policy makers. Academics can benefit from a better knowledge of the building blocks of cosmopolitanism, allowing them to concentrate on key variables in such an approach to culture. For cultural practitioners, having a clearer idea about the profile of people who have a higher level of cosmopolitanism would be useful in defining the target group and positioning for their cultural products. Finally, policy makers could obtain important information from this analysis, for example, tailoring policies to specific target countries if they wanted to increase the level of cosmopolitanism in a specific area (for instance, the European Union).

2. Literature review

Cosmopolitanism

Several studies have looked at interest in and openness to foreign cultural experiences. European level research showed the extent to which cross-cultural contact already occurs and highlighted the value of cultural exchange to society (Hanquinet and Savage 2018), as well as the willingness of Europeans to meet people from other countries and learn a new language (Eurobarometer 2007). The increase in cross-border connectedness is one of the most significant social phenomena of our times, which has greatly impacted our daily lives to have had a real effect on changing people's mind sets (Kuhn 2015). Like others, Kuhn maintains that globalisation and global interconnectedness have made people more open to the culture of others and more cosmopolitan. Kuhn (2011) uses the term 'individual transnationalism' to describe personal cross-border and virtual interactions and mobility, and indeed shows that the effect of individual transnationalism on support for the concept of the EU is greater in more globalised countries. In addition, individuals who do not interact across borders on a regular basis tend to be less educated, worse-off economically, and older (Phillips and Smith 2008; Hanquinet and Savage 2018).

Macro trends of cultural cosmopolitanism have been associated with economic, cultural, and political processes of globalisation (e.g. Woodward, Skrbis, and Bean 2008; Kuhn 2011) as well as with specific country characteristics (e.g. Pichler 2009). Examples include the role the educational system plays in fostering cultural heterogeneity, the degree to which media and cultural institutions are open to promoting national and international culture, and the extent to which a society is open to cultural imports and is welcoming to immigrants with other ethnic and cultural backgrounds (Janssen, Kuipers, and Verboord 2008).

Parallel to trends of globalisation and increasing openness, European and other Western societies have experienced an increase in social ethnocentrism (Aschauer 2016; Bizumic, Monaghan, and Priest 2021), which is associated with more negative stances towards cultural diversity (Aschauer 2016). Recent developments, such as the increasing popularity of right-wing populist leaders in many countries and the support for Brexit, suggest that ethnocentrism has gained ground in recent years (Bizumic, Monaghan, and Priest 2021). This tendency to place one's own ethnic group at the centre has socio-psychological (cultural openness and patriotism), political (government propaganda), economic (state of the economy), and demographic (social class and education) sources (López-Lomelí, Alarcón-Del-Amo, and Llonch-Andreu 2019). Discontent with one's socio-economic or general life situation has also been found to negatively influence people's openness toward diverse others and foreign cultures

(e.g. Korol and Bevelander 2021; Aschauer 2016). In light of these contrasting trends and given the growing significance of cosmopolitanism for processes of social and cultural stratification, it is imperative to examine different aspects of individuals' openness and its correlates. Previous studies have outlined the impact of socio-demographic variables on cultural and political participation in general and on cultural cosmopolitanism in particular. Younger, educated individuals, from higher status groups are more likely to hold cosmopolitan attitudes (Pichler 2009). In addition, gender and religious denomination play a role in shaping such attitudes (Pichler 2009; Rovisco and Kim 2014; Seo and Gao 2015; Driezen, Verschraegen, and Clycq 2021). However, the explanatory power of these socio-demographic variables is quite limited (Makrides et al. 2021), leaving us with the question of what other factors promote the development of a cosmopolitan outlook? To answer this question, and following the review above, we turn to the way individuals come into contact with new sources of information that might influence their perceptions.

Personal exposure to other cultures

Research has shown that cosmopolitan orientations are more prevalent among individuals living in large cities rather than those living in smaller towns or villages. While the mechanisms behind this difference are still unexplored, longitudinal studies indicate that this divide may be the outcome of sorting mechanisms and composition effects (Gallego et al. 2016; Maxwell 2020). People with cosmopolitan attitudes often choose to live in urban centres with more job offers, socio-economic resources, and lifestyle opportunities. This notwithstanding, other studies suggest that it is not only social sorting that attracts cosmopolitans to cities. Urban living environments themselves can make people more cosmopolitan. For example, research in the United States (Gimpel et al. 2020) and the Netherlands (Huijsmans et al. 2021) that finds sizeable difference in cosmopolitan political orientations along the urbanisation continuum. This difference cannot be explained by the socio-demographic composition of the population and accelerating processes of social sorting alone and is in part attributed to the more globalized and diversified socio-cultural contexts in which urbanites live.

Residents of larger cities are more likely to encounter a larger and more diverse group of people in the public space (Parker 2015), which makes them more prone to accept cultural differences (Wood and Landry 2008; Wessendorf 2014). Such exposure may lead to a positive stance towards multiculturalism compared to people living in less urbanised areas (Alba and Foner 2017; Janssen et al. 2019; Van Heerдин and Ruedin 2019; Huijsmans et al. 2021). Given the higher population density and diversity of larger cities, urbanites tend to have more diverse social networks and more frequent social interactions with diverse others, which, according to intergroup contact theorists, foster cosmopolitan attitudes (Pettigrew and Tropp 2006; Paluck, Green, and Green 2019). While there are also studies highlighting the negative impact of exposure to different national origin or ethno-racial groups, the empirical evidence for urban settings suggests that social contacts and casual encounters with different groups contribute to the development of cosmopolitan attitudes (Maxwell 2020).

Through practices and social relations associated with transnational mobility, individuals become familiar with foreign cultures, places, and people – an important prerequisite for developing cosmopolitan dispositions (Robertson 1992; Beck, 2004; Kuhn 2011). Extensive international travel strongly promotes cosmopolitan attitudes (Gustafson 2009) and migration to another country has a similar effect (Tzaninis 2020; Horst and Olsen 2021). A representative survey in Germany confirmed that border-crossing experiences and transnational social relations increase the likelihood that people will adopt cosmopolitan attitudes (Mau, Mewes, and Zimmermann 2008). This 'transnationality' effect remains stable even after controlling for socio-economic characteristics such as education, age, and income.

Mediated exposure to other cultures and perspectives

As outlined above, contact theory literature (Pettigrew et al. 2011) suggests that transnational experience can lead to exposure to other cultures and perspectives, which in turn increases the likelihood that people will develop cosmopolitan orientations. However, exposure to other cultures does not necessarily occur through international travel, migration, or other forms of cross-border mobility, but can also occur through media consumption and engagement with foreign cultural offerings (Szerszynski and Urry 2006; Petzold 2017).

