QUT Digital Repository:
http://eprints.qut.edu.au/

TITLE PAGE

Attitudes toward globalization and cosmopolitanism: Cultural diversity, personal consumption and the national economy.

Abstract:
One of the widely accepted consequences of globalization is the development of individual outlooks, behaviours and feelings that transcend local and national boundaries. This has encouraged a re-assessment of important assumptions about the nature of community, personal attachment and belonging in the face of unprecedented opportunities for culture, identities and politics to shape, and be shaped by, global events and processes. Recently, the upsurge of interest in the concept of cosmopolitanism has provided a promising new framework for understanding the nexus between cosmopolitan dispositions and global interconnectedness across cultural, political and economic realms. Using data from a representative social survey of Australians this paper investigates the negotiation of belonging under the conditions of globalization. The data tap into attitudes and behaviours associated with a broad gamut of cosmopolitan traits in the domains of culture, consumption, human rights, citizenship, and international governance. They show how cosmopolitan outlooks are shaped by social structural factors, and how forms of identification with humanity and the globe are fractured by boundaries of self and others, threats and opportunities, and the value of things global and local.

Woodward, Ian (contact author)
Senior Lecturer, School of Arts
Griffith University
Australia
Email: i.woodward@griffith.edu.au

Skrbis, Zlatko
Professor, School of Social Science
University of Queensland
Australia

Bean, Clive
Professor and Head of Humanities Programme
Queensland University of Technology
Australia

Attitudes toward globalization and cosmopolitanism: Cultural diversity, personal consumption and the national economy.

Introduction

Proliferation of writing on what or who is cosmopolitan, or indeed what cosmopolitanism is, continues apace. Just a few years ago sociologists are likely to have felt comfortable in the belief that the basis of cosmopolitanism was to be found in emergent outlooks, feelings and affiliations that transcend local and national boundaries and which afford both a 'delight in difference' (Hannerz 1990) and enhance intercultural interpretive skills. A range of authors has articulated this position. For example, Hannerz (1996) identified cosmopolitanism as a perspective, or state of mind. For Szerszynski and Urry (2002, 2006) an important element of the cosmopolitan disposition is the privileging of an ocular consciousness that identifies and consumes cultural difference via access to an extraordinary volume of global visual flows. For Hall (2002), cosmopolitanism is defined by a competence with different cultural vocabularies which may be displayed in relation to cultural objects as diverse as music and food, styles of self-presentation, and moral and ethical outlooks. Such attributes are frequently identified as being underpinned by a variety of processes and transformations, emphasizing the contributions of vanguard literatures on globalization, transnationalism and associated ideas like belonging, locale and mobilities.

Beyond this oeuvre, which one could identify as conceiving cosmopolitization as an externally mediated process of individual change – a type of cosmopolitization from within – a more ambitious theorisation has recently developed. For example, recent proclamations on the nature of what Beck (2006) calls 'philosophical cosmopolitanism' move the concept away from individual attitudes and values to being a tool for the re-wiring of sociological theory through a non-essentialist, multi-perspectival lens. Many working in social theory will see this as a laudable goal, and certainly it is part of the broader process of cosmpolitization. However in this paper we adopt an empirical, quantitative approach to explore facets of the interweaving of globalization and cosmopolitan outlooks. Using social survey data we develop a set of cosmopolitan scales purpose-built from recent theoretical literatures on cosmopolitan

practices and outlooks to explore facets of cosmopolitanism as it can be identified in everyday outlooks and practices. We explore the expression and variation of outlooks, beliefs and feelings associated with the cosmopolitan disposition.

Given that scholarship in the field is both diverse in its assumptions and goals and is the subject of intense theoretical refinement and extension by scholars, at the outset we must locate our own approach. 'Cosmopolitan' can mean anything from an attitude or value, to a regime of international governance, or a set of epistemological assumptions about the nature of social structures. This multiplicity of inquiry highlights the promise and excitement around the concept and its genuine potential as a developmental, self-problematising set of relations (Delanty 2006), but it also highlights the concept's limits as an analytic device for sociological inquiry. In our reading, there are three main skeins in the literature on cosmopolitanism, emphasizing institutional, political or cultural dimensions. At its most macro level cosmopolitanism refers to an ambition or project of supra-national state building, including regimes of global governance, and legal-institutional frameworks for regulating events and processes which incorporate, but have impacts, beyond any one nation. At a political level, cosmopolitanism refers to a position or principle, emphasizing hybridity, multiplicity, inclusivity and acknowledgement of diverse cultural forms and expressions. Finally, as a cultural phenomenon – and there appears to be a high degree of agreement on this point in the literature – cosmopolitanism is defined by an openness to other cultures, values and experiences. Such a cultural outlook is identified as underpinned by new types of mobilities of capital, people and things (Beck 2006; Hannerz 1990; Szerszynski and Urry 2002, 2006); elaborated, flexible and heterogeneous outlooks and modes of corporeal engagement grounded in cultural-symbolic competencies founded in a type of 'code-switching' capacity (Bernstein 1972; Chaney 2002; Côté 1996; Emmison 2003; Hall 2002; Waldron 1992), and an expanded, inclusive ethical core emphasizing worldliness and communitarianism (Hannerz 1990; Nussbaum 1994; Tomlinson 1999). In this paper we are able to deal with aspects of the second (politics) and especially the third (culture) element in this body of literature which investigates cosmopolitanism as a set of practices and outlooks that seek out, and value, cultural difference and openness.

