



**University of
Zurich**^{UZH}

**Zurich Open Repository and
Archive**

University of Zurich
Main Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2015

Cosmopolitan cultural consumption: Preferences and practices in an heterogenous, urban population in Switzerland

Rössel, Jörg ; Schroedter, Julia H

Abstract: Several authors in contemporary cultural consumption research have argued that the traditional axis of distinction between highbrow culture and popular culture is in the process of being replaced by a new axis of distinction between an open cosmopolitan cultural capital and a more local less open, cultural capital. We take up this issue and study cosmopolitan cultural consumption, which is defined by its openness for and engagement with cultural products and services from foreign cultures. We have exploratively developed new measures of cosmopolitan cultural consumption, which focus on the geographic breadth of consumption beyond western countries and on knowledge, tastes and modes of consumption, thus taking the esthetic disposition in consumption into account. Furthermore, the data enable us to study the relationship between consumption and other measures of transnational experiences and identification. Our results indicate that cosmopolitan consumption is not rampant in the population. Furthermore, it is part of a broader pattern of cosmopolitanism that is characterized by supranational identifications, transnational relations, and experiences. They show furthermore that cosmopolitan cultural consumption is strongly determined by different forms of cultural capital, thus being a form of class-based practice.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2015.02.009>

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-110103>

Journal Article

Accepted Version

Originally published at:

Rössel, Jörg; Schroedter, Julia H (2015). Cosmopolitan cultural consumption: Preferences and practices in an heterogenous, urban population in Switzerland. *Poetics*, 50:80-95.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2015.02.009>

Cosmopolitan Cultural Consumption. Preferences and Practices in an Heterogenous, Urban Population in Switzerland

Jörg Rössel and Julia H. Schroedter

1. Introduction

Processes of globalization, transnationalization and Europeanization have been discussed in the social sciences at least since the 1970s, often with a focus on economic and structural developments (Ley, 2004; Held, et al. 1999; Gerhards and Rössel, 1999). Under the heading “cosmopolitanism,” the “subjective” side of these processes, like transnational identifications, cosmopolitan consumption and transnational practices, is increasingly taken into account (Szerszynski and Urry, 2002; Hannerz, 1990: 238; Pichler, 2012: 22).¹ The main focus of our paper are the measurement and actual prevalence of such cosmopolitan consumption practices as well as their social and cultural determinants.

However, the label cosmopolitanism subsumes a variety of different meanings, which should be carefully differentiated, as especially Vertovec and Cohen (2002) as well as Szerszynski and Urry (2002) have shown. They distinguish a philosophical cosmopolitanism focusing on universal norms from a cultural cosmopolitanism which is based on the consumption of culturally diverse goods and services. Practical cosmopolitanism, the next form, goes partially beyond this consumption-based cosmopolitanism in targeting behavior and skills, which enable people to actively understand and participate in other cultures. A further aspect is the political dimension of cosmopolitanism, which includes issues like global governance und global civil society. Finally, the term cosmopolitanism furthermore means a specific form of identifying as a world citizen and having cosmopolitan attitudinal orientations towards different aspects of life.

In this paper we focus especially on cosmopolitan cultural consumption as dependent variable, though we take cosmopolitan identification and other transnational practices, as determinants of cultural consumption, into account. Several authors agree that cosmopolitan orientations, consumption and practices are characterized by a strong openness to learn about, participate in and reflect on new and culturally foreign practices and experiences (Cleveland et al., 2009: 119; Hannerz, 1990: 239; Woodward et al., 2008: 209; Skrbis and Woodward, 2007: 730; Ley, 2004: 159; Szerszynski and Urry, 2002: 468). Therefore, we define

cosmopolitan cultural consumption by its openness for and engagement with cultural products and services from foreign cultures.³

This relates to the classic distinction between locals and cosmopolitans drawn by Robert Merton. In Merton's study, locals were strongly focused on the social and cultural life of their town, whereas cosmopolitans were intellectually and culturally open to other parts of the country and to the nation (1968). With the increasing transnationalization of some social fields, cosmopolitanism is no longer focused on the national but on the transnational and even global level, whereas the locals are mainly interested in the local and national arena (Hannerz, 1990; Fligstein, 2008; Meuleman and Savage, 2013). Thus, the terms locals and globals have to be understood in relation to the existing social fields and their geographical spread (Gerhards, 2012). In lifestyle and consumer research the issue of cosmopolitanism dates at least back to the 1990s, when Holt (1997) contrasted a largely local orientation among working-class respondents in a central Pennsylvanian rural county with the more national and international focus of certain segments of the upper-middle-class. In contemporary cultural consumption studies, several authors have argued that the traditional axis of distinction between highbrow culture and popular culture is in the process of being replaced by a new axis of distinction between an open cosmopolitan cultural capital and a more local, less open, cultural capital (Prieur and Savage, 2013; Roose et al., 2012; Meuleman and Savage, 2013). However, based on existing research it is not clear, if the second axis is indeed replacing the first, or if they form independent dimensions of the social space or as another possibility, the two axes are linked to each other (Cappeliez and Johnston, 2013; Johnston and Bauman, 2007; Ollivier, 2008; Rössel and Schroedter, 2013).

In this paper, we take up this discussion and focus on three issues. First, in our view, the measurement of cosmopolitan cultural consumption is still mainly focused on Western Culture (cf. Meuleman and Savage, 2013). This neglects the range of cultures from which goods and services originate. Therefore, we have tried to exploratively develop additional measures of cosmopolitan cultural consumption, which take its geographical breadth into account. Second, we want to add to the existing literature by more comprehensively outlining the determinants of cosmopolitan cultural consumption, which we regard as shaped by different forms of cultural and linguistic capital. At this point, we also take up the question, of how the traditional highbrow dimension of the lifestyle space is related to the axis depicting the level of openness and cosmopolitanism. Third, we assume, that in contrast to other forms of cultural consumption cosmopolitanism is embedded in supranational identifications and transnational social relations and experiences. Therefore, we attempt to go beyond the social

structural explanations of cultural consumption (cf. Rössel, 2011**b**; van Eijck, 2011) and integrate explanations of cosmopolitanism from other sociological fields. If cosmopolitan consumption is indeed linked to cosmopolitan identifications on the one hand, and to different forms of transnational social relations and experiences on the other, thus, if different forms of cosmopolitanism go together, it can be seen as part of a more comprehensive cosmopolitan syndrome. This would refute the thesis that cosmopolitan cultural consumption is in a certain sense a form of superficial and commodified cosmopolitanism with little meaning and impact (Woodward et al., 2008: 212; Pichler, 2008: 1117–1118).

2. Theory: Cosmopolitan Cultural Consumption and its Determinants

2.1. The emergence of cosmopolitan cultural consumption

For a rather long time, research on cultural consumption focused on the class basis of highbrow consumption, and the distinctive value it played in the reproduction of class structure (Bourdieu, 1984). This research tradition assumed that the main axis of the space of lifestyle is constituted by the opposition between highbrow culture and popular culture.

The discussion of the social relevance, and distinctiveness, of highbrow culture has continued, sparked particularly by the concept of the cultural omnivore introduced by Peterson and Kern (1996). They argue that the classic distinction between highbrow and lowbrow has been replaced by the distinction between the cultural omnivore and the cultural univore. In recent discussions about the dimensionality of the space of lifestyles the term openness is often used to denote its new central axis (Roose et al., 2012; Ollivier, 2008). In this context, the concept openness subsumes a variety of meanings.