Research presents evidence on the role of news media in the emergence of cosmopolitan orientations. For example, Chouliaraki (2008) shows how satellite news stories on suffering in distant lands may help promote the creation of cosmopolitan communities of emotion and action. Entertainment media, popular culture, and fictional genres also have strong potential to raise awareness to diverse and distant others, to convey their lived experiences in a compelling manner, and to generate feelings of connection with and empathy towards them (Koopman 2016). Exposure to foreign media can serve as a catalyst for cosmopolitan stances, for instance, allowing people relate to distant others (Robertson 2010) or making foreign affairs more accessible through translation, thus facilitating a degree of cosmopolitan openness (Bielsa 2016).

One can distinguish at least three types of mediated exposure. First, internet-based media have enabled people from around the world to scope for news, information or entertainment, created in different parts of the world with one click. There is some evidence that Europeans using more interactive features of the internet have higher levels of cosmopolitanism (Verboord 2017). Second, despite certain language barriers, many Europeans also consume films, music, and television shows originating either from other countries, translated or in the original language (Cicchelli and Octobre, 2017; Cicchelli et al. 2021). Previous research suggests that higher levels of such foreign cultural consumption are associated with more cosmopolitan orientations (e.g. Meuleman 2014; Recchi 2014). The consumption of TV content in a foreign language proved to be an important variable in predicting European identification of citizens (Pötzschke and Braun 2019). Third, researchers have pointed to the specific features of fiction book reading – which can enhance empathy and the comprehension of other perspectives – for stimulating cosmopolitan orientations (Kidd and Castano 2013; Koopman 2016). To summarize, different avenues of exposure to other cultures and perspectives, both direct and mediated, may lead to cosmopolitan dispositions (cf. Recchi 2014; Petzold 2017).

Research questions

To add to the literature on the factors conditioning cosmopolitanism, we examine whether and how personal and mediated exposure correlate with three dimensions of cosmopolitanism we take into consideration. We analyse originally collected multi-county dataset, and posit two research questions:

- (1) To what degree are personal and mediated exposure to different cultures associated with different dimensions of cosmopolitanism?
- (2) What are the main similarities and differences in these associations in nine European countries?

3. Methodology

Data

Our data collection is part of a larger project [Anonymised] that covers nine European countries – Croatia, Denmark, Finland, France, The Netherlands, Serbia, Spain, Switzerland, and the UK. These countries represent a good variety in terms of geographic region within Europe, size of population,

Table 1. Survey methodology and sample statistics ($n = 14,384$).

Country	Survey agency	Sample size <i>n</i>	Gender (female)	Age M (<i>SD</i>)	Highest education (vocational tertiary or university degree)
Croatia	Ipsos	1,200	54.2%	46.89 (16.73)	23.2%
Denmark	Epinion	1,666	54.7%	53.35 (16.01)	46.5%
Finland	Taloustutkimus	1,247	54.7%	55.17 (17.63)	49.3%
France	IFOP	2,259	53.8%	51.56 (19.54)	43.2%
Netherlands	I&O Research	1,596	53.7%	49.82 (17.14)	44.5%
Serbia	Ipsos	1,237	55.7%	48.24 (16.56)	25.0%
Spain	Ipsos Spain	1,398	52.1%	47.27 (14.93)	58.9%
Switzerland	DemoSCOPE	1,370	50.4%	51.83 (14.86)	40.9%
United Kingdom	YouGov	2,411	58.1%	50.66 (16.91)	51.1%

Note. Method of data collection was determined based on local conditions and included face-to-face, computer-assisted web interview, computer-assisted telephone interview, and paper-and-pencil interview. Sample sizes differ in some analyses due to missing data.

cultural policy frameworks, status of affiliation with the European Union, and manifestation of globalization and migration. A survey was administered to representative samples of the adult population (18–80 years old) in each country between mid-April and early July 2021 by specialised national survey agencies (see Table 1). We secured 14,384 completed questionnaires in total. Although the sample resembles the population structure in terms of age, gender, and educational attainment in each country fairly closely, in some countries, women, older age groups, and/or highly educated inhabitants were overrepresented. Therefore, weight variables were applied in the multivariate analyses.

Dependent variables

The survey included twelve statements to probe respondents' cosmopolitan orientations (see Table 2). Respondents were asked to indicate their (dis)agreement with each statement using a 5-point Likert scale (0=strongly disagree, 4=strongly agree). For item 7, reversed coding was applied. Principal component analysis (PCA; Child 2006; Garson 2022) was conducted to examine if these twelve items could be grouped into broader constructs, representing different dimensions of cosmopolitanism. Based on the PCA analysis we constructed three dependent variables that provide alternative and complementary measures of cosmopolitanism: *Cultural openness*, *Political openness*, and *Interpersonal openness*. The values of each of these indices of openness range from 0 (lowest) to 4 (highest).

Table 2 summarizes the results of the principal components analysis. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy had a suitable value (.90), while Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($p < 0.001$), indicating that the PCA is appropriate with our data. We used an oblique rotation method (direct oblimin) since we assumed dimensions are correlated. Components or factors with an eigenvalue of 1 or higher, at least three salient pattern coefficients ($>.50$), and internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's alpha $>.70$), and that were theoretically meaningful were retained. The resulting three-factor solution explained 68.79% of the variance, which is typical of social and behavioral sciences (Child 2006). Since we used oblique rotation, we also inspected the interfactor correlations. The results proved satisfactory with the average between factor correlation (Appendix

Table 2. Principal components analysis (PCA) of cosmopolitan orientations: pattern matrix.

		Components		
		1.Cultural Openness	2. Political Openness	3. Interpersonal Openness
1	I like to learn about other ways of life	.842	-.019	.088
2	I am interested in learning more about people who live in other	.838	.014	.078
3	I enjoy being with people from other countries	.830	-.015	.130
4	I enjoy exchanging ideas with people from other cultures and countries	.817	-.025	.148
5	It is a good thing to be part of EU/it is a bad thing not to be part of the EU	-.129	.879	.101
6	Membership of the EU has brought/can bring new opportunities to people in my country	-.116	.858	.153
7	I feel that our way of life is threatened by foreign cultures (<i>Reversed coding Strongly disagree = 4</i>)	.354	.518	-.240
8	Increased presence of different cultures in my country has enriched people's lives	.346	.516	.034
9	At cultural events I often feel a sense of belonging and togetherness with other participants	-.046	.043	.865
10	It is great to participate in cultural events and activities with a very diverse group of people	.213	.049	.709
11	Culture connects people and bridges political, social and religious divides	.088	.176	.653
12	At cultural events I like to talk to people who have different background than me	.273	-.088	.649
	Reliability (internal consistency) Cronbach's α	.91	.73	.82
	Eigenvalue	5.583	1.660	1.013
	Explained variance before rotation (%)	46.53%	13.83%	8.44%
	Cumulative explained variance	46.53%	60.36%	68.79%

Oblimin rotation with Kaiser normalization (missing values excluded listwise). Values in boldface indicate the factor to which each item was assigned. Software package used: IBM SPSS version 28.0.1.0.