The idea that cultural openness defines the cosmopolitan outlook is the dominant way of conceptualising the idea, at least in very recent literatures. However vague and analytically blunt the term, it is possible to see how 'openness' to alternative cultural forms, practices and experiences is central to all of the dimensions of cosmopolitanism outlined above (Skrbis and Woodward 2007). Accordingly, the idea of cultural 'openness' has been a wellspring for general conceptions of cosmopolitanness as an outlook or, disposition. The first empirical use of 'cosmopolitan' in this vein was Robert Merton's ([1949]1968) study of the patterns of influence in an American small town. In this study he juxtaposes parochials and cosmopolitans, with the latter always outwardly focused and ecumenical. Such linking of cosmopolitan with characteristics of outward openness are frequently summarised as a core characteristic of cosmopolitanism in the contemporary literature as well (Hannerz 1990; Roudometof 2005; Tomlinson 1999; Urry and Szerszynski 2002; Vertovec and Cohen 2002). For example, Hannerz (1990: 239) defines the cosmopolitan as having 'an intellectual and aesthetic stance of openness toward divergent cultural experiences' and a 'willingness to engage with the other'. Urry and Szerszynski (2002: 468) concur with this idea, adding that this disposition of cosmopolitan openness is exhibited 'towards people, places and experiences from other cultures'. However, as Skrbis, Kendall and Woodward (2004: 127) point out, the notion of cosmopolitan openness is 'vague and diffuse', having appalling analytic value in helping to understand what is cosmopolitan. How one could empirically identify and measure such openness is not so clear. This is one of the most pressing problems in progressing sociological investigations of 'actually existing' cosmopolitanism (Calhoun 2002; Robbins 1998), and presents the underlying research problem we deal with in this paper.

There are a couple of further major lines of cleavage that exist in cosmopolitanism studies that deserve highlighting. The first is around theoretical and empirical approaches to the topic. The strong theoretical approach is best exemplified in the recent work by Beck (2006) and Beck and Sznaider (2006), who present a vision of cosmopolitanism with a radical epistemological core that challenges the basis of mainstream sociological theory. The clearest expression of this challenge is their critique of methodological nationalism – a critique that is shared with studies of transnationalism (e.g. Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002) – which emphasizes the

limitations flowing from social sciences' 'silent commitment to the nation-state' (Beck and Sznaider 2006: 4). The newly emerging interdependencies of culture, politics, environment and economy call for a radical break with the nation-stained tradition of doing social science research. At the empirical level, however, the concept of cosmopolitanism is receiving more frequent attention in a variety of applications in sub-fields like urban studies (e.g. Binnie et al. 2006), transnationalism and diaspora studies (e.g. Rajan and Sharma 2006), modes and practices of cross-cultural engagement (e.g. Lamont and Aksartova 2002), and studies of locality and belonging (e.g. Savage, Bagnall and Longhurst 2005; Skeggs 2004; Szerszynski and Urry 2006).

The second analytic dilemma focuses around the question about whether cosmopolitanism necessarily has anything at all to do with globalization. It is incorrect – both historically and empirically – to see globalization as a necessary and sufficient condition for the emergence of cosmopolitanism. Globalized we all may be but this doesn't make us cosmopolitans. One does not need to be globally mobile in order to possess cosmopolitan values. For example, a person might see a trip to the 'north' or 'south' of their own region or nation as a type of cosmopolitan experience whereby they come into contact with diverse types of people with cultural habits and norms different to their own. And in turn, there are those who are globally mobile but do not necessarily uphold cosmopolitan values. Indeed, exposure may even lead to increased insularity and parochialism. Yet, as Szerszynski and Urry (2002, 2006) demonstrate, it is via corporeal and imaginative engagement with people, places and events outside local and national fields that the cosmopolitan outlook finds its most fertile energy. The opportunities for such experiences – even those primarily imaginary or mediated within one's own lounge room – are greater now than ever before. Working to identify cosmopolitanism as a set of attitudes, outlooks and practices – a disposition – this paper works with an assumption that it is through engagements with various forms and representations of the global that cosmopolitan, or anti-cosmopolitan, values surface and find expression.

The cosmopolitan disposition of 'cultural openness'
In this paper we empirically investigate cosmopolitan attitudes and practices and in doing so we make use of the concept of the 'cosmopolitan disposition'. This focus on dispositions is consistent with the idea that cosmopolitanism involves particular

competencies, modes of managing meanings, and various forms of mobility. Before discussing exactly what might be agreed upon as the distinguishing features of such a cosmopolitan disposition, we shall first discuss what we mean by the concept of disposition. It is primarily through Bourdieu's (1977) development of the idea of habitus that the concept of 'disposition' has gained recent currency. Bourdieu understands the habitus as a set of self-orienting, practical dispositions formed historically and through socially situated conditions. He defines the habitus, in short, as 'a system of dispositions', and in turn a disposition as a 'predisposition, tendency, propensity or inclination' (Bourdieu 1977: 214). In Bourdieu's terms, dispositions and practice are engaged dialogically, and can be identified as a consistent set of simultaneously cognitive and cultural structures of thought and action. The most important aspect of a disposition is its capacity to enable agents to view events, objects and things in culturally unique but nevertheless structurally grounded ways, bringing to bear a particular set of cultural understandings on the world. Thus, it is a disposition which can allow some agents to think, feel and act in ways that might be called 'cosmopolitan'.