First, it is a personality trait indicating openness to new experiences, imaginativeness, and joy in experimentation. Therefore, it is statistically related to an open and tolerant handling of aesthetic experiences and art objects (Chamorro-Premuzic et al., 2009; Roose et al., 2012). This tolerant and open attitudes may appear in quite different shapes in cultural consumption, e. g. as the tendency to appreciate and consume cultural products from a wide variety of different genres, like the cultural omnivore described by Peterson and Kern (1996) or as the disposition to enjoy products and services from quite different cultural and geographic origins, like the cosmopolitan consumer. Based on qualitative interviews Ollivier (2008) has furthermore established that openness may come in different forms, from a rather highbrow mode connected with a strong focus on expert knowledge, to a more practical mode concerned with technical and practical domains. Cappeliez and Johnston (2013) have shown rather similar results for cosmopolitan consumption related to food, where a knowledge-

oriented, connoisseur mode of consumption is contrasted to more pragmatic and tentative ways of consumption.

Second, it denotes the breadth of tastes, the tolerance for different genres and encompassing participation in quite different cultural activities. The breadth of tastes has been especially emphasized in the cultural omnivore discussion (Peterson and Kern, 1996). In contemporary society, cultural distinction is not anymore based on a preference for traditional highbrow culture alone, but on the breadth of cultural tastes and knowledge. Lizardo (2005) links this discussion to world polity theory. He studied the relationship between a cosmopolitan identity (as a citizen of the world) and the number of cultural likes and dislikes in popular and highbrow cultural consumption in Spain. It turned out, that individuals, who thought of themselves as world citizens clearly had a broader range of tastes and were more culturally tolerant than those who did not. This indicates, that the openness to different genres may be related to the openness to products from different cultures and geographic origins. Lizardo's (2005) study is thus a rather meaningful signal that cultural openness, in the sense of breadth of taste or cultural omnivorism, is linked to the concept of cosmopolitanism.

Third, more recent publications have shown that the major dimension structuring the field of lifestyles is along a continuum between the poles of engagement and disengagement. At one end, we find a statistical cluster of those who engage in several culturally different activities, while at the other, we find a group that is disengaged and spends much time at home, maybe watching TV or listening to the radio (Bennett et al., 2008; Roose et al., 2012). This dimension is of course closely linked to the omnivore-univore continuum juxtaposing persons with a broad taste and persons with a more narrow taste (Roose et al., 2012). In all these studies, the axis of engagement and disengagement is closely linked to education, with the highly educated, upper-middle class at the more engaged end of the continuum. It is important to emphasize that these dimensions are not meant to describe categorical differences, but continua along which measures of cosmopolitanism, openness and levels of engagement change gradually.

Fourth, several authors go one step further and indicate that the current transformation of the social space leads to a new fundamental dimension with the poles of local and cosmopolitan, which is connected to the engagement axis. Prieur and Savage (2013) argued that the preference for traditional highbrow culture is in decline even among the highly educated and has lost much of its distinctiveness and legitimacy. Furthermore, those who belong to the contemporary upper and upper-middle classes tend to choose quite freely from the emerging smorgasbord of popular choices, which is driven by increasing differentiation of

genres and the proliferation of offerings of the cultural and consumer industries (Aspers and Godard, 2013; Dowd, 2011; Schulze, 1992). Replacing the traditional highbrow dimension of the space of lifestyle is thus the new axis juxtaposing the local versus the cosmopolitan (Prieur and Savage, 2013: 14; Prieur et al., 2008).

Examples for this orientation are also found in Holt's now classic study from central Pennsylvania, where he found one fraction of the upper middle class to be nationally and internationally oriented, having a taste for diversity and a reflexive and sometimes ironic approach to consumption, whereas the working class was rather locally oriented in its tastes and participation patterns (Holt, 1997: 336–338). Further evidence comes from Thompson and Tambyah (1999) in their study of expatriates in Singapore. They find a pronounced preference for the culturally diverse and exotic. Interestingly, they also emphasize the specific mode of consumption among these cosmopolitan consumers with high cultural capital, which they contrast with the tourist experience. In contrast to the tourists, these expatriates express the wish not to simply be passive bystanders, but to be serious participants in the authentic culture (Thompson and Tambyah, 1999: 217; Prieur and Savage, 2013: 14; see also: Cappeliez and Johnston, 2013).

A recent study by Meuleman and Savage (2013) analyzes the geographic range of cultural and aesthetic tastes for films, books and music based on a correspondence analysis (Meuleman and Savage, 2013: 235). The analysis resulted in three main geographic dimensions of taste preferences. The first dimension pitted those with an interest in all cultures (including Dutch), who were generally culturally engaged, against those with an exclusively Dutch taste and a rather disengaged relationship to culture. The second dimension pitted those with a preference for U. S. American popular culture against those with more highbrow and European preferences. The third dimension contrasted the exclusively Dutch with all other configurations in their geographic range of tastes (Meuleman and Savage, 2013: 240–242). The first dimension is clearly linked to education, the second to age, but the third dimension has an only weak relationship to education and age. There is indeed significant evidence for the emergence of a cultural consumption dimension that contrasts more locally based forms of consumption to more cosmopolitan forms. Furthermore, there is a strong conceptual relation to the literature on cultural omnivorism. Both concepts are based on an encompassing notion of openness towards a broader range of tastes and cultural engagements.

However, there has been a discussion about the relevance of cosmopolitan consumption. Is this a genuine form of cosmopolitanism or just a form of trivial globalism where contemporary consumers help themselves from the global smorgasbord of goods and

services (Woodward et al., 2008: 212; Szerszynski and Urry, 2002: 477)? Several studies suggest a kind of supermarket for global goods and services without any serious consequences for normative or political forms of cosmopolitanism (Skrbis and Woodward, 2007: 737–738; Woodward et al., 2008: 217–218; Pichler, 2008: 1117–1118). In contrast, Lizardo (2005) has shown that there is indeed a link between cosmopolitan identity and cultural taste. Therefore, it is still unclear, if patterns of cosmopolitan consumption are connected to other forms of cosmopolitan identities and attitudes, thus forming part of a broader syndrome, or not.

Our paper is based on the premise that cosmopolitan cultural consumption is a substantive and relevant phenomenon not only for cultural consumption research but also for the study of cosmopolitanism in general. The cosmopolitan dimension may emerge as one of the most important axes of the field of lifestyles, pitting locals against cosmopolitans (Holt, 1997; Meuleman and Savage, 2013; Prieur and Savage, 2013). This implies on the one hand that cosmopolitan consumption may not be as widespread as often assumed and on the other hand, that cosmopolitan consumption may have a distinctive value for the reproduction of social class structures (Holt, 1997; Meuleman and Savage, 2013; Prieur and Savage, 2013; Cappeliez and Johnston, 2013). This research also suggests that cosmopolitan consumption is related to other forms of cosmopolitanism (Vertovec and Cohen, 2002), potentially making it part of a coherent syndrome, which is characterized by strong openness towards culturally foreign practices and experiences (Cleveland et al., 2009: 119; Hannerz, 1990: 239; Woodward et al., 2008: 209; Skrbis and Woodward, 2007: 730; Ley, 2004: 159; Szerszynski and Urry, 2002: 468). Thus, the relationship between different forms of cosmopolitanism should be studied empirically.