A1b) being considerably lower (.333) than the average within factor correlation (.557; cf. Appendix A1a).

The boldfaced values in Table 2 indicate the component to which each item was assigned based on its pattern coefficients (>.50). We find three clearly distinct clusters. The first component, which we termed **Cultural openness**, contains the four items that we used from Cleveland et al. (2014) scale of cosmopolitanism and that are indicative of people's interest in/curiosity about other countries and cultures. The **Political openness** component includes four items that measure attitudes towards increased supranational connectedness as well as attitudes toward the impact of increased cultural diversity and foreign cultural influences in one's country and were inspired by prior work on political dimensions of cosmopolitanism (Pichler 2008; Kuhn, Solaz, and van Elsas 2018; Mau, Mewes, and Zimmermann 2008; Maxwell 2020). The third component, which we labelled **Interpersonal openness**, includes four items that are indicative of people's attitudes towards social encounters/interactions with diverse others in the context of cultural activities and events. The focus on cultural activities and events has to do with one of the objectives of our survey, which aimed to shed light on the bridging potential of cultural participation (e.g. Quinn et al. 2022). However, while the scope of this measurement is limited to the cultural domain, it is arguably also indicative for interpersonal openness more broadly.

Independent variables

Socio-demographic variables include gender, age, and education based on their prominence in previous studies on cultural and political openness. *Gender* is measured as female (1) and male (0). *Education level* is measured using six categories (0 = no formal/only primary; 1 = lower secondary; 2 = upper secondary general; 3 = upper secondary vocational; 4 = vocational tertiary; 5 = university degree). *Age* is measured in years. Table 1 provides descriptive statistics of the sample.

Satisfaction with financial situation and with life in general. We included measurements of respondents' satisfaction with their financial situation as well as general life satisfaction as control

variables, because previous studies suggest that discontent with one's socio-economic or life situation may negatively impact one's openness toward diverse others and foreign cultures. Both variables were measured on a 7-point scale (0 = extremely dissatisfied, 7 = extremely satisfied).

Personal exposure to other cultures. We used five variables to capture the extent to which people have been in contact with cultures and diverse others.

Urban status is a self-reported measure of the size of the community in which the respondents reside (similar to the 'Domicile' variable used in the European Social Survey). It consists of ten categories ranging from 1 ('farm or home in countryside') to 10 ('capital city of country'). Inclusion of this variable assumes that those who live in the capital or other large cities have more opportunities to encounter varied cultures and immigrants from different cultural backgrounds.

Migration background and non-European ancestry. These two variables consider that cosmopolitanism may develop from migration processes and the subsequent connection to a diversity of cultures and places. The first variable indicates if respondents, or one or both of their parents, were born in another country (0 = no; 1 = yes). Respondents were also asked to mention a maximum of two ancestries from a pre-coded list with the option to add an ancestry themselves. Based on these answers, the variable *non-European ancestry* (0 = no; 1 = yes) was constructed.

Diverse social interactions and experience with other European cultures examine the level of first hand, in-person interactions and experiences with people from different cultures (each measured on a 5-point Likert scale, 0 = low level, 4 = high level). Items included: 'I frequently encounter people from other cultural or ethnic backgrounds in my daily life', and 'European integration has enabled me to experience other European cultures'.

Mediated exposure to other cultures and perspectives. Six measures indicate how often respondents get in contact with other cultures and perspectives through various media. All variables were measured on a 5-point scale (0 = almost never, 4 = almost daily).

Foreign news: the consumption of foreign newspapers or news websites. We chose this measure to reflect the respondents' exposure to news and narratives beyond their own countries.

Internet use: much like the consumption of foreign news, we selected the use of social media based on the notion that Internet use and social media engagement could potentially increase exposure to other cultures.

Book reading: similarly, we regarded book reading as yet another form of exposure to different perspectives and ways of living.

Foreign culture non-English: Consumption of foreign films and television and foreign music as a predictor of cosmopolitanism assumes that frequent exposure to foreign audio-visual entertainment might increase cosmopolitan orientations. The reliability score for this scale was 0.746, and it includes only items that focus on the consumption of non-English content. We did so for several reasons. First, English is the UK's native language. Therefore, consuming cultural output in this language is not likely to contribute to one's cosmopolitan dispositions in this country. Second, the level of interest in non-English foreign content seems a stronger form of exposure to foreign cultures than exposure to Anglo-Saxon culture which is far more common and omnipresent across Europe. Items included: How often, if at all, do you listen to the following types of music (either on radio, TV, CD, vinyl, online, or live): Music in other European languages (i.e. excluding the English language), and Music in languages from other parts of the world, and 'How often, if at all, do you watch the following types of TV series or films (either on TV, DVD, online, or in movie theatres): TV series or films from other European countries, TV series or films from other parts of the world'.

Anglo-Saxon culture. Given that Anglo-Saxon culture may be more common and more accessible across Europe, but nevertheless constitutes foreign culture for most of the respondents in our sample, we included a separate two-item variable measuring the extent to which people consume Anglo-Saxon culture TV series, films and music.

Domestic culture. This two-item variable measures the extent to which people consume domestic TV series, films and music, as this may have a negative impact on people's openness towards other cultures (Meuleman 2014).

Finally, we note that in the multivariate analyses presented below, all variables were rescaled between 0 and 1 to facilitate interpretation.

4. Analytical approach

The nine European countries in our study represent different policy models, media systems, population characteristics, EU membership status (members and non-members), levels of globalization, and positions in the cultural world-system (more or less central languages and systems of cultural production). Although such country characteristics may influence the extent to which inhabitants hold cosmopolitan orientations (e.g. Pichler 2012), our statistical analyses will not examine the impact of any *specific*, country-level features on individual outcomes, because the sample of 9 countries is too small to do so in a reliable or comprehensive manner (Bryan and Jenkins 2016; Möhring 2012).