In identifying strands of research that theorise cosmopolitanism as a characteristic within and of individuals, Vertovec and Cohen (2002:13) identify the cosmopolitan individual as having a distinctive set of attitudes, and a discernible corpus of practices. In distinguishing between attitudes and practices as two components of the cosmopolitan individual, Vertovec and Cohen usefully append practices to attitudes, suggesting that to be cosmopolitan involves a mode of acting or performing, as much as it does thinking and feeling. We understand attitudes to broadly encompass beliefs, values and outlooks, while we take practices to refer to coordinated sets of learned cultural competencies which must be applied in particular social situations, akin to a cultural repertoire or mode of behaviour. Hannerz (1990: 239) also highlights this discursive feature of cosmopolitan orientations, referring to cosmopolitanness as a body of cultural skills required to manoeuvre within 'a particular system of meanings and meaningful forms'. Following Bourdieu's work, Skrbis, Kendall and Woodward (2004) also advocate the idea of disposition in order to identify the principles and procedures people use in their relations with objects and others, and which could be used to distinguish cosmopolitan individuals from non-cosmopolitan, or less cosmopolitan individuals. On this basis, they propose that there should be 'carriers' of

cosmopolitanism, and that these individuals should have particular cultural attributes, comprising sets of attitudes, values, behaviours and practices that distinguish them from non-cosmopolitans. Our analysis progresses with these tenets as guiding principles.

The data we present in this paper taps into a broad gamut of attitudes, values and behaviours generally associated with cosmopolitan dispositions − as attitude, and as practice − including cross-cultural consumption, international human rights issues, citizenship and belonging, and international governance. In the analysis that follows, the distribution and strength of cosmopolitan commitments within the Australian population is investigated, and their covariance with other contextual variables explored through statistical analysis. The data allow us to identify the degree of acceptance of various strands of cosmopolitan values, and assist in understanding ways of conceptualising cosmopolitanism as an analytic construct. Before turning to the data, however, we wish to make some preliminary observations regarding intractable debates and contentions in the literature on cosmopolitanism which are relevant to our understanding of dispositions and interpretation of the survey data.

Research questions

Our empirical research into the dimensions of cosmopolitanness recognizes that openness could be manifested in a variety of ways, both as an attitude and practice, and within a range of possible domains of everyday action. Furthermore, some of these domains could easily be thought of as 'banal' (Beck 2006; Billig 1995; Szerszynski and Urry 2002) or 'aesthetic' (Chaney 2002; Regev 2007), emphasizing the seemingly depthless, surface and consumptive aspects of this style of cosmopolitan engagement, while some are deeper, authentic, 'true' (Vertovec and Cohen 2002: 8), or indeed 'reflexive' (Skrbis, Kendall and Woodward 2004) forms of engagement. For example, the relationship between consumptive or commodified forms of cosmopolitanism is frequently understood to be unrelated to genuine or deep forms of cosmopolitan engagement (see Calhoun 2002), though there is a lack of data available to address such a question, and even some evidence to suggest the contrary hypothesis (see Szerszynski and Urry 2002). So, for example, is a person who listens to world music and enjoys ethnic cuisine necessarily cosmopolitan? Such practices are not sufficient in themselves, but they may be likely to be associated with those

who hold deep or reflexive cosmopolitan values. The prospect of demonstrating any causal link is harder. Admittedly, it is also worth noting that such dichotomies are potentially limiting in helping to see cosmopolitanism as formative or relational (Beck 2002), or processual (Hannerz1990: 238), but they do help to us to analytically untangle spheres of being and thinking, surface and deep, characteristics of the cosmopolitan.

In this paper we address three questions:

1. The first important question our paper addresses concerns the strength of cosmopolitan values in Australian society. Using measures which tap into dimensions of national and international belonging, our data show patterns of commitments to the nation and the world in a variety of contexts such as international governance, migrant assimilation, tolerance and trust, and identity.

2. The second fundamental question develops from the first and relates to whether it is possible to identify a set of cosmopolitan values which is theoretically consistent and statistically coherent, or, whether the commitment to a diverse range of cosmopolitan values and practices is fractured along certain domains of practice, for example, between ethical values and consumption practices. Such fissures may mean that it is difficult to make firm commentary about who might be an exemplar cosmopolitan, or who befits the cosmopolitan tag most strongly. Furthermore, we may find that some groups within the population express some components of the larger set of cosmopolitan values, while they reject or feel less strongly about a different subset of cosmopolitan values, which other social groups may endorse. So, instead of an ideal type of cosmopolitan subject, we may find a variety of different expressions of 'cosmopolitanness', based in differentially valued aspects of the cosmopolitan ethos. For example, are the consumers of 'banal' cosmopolitan – the global shoppers – also likely to be those who endorse human rights issues or feel generous toward migrants and refugees? This type of conundrum is a matter of empirical investigation taken up in our paper.

3. The third question relates to the extent to which cosmopolitan values displace local and national attachments, or whether they co-exist, and on what terms.

Cosmopolitanism is invariably defined in opposition to local, and most importantly national, boundaries, given that the nation has been the privileged domain for understanding citizenship and belonging (Beck 2002). Are there some issues on which individuals accede to the idea of global humanity and humankind, and some where their allegiances to home culture become apparent and mobilized? How might the strengths of such allegiances challenge the development of cosmopolitan orientations, and the possibility of a broadly accepted cosmopolitan society?