Therefore, we take up the existing literature on cosmopolitan cultural consumption and focus on three aims in our analysis of this phenomenon. First, we develop additional measures of cosmopolitan cultural consumption. Here we take up two issues: First, the discussion in the field of lifestyle research has pointed out that it is too narrow to conduct research on cultural consumption only by examining the taste for certain genres or the frequency of participating in certain cultural activities (cf. Lizardo, 2005; Meuleman and Savage, 2013). Therefore, in our study we include measures of knowledge about artists, indicators of taste for cuisines and music, and measures of certain modes of cosmopolitan consumption (Holt, 1997; Rössel, 2011a; Roose et al., 2012). Especially with the indicators of the way of consuming, we are able to tap on the results established by Ollivier (2008) and Cappeliez and Johnston (2013), thus studying the aesthetic disposition (Bourdieu, 1984). Secondly, in measuring the

geographic range of cosmopolitanism, we include a broader range of geographic alternatives than in previous studies. For one, the study by Meuleman and Savage (2013) distinguishes just between Dutch, European, American and other origins of cultural products. This is of course a very important differentiation, but since Dutch, European and American culture all belong to the Western culture, one may ask if this differentiation is sufficient for establishing cosmopolitan consumption. Therefore, we add to the existing literature by focusing on measures that go beyond western culture and put more emphasis on a stronger differentiation of non-Western cultures in our measurement.

Secondly, we also address the issue of the relevance of cosmopolitan cultural consumption by analyzing the relationship between various indicators of cosmopolitan consumption and other forms of cosmopolitanism or transnationalism. Our third aim is connected to this issue: Existing research on cosmopolitan cultural consumption has clearly shown that this form of consumption is linked to class and age (Holt, 1997; Cappeliez and Johnston, 2013; Meuleman and Savage, 2013). We want to broaden this picture by analyzing the role different forms of capital play in determining cosmopolitan consumption as well as the importance of other forms of cosmopolitan engagement like transnational experiences, social relations and supranational identities for shaping consumption. Therefore, in our discussion of the main determinants of cosmopolitan consumption, we will not only rely on the literature on cultural consumption, but also on the relevant discussions on transnationalism and cosmopolitanism in general.

2. 2 Determinants of cosmopolitan consumption

Lizardo (2005) demonstrated that those who had a supranational identity have a broader cultural taste and are culturally more tolerant. His explanation of this statistical relationship is based on world polity theory. The institutionalized model of personhood in world culture pictures the person as free to choose between different alternatives based on personal tastes and as not subject to a rigid hierarchy. Therefore, self-identified world citizens should tend to cross more boundaries between taste genres and tolerate more different genres.

Other studies (Cleveland et al., 2009; see also Meuleman et al., 2012) have shown that cosmopolitan attitudes clearly shape consumer behavior; those who are more cosmopolitan buy more exotic goods and more luxury goods. A stringent theoretical explanation for the relationship between cosmopolitan identity and cosmopolitan consumption could be based on symbolic interactionist identity theory, which assumes that individuals try to uphold and strengthen certain aspects of their identity through meaningfully

related forms of behavior (Stryker and Burke, 2000). Thus it seems likely that self-identified world citizens bolster their identity with more cosmopolitan and less local forms of consumption.

H₁: The more a person identifies with supranational entities, the more cosmopolitan her lifestyle is.

Research on migration and integration has extensively examined transnational social relations, and has shown that many who have a migration background also have transnational social ties to their country of origin (Waldinger, 2009). It is well documented, in addition, that many without a migration background have transnational social ties to friends and relatives in foreign countries (Mau, 2010; Díez Medrano, 2010; Fligstein, 2008). The transnational character of social ties can be based on the crossing of national territorial boundaries, e. g. a Canadian having Italian friends in Italy, but also on the crossing of national symbolic boundaries within a locality, e. g. a Canadian in Toronto having Italian friends in Toronto. Since our data include only information about the first meaning of transnational relations, we concentrate just on this interpretation. Of particular importance are the studies showing that transnational social ties have positive consequences for cosmopolitan attitudes, on attitudes toward supranational entities such as the European Union (Mau et al., 2008; Kuhn, 2011, 2012; Favell et al., 2011: 26–27; Gustafson, 2009), and even on consumption (Díez Medrano, 2010).

There are at least two possible theoretical explanations for this. First, individuals with more transnational social networks should have more information about a broader geographic range of cultural goods and services, and are thus able to develop a preference for them. Second, the contact hypothesis from social psychology argues that positive interactions with foreign persons lead to more positive attitudes towards these persons and their culture (Mau et al., 2008).

This leads us to hypothesize that transnational social ties should not only augment information about foreign cultures but also lead to a taste for foreign cultures and thus to a cosmopolitan lifestyle.

H₂: The more transnational social relations a person has, the more cosmopolitan her lifestyle is.

H_{2a}: The more local social relations a person has, the less cosmopolitan her lifestyle is.

There are more social sources of transnational experiences as well, including one's own experiences of migration, holidays, travel and longer and shorter stays abroad (Andreotti et al., 2013; Díez Medrano, 2010; Mau, 2010; Mau and Mewes, 2012; Ley, 2004: 159). However, despite the right of EU-citizens to move to and settle anywhere in the EU, spatial mobility and migration remains on a very low level. Only 4 percent of the EU population has ever lived in another EU country (Favell et al., 2011: 22–23; Andreotti et al., 2013).

Travelling for work or leisure reasons, however, is widespread among Europeans, and is definitely not an elite phenomenon (Mau et al., 2008: 5; Cleveland et al., 2009: 120; Díez Medrano, 2010). Still, though popular, travelling is more common among males, those with high incomes, university graduates, urbanites and among those who live in modernized and globalized countries (Andreotti et al., 2013; Mau and Mewes, 2012; Fligstein, 2008; Gustafson, 2009; Díez Medrano, 2010). Based on the same theoretical rationale as above, we expect transnational experience based on travelling and stays abroad to increase an individual's cosmopolitan orientation and cosmopolitan cultural consumption.

H₃: The more transnational experiences a person has, the more cosmopolitan her lifestyle is.

The discussion about cosmopolitanism has long been accompanied by reflections about its structural and class base (Skrbis and Woodward, 2007; Ley, 2004; Calhoun, 2002; Hannerz, 1990). Some authors argue cosmopolitanism is not only an elite phenomenon and that certain forms of it are also found among the working or lower classes (Mau et al., 2008: 5; Cleveland et al., 2009: 120; Pichler, 2012; Lamont and Aksartova, 2002). However, the existing empirical evidence suggests that many forms of cosmopolitanism, whether in lifestyle (Meuleman and Savage, 2013; Roose et al., 2012), attitude (Pichler, 2008; Woodward et al., 2008; Fligstein, 2008), transnational experience or social ties (see above), are linked to resource endowment. As Lamont and Aksartova (2002: 2) state in their paper, that otherwise shows the existence of certain forms of cosmopolitanism among working class men: "Unlike the commonly envisaged cosmopolitans, the majority of people in the working class do not trade, work, love, marry or do research internationally, to paraphrase Beck (2000)". Therefore, it is still necessary to discuss the theoretical connection between certain forms of capital endowment and cosmopolitan cultural consumption and to test this hypothesized linkage empirically. We can expect, that especially those forms of cosmopolitanism, that need certain costly resources, to be unequally distributed according to class and capital forms.

One variable is consistently related to indicators of cosmopolitanism, whether this is in consumption, attitudes or identifications, namely cultural capital in terms of education. There are two main theoretical rationales for this relationship with regard to cultural consumption (van Eijck, 2011; Roose and van der Stichele, 2010). First, education is a primary status attribute in contemporary societies and actors simply use specific forms of consumption to signal their social status (Bourdieu, 1984; Roose and van der Stichele, 2010). Second, education may increase the capacity for processing complex information and thus persons with higher levels of education could have a higher capacity for enjoying cultural goods and services of higher complexity, meaning highbrow culture or culturally exotic and foreign objects (Bourdieu, 1968; Notten et al., 2014; Rössel, 2011a).

H₄: The more cultural capital in terms of education a person has, the more cosmopolitan her lifestyle is.