Notwithstanding our focus on individual-level predictors, we used a multilevel model (but one without any specific predictors at the country level because of the small number of countries) in order to account for the nested structured of our data, in which level 1 units (individuals) are nested within level 2 units (in our case, the nine European countries). A regular regression does not consider the grouping of data, which subsequently leads to underestimation of coefficients and overstatement of coefficient significance (Gelman and Hill 2006). In contrast, a multilevel model with only a limited number of level 2 units, still produces reliable fixed regression coefficients and level-1 variance components (Maas and Hox 2005). Additionally, the multi-level models can be used to gain insight in how much of the variance in the outcome variables is explained by differences at the country-level and individual-level characteristics, respectively.

5. Findings

As a first step, we estimated the null models with only a random intercept but no independent variables. Based upon variances at the individual and country level, this allowed us to assess how much of the explained variance is situated at each level by calculating the Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC). The ICCs ranged from 3.4% for cultural openness, to 4.0% for interpersonal openness, to 7.0% for political openness. This indicates that the differences between countries are relatively small, especially in the case of cultural and interpersonal openness. We note that these ICC's should be interpreted with caution, because a small level 2 sample size (i.e. 9 countries) might lead to an overestimation of the level 2 variance components (Maas and Hox 2005), which would imply that the between country variances might be (even) lower than the mentioned ICC percentages.

Table 3 presents the weighted results of three models for each dependent variable. Model 1 includes only the socio-demographic variables and the two satisfaction variables, Model 2 adds the personal exposure variables, and Model 3 adds the mediated exposure variables.¹

For all three dimensions of cosmopolitanism, the explained variance in Model 1 – containing only the demographic characteristics and the two satisfaction variables – is limited. This result is in line with previous studies. The table reports the marginal pseudo R^2 , which indicates the variance explained only by the fixed effects at level 1, as well as the conditional pseudo R^2 , which indicates the variance explained by the entire model including both the fixed effects and the random effects of the country-level. The marginal pseudo R^2 lies between 2.2% and 4.8%. The conditional pseudo R^2 is slightly higher, particularly for political openness (11.8%), indicating that the cross-national differences are greater for political openness than for the other two forms of openness.

Despite the relatively limited explanatory power, the socio-demographic variables have significant and similar associations with all three indicators of openness. Having higher levels of education, identifying as female, and being younger are all associated with more cosmopolitan orientations. The strength of the associations differs slightly across the three indicators. Education and gender

Table 3. Multilevel linear regression analysis of cultural, interpersonal, and political dimensions of cosmopolitanism.

	Cultural openness			Interpersonal openness			Political openness		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Socio-demographics									
Level of education (0-1)	.106***	.092***	.051***	.051***	.041***	.018***	.108***	.092***	.085***
Female (0/1)	.034***	.039***	.034***	.029***	.032***	.028***	.032***	.034***	.033***
Age (0-1)	-.143***	-.015~	.008~	-.085***	.011	.021*	-.10***	-.032***	-.034***
Satisfaction									
Satisfaction with financial situation (0-1)	-.000	.005	.000	.005	.009	-.006	.054***	.055***	.055***
General satisfaction with life (0-1)	.030***	.014~	.015~	.042***	.027**	.026***	.045***	.030***	.031***
Personal exposure									
Urban status (0-1)		.012~	-.002		-.012*	-.019**		.042***	.037***
Migrant background (0/1)		.015**	.009~		.005	.004		.025***	.020***
Non-European ancestry (0/1)		.033***	.039***		.059***	.060***		.043***	.041***
Diverse social interactions (0-1)		.158***	.136***		.130***	.113***		.018**	.011~
Experience with other European cultures (0-1)		.249***	.205***		.219***	.193***		.254***	.243***
Mediated exposure									
Internet use (0-1)			.064***			.015~			-.053***
Foreign news (0-1)			.040***			.021***			.011*
Foreign culture (non-ENG) (0-1)			.088***			.074***			.051***
Anglo-Saxon culture (0-1)			.065***			.033***			.019*
Domestic culture (0-1)			-.034***			.021***			-.029**
Book reading (0-1)			.077***			.055***			.029***
Intercept	.669***	.401***	.291***	.625***	.405***	.335***	.510***	.323***	.361***
Variance country level	.002*	.001*	.002*	.002*	.003*	.003*	.004*	.003*	.003*
Variance individual level	.053***	.042***	.039***	.043***	.035***	.034***	.048***	.042***	.041***
-2 restricted log-likelihood	-1849,756	-4735,575	-5655,382	-4436,707	-7022,945	-7477,280	-2759,089	-4511,064	-4620,674
Pseudo R ² (marginal)	.048	.244	.298	.022	.192	.220	.048	.180	.189
Pseudo R ² (conditional)	.079	.261	.329	.064	.250	.286	.118	.236	.241

Random intercept models. Maximum likelihood estimates. Results are weighted. Unstandardized coefficients. Variables are rescaled between 0-1 to facilitate interpretation. Two-tailed tests of significance: *** $p < .001$ ** $p < .01$ * $p < .05$ ~ $p < .10$. Software package used: IBM SPSS version 28.0.1.0.

continue to have a significant impact in Model 3 for all three types of openness. In contrast, age differences can be fully explained by the exposure variables in Model 3 for cultural openness, while they persist for political openness, and, to a lesser extent, interpersonal openness. The two satisfaction variables appear especially relevant for political openness, indicating that people who are more satisfied with their financial situation and overall life situation display higher levels of political openness. For cultural and interpersonal openness, we only find a modest, positive association with life satisfaction.

When we add the personal exposure variables in Model 2, the explained variances increase considerably for all three dimensions of cosmopolitanism, with a particular strong increase for cultural openness. Having a migrant background and having a non-European ancestry are both associated with higher levels of cosmopolitan orientations, but this result comes out stronger for latter than for the former association. The impact of urban status is not stable across the three forms of openness. In accordance with the extant literature, living in larger cities contributes to political cosmopolitan orientations, but for interpersonal openness, we find a modest, opposite association, whereas cultural openness is not significantly related to urban status. Having diverse social interactions does not change political openness very much, in contrast to cultural and interpersonal openness. This result seems to make sense: regularly meeting people from other backgrounds is more likely to shape openness to cultural practices on the individual level than more abstract viewpoints in the political or ideological realm. Persons who have first-hand experience with other European cultures show unambiguously higher levels of all forms of cosmopolitanism.

In Model 3, we add the mediated exposure variables. Again, doing so improves the explained variances most strongly for cultural openness, and only to a limited extent for political openness, although the improvement is statistically still significant (see Appendix Table A2, which compares the models). In other words, being exposed to media that bring different (foreign) views of the world increases one's openness to other cultures, as well as diverse others, but overall has a limited association with cosmopolitan orientations in the political realm.