Data, definitions and measurement

The analysis employs data from the 2004 Australian Election Study, a national post-election survey of political attitudes and behaviour conducted by mail. The survey was based on a systematic random sample stratified by state of enrolled voters throughout Australia, drawn by the Australian Electoral Commission. Non-respondents were sent several follow-up mailings and the final sample size was 1769, representing a response rate of 45 per cent. The study was conducted by Clive Bean, Ian McAllister, Rachel Gibson and David Gow, funded by the Australian Research Council and the fieldwork was managed by the Australian Social Science Data Archive at the Australian National University. For further details see Bean et al. (2005).[1]

In the empirical analysis that follows we present data on three broad attitudinal components of cosmopolitan openness. First, we investigate aspects of personal consumption that endorse the possibilities afforded by intercultural mixing, and the sourcing and sampling of things for the purpose of one's enjoyment (see factor 2, Table III). This is consumptive or commodity-based cosmopolitanism, which frequently has an aesthetic component that requires particular learned cultural competencies and stances (Bourdieu 1984; Skeggs 2004), and is linked to a broader tendency understood in literatures on cultural consumption as cultural omnivorousness (see Petersen 2005; Petersen and Kern 1996). Second, we investigate intellectual and ethical dispositions toward cosmopolitanness, which we see evinced by a curiosity about learning from other cultures and a desire to see global diversity of cultural practices maintained (see factor 3, Table III). An important component of this

is feelings toward the link between globalization and human rights, cultural diversity, and global environmental protection. These core components of openness are counterbalanced by a third important dimension, which taps into people's sense of locatedness within global economies, and the potential for their location to have potentially negative impacts on their lives, for example through effects on local companies, the economy, jobs, and job security (see factor 1, Table III). We feel that including such economic realities is a good test for the robustness of cosmopolitan orientations in other domains. For example, is a person likely to remain committed to cosmopolitan values even if it might be at their own (economic) expense, or their town or city's expense?

Discussion of results

In order to provide background for the exploration of the three dimensions of cosmopolitan openness, we first examine some descriptive information about selected components of the strength of people's sense of belonging to the nation and to the global community, their sense of commitment to multiple places and regions, and their commitment to accepting difference within local settings (Table I). The first item we report in this table taps into a dimension that is arguably a gold-standard in conceptions of cosmopolitan orientations – the extent to which individuals feel themselves attached to the world, rather than (or in addition to) national or local settings. For reasons of comparability our question was modelled on the US-based Programme on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) (2000) and allowed respondents the possibility of dual affiliations: the possibility of feeling a world citizen as well as an Australian citizen. The extent of agreement with this statement in our sample is high: almost two-thirds (64 per cent) of respondents agree they feel like a citizen of the world as well as a national citizen, a quarter (25 per cent) neither agree nor disagree, and only 11 per cent disagree with the statement. This tells us that a relatively high proportion of the population feel they are members of a community larger than the nation, and endorses the idea of emerging cosmopolitan citizenship, at least at first glance. This result is not very dissimilar to the findings of the PIPA study (2000: 89), which found that nearly 73 per cent of respondents either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with the question 'I regard myself as a citizen of the world as well as a citizen of the United States.'

Table I about here

Two points need to be made about this result. First, the notion of feeling a 'citizen of the world', as suggested by our question, is quite open. What is the basis of such a feeling? Does this mean a citizen who is free and has the cultural and economic capacity to travel and dabble, in a consumerist sense, or a citizen who feels obliged and responsible to anonymous others? Second, our survey item also does not force a choice between feeling more attached to one locality than the other, and this may mean more respondents are happy to agree with the statement precisely for the reason that it allows dual identifications. However, we think this capacity to imagine multiple affiliations more accurately taps into a cosmopolitan ethos: forcing choices does not allow the expression of multiple attachments that is one of the defining factors of being cosmopolitan. Nevertheless, using a different item which forces a choice between a primary sense of belonging to local, national and global contexts, Phillips (2002) found only around 10 per cent of the Australian population identified with 'the world as a whole', albeit using a different survey item, and with data collected nearly ten years earlier than ours. Taken as a one-off figure, our result then is initially more promising on the possibility of developing cosmopolitan sentiments. Broadly, it fits with Szerszynski and Urry's (2002) suggestion that there is a relatively high degree of recognition and engagement amongst their qualitative sample with things global. The type and durability of such engagements require further interrogation.

Beyond this initial item, Table I illustrates some interesting tensions about how such feelings of cosmopolitan attachment to globality find their expression. Item 2 in the table indicates, perhaps not surprisingly, a very high degree of warmth of feeling toward one's nationality, with 90 per cent endorsement of Australian citizenship rather than that of some other country. Items 3 and 5 in the table indicate support for the idea that migrants to Australia should try to be more like other Australians (53 per cent in agreement), and that new migrants should learn what it is to be Australian (60 per cent in agreement). In emphasizing the migrant's obligation to the host culture, both of these items seem somewhat in contradiction with the initial expression of identification with the world. Again, contradictorily, items 4 and 6 in Table I show support for elements of the cosmopolitan programme for international laws and regulation on environmental matters, and in favour of social difference. For example,

52 per cent of respondents indicate that international bodies should be able to tell countries what to do about environmental matters and 48 per cent reject the notion that they are distrusting of people who are different. This contradictory pattern suggests respondents easily adopt certain elements of a cosmopolitan programme, but accept cultural difference variably, and on the terms of the host culture. This fits with Beck's notion that we come to know cosmopolitan society partly through its enemies in a relational manner, and that 'connections between cosmopolitan changes and movements and on the other the *resistances and blockages triggered* by them are analysed together' (Beck 2002: 98).

Tables II and III present data on dimensions of globalization processes. They provide further support for this tension whereby certain elements of the cosmopolitan programme are endorsed while others are rejected. The distributions of responses to the questions comprising each of three dimensions of attitudes toward globalization are provided in Table II. This table squarely positions a range of particular empirical indicators of cosmopolitanism (Beck 2002; Skrbis, Kendall and Woodward 2004; Szerszynski and Urry 2002) within a set of questions on the general impacts of globalization. Though it does not reference cosmopolitanism explicitly, it operationalizes important aspects of such a set of attitudes and practices. As discussed further in relation to Table III, below, we group these indicators under three categories: personal consumption, culture and diversity, and a third category, the national economy. This final category does not tap directly into elements of the cosmopolitan sentiment as discussed in theoretical literatures, but in establishing space for the expression of defensive attitudes about the local economy, jobs and economic security, it effectively targets one of the opposites of cosmopolitanism, national self-interest. In doing so, it helps to illustrate an important set of limiting or boundary-defining factors in the formation of cosmopolitan outlooks.