Empirical evidence still exists that a highbrow orientation is a sign of cultural capital in contemporary societies, though this may be decreasing in relevance (DiMaggio and Mukhtar, 2004; Rössel, 2012). It represents a competence to decode complex works of art or information without regard to the respective content, because it has a focus on formal structures of aesthetic objects and thus constitutes an aesthetic disposition. Therefore, that ability is transferable to new or culturally foreign objects and is the basis for the aestheticization of completely new aspects of life (Bourdieu, 1984). This is consistent with empirical research about cultural omnivores, which usually shows that persons with a highbrow taste also like a multitude of other genres and participate in a multitude of other activities (Peterson and Kern, 1996; Roose et al., 2012).

Based on these considerations, we hypothesize that persons with a stronger highbrow orientation also tend towards a more cosmopolitan lifestyle. This hypothesis speaks directly to the discussion about the new dimensions of the space of lifestyles. We test empirically if highbrow culture is connected to the local versus cosmopolitan dimension.

H₅: The more cultural capital in terms of highbrow orientation a person has, the more cosmopolitan her lifestyle is.

One form of capital, which is still too often neglected in discussions about cosmopolitanism and transnationalism, is linguistic capital. As Bourdieu has nicely shown, the ability to speak the national standard language without accent is a form of capital in national fields like the labor market or the educational system (Bourdieu, 1990). With the increasing transnationalization of social relations and economic exchanges, the geographic

range of the linguistic market has increased, and the ability to speak foreign languages therefore has become a major form of linguistic capital (Gerhards, 2012; Rössel and Schroedter, 2013). The market for linguistic capital is not restricted to labor markets or the educational system, but foreign language proficiency is, in many cases, a necessary condition for trading, working, loving or marrying internationally. And surely it is necessary for a serious and reflective engagement with foreign cultures. Therefore, we expect linguistic capital to shape cosmopolitan consumption.

H₆: The more linguistic capital a person has, the more cosmopolitan her lifestyle is.

3. Data and Methods

Our study is based on data from an online survey we conducted in Zurich between June and September 2012 (Schroedter and Rössel, 2013). Zurich is with roughly 400.000 inhabitants the biggest city in Switzerland. Despite its relatively small population size it is counted among the world-wide leading, sometimes even among the global cities in studies of international city networks (Taylor, 2005). Zurich is the head quarter of several major international companies, especially in the finance and banking sector. However, Zurich is also a major location of the creative industries and an important tourist destination in Switzerland. Therefore, it offers a varied and broad infrastructure to support cosmopolitan lifestyles, from various outdoor activities, to institutions of high-brow and popular culture and various restaurants and clubs. The economic position as a global city and the high quality of living attracts a high number of migrants from other countries. Currently, the percentage of non-Swiss inhabitants is around 32 %, however, the foreign born share of the population is around 50 %. The majority of migrants originate in other European countries, but a sizable share comes from non-European countries (Kanton Zürich, 2013; Schroedter and Rössel, 2014).

The survey was addressed to persons in mono- and bi-national partnerships (both marital and non-marital). The sample included individuals who live together with their partner, and included persons from Switzerland, the EU-27 countries, and other European and non-European countries. Therefore, it is not a representative survey of the population of Zurich, but instead it is a survey of a group that is very heterogeneous in both national and cultural terms, thus somewhat exaggerating the heterogeneity of Zurich's population. Because of the national and cultural heterogeneity of the sampled individuals it is well suited to analyze the causal mechanisms underlying the formation of cosmopolitan lifestyles. However,

in interpreting the results one should take into account that the sample probably contains persons with an above average endowment with transnational experiences and networks.

The basic sample was drawn randomly from the population register of the city of Zurich, using several predefined strata. We contacted all the selected persons by letter mail in both German and English and invited them to participate in the online survey. At increasing time intervals, we sent three reminders to the sampled persons. Based on this procedure, we were able to achieve a return rate of about 40 percent.

We first developed an indicator of cosmopolitan cultural knowledge by asking about the respondents' knowledge of nine musicians and composers from Western Europe (Adele; Franz Schubert), Eastern Europe (Dima Bilan; Modest Mussorgsky), Australasia (TVXQ [Tong Vfang Xien Qi]; Ryuichi Sakamoto, Peter Sculthorpe) and South America (Juanes, Heitor Villa-Lobos). All are generally well known in their field and also in their region of origin: We established their renown by looking at criteria like winning of awards, chart positions and importance in musical history. They come from highbrow as well as from popular culture and represent a broader geographical range of countries compared to previous research. We chose not to include North-American artists, because they have been covered in already published studies (Meuleman and Savage, 2013). However, as Table 1 indicates, apart from the musicians and composers from Western Europe, the degree of familiarity with these musicians and composers even among our sample is on a rather low level. As our dependent variable, we computed a simple sum-index of all musicians and composers a respondent knew, ranging from zero to nine.

Table 1 Knowledge of musicians and composers

	Known (in Percent)	Distribution of Sum-Index	N	Percent
		0	115	6.9
Franz Schubert	84.4	1	268	16.1
Adele	69.7	2	448	26.8
Juanes	41.6	3	497	29.8
Modest Mussorgsky	22.4	4	221	13.2
Heitor Villa-Lobos	14.4	5	77	4.6
Ryuichi Sakamoto	11.9	6	24	1.4
Dima Bilan	3.9	7	10	0.6
Peter Sculthorpe	2.9	8	3	0.2
TVXQ (Tong Vfang Xien Qi)	1.4	9	6	0.4
Total	-	Total	1,669	100.0

Source: Swiss EUMARR Survey (n=1,669)

Secondly, based on the same list of musicians and composers we constructed a variable indicating the taste for music from different world regions. We differentiated between four

geographical areas: Western Europe, Eastern Europe, Australasia and South America (see above). The focus here was not on the mere knowledge of the respective musicians and composers but instead on the stated preference (not actual listening) for their music. The dependent variable sums the number of regions where preferred artists come from and accordingly ranges from zero to four. The distribution of the variable is presented in Table 2.

Table 2 Taste for music from different world regions

Distribution of Sum-Index	N	Percent
0	416	24.9
1	683	40.9
2	407	24.4
3	138	8.3
4	25	1.5
Total	1,669	100.0

Source: Swiss EUMARR Survey (n=1,669)

Thirdly, we developed a further measure of cosmopolitan tastes based on the preference for foreign cuisines. We computed a simple sum-index based on a list of twenty-four national cuisines for which respondents could indicate their preference (Warde et al., 1999). Most of these cuisines are also well represented in the multifarious restaurant sector of Zurich. The distribution of the index is shown in Table 3. The results indicate a preference for the Swiss, Mediterranean and Asian cuisine, which is probably similar to urban settings in other Western countries (Warde et al., 1999). In both the indicator of cosmopolitan cultural knowledge as well as in the indicator of cosmopolitan tastes we prefer a sum indicator because it measures the actual geographical breadth of knowledge of and tastes for cultures from different parts of the globe. Hence, for instance for a Dane to know or like Spanish movies or Spanish literature is not a sign of a cosmopolitan taste. In this case cultural products from just one origin country are involved. Cosmopolitanism as a generalized openness to foreign cultures implies a certain breadth of knowledge and taste, which we attempt to measure in our indicators. However, in one respect these measures are of course limited, since they simply count the number of origin countries or world regions and thus are not able to differentiate between different forms of cosmopolitanism or openness. In e. g. a connoisseur mode of cosmopolitanism (Cappeliez and Johnston, 2013: 441–442; Ollivier, 2008), consumers tend to focus on the manner in which food is appreciated and they attempt to reach expert knowledge on specific food items. This often means, that the local producers, local production methods and local terroir may become very important, thus entangling the local and the cosmopolitan.

Based on our measure we are not able to differentiate a connoisseur consumer from a pragmatic consumer of, e. g. Thai food.