Considering the separate indicators, Internet use has a positive association with cultural openness, but a negative one with political openness, whereas we find no relationship with interpersonal openness. Consuming foreign news, foreign non-English and Anglo-Saxon cultural products each are associated with higher levels of openness for all indicators. These findings stand even while controlling for consuming domestic culture, which, in line with the literature, is negatively associated with both cultural and political openness, but positively with interpersonal openness. Finally, the more respondents tend to read books the more open they are in every studied dimension.

To gain insight into cross-national similarities and differences in the associations of the two sets of exposure predictors (research question 2), we also estimated separate regression models per country of the three forms of openness with the same predictors as in model 3 in Table 3.² The results are presented in the Appendix (Tables A3a, A3b, and A3c). In each country, the results for having diverse social interactions and experience with other European cultures are very similar to those found in the analysis of the aggregated data (Table 3). For cultural and interpersonal openness, we find a strong positive association of both experience with other European cultures and diverse social interactions in all nine countries; for political openness – like in the aggregate model – experience with other European cultures is clearly more important than diverse social interactions, the latter being no longer significant for most countries. Urban status only has an impact on political openness in Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and the UK, whereas the positive association between migrant background and political openness is only found for Denmark, France, Spain, Switzerland, and the UK.

Looking at the impact of the mediated exposure predictors, in the case of cultural and interpersonal openness, the positive association with the consumption of (non-English) foreign culture and/or Anglo-Saxon culture and book reading holds for most countries. The positive association with foreign news consumption for cultural and interpersonal openness is also found for most countries,

most consistently for Spain, the UK, Denmark and France. The positive association with Internet use in the aggregated data is only visible for Croatia, the Netherlands, Serbia, Spain, and the UK.

For political openness, the negative association with internet use in the overall model is only manifest for Serbia and Switzerland, whereas for Denmark, Spain and the UK we observe a strong positive association. The moderate positive association with foreign news media consumption in the aggregate model is only visible for Serbia and the UK; the positive association of political openness with foreign and Anglo-Saxon cultural consumption and book reading we found for the aggregate data are not significant anymore in the majority of countries.

The generally weaker effects of socio-demographic predictors on cultural and interpersonal openness, are mostly also found in the separate country analyses. For political openness, the fairly strong positive impact of education in the overall model is only visible in the case of Denmark, France, the Netherlands, Spain, and the UK. Finally, like in the overall analysis, we find that respondents who are more positive about their financial satisfaction show more political openness in most countries.

6. Conclusions

Cosmopolitanism is often associated with showing respect for and expressing deep interest in cultural products, images, and ideas from countries or societies outside one's own domestic life sphere. Cosmopolitanism can serve as a form of cultural capital and as such, previous studies have often emphasized the socio-economic configuration of the cosmopolitans as individuals with higher education and higher socio-economic status. This paper broadens the perspective on cosmopolitanism by (a) examining how exposure to other cultures, in both personal and mediated form is associated with cosmopolitan orientations, (b) considering cultural, interpersonal, and political dimensions of cosmopolitanism, and (c) analysing nine European countries that differ in, among other things, the size and cultural diversity of their population, global connectedness, cultural traditions, and policy models.

We make several significant contributions to the literature. First, we show that exposure to social interactions and exposure to culture via various media, contribute significantly to the explained variance of cosmopolitan orientation – taking the social background of individuals into account. Thus, beyond demographic characteristics, what really matters for cosmopolitanism is the opportunity to learn about and engage with content and people from other cultures. The country-by-country analyses demonstrated that this finding is remarkably robust across countries and can thus be of interest to both European and national policy makers, as it means that policy can contribute to furthering both personal and media exposure to increase cosmopolitanism, leading to cohesion and solidarity in the context of multiculturalism, migration, and various identity and heritage issues in Europe as well as individual countries. The distinction we make between personal and mediated exposure to other cultures is also insightful in terms of understanding the mechanisms that drive cosmopolitanism in particular and cultural stratification more generally.

A second relevant finding is the consistency in the correlates of the three different measures of cosmopolitanism, with only a few exceptions, notably the effect of urban status and financial satisfaction. This overall consistency might indicate that the three dimensions complement each other in depicting a personality trait of being open. Using these measures, we can construct a profile of 'the cosmopolitans': individuals who are open to consuming, engaging, socialising, and connecting with cultures other than their own.

Our third contribution is our use of data from nine European countries which adds to the limited examination of quantitative data on cosmopolitanism and almost non-existent study of the issue from a multi-country perspective. While the countries differ in size, global connectedness, position in the EU, cultural diversity of their populations, migration policies, cultural policy traditions, and media systems, our findings suggest that differences in cultural, interpersonal, and political openness are largely attributable to individual-level variables rather than meaningful country effects. The country-

level variance appears somewhat higher for political openness, but overall the multilevel models show relatively little variance at the country level.

Future research could include additional variables that might be correlates of cosmopolitanism, such as personality traits, because the role played by personality in fostering a cosmopolitan orientation is still unclear (Cleveland et al. 2014) and include additional – European and non-European – countries to provide more insights into cross-national similarities or differences in this regard. The inclusion of a larger number of countries would also allow for an examination of the effect of specific country-level features on cosmopolitan orientations. The growing segment of cosmopolitan people dictates that more research is needed to clarify who these cosmopolitans are and how they behave across countries (Cleveland et al. 2011). Such research would reveal whether insights pertaining to cosmopolitans' behaviours and attitudes hold true across different countries and, if not, how they differ. In addition, it would be interesting to examine whether and how major shocks such as an economic crisis or the COVID-19 pandemic impact cosmopolitanism (Makrides et al. 2021). We found that demographic variables have a relatively small effect on the different types of cosmopolitanism compared to the exposure predictors. Follow-up studies could test whether demographic characteristics can act as moderators on the relationship between other types of determinants and the level of cosmopolitanism. (Pichler 2009)

Notes

1. Multicollinearity test were performed, showing that the correlations between predictors were within acceptable limits. Appendix Table A4 presents the correlations between predictor variables.
2. Non-European ancestry was not included here because of this category was too small or lacking in some countries.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Funding

The work was supported by the European Commission [870691].