Table II shows very strong agreement on the benefits of globalization within the realm of personal consumption. It effectively shows that people endorse the possibility of globalization for enhancing their opportunities to consume products from around the world. For example, 86 per cent of respondents agreed globalization allows them greater choice in things like food, films and TV (item 6), while 93 per cent agree that it is good for access to goods and services outside Australia (item 9). It

therefore suggests strong support for the consumptive, or aesthetic, aspects of the cosmopolitan agenda. Likewise, in the realm of culture (items 7, 8 and 11) there is strong evidence of key elements of the cosmopolitan disposition, with people strongly endorsing sampling different cultures (92 per cent agreement), learning about other cultures (93 per cent agreement), and maintaining cultural diversity (74 per cent agreement). The operative terms in the survey items are telling of the types of attitudes finding expression here: 'sampling', 'learning', 'choice', 'access' all reference ideas of the empowered consumer, which respondents clearly find appealing. Table II also shows that the majority of people believe that globalization is good for democracy and human rights (83 per cent).

Table II about here

However, it is in the realm of the national economy that we see evidence of some important sticking-points concerning the potential benefits of globalization , and the limits of globality. While people are generally favourably disposed toward globalization overall (86 per cent agreement), and there is still general agreement amongst the population that globalization is good for the Australian economy (83 per cent agreement), there are also substantial minorities of respondents who perceive negative economic consequences of globalization . This is most pronounced on the question of job creation prospects for local workers, and for local companies where up to 36 per cent and 24 per cent of respondents respectively feel that globalization has a negative effect (items 5 and 2 respectively). We can identify a similar pattern emerging on the question of whether globalization is good for Australian culture (item 13), where one-third (33 per cent) feel it has a bad effect. This pattern seems to suggest robust support for certain elements of the cosmopolitan agenda – particularly those based around personal consumption, sampling and learning about diverse cultures, and the promotion of rights for humans and the environment. Yet, this support seems tempered by stronger feelings of national-interest on matters relating to the economy that have the potential to impact negatively on one's own living standards, and the protection of local culture. It suggests that people's cultural generosity will only go so far, and that cosmopolitan sentiments can be dissolved by a range of other mitigating factors but especially those which possibly threaten people's economic position.

The results of the factor analysis presented in Table III show three separate dimensions, with very little cross-loading among the items.[2] The first dimension is centred around items focusing on the impact of globalization on both the individual's economic situation and Australia's economy as a whole and can be termed the 'national economy'. The second factor is based on four items relating to the potential for greater personal choice in both culture and material commodities and can be labelled 'personal consumption and choice'. The third and final factor relates to the implications of globalization for political, cultural and environmental diversity and we have labelled this dimension 'culture, diversity and global rights'. The factor analysis findings are important, because they suggest we can identify analytically separate strands of actually existing cosmopolitanism centred around 'consumptive', 'diversity', and 'national economy' dimensions. The suggestion is that each factor drives a different set of agendas in the expression of cosmopolitanism in individuals, each reflecting distinct drives and desires associated with cosmopolitan outlooks.

Table III about here

The next analytic step is to show how these distinct factors we have located are expressed along particular social cleavages. Previous research and theorising suggest a number of social structural variables that are potentially important predictors of the strength of the dimensions of cosmopolitanism we have identified (Bean 1995, 2002; Jones 1997; Phillips 1998). In addition to the more obvious factors like occupational class categories, age, gender and education, we have included other variables with the potential to distinguish cosmopolitan attitudes, including income, trade union membership, religious denomination, religious attendance, region of residence and ethnic background in a multivariate analysis, the results of which are shown in Table IV. The statistical method used to estimate the equations is ordinary least squares regression, with pairwise deletion of missing data. The dependent variables are multiple-item scales based on the factor solution in Table III. The three scales have high reliability coefficients, with Cronbach's alphas of 0.85 for the national economy scale, 0.88 for the personal consumption and choice scale and 0.77 for the culture diversity and global rights scale. The additive scales have been rescored to run

between zero and 1 for ease of interpretation of the regression coefficients, as have all of the independent variables, except for age, scored in years, and income, scored in tens of thousands of dollars. Apart from church attendance, which is a six-point scale, all other dependent variables are dummy variables.

Table IV about here

The results of the analysis are interesting. Overall, the R-squared coefficients at the bottom of the table, showing the total variation explained for each equation, indicate that there is only a modest association between social cleavages and cosmopolitan dispositions and no one socio-demographic variable has a statistically significant effect across all three dimensions of cosmopolitanism/globalization, although age, religion and ethnicity each predict two of the three dimensions.

Taking attitudes toward the national economy first, five variables registered significant effects, age, occupation, union membership, religious denomination and ethnicity. The results show, for instance, that younger Australians are more likely than older Australians to think that globalization is good for the national economy and this is a statistically robust finding. Turning to occupation, and keeping in mind that these are weak findings only significant at the 0.1 level, managers and administrators are slightly more likely than the reference category of semi-skilled and unskilled workers to see the economic virtues of globalization, while interestingly professionals are less likely. It may be that some professionals see the opening up of their employment markets via globalization as a threat to their economic prospects through the increase in external competition this may bring. Similarly, trade union members are less likely to see economic gains in globalization than non-unionists. With respect to religion, compared to mainstream Protestants, Catholics, members of other religious denominations and those professing no religious affiliation are all less positive about globalization from an economic perspective. And finally, those whose birthplace is a non-English speaking country are significantly more likely to think that globalization is good for the national economy than the Australian born.