Finally, we added two indicators of actual and preferred modes of cosmopolitan consumption. On the one hand we asked respondents if they prefer to watch movies in a dubbed version or in the original version, on the other hand we asked if they have read at least one book in a language other than their mother tongue in the last 12 months. Both indicators are well suited to capture the different forms of cosmopolitan consumption, especially the ones, which are considered more authentic by many respondents (Szerszynsky and Urry, 2002; Thompson and Tambya, 1999; Prieur and Savage, 2013; Hannerz, 1990: 239; Cappeliez and Johnston, 2013). This is obviously linked to the idea of a connoisseur mode of cosmopolitan consumption discussed above (Cappeliez and Johnston, 2013) and to Bourdieu's concept of an aesthetic disposition, which upper class and upper middle class consumers apply not only to traditional highbrow items, but also to everyday objects like food or fashion on the one hand and popular culture on the other hand (Bourdieu, 1984: 32– 33; Ollivier, 2008). In sum, our measures of cosmopolitanism cover a broad range of preferences and practices: firstly, musical knowledge and preferences relate to the most important form of cultural consumption discussed in the debate on cultural omnivorism (Kern and Peterson, 1996; Peterson, 2005), secondly, we include also everyday mundane forms of consumption, like food, which are still strongly linked to cultural frames (Cappeliez and Johnston, 2013; Duruz, 2005). And finally, we chose to measure the aesthetic disposition of the respondents by focusing on forms of cultural consumption (books and film), where it is rather easy to grasp the mode of cosmopolitan consumption by focusing on the language used.

Table 3 Cuisines liked

Cuisine	Indicated in Percent	Distribution of Sum-Index	N	Percent
		0	16	1.0
Italian	94.4	1	30	1.8
Swiss	86.2	2	13	0.8
Thai	74.7	3	21	1.3
French	71.1	4	36	2.2
Indian	70.7	5	58	3.5
Chinese	69.6	6	72	4.3
Spanish	67.9	7	90	5.4
Greek	65.4	8	105	6.3
Mexican	64.1	9	133	8.0
Japanese	61.7	10	150	9.0
German	60.7	11	130	7.8
Lebanese	52.7	12	130	7.8
American	52.2	13	118	7.1
Moroccan	43.7	14	121	7.3
Turkish	43.4	15	122	7.3
Vietnamese	40.6	16	74	4.4

Cuisine	Indicated in Percent	Distribution of Sum-Index	N	Percent
Indonesian	31.5	17	71	4.3
Korean	24.8	18	51	3.1
Scandinavian	17.1	19	40	2.4
Hungarian	17.0	20	24	1.4
Cuban	13.5	21	15	0.9
Russian	11.3	22	12	0.7
Dutch	8.8	23	6	0.4
Polish	8.3	24	31	1.9
Total	-	Total	1,669	100.0

Source: Swiss EUMARR Survey (n=1,669)

After presenting the operationalization of our dependent variable, cosmopolitan cultural consumption, we now turn to the explanatory variables. With regard to our first hypothesis, our survey contained a measurement of the respondent's identification with supranational entities. Among others they were asked to indicate how much they feel as European and as a citizen of the world. Our second hypothesis assumes an impact of transnational respective local social relations on cosmopolitan consumption. Therefore, we measured the number of strong social relations to persons in the EU-27 countries, to persons in other countries and as an indicator of local social networks to persons within Switzerland. Our third hypothesis refers especially to transnational experiences persons have made during shorter or longer stays in foreign countries. We used four indicators to measure this construct: First, we counted the number of times respondents travelled abroad during their childhood and youth (until their 16th birthday). Second, we counted the number of continents they visited during their lifetime. Third, we asked for the number of longer stays abroad (longer than three months), and fourth, we asked if respondents had a partner born in a different country than themselves. With regard to hypothesis four, we measured the persons' education with four categories of educational levels (lower than higher secondary, which means all certificates lower than the general qualification for university-entrance, post-secondary, which refers to higher vocational education, tertiary, which refers to academic education, PhD). Furthermore, since the cultural capital of the parents has often been discussed as a determinant of lifestyles in cultural consumption research (Bourdieu, 1984; Nagel, 2010), we included measurements of the parents' education in our models, which also have four levels (lower secondary, which refers to the obligatory school of eight or nine years, secondary, postsecondary, tertiary). With respect to the fifth hypothesis, we measured the highbrow orientation of our respondents based on an additive scale composed of indicators of participation in highbrow cultural events and institutions (e. g. theater performance, art museums, classical concerts) and a taste for classical music and opera. The sixth hypothesis has a focus on linguistic capital. This was

measured as the number of fluently spoken foreign languages of the respondents. Finally, we added several control variables: age and gender, furthermore income and region of origin (results not reported).³

The statistical analyses were conducted with different statistical techniques. Both the dependent variable on cosmopolitan cultural knowledge (music) and the variables on cosmopolitan tastes (music and cuisines) are count data. Accordingly, we computed poisson regressions with robust standard errors (Cameron and Trivedi, 1998; Long, 1997: 217ff.).⁴ The two measures of modes of cosmopolitan consumption are dichotomous; therefore we ran logistic regression models.

4. Empirical Results

In the presentation of our empirical results, we start with the analysis of cosmopolitan cultural knowledge, measured as the number of known composers or musicians from four different world regions. A brief look at model 1 in Table 4 shows that a clear pattern emerges with regard to our hypotheses. First, with regard to H₁ we find mixed results: the identification as world citizen is positively related to a greater breadth of knowledge, whereas identifying with Europe is not. Turning to H₂ we find that transnational networks indeed have an impact on cosmopolitan cultural knowledge. However, only social relations to persons living in non EU-27 countries are relevant. Local social networks or networks in EU-27 countries do not have an impact on the geographical range of musicians and composers known. There is no support for H₃ and H₄ either. All indicators for H₃ do not have a significant effect or point (as in the case of continents visited) in the wrong direction. The incident rate ratio for cultural capital in the form of education is positive but fails statistical significance. However, there is strong support for H₅: A highbrow orientation clearly increases cosmopolitan cultural knowledge. Finally, with regard to H₆ we again find supporting evidence. Respondents with higher linguistic capital tend to have more cosmopolitan cultural knowledge. Each additional language is associated with an estimated 6 % increase in numbers of known musicians/composers. The control variables do not have any significant effect on the dependent variable.

In a second step, we turn to the analysis of cosmopolitan taste. The first dependent variable counts the number of different regions the respondents like music from (cf. model 2). The determinants are similar to those of cosmopolitan knowledge. The number of foreign languages spoken and the highbrow orientation both have a strong significant effect on the preference for music from different regions of the world (H₅ and H₆). Moreover, strong

relations to friends or relatives in non-EU countries have a positive influence on a cosmopolitan taste for music.

The other indicator of cosmopolitan taste is the number of cuisines a respondent likes. Results are presented in model 3. Starting with our first hypothesis, we find some supportive evidence. Persons who identify as world citizens tend to like more cuisines. Also, identification with Europe has a positive impact. In the case of culinary taste, there is, however, no support for the second hypothesis. Close social relations in Switzerland do not belittle the taste for more cuisines (H_{2a}). And similar to a cosmopolitan taste for music, social networks to persons in non-EU countries have a positive impact on the number of cuisines liked. Furthermore, there is strong support for our third hypothesis. Three of our four indicators of transnational experience have strong significant effects on cosmopolitan taste patterns regarding foreign cuisines. Here we also find empirical evidence for the fourth hypothesis. It is especially among persons with a tertiary degree or even a Ph.D. that one finds those who like more foreign cuisines than among persons with lower levels of education. Cultural capital in form of a highbrow orientation is again important for cosmopolitan tastes, thus strongly supporting H₅. In contrast, the number of foreign languages spoken fluently does not have a significant impact, so that here we do not find evidence for hypothesis 6. The cognitive and practical accessibility of consumer goods in different areas of consumption differ in their dependence on language (see Janssen et al., 2008; Gerhards and Rössel, 1999). The field of cooking and cuisines may be one of the more language-independent cases of consumption, thus explaining the irrelevance of language proficiency.