ORCID

Tally Katz-Gerro  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1157-083X>
 Susanne Janssen  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8984-3498>
 Neta Yodovich  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3764-7284>
 Marc Verboord  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6098-3075>
 Joan Llonch-Andreu  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1624-3133>

References

- Alba, R., and N. Foner. 2017. "Immigration and the Geography of Polarization." *City & Community* 16 (3): 239–247. doi:10.1111/cico.1224.
- Aschauer, W. 2016. "Societal Malaise and Ethnocentrism in the European Union: Monitoring Societal Change by Focusing on EU citizens' Perceptions of Crisis." *Historical Social Research/Historische Sozialforschung* 41 (2): 307–359.
- Beck, U. 2004. "Cosmopolitical Realism: On the Distinction Between Cosmopolitanism in Philosophy and the Social Sciences." *Global Networks* 4 (2): 131–156.
- Beck, U., and E. Grande. 2010. "Varieties of Second Modernity: The Cosmopolitan Turn in Social and Political Theory and Research." *The British Journal of Sociology* 61 (3): 409–443. doi:10.1111/j.1468-4446.2010.01320.x.
- Bielsa, E. 2016. *Cosmopolitanism and Translation: Investigations into the Experience of the Foreign*. London: Routledge.

- Bizumic, B., C. Monaghan, and D. Priest. 2021. "The Return of Ethnocentrism." *Political Psychology* 4 (S1): 29–73. doi:10.1111/pops.12710.
- Bryan, M. L., and S. P. Jenkins. 2016. "Multilevel Modelling of Country Effects: A Cautionary Tale." *European Sociological Review* 32 (1): 3–22. doi:10.1093/esr/jcv059.
- Cappeliez, S., and J. Johnston. 2013. "From Meat and Potatoes to "Real-deal" Rotis: Exploring Everyday Culinary Cosmopolitanism." *Poetics* 41 (5): 433–455. doi:10.1016/j.poetic.2013.06.002.
- Carlson, S., J. Gerhards, and S. Hans. 2017. "Educating Children in Times of Globalisation: Class-Specific Child-Rearing Practices and the Acquisition of Transnational Cultural Capital." *Sociology* 51 (4): 749–765. doi:10.1177/0038038515618601.
- Chamorro-Premuzic, T., S. Reimers, A. Hsu, and G. Ahmetoglu. 2009. "Who Art Thou? Personality Predictors of Artistic Preferences in a Large UK Sample: The Importance of Openness." *British Journal of Psychology* 100 (3): 501–516. doi:10.1348/000712608X366867.
- Child, D. 2006. *The Essentials of Factor Analysis*. 3rd ed. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Chouliaraki, L. 2008. "The Symbolic Power of Transnational Media: Managing the Visibility of Suffering." *Global Media and Communication* 4 (3): 329–351. doi:10.1177/1742766508096084.
- Cicchelli, V., and S. Octobre. 2017. "Aesthetico-Cultural Cosmopolitanism Among French Young People: Beyond Social Stratification, the Role of Aspirations and Competences." *Cultural Sociology* 11 (4): 416–437.
- Cicchelli, V., and S. Octobre. 2018. *Aesthetico-Cultural Cosmopolitanism and French Youth – the Taste of the World*. London: Palgrave.
- Cicchelli, V., S. Octobre, V. Riegel, T. Katz-Gerro, and F. Handy. 2021. "A Tale of Three Cities: Aesthetico-Cultural Cosmopolitanism as a New Capital Among Youth in Paris, São Paulo, and Seoul." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 21 (3): 576–597. doi:10.1177/1469540518818629.
- Cleveland, M., S. Erdoğan, G. Arkan, and T. Poyraz. 2011. "Cosmopolitanism, Individual-Level Values and Cultural-Level Values: A Cross-Cultural Study." *Journal of Business Research* 64 (9): 934–943. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2010.11.015.
- Cleveland, M., M. Laroche, I. Takahashi, and S. Erdoğan. 2014. "Cross-Linguistic Validation of a Unidimensional Scale for Cosmopolitanism." *Journal of Business Research* 67 (3): 268–277. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.05.013.
- Driezen, A., G. Verschraegen, and N. Clycq. 2021. "Religion and Everyday Cosmopolitanism Among Religious and Non-Religious Urban Youth." *Current Sociology* 69 (6): 785–805. doi:10.1177/0011392120932942.
- Eurobarometer. 2007. *European cultural values*, Eurobarometer EBS 278. Brussels, Belgium: European Commission Directorate.
- Friedman, S., M. Savage, L. Hanquinet, and A. Miles. 2015. "Cultural Sociology and New Forms of Distinction." *Poetics* 53: 1–8. doi:10.1016/j.poetic.2015.10.002.
- Gallego, A., F. Buscha, P. Sturgis, and D. Oberski. 2016. "Places and Preferences: A Longitudinal Analysis of Self-Selection and Contextual Effects." *British Journal of Political Science* 46 (3): 529–550. doi:10.1017/S0007123414000337.
- Garson, G. D. 2022. *Factor Analysis and Dimension Reduction in R: A Social Scientist's Toolkit*. London: Routledge.
- Gelman, A., and J. Hill. 2006. *Data Analysis Using Regression and Multilevel/Hierarchical Models*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Gimpel, J. G., N. Lovin, B. Moy, and A. Reeves. 2020. "The Urban–Rural Gulf in American Political Behavior." *Political Behavior* 42 (4): 1343–1368. doi:10.1007/s11109-020-09601-w.
- Gustafson, P. 2009. "More Cosmopolitan, No Less Local: The Orientations of International Travelers." *European Societies* 11 (1): 25–47. doi:10.1080/14616690802209689.
- Hannerz, U. 1990. "Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture." *Theory, Culture & Society* 7 (2–3): 237–251. doi:10.1177/026327690007002014.
- Hanquinet, L., and M. Savage. 2018. "Feeling European in a Globalised World and the Role of Mobility, Networks, and Consumption. A Comparative Approach to British Exceptionalism." *European Journal of Cultural and Political Sociology* 5 (4): 423–454. doi:10.1080/23254823.2018.1478249.
- Hedegard, D. 2015. "Transnational Connections: The Meaning of Global Culture in the Tastes of Brazilian Elites." *Poetics* 53: 52–64. doi:10.1016/j.poetic.2015.08.001.
- Horst, C., and T. V. Olsen. 2021. "Transnational Citizens, Cosmopolitan Outlooks? Migration as a Route to Cosmopolitanism." *Nordic Journal of Migration Research* 11 (1): 4–19. doi:10.33134/njmr.337.
- Høy-Petersen, N. 2021. "Civility and Rejection: The Contextuality of Cosmopolitan and Racist Behaviours." *Sociology* 55 (6): 1191–1210. doi:10.1177/00380385211011570.
- Huijsmans, T., E. Harteveld, W. van der Brug, and B. Lancee. 2021. "Are Cities Ever More Cosmopolitan? Studying Trends in Urban-Rural Divergence of Cultural Attitudes." *Political Geography* 86: 102353. doi:10.1016/j.polgeo.2021.102353.
- Igarashi, H., and H. Saito. 2014. "Cosmopolitanism as Cultural Capital: Exploring the Intersection of Globalization, Education and Stratification." *Cultural Sociology* 8 (3): 222–239. doi:10.1177/1749975514523935.
- Janssen, S., G. Kuipers, and M. Verboord. 2008. "Cultural Globalization and Arts Journalism: The International Orientation of Arts and Culture Coverage in Dutch, French, German, and US Newspapers, 1955 to 2005." *American Sociological Review* 73 (5): 719–740. doi:10.1177/000312240807300502.