Age also predicts attitudes on the personal consumption and choice dimension. Consistent with their attitudes on the economic dimension, younger people feel more

positive towards the personal consumption benefits of globalization than older people. Those on higher incomes are more positive about the consumption and choice benefits of globalization as well, which may reflect the greater capacity that wealthier individuals would have to avail themselves of a wider range of choices and opportunities. People who attend church more frequently are also more positive as are those who live in an urban location rather than a rural region, where access to consumption choices and exposure to other cultures is likely to be much more limited.

Of the three dimensions of globalization processes, the culture, diversity and global rights scale is best predicted by social structure. Gender, education, occupation, religion and ethnic background all have statistically significant associations with the diversity dimension. Men are less likely than women to think that globalization is good for culture, diversity and rights. Perhaps surprisingly, the university educated are less likely than those with lesser education to perceive benefits from globalization for diversity. This finding is, however, consistent with the fact that professionals are also less inclined than other occupational groups to see globalization as positive for diversity and perhaps reflects the concerns that are held by many highly educated people about the impact that globalization may have on cultural and environmental diversity in different parts of the world. Members of minority religions and those with no religion are also inclined to be against this form of globalization. Again, however, those of non-English-speaking ethnic origins are significantly inclined to feel that globalization is good for culture, diversity and rights.

In summary, while there is some overlap in the socio-demographic predictors of the three dimensions of cosmopolitan attitudes, perhaps the most interesting finding is the diversity of predictors revealed in the analysis, a finding that serves to reinforce our earlier suggestion of there being a distinct set of agendas in the expression of cosmopolitanism reflected by each of the three separate dimensions.

Conclusion
This paper is a quantitative exploration of the nature and salience of cosmopolitan dispositions in the Australian population, based on a representative sample of Australian voters. We engaged theoretical literatures on cosmopolitanism to develop a series of key indicators of the cosmopolitan disposition, including feelings of

belonging, consumptive or aesthetic cosmopolitanism, commitments to cultural diversity and human rights, and a series of items on the national economy.

The statistical analysis bears out a couple of important findings. First, the data show the existence of distinct domains for the expression of cosmopolitan, and anti-cosmopolitan, sentiments. These domains represent two central facets of cosmopolitanism as it can be quantitatively measured: first, the increased flow of cultural goods and an openness to cultural difference and, second, the commitment to cultural diversity and the acknowledgement of human rights. While Australians are strongly positively disposed to globalization generally, and feel themselves both Australian and citizens of the world, the data show that the most positive sentiments toward the global are in the field of personal consumption, choice and cultural openness. A substantial portion of the sample still agree that globalization protects diversity and rights, but a series of defensive anxieties surface when people are prompted to think about whether globality is good for jobs creation, Australian culture, cultural diversity and human rights and the environment. This finding suggests that anxieties about the health and vibrancy of the local economy and local culture may well mitigate elements of cosmopolitan openness, empathy and hospitality. These are one set of 'adversaries' (Beck 2006) of the cosmopolitan outlook.

Our analysis also identifies the existence of three different dimensions of a cosmopolitan disposition, centred on 'consumption and choice', 'cultural diversity' and 'economy'. The findings point to the identification of analytically distinct strands of cosmopolitan outlooks which we believe underpin a different set of agendas or social interests, each contributing in diverse ways to the expression of cosmopolitan outlooks and practices. Our results show that there is no one social group which exhibits what may be thought of as an ideal type of cosmopolitan disposition that embraces both consumptive/choice and diversity dimensions. We believe this presents a challenge for empirically operationalising, and indeed defining, the concept itself. Because the concept catches a wide range of political, cultural and social attitudes and behaviours, including things such as an interest in sampling or learning about different cultures in consumptive domains to a commitment to human rights and cultural diversity, trying to locate its pure or ideal social expression is difficult.

Our analysis shows 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. Cosmopolitan attitudes both flower and wither along certain social-structural lines and in relation to unique elements of the cosmopolitan agenda. The results also urge us to ask an important question in future research regarding the universality of cosmopolitan outlooks. Further work is needed to capture and then differentiate the effects of different dimensions of cosmopolitanism as a way of thinking about 'pathways' into cosmopolitanism, and threshold levels of 'cosmopolitanness'. Our results suggest that there are multiple cosmopolitanisms, each defined by a particular mode of cultural engagement, and that that each mode is favoured differentially. Cosmopolitan outlooks develop from the expression of universal sentiments to which most in the globalizing world have access, but they are also ruptured and skewed by the peculiarities of discourses within the nation and by social-cultural location, both of which necessarily mediate the production and reception of cosmopolitan sentiments in particular locales.

: *Frequency distributions of attitudes toward globality and cosmopolitan culture*

How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?	Strongly agree %	Agree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Disagree %	Strongly disagree %	(n)
1. I regard myself as a citizen of the world as well as an Australian citizen	22	42	25	9	2	(1719)
2. I would rather be a citizen of Australia than any other country in the world	70	20	8	1	1	(1735)
3. People who come to live in Australia should try harder to be more like other Australians	20	33	22	19	6	(1728)
4. It should be up to each country how it deals with its environment – international bodies should not tell countries what to do	11	19	18	35	17	(1728)
5. It is more important for new migrants to leant what it is to be Australian than to cling to their old ways	22	38	24	14	3	(1723)
6. I distrust people who try to be different from the rest of us	4	13	34	38	10	(1716)

Table II: *Frequency distributions of attitudes toward dimensions of globalization processes*