Table 4 Determinants of cosmopolitan cultural consumption

	Model 1 Knowledge: Musicians/ composers	Model 2 Taste I: Music from different regions	Model 3 Taste II: Different cuisines	Model 4 Practice I: Films in Original	Model 5 Practice II: Books in foreign language
	IRR	IRR	IRR	OR	OR
Age (cent. 37 years)	1.00	1.01**	1.00	1.00	0.98
Sex (Ref. female)	1.00	1.04	0.94**	0.91	0.93
Education of father (Ref. sec.)					
Lower secondary	1.03	1.07	0.91*	0.57*	1.31
Postsecondary	0.98	0.98	0.99	1.18	1.14
Tertiary	0.98	0.98	0.99	1.66*	1.04
Education of mother (Ref. sec.)					
Lower secondary	0.95	0.97	1.04	0.83	1.05
Postsecondary	1.00	1.07	1.03	0.92	1.11
Tertiary	1.00	1.09	0.97	0.84	1.23
Education (Ref. max. higher sec.)					
Postsecondary	0.98	1.00	1.03	1.03	1.24
Tertiary	1.01	1.09	1.09**	2.12***	2.24***
Ph.D.	1.02	1.13	1.13***	2.66**	3.56***

	Model 1 Knowledge: Musicians/ composers	Model 2 Taste I: Music from different regions	Model 3 Taste II: Different cuisines	Model 4 Practice I: Films in Original	Model 5 Practice II: Books in foreign language
	IRR	IRR	IRR	OR	OR
Income (cent. 7.100 SFR)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00**	1.00
<i>Transnational experience</i>					
Travels abroad (before age 16)	1.00	1.00	1.00**	0.99	1.00
Continents visited	0.97*	0.99	1.05***	1.23***	1.09*
Longer stays abroad	1.00	1.00	1.02**	1.37***	1.20***
Partner born in different country	1.04	1.00	1.00	1.10	1.16
<i>Skills/interests</i>					
Foreign languages spoken	1.06***	1.10***	1.00	1.29**	1.28***
Highbrow orientation	1.07***	1.11***	1.03***	1.26***	1.12**
<i>Identification</i>					
ID: World citizen	1.01**	1.01	1.01**	1.02	1.02
ID: European	1.00	1.01	1.01**	1.02	1.01
<i>Social capital</i>					
Network: non-EU country	1.14***	1.14**	1.05*	1.52**	1.50***
Network: EU country	1.01	1.01	1.00	1.41	1.33
Network: Switzerland	1.03	1.00	1.01	1.04	0.89
Intercept	1.76***	0.63***	6.90***	0.28***	0.09***
Chi ²	177.37	208.50	314.90	209.79	247.52
Pseudo-R ² (Nagelkerke)	0.08	0.08	0.27	0.26	0.23
N	1,669	1,669	1,669	1,649	1,651

Source: Swiss EUMARR Survey; all models also control for region of origin (not reported); Model 1-3: Poisson regression (IRR = incidence rate ratios); Model 4 and 5: Binary logistic regression (OR = Odds Ratios); * p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001

We now turn to the indicators of the modes of cosmopolitan cultural consumption. Firstly, we analyze the determinants of a preference for watching movies in the original versus a dubbed version. The results are shown in model 4 in Table 4. With regard to hypothesis 1 we neither find a positive effect of feeling as a world citizen nor of feeling European. Both factors do not seem to be relevant determinants of preferring to watch films in their original version. Hypothesis 2 assumes an effect of transnational social networks on cosmopolitan consumption. The empirical evidence partly supports this hypothesis. Again, only social networks to non-European countries have a statistically significant effect. Furthermore, looking at the evidence for hypothesis 3, two of the indicators of transnational experiences exhibit strong positive effects on the preference for watching movies in the original version: the number of longer stays abroad as well as the number of continents visited. In contrast, both the number of countries visited up to age 16 and having a partner born in a different country does not have a statistically significant impact. Turning to H₄, we find that persons with tertiary education and higher have a substantially increased probability of liking watching movies in the original language. The same is true for H₅, where the statistical results clearly show that persons with a highbrow orientation tend to watch movies

in dubbed versions. Furthermore, foreign language proficiency has a clear positive impact, as predicted by H₆.

Our second indicator of modes of cosmopolitan cultural consumption focuses on reading activities. Respondents were asked to indicate if they had read a book in a language other than their mother tongue in the last twelve months. The results presented in model 5 in Table 4 are strikingly similar to the results for film preferences.

5. Summary and Discussion

Our paper is an attempt to contribute to the emerging debate about cosmopolitan lifestyles. We have built our argument on the existing literature on cosmopolitanism in general, cosmopolitan attitudes, transnational relations and experiences, and the discussion in cultural consumption research about a shift towards more open and cosmopolitan lifestyles (Holt, 1997; Vertovec and Cohen, 2002; Szerszynski and Urry, 2002; Lizardo, 2005; Skrbis and Woodward, 2007; Woodward et al., 2008; Pichler, 2012; Roose et al., 2012; Prieur and Savage, 2013; Meuleman and Savage, 2013).

Our paper contributes to this discussion in three ways. First, we developed alternative measures of cosmopolitan consumption. The existing literature often uses proxy measures such as internet and new media use, or geographically restricted measures of transnational consumption, which focus on the Western world. In our paper, we tried to use indicators which focused on the geographic breadth of consumption (cf. the three models of cultural knowledge and taste). These measures are definitely not able to differentiate between various modes of cosmopolitan consumption. At this point, further research based on qualitative methods is needed (e. g. Capelliez and Johnston, 2013; Duruz, 2005). Second, we developed hypotheses about the determinants of cosmopolitan consumption, especially with regard to the role of cosmopolitan identifications, transnational social relations and experiences, and the stratification of this form of consumption based on different capital forms. Third, by analyzing the relationship between indicators of cosmopolitan consumption and measures of cosmopolitan identification, transnational relations and experiences, we attempted to show that cosmopolitan consumption is not as trivial as often assumed in the literature but is related to other forms of cosmopolitanism.

Our empirical results clearly point to the complex character of cosmopolitan consumption (for previous results: Duruz, 2005; Ollivier, 2008; Cappeliez and Johnston, 2013; Meuleman and Savage, 2013). On the one hand, the descriptive empirical evidence has shown that our respondents, though they belong to a nationally very heterogeneous and

transnational group, do not exhibit strong cosmopolitan consumption knowledge and tastes, at least according to the measures used. Since our measurement of cosmopolitan consumption is not based on a preference for cultural goods and services from only one country, but on the geographic breadth of preferences, a lower level of cosmopolitan preferences is to be expected, since one can expect a lower familiarity and preference for the non-Western cultural products chosen for our questionnaire (cf. Delhey et al., 2014).⁵ On the other hand, most of our indicators are related to identification as world citizen, to some form of transnational social relation or to some form of transnational experience. Thus, cosmopolitan consumption is part of a broader pattern of cosmopolitanism that is characterized by certain identifications, transnational relations, and experiences. Therefore, what is sometimes regarded as trivial cosmopolitan consumption is a meaningful component of a cosmopolitan syndrome, where different forms of cosmopolitanism go hand in hand. Based on our cross-sectional survey, we are of course not able to clearly specify the direction of causality with regard to the different dimensions of cosmopolitanism. Furthermore, since our heterogeneous sample may exhibit more variance with regard to the identification as world citizen, to transnational experiences and relations, some of our correlations may be stronger than in a simple random population sample of the resident population of Zurich.