- Janssen, H. J., M. van Ham, T. Kleinepiet, and J. Nieuwenhuis. 2019. "A Micro-Scale Approach to Ethnic Minority Concentration in the Residential Environment and Voting for the Radical Right in the Netherlands." *European Sociological Review* 35 (4): 552–566. doi:10.1093/esr/jcz2018.
- Katz-Gerro, T. 2017. "Cross-National Differences in the Consumption of Non-National Culture in Europe." *Cultural Sociology* 11 (4): 438–467. doi:10.1177/1749975517725637.
- Keating, A. 2021. "Mobility for Me but Not for Others: The Contradictory Cosmopolitan Practices of Contemporary White British Youth." *Sociology* 55 (6): 1100–1116. doi:10.1177/0038038521999565.
- Kidd, D. C., and E. Castano. 2013. "Reading Literary Fiction Improves Theory of Mind." *Science* 342 (6156): 377–380. doi:10.1126/science.1239918.
- Koopman, E. 2016. "Effects of "Literariness" on Emotions and on Empathy and Reflection After Reading." *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts* 10 (1): 82–98. doi:10.1037/aca0000041.
- Korol, L., and P. Bevelander. 2021. "Does Young adults' Life Satisfaction Promote Tolerance Towards Immigrants? The Role of Political Satisfaction and Social Trust." *Current Psychology* 42 (7): 1–12. doi:10.1007/s12144-021-01923-0.
- Kuhn, T. 2011. "Individual Transnationalism, Globalisation and Euroscepticism: An Empirical Test of Deutsch's Transactionalist Theory." *European Journal of Political Research* 50 (6): 811–837.
- Kuhn, T. 2015. *Experiencing European Integration: Transnational Lives and European Identity*. Oxford: OUP Oxford.
- Kuhn, T., H. Solaz, and E. J. van Elsas. 2018. "Practising What You Preach: How Cosmopolitanism Promotes Willingness to Redistribute Across the European Union." *Journal of European Public Policy* 25 (12): 1759–1778. doi:10.1080/13501763.2017.1370005.
- Kuipers, G., and J. De Kloet. 2009. "Banal Cosmopolitanism and the Lord of the Rings: The Limited Role of National Differences in Global Media Consumption." *Poetics* 37 (2): 99–118. doi:10.1016/j.poetic.2009.01.002.
- Kurasawa, F. A. 2004. "A Cosmopolitanism from Below: Alternative Globalization and the Creation of a Solidarity Without Bounds." *European Journal of Sociology* 45 (2): 233–255. doi:10.1017/S0003975604001444.
- Lamont, M., and S. Aksartova. 2002. "Ordinary Cosmopolitanisms: Strategies for Bridging Racial Boundaries Among Working-Class Men." *Theory, Culture & Society* 19 (4): 1–25. doi:10.1177/0263276402019004001.
- Leung, A.K. -Y., K. Koh, and K. -P. Tam. 2015. "Being Environmentally Responsible: Cosmopolitan Orientation Predicts Pro-Environmental Behaviors." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 43: 79–94. doi:10.1016/j.jenvp.2015.05.011.
- Lizardo, O. 2005. "Can Cultural Capital Theory Be Reconsidered in the Light of World Polity Institutionalism? Evidence from Spain." *Poetics* 33 (2): 81–110. doi:10.1016/j.poetic.2005.02.001.
- López-Lomelí, M. Á., M. D. C. Alarcón-Del-Amo, and J. Llonch-Andreu. 2019. "Segmenting Consumers Based on Their Evaluation of Local, Global and Glocal Brands." *Journal of International Consumer Marketing* 31 (5): 395–407. doi:10.1080/08961530.2019.1590282.
- Maas, C. J., and J. J. Hox. 2005. "Sufficient Sample Sizes for Multilevel Modeling." *Methodology: European Journal of Research Methods for the Behavioral & Social Sciences* 1 (3): 86–92. doi:10.1027/1614-2241.1.3.86.
- Makrides, A., O. Kvasova, A. Thrassou, E. Hadjielias, and A. Ferraris. 2021. Consumer Cosmopolitanism in International Marketing Research: A Systematic Review and Future Research Agenda. *International Marketing Review*. 39 (5): 1151–1181. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/0265-1335.htm>
- Marčelić, S., Ž. Tonković, and K. Krolo. 2022. "Banal Cosmopolitanism? Values and Cultural Repertoires of Youth in Adriatic Croatia." *Cultural Sociology* 16 (2): 250–273. doi:10.1177/17499755211027128.
- Mau, S., J. Mewes, and A. Zimmermann. 2008. "Cosmopolitan Attitudes Through Transnational Social Practices?" *Global Networks* 8 (1): 1–24. doi:10.1111/j.1471-0374.2008.00183.x.
- Maxwell, R. 2020. "Geographic Divides and Cosmopolitanism: Evidence from Switzerland." *Comparative Political Studies* 53 (13): 2061–2090. doi:10.1177/0010414020912289.
- Maxwell, R., and M. DeSoucey. 2016. "Gastronomic Cosmopolitanism: Supermarket Products in France and the United Kingdom." *Poetics* 56: 85–97. doi:10.1016/j.poetic.2016.03.001.
- Medrano, J. D. 2016. "Globalization, Transnational Human Capital, and Employment in the European Union." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 57 (6): 449–470. doi:10.1177/0020715216684182.
- Merton, R. K. 1957. *Patterns of Influence: Local and Cosmopolitan Influentials, in Social Theory and Social Structure*, 387–420. New York: The Free Press.
- Meuleman, R. 2014. *Consuming the Nation: Domestic Cultural Consumption: Its Stratification and Relation with Nationalist Attitudes*. Utrecht: Utrecht University.
- Meuleman, R., M. Lubbers, and M. Verkuyten. 2016. "Parental Socialization and the Consumption of Domestic Films, Books and Music." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 18 (1): 103–130. doi:10.1177/1469540516648372.
- Meuleman, R., and M. Savage. 2013. "A Field Analysis of Cosmopolitan Taste: Lessons from the Netherlands." *Cultural Sociology* 7 (2): 230–256. doi:10.1177/1749975512473991.
- Möhring, K. 2012. "The Fixed-Effects as an Alternative to Multilevel Analysis for Cross-National Analyses. GK SoClife." *Working Papers Series* 16.
- Ollivier, M. 2008. "Modes of Openness to Cultural Diversity: Humanist, Populist, Practical, and Indifferent." *Poetics* 36 (2): 120–147. doi:10.1016/j.poetic.2008.02.005.
- Paluck, B. L., S. Green, and D. Green. 2019. "The Contact Hypothesis Reevaluated." *Behavioural Public Policy* 3 (2): 129–158. doi:10.1017/bpp.2018.25.