	Very good %	Good %	Bad %	Very bad %
How positive overall do you feel about the process of globalization ?	26	60	9	4
Do you think globalization is good or bad for the following?				
National economy:				
1. Consumers like you	11	76	12	1
2. Australian companies	16	60	20	4
3. The Australian economy	16	67	15	2
4. Your own standard of living	8	75	15	1
5. Creating jobs in Australia	9	55	30	6
Personal consumption and choice:				
6. Your range of choice in things like food, films and TV	20	66	11	3
7. Your ability to sample different cultures	22	70	7	1
8. Your ability to learn about cultures other than your own	23	70	7	1
9. Your access to goods and services outside Australia	21	72	6	1
Culture, diversity and global rights:				
10. Democracy and human rights abroad	13	70	13	3
11. Maintaining cultural diversity in the world	13	61	20	6
12. The environment	8	55	26	10
13. Australian culture	9	58	26	7

Table III: *Factor analysis of attitudes toward dimensions of globalization processes*

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Do you think globalization is good or bad for the following?			
National economy:			
1. Consumers like you	**0.68**	0.34	0.12
2. Australian companies	**0.75**	0.12	0.27
3. The Australian economy	**0.79**	0.11	0.29
4. Your own standard of living	**0.78**	0.21	0.19
5. Creating jobs in Australia	**0.66**	0.07	0.47
Personal consumption and choice:			
6. Your range of choice in things like food, films and TV	0.24	**0.70**	0.28
7. Your ability to sample different cultures	0.12	**0.88**	0.24
8. Your ability to learn about cultures other than your own	0.10	**0.88**	0.23
9. Your access to goods and services outside Australia	0.23	**0.81**	-0.00
Culture, diversity and global rights:			
10. Democracy and human rights abroad	0.30	0.23	**0.55**
11. Maintaining cultural diversity in the world	0.13	0.24	**0.75**
12. The environment	0.27	0.07	**0.77**
13. Australian culture	0.30	0.18	**0.71**

Note:

Factor loadings from principal components extraction with varimax rotation.

Source: Australian Election Study, 2004 (n = 1769) - Bean, C., McAllister, I., Gibson, R., and Gow, D. 2005 *Australian Election Study, 2004: User's Guide for the Machine-Readable Data File*. Canberra: Australian Social Science Data Archive, Australian National University.

Table IV: *Multivariate analysis of socio-demographic predictors of attitudes toward dimensions of globalization processes*

	National economy		Personal consumption and choice		Culture, diversity and global rights	
	b	beta	b	beta	b	beta
Male gender (ref: female gender)	0.00	0.01	-0.01	-0.04	-0.03	-0.08***
Age	-0.001	0.09***	-0.001	-0.15***	-0.000	-0.01
University education	0.01	0.02	0.00	-0.00	-0.05	-0.12***
Occupation (ref: semi & unskilled workers)						
Managers and administrators	0.03	0.05*	0.02	0.04	0.00	0.01
Professionals	-0.03	-0.07*	0.01	-0.01	-0.03	-0.06*
Associate professionals	-0.01	-0.03	0.01	0.04	-0.02	-0.04
Clerical and sales	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02
Trades	-0.00	-0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.01	-0.01
Income	0.001	0.02	0.004	0.06**	0.001	0.02
Trade union membership	-0.02	-0.05*	-0.01	-0.03	-0.02	-0.04
Religion (ref: Protestant)						
Catholic	-0.02	-0.06*	0.00	0.00	-0.01	-0.03
Other religion	-0.05	-0.11***	-0.00	-0.01	-0.06	-0.10***
No religion	-0.05	-0.13***	-0.00	-0.01	-0.08	-0.19***
Church attendance	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.05*	0.02	0.04
Urban residence	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.06**	-0.00	-0.00
Ethnicity (ref: Australian born)						
English-speaking background	0.01	0.03	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.02
Non-English-speaking background	0.05	0.11***	0.02	0.04	0.07	0.12***
Constant	0.68***		0.74***		0.64***	
R-squared	0.04		0.04		0.09	

Notes:
Ordinary least squares regression analysis showing unstandardised coefficients (bs) and standardised coefficients (betas). See text for further details.

* p < .10; ** p < .05; *** p < .01.

Bibliography

Bean, C. 1995 'Determinants of Attitudes Towards Questions of Border Maintenance in Australia', *People and Place* 3(3): 32-40.

Bean, C. 2002 'Open or Closed Boundaries? Attitudes Towards Sovereignty Issues in Australia', *Policy, Organisation and Society* 21(1): 25-48.

Bean, C., McAllister, I., Gibson, R., and Gow, D. 2005 *Australian Election Study, 2004: User's Guide for the Machine-Readable Data File*, Canberra: Australian Social Science Data Archive, Australian National University.

Beck, U. 2002 'The Cosmopolitan Perspective: Sociology of the Second Age of Modernity' *The British Journal of Sociology* 51(1): 79-106.

Beck, U. 2006 *The Cosmopolitan Vision*, Cambridge, Polity.

Beck, U., and Sznaider, N. 2006 'Unpacking Cosmopolitanism for the Humanities and Social Sciences: A Research Agenda', *The British Journal of Sociology* 57(1): 1-23.

Bernstein, B. 1972 *Class, Codes and Control*, London: Paladin.

Billig, M. 1995 *Banal Nationalism*, London: Sage.

Binnie, J., Holloway, J., Millington, S., and Young, C. (eds) 2006 *Cosmopolitan Urbanism*, Routledge: London.