Turning now to our second question, we were able to study the determinants of cosmopolitan cultural knowledge, tastes and modes of consumption from several theoretical perspectives. We hypothesized that these forms of consumption are related to supranational forms of identification (H_1). This was partly substantiated by empirical evidence, however, with the qualification that above all the identification as a world citizen was relevant (in two out of five cases), not the identification with Europe. Moreover, we expected that transnational social relations abet forms of cosmopolitan consumption (H_2). This was again borne out by the statistical analyses. However, it turned out that local social relations did not have any negative effect on the dependent variables and positive effects of social relations with persons in EU-27 countries failed statistical significance. Only strong social relations to persons living in non-EU-27 countries significantly and substantially fostered cosmopolitan consumption. Our next hypothesis (H_3) focused on the influence of transnational experiences on cosmopolitan consumption. Here we partly found support for the hypothesis. The number of continents visited during one's lifespan as well as longer stays abroad turned out to have a statistically significant positive effect for three of the five indicators. It is remarkable that identifications and transnational social relations are only statistically relevant if they lie outside of the European Union and are of a more global character. This may be explained by

the fact, that our measurement of cosmopolitan consumption had a focus on non-Western and non-European goods and services. Thus, it corresponds to global social relations and identifications, which transcend the European Union.

The following three hypotheses were based on the discussion about the class character of cosmopolitanism and focused on the relevance of three forms of capital as determinants of cosmopolitan consumption. Education as the most important form of institutionalized cultural capital (H₄) had a statistically significant impact on three of the five indicators of cosmopolitan consumption. Highbrow cultural orientation (H₅) is the only variable with a consistent positive effect on all indicators of cosmopolitan consumption. Our data clearly supports Bourdieu's notion that the aesthetic disposition of classical highbrow culture, with its focus on formal aesthetic aspects of arts and culture, lends itself to a transfer towards heterogeneous and foreign forms of culture and therefore also to cosmopolitan forms of consumption (cf. Bourdieu, 1984: 40–41; Cappeliez and Johnston, 2013; Ollivier, 2008; Rössel, 2011a). Finally, we included linguistic capital (H₆) as a further determinant in our models. It had four statistically significant effects on the five indicators of cosmopolitan consumption. The empirical evidence clearly shows that the three forms of capital are strong determinants of cosmopolitan cultural consumption. This indicates that cosmopolitan consumption is a form of class-based, maybe even distinctive type of lifestyle. As already shown in previous research the access to certain forms of cosmopolitan consumption is based on the resource-endowment of persons (Cappeliez and Johnston, 2013; Meuleman and Savage, 2013; Woodward et al., 2008). Furthermore, it appears to have a strong link to the traditional highbrow model of distinctive consumption. Thus the lifestyle axis depicting openness and cosmopolitanism does not replace the traditional highbrow dimension of the lifestyle space, but it is closely linked to it.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the European Science Foundation and the Swiss National Science Foundation. We have to thank the editors and the reviewers for their helpful criticism and suggestions.

Endnotes

1. A simple word count with the stem “cosmopol*” shows only 15 articles in 1980 in the Web of Science, which contained this stem. This rose only to 34 in 1990, but then to 224 in 2000 and 747 in 2010.

2. The means and distribution of all dependent and independent variables are available from the authors.
3. The means and distribution of all dependent and independent variables are available from the authors.
4. The IRR (Incidence rate ratio) provided in the tables gives the factor change in the average expected frequency of the dependent variable resulting from a one unit change in the independent variable. This is explained for the effect of linguistic capital in model 1.
5. So for example in the study by Meuleman and Savage high percentages of the their Dutch respondents like US-American films (67.6 %), books (44.7 %) or music (80.8 %) but a clearly smaller percentage of respondents indicated to like films (48.2 %), books (30.7 %) or music (36.5 %) from any non-Western country.

6. References

- Andreotti, A., Le Galés, P. and Moreno Fuentes, F.J., 2013. Transnational Mobility and Rootedness: The Upper Middle Class in European Cities. *Global Networks* 13, 41–59.
- Aspers, P., Godart F., 2013. Sociology of Fashion. Order and Change. *Annual Review of Sociology* 39, 171–192.
- Beck, U., 2000. The Cosmopolitan Perspective: Sociology of the Second Age of Modernity. *British Journal of Sociology* 51, 79–105.
- Bennett, T., Savage, M., Silva, E.B., Warde, A., Gayo-Cal, M., Wright, D., 2008. *Class, Culture, Distinction*. Routledge, London.
- Bourdieu, P., 1968. Outline of a Sociological Theory of Art Perception. *International Social Science Journal* 20, 589–612.
- Bourdieu, P., 1984. *Distinction. A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Bourdieu, P., 1990. Was heißt Sprechen? Die Ökonomie des sprachlichen Tausches. Braumüller, Wien.
- Calhoun, C., 2002. The Class Consciousness of Frequent Travelers: Toward a Critique of Actually Existing Cosmopolitanism. *South Atlantic Quarterly* 101, 869–897.
- Cameron, A.C., Trivedi, P.K., 1998. *Regression Analysis of Count Data*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Cappeliez, S., Johnston, J., 2013. From Meat and Potatoes to “Real-Deal” Rotis: Exploring Everyday Culinary Cosmopolitanism. *Poetics* 41, 433–455.
- Chamorro-Premuzic, T., Reimers, S., Hsu, A., Ahmetoglu, G., 2009. Who art thou? Personality Predictors of Artistic Preferences in a Large UK sample: the Importance of Openness. *British Journal of Psychology* 100, 501–516.

- Cleveland, M., Laroche, M., Papadopoulos, N., 2009. Cosmopolitanism, Consumer Ethnocentrism, and Materialism: An Eight-Country Study of Antecedents and Outcomes. *Journal of International Marketing* 17, 116–146.
- Delhey, J., Deutschmann, E., Graf, T., Richter K., 2014. Measuring the Europeanization of Everyday Life: Three New Indices and an Empirical Application. *European Societies* 16, 355–377.
- Díez Medrano, J., 2010. A New Society in the Making. European Integration and European Social Groups. KFG-Working Paper 12.
- DiMaggio, P., Mukhtar, T., 2004. Arts Participation as Cultural Capital in the United States, 1982–2002: Signs of Decline? *Poetics* 32, 169–204.
- Dowd, T., 2011. Production and Producers of Lifestyles. In: Rössel, J., Otte, G., (Eds.), *Lebensstilforschung (Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Special Issue 51)*. VS, Wiesbaden, pp. 113–138.
- Duruz, J., 2005. Eating at the Borders: Culinary Journeys. *Environment and Planning D. Society and Space* 23, 51–69.
- Favell, A., Recchi, E., Kuhn, T., Jensen, J.S., Klein, J., 2011. The Europeanisation of Everyday Life: Cross-Border Practices and Transnational Identifications among EU and Third-Country Citizens. EURO CROSS Working Paper # 1.
- Fligstein, N., 2008. *Euroclash. The EU, European Identity, and the Future of Europe*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Gerhards, J., 2012. From Babel to Brussels. European Integration and the Importance of Transnational Linguistic Capital. *Berlin Studies on the Sociology of Europe (BSSE) No. 28*. Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin.
- Gerhards, J., Rössel, J., 1999. Zur Transnationalisierung der Gesellschaft der Bundesrepublik. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 28 (5), 325–344.
- Gustafson, P., 2009. More Cosmopolitan, No Less Local. *European Societies* 11, 25–47.
- Hannerz, U., 1990. Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture. *Theory, Culture and Society* 7, 237–251.
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., Perraton, J., 1999. *Global Transformations. Politics, Economics and Culture*. Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- Holt, D.B., 1997. Poststructuralist Lifestyle Analysis: Conceptualizing the Social Patterning of Consumption in Postmodernity. *Journal of Consumer Research* 23, 326–350.
- Janssen, S., Kuipers, G., Verboord, M., 2008. Cultural Globalization and Arts Journalism: The International Orientation of Arts and Culture Coverage in Dutch, French, German, and U. S. Newspapers, 1955 – 2005. *American Sociological Review* 73, 719–740.
- Johnston, J., Baumann, S., 2007. Democracy versus Distinction: A Study of Omnivorousness in Gourmet Food Writing. *American Journal of Sociology* 113, 165–204.
- Kanton Zürich, 2013. Zwei Fünftel der Zürcher mit Migrationshintergrund. *Statistik.Info* 2013/5.