- Parker, S. 2015. *Urban Theory and the Urban Experience: Encountering the City*. 2nd ed. Milton Park: Routledge.
- Pettigrew, T., and L. Tropp. 2006. "A Meta-Analytic Test of Intergroup Contact Theory." *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology* 90 (5): 751–783. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751.
- Pettigrew, T., L. Tropp, U. Wagner, and O. Christ. 2011. "Recent Advances in Intergroup Contact Theory." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 35 (3): 271–280. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.03.001.
- Petzold, K. 2017. "Cosmopolitanism Through Mobility: Physical-Corporeal or Virtual-Imagined?" *The British Journal of Sociology* 68 (2): 167–193. doi:10.1111/1468-4446.12253.
- Phillips, T., and P. Smith. 2008. "Cosmopolitan Beliefs and Cosmopolitan Practices: An Empirical Investigation." *Journal of Sociology* 44 (4): 391–399. doi:10.1177/1440783308097128.
- Pichler, F. 2008. "How Real is Cosmopolitanism in Europe?" *Sociology* 42 (6): 1107–1126. doi:10.1177/0038038508096936.
- Pichler, F. 2009. Down-To-earth' Cosmopolitanism: Subjective and Objective Measurements of Cosmopolitanism in Survey Research. *Current Sociology*, 57 (5): 704–732.
- Pichler, F. 2012. "Cosmopolitanism in a Global Perspective: An International Comparison of Open-Minded Orientations and Identity in Relation to Globalization." *International Sociology* 27 (1): 21–50. doi:10.1177/0268580911422980.
- Pötzschke, S., and M. Braun. 2019. "Social Transnationalism and Supranational Identifications." In *Everyday Europe*, edited by E. Recchi, A. Favell, F. Apaydin, R. Barbulescu, M. Braun, I. Ciornei, N. Cunningham, J. D. Medrano, D. N. Duru, L. Hanquinet, and J. S. Jensen, 115–136. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Prieur, A., and M. Savage. 2013. "Emerging Forms of Cultural Capital." *European Societies* 15 (2): 246–267.
- Quinn, B., A. Colombo, K. Lindström, D. McGillivray, and A. Smith. (2022). Festivals, public space and cultural inclusion: public policy insights. In *Events and Sustainability* (pp. 137–155). Routledge.
- Recchi, E. 2014. "Pathways to European Identity Formation: A Tale of Two Models." *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research* 27 (2): 119–133. doi:10.1080/13511610.2013.873709.
- Recchi, E., A. Favell, and the EUCROSS Team. 2019. *Everyday Europe: Social Transnationalism in an Unsettled Continent*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Robertson, A. 2010. *Mediated Cosmopolitanism: The World of Television News*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Robertson, R. 1992. *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*, Vol. 16. London: Sage.
- Roose, H., K. Van Eijck, and J. Lievens. 2012. "Culture of Distinction or Culture of Openness? Using a Social Space Approach to Analyze the Social Structuring of Lifestyles." *Poetics* 40 (6): 491–513. doi:10.1016/j.poetic.2012.08.001.
- Rössel, J., and J. H. Schroedter. 2015. "Cosmopolitan Cultural Consumption: Preferences and Practices in a Heterogenous, Urban Population in Switzerland." *Poetics* 50: 80–95.
- Rovisco, M., and S. C. Kim, Eds. 2014. *Cosmopolitanism, Religion and the Public Sphere*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Savage, M., D. Wright, and M. Gayo-Cal. 2010. "Cosmopolitan Nationalism and the Cultural Reach of the White British." *Nations and Nationalism* 16 (4): 598–615. doi:10.1111/j.1469-8129.2010.00449.x.
- Seo, Y., and H. Gao. 2015. "Towards a Value-Based Perspective of Consumer Multicultural Orientation." *European Management Journal* 33 (1): 30–36. doi:10.1016/j.emj.2014.06.001.
- Szerszynski, B., and J. Urry. 2006. "Visuality, Mobility and the Cosmopolitan: Inhabiting the World from Afar." *The British Journal of Sociology* 57 (1): 113–131.
- Thomas, K. 2022. "The Psychology of Distinction: How Cultural Tastes Shape Perceptions of Class and Competence in the U.S." *Poetics* 101669: 101669. doi:10.1016/j.poetic.2022.101669.
- Tzaninis, Y. 2020. "Cosmopolitanism Beyond the City: Discourses and Experiences of Young Migrants in Post-Suburban Netherlands." *Urban Geography* 41 (1): 143–161.
- Van Heerden, S., and D. Ruedin. 2019. "How Attitudes Towards Immigrants are Shaped by Residential Context: The Role of Ethnic Diversity Dynamics and Immigrant Visibility." *Urban Studies* 56 (2): 317–334. doi:10.1177/0042098017732692.
- Varriale, S. 2016. *Globalization, Music and Cultures of Distinction*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Verboord, M. 2017. "Internet Usage and Cosmopolitanism in Europe: A Multilevel Analysis." *Information, Communication & Society* 20 (3): 460–481. doi:10.1080/1369118X.2016.1187193.
- Weenink, D. 2007. "Cosmopolitan and Established Resources of Power in the Education Arena." *International Sociology* 22 (4): 492–516.
- Weenink, D. 2008. "Cosmopolitanism as a Form of Capital: Parents Preparing Their Children for a Globalized World." *Sociology* 42 (6): 1089–1106. doi:10.1177/0038038508096935.
- Wessendorf, S. 2014. *Commonplace Diversity: Social Relations in a Super-Diverse Context*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wood, P., and C. Landry. 2008. *The Intercultural City: Planning for Diversity Advantage*. Milton Park: Routledge.
- Woodward, I., Z. Skrbis, and C. Bean. 2008. "Attitudes Towards Globalization and Cosmopolitanism: Cultural Diversity, Personal Consumption and the National Economy." *The British Journal of Sociology* 59 (2): 207–226. doi:10.1111/j.1468-4446.2008.00190.x.