Bourdieu P. 1977 *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. 1984 *Distinction. A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Calhoun, C. 2002 'The Class Consciousness of Frequent Travellers: Towards a Critique of Actually Existing Cosmopolitanism' in S. Vertovec and R. Cohen (eds) *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism – Theory, Context, Practice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chaney, D. 2002 'Cosmopolitan Art and Cultural Citizenship', *Theory, Culture & Society* 19(1-2): 157-74.

Côté, J. 1996 'Sociological Perspectives on Identity Formation: The Culture-Identity Link and Identity Capital', *Journal of Adolescence* 19: 417-28.

Delanty, G. 2006 'The Cosmopolitan Imagination: Critical Cosmopolitanism and Social Theory', *The British Journal of Sociology* 57(1): 25-47.

Emmison, M. 2003 'Social Class and Cultural Mobility: Reconfiguring the Cultural Omnivore Thesis', *Journal of Sociology* 39(3): 211-230.

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.

Hannerz, U. 1990 'Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture', in M. Featherstone (ed.) *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*, London: Sage.

Hannerz, U. 1996 *Transnational Connections*, London: Routledge.

Jones, F.L. 1997 'Ethnic Diversity and National Identity', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology* 33(3): 285-305.

Lamont, M. and Aksartova, S. 2002 'Ordinary Cosmopolitanisms: Strategies For Bridging Racial Boundaries Among Working-Class Men', *Theory, Culture & Society* 19(4): 1–25.

Merton, R. 1968[1949] *Social Theory and Social Structure* (Enlarged Edition), New York: The Free Press.

Nussbaum, M. (1994) 'Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism', *Boston Review* 19(5): 3–34.

Petersen, R.A. 2005 'Problems in Comparative Research: The Example of Omnivorousness' *Poetics* 33: 257-82.

Petersen, R.A., and Kern, R.M. 1996 'Changing Highbrow Taste: From Snob to Omnivore' *American Sociological Review* 61: 900-907.

Phillips, T. 1998 'Popular Views About Australian Identity: Research and Analysis', *Journal of Sociology* 34(3): 281-302.

Phillips, T. 2002 'Imagined Communities and Self-Identity: An Exploratory Quantitative Analysis' *Sociology* 36(3): 597-617.

Programme on International Policy Attitudes 2000 *Americans on Globalization. A Study of US Public Attitudes*; at http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Globalization/AmericansGlobalization_Mar00/AmericansGlobalization_Mar00_quaire.pdf. Accessed on 20 February, 2008.

Rajan, G., and Sharma, S. (eds) 2006 *New Cosmopolitanisms: South-Asians in the US*, Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

Regev, M. 2007 'Cultural Uniqueness and Aesthetic Cosmopolitanism', *European Journal of Social Theory* 10(1): 123-138.

Robbins, B. 1998 'Introduction Part I: Actually Existing Cosmopolitanism', in P. Cheah and B. Robbins (eds) *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feelings Beyond the Nation*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Roudometof, V. 2005 'Transnationalism, Cosmopolitanism and Globalization' *Current Sociology* 53(11): 113-135.

Savage, M., Bagnall, G., and Longhurst, B. 2005 *Globalization and Belonging*, London: Sage.

Skeggs, B. 2004 *Class, Self, Culture*, Routledge: London.

Skrbis, Z., and Woodward, I. 2007 'The Ambivalence of Ordinary Cosmopolitanism: Investigating the Limits of Cosmopolitan Openness' *The Sociological Review* 55(4): 730-747.

Skrbis, Z., Kendall, G., and Woodward, I. 2004 'Locating Cosmopolitanism: Between Humanist Ideal and Grounded Social Category', *Theory, Culture & Society* 21(6): 115-136.

Szerszynski, B., and Urry, J. 2002 'Cultures of Cosmopolitanism', *The Sociological Review*' 50(4): 461-481.

Szerszynski, B., and Urry, J. 2006 'Visuality, Mobility and the Cosmopolitan: Inhabiting the World From Afar' *The British Journal of Sociology* 57(1): 113-131.

Tomlinson, J. 1999 *Globalization and Culture*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Vertovec, S. and R. Cohen (eds) 2002 *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism – Theory, Context, Practice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Waldron, J. 1992 'Minority Cultures and the Cosmopolitan Alternative', *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform* 25(3): 751-793.

Wilson, S., Meagher, G., Gibson, R., Denemark, D., and Western, M. (2005) *Australian Social Attitudes: The First Report*, Sydney: UNSW Press.

Wimmer, A. and Glick Schiller, N. 2002 'Methodological Nationalism and Beyond. Nation State Formation, Migration and the Social Sciences', *Global Networks* 2(3): 301- 334.

---

[1] The response rate is equivalent to that for other social surveys conducted in Australia in recent years using similar procedures (see Wilson et al. 2005). As with such other surveys, the current sample reflects the population well in terms of the distribution of gender, but over-represents older people at the expense of the young and the better educated at the expense of the least-well educated. Given the generally modest effects of social structure on cosmopolitan attitudes revealed in this analysis, any non-response bias generated from these sources is likely to be relatively small with respect to the data under consideration.

[2] Two items that were originally part of this battery were excluded from the analysis when it became apparent that they did not fit neatly within one of these three factors. The two items were 'providing jobs and strengthening the economy in poor countries' and 'job security for Australian workers'. The items in the factor analysis are from a battery of questions presented in sequence, as per standard survey research practice. It is not, however, simply an accident of ordering that has generated the three dimensions identified. For example, the culture, diversity and rights factor is based on items 2, 5, 9 and 11 on the original list as presented to respondents, while the national economy dimension is based on items 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8. The three scales are positively correlated with each other, with correlations ranging between 0.46 and 0.65, showing that while each cosmopolitan dimension tends to be related to the others as we would expect, they each also have substantial independence from one another.