- Kuhn, T., 2011. Individual Transnationalism, Globalisation and Euroskepticism: An Empirical Test of Deutsch's Transactionalist Theory. *European Journal of Political Research* 50, 811–837.
- Kuhn, T., 2012. Europa Ante Portas: Border Residence, Transnational Interaction and Euroscepticism in Germany and France. *European Union Politics* 13, 94–117.
- Lamont, M., Aksartova, S., 2002. Ordinary Cosmopolitans: Strategies for Bridging Racial Boundaries among Working-Class men. *Theory, Culture and Society* 19, 1–25.
- Ley, D., 2004. Transnational Spaces and Everyday Lives. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 29, 151–164.
- Lizardo, O., 2005. Can Cultural Capital Theory be Reconsidered in the Light of World Polity Institutionalism? Evidence from Spain. *Poetics* 33, 81–110.
- Long, J.S., 1997. *Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables*. Sage, Thousand Oaks.
- Mau, S., 2010. *Transnationalism. Lifeworlds beyond the Nation-State*. Routledge, London/New York.
- Mau, S., Mewes, J., Zimmermann, A., 2008. Cosmopolitan Attitudes through Transnational Social Practices? *Global Networks* 8, 1–24.
- Mau, S., Mewes, J., 2012. Horizontal Europeanisation in Contextual Perspective. *European Societies* 14, 7–34.
- Merton, R.K., 1968. *Social Theory and Social Structure*. Free Press, New York.
- Meuleman, R., Bekhuis, H., Lubbers, M., Scheepers, P., 2012. Own Culture First? Nationalism and the Preference for National Cultural Goods. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*. Advance Access. doi: 10.1093/ijpor/eds024.
- Meuleman, R., Savage, M., 2013. A Field Analysis of Cosmopolitan Taste: Lessons from the Netherlands. *Cultural Sociology* 7, 230–256.
- Nagel, I., 2010. Cultural Participation between the Ages of 14 and 24: Intergenerational Transmission or Cultural Mobility? *European Sociological Review* 26, 541–556.
- Notten, N., Lancee, B., van de Werfhorst, H.G., Ganzeboom, H. B.G., 2014. Educational Stratification in Cultural Participation: Cognitive Competence or Status Motivation? *Journal of Cultural Economics*. Advance Access. doi: 10.1007/s10824-014-9218-1.
- Ollivier, M., 2008. Modes of Openness to Cultural Diversity: Humanist, Populist, Practical and Indifferent. *Poetics* 36, 120–147.
- Peterson, R.A., 2005. Problems in Comparative Research. The example of omnivorousness. *Poetics* 33, 257–282.
- Peterson, R.A., Kern, R.M., 1996. Changing Highbrow Taste: From Snob to Omnivore. *American Sociological Review* 61, 900–907.
- Pichler, F., 2008. How Real is Cosmopolitanism in Europe? *Sociology* 42, 1107–1126.

- Pichler, F., 2012. Cosmopolitanism in a Global Perspective: An International Comparison of Open-minded Orientations and Identity in Relation to Globalization. *International Sociology* 27, 21–50.
- Prieur, A., Skjott-Larsen, J., Rosenlund, L., 2008. Cultural Capital Today: A Case Study from Denmark. *Poetics* 36, 45–70.
- Prieur, A., Savage, M., 2013. Emerging Forms of Cultural Capital. *European Societies* 15, 246–267.
- Roose, H., van der Stichele, A., 2010. Living Room vs. Concert Hall. Patterns of Music Consumption in Flanders. *Social Forces* 89, 185–207.
- Roose, H., van Eijck, K., Lievens, J., 2012. Culture of Distinction or Culture of Openness? Using a Social Space Approach to Analyze the Social Structuring of Lifestyles. *Poetics* 40, 491–513.
- Rössel, J., 2011a. Cultural Capital and the Variety of Modes of Cultural Consumption in the Opera Audience. *Sociological Quarterly* 52(1), 83–103.
- Rössel, J., 2011b. Soziologische Theorien in der Lebensstilforschung. In: Rössel, J., Otte, G., (Eds.), *Lebensstilforschung (Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Special Issue 51)*. VS, Wiesbaden, 35–61.
- Rössel, J., 2012. Gibt es in der Schweiz soziale Schichten? *Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 38, 99–124.
- Rössel, J., Schroedter, J.H., 2013. Der Erwerb linguistischen Kapitals. Transnationales und Schweiz-spezifisches linguistisches Kapital im Vergleich. in Gerhards, Jürgen; Hans, Silke and Sören Carlson (eds.), *Globalisierung, Bildung und grenzüberschreitende Mobilität*. Wiesbaden: VS Springer.
- Schulze, G., 1992. *Die Erlebnisgesellschaft. Kultursoziologie der Gegenwart*. Campus, Frankfurt.
- Schroedter, J.H., Rössel, J., 2013. Codebook of the EUMARR Survey: Switzerland. http://www.suz.uzh.ch/schroedter/forschung/Codebook_EUMARR_Switzerland_V1.pdf
- Schroedter, J.H., Rössel, J., 2014: Europeanization without European Union? The Case of Bi-National Marriages in Switzerland. *Population, Space and Place* 20: 139–156.
- Skrbis, Z., Woodward, I., 2007. The Ambivalence of Ordinary Cosmopolitans: Investigating the Limits of Cosmopolitan Openness. *Sociological Review* 55, 730–747.
- Stryker, S., Burke, P.J., 2000. The Past, Present and Future of an Identity Theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 63, 284–297.
- Szerszynski, B., Urry, J., 2002. Cultures of Cosmopolitanism. *Sociological Review* 50, 461–481.
- Taylor, P.J., 2005. Leading World Cities. Empirical Evaluations of Urban Nodes in Multiple Networks. *Urban Studies* 42, 1593–1608.
- Thompson, C.J., Tambyah, S.K., 1999. Trying to be Cosmopolitan. *Journal of Consumer Research* 26, 214–241.

- Van Eijck, K., 2011. Vertical Life Style Differentiation: Resources, Boundaries, and the Changing Manifestations of Social Inequality. In: Rössel J., Otte G., (Eds.): *Lebensstilforschung (Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Special Issue 51)*. VS, Wiesbaden, pp. 247–268.
- Vertovec, S., Cohen, R., 2002. *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context, Practice*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Waldinger, R., 2009. Beyond transnationalism: An alternative perspective on immigrants' homeland connections. In: Rosenblum, M., und Daniel T. (Eds.). *Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, 74–83.
- Warde, A., Martins, L., Olsen, W., 1999. Consumption and the Problem of Variety: Cultural Omnivorousness, Social Distinction and Dining Out. *Sociology* 33, 105–127.
- Woodward, I., Skrbis, Z., Bean, C., 2008. Attitudes towards Globalization and Cosmopolitanism: Cultural Diversity; Personal Consumption and the National Economy. *British Journal of Sociology* 59, 207–226.