

Conceptualizing the Field

Consuming the Other, Marketing Difference

Woodward, Ian; Emontspool, Julie

Published in:
Cosmopolitanism, Markets, and Consumption

DOI:
10.1007/978-3-319-64179-9_2

Publication date:
2018

Document version:
Accepted manuscript

Citation for published version (APA):
Woodward, I., & Emontspool, J. (2018). Conceptualizing the Field: Consuming the Other, Marketing Difference. In J. Emontspool, & I. Woodward (Eds.), *Cosmopolitanism, Markets, and Consumption: A Critical Global Perspective* (pp. 11-37). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-64179-9_2

Go to publication entry in University of Southern Denmark's Research Portal

Terms of use

This work is brought to you by the University of Southern Denmark.
Unless otherwise specified it has been shared according to the terms for self-archiving.
If no other license is stated, these terms apply:

- You may download this work for personal use only.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying this open access version

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details and we will investigate your claim.
Please direct all enquiries to puresupport@bib.sdu.dk

CONCEPTUALIZING THE FIELD. CONSUMING THE OTHER, MARKETING DIFFERENCE

IAN WOODWARD AND JULIE EMONTSPOOL

Reference:

Woodward, I., & Emontspool, J. (2018). Conceptualizing the Field: Consuming the Other, Marketing Difference. in J. Emontspool, & I. Woodward (eds.), *Cosmopolitanism, Markets, and Consumption: A Critical Global Perspective* (pp. 11-37). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

The concept of cosmopolitanism is an idea of ancient philosophical origin now rejuvenated within a variety of research fields and increasingly applied across the social sciences and humanities. Though deployed in various ways, at its core it houses a family of associated concepts related to understanding practices and structures of seeking connection and dialogue with culturally different others. Within this broad frame, cosmopolitanism is composed of multiple intellectual threads, including being a normative philosophy, ethical habits, modes of transnational governance, a socio-cultural process, and a cultural practice (Vertovec and Cohen, 2002; Beck, 2006; Beck and Sznaider, 2006; Woodward, Skrbis and Bean, 2008). In the context of this book, building on the idea that cosmopolitanism assists researchers in exploring encounters with diversity in everyday settings (Hannerz, 1990; Nussbaum, 1996; Appiah, 2006; Delanty, 2011), we explore the mediation and possibilities of these encounters in the context of consumption practices, consumer experience, and market processes.

Cosmopolitanism has captured the imaginations of researchers because it represents social and political critique and hope, and because it offers a rigorous, expansive and innovative body of theory for conceptualising the hybrid and relational aspects of the globally-networked social world. The ancient idea that a person could be a citizen of the world has never seemed so concrete in technological terms, nor so ethically and politically necessary, until recent times. Not only are there more opportunities for various types of mobilities and engagements with difference and Otherness in both local and global settings, there are compelling reasons and demands for an ethics that connects universal values with practices of respect for local value and difference (Appiah, 2006). The demands and opportunities of a cosmopolitan ethics are multi-scalar; they offer as much for urgent global problems related to extreme inequalities and geo-political complexities related to refugees and asylum seekers, as they do for having respect for difference and diversity within local neighbourhoods.

In the last decade or so, picking up on the utility of the cosmopolitanism concept, researchers have begun to empirically explore meanings and practices of cosmopolitan openness and ethics in a variety of forms and settings (Delanty, 2012; Rovisco and Nowicka, 2011). In this collection we adopt a similar strategy, but take a particular focus on cosmopolitan ethics as mediated and experienced through market arrangements and consumption practices. Such a juxtaposition of fields might at first seem incompatible. There is a long-standing, seemingly instinctive, tendency in political and social thought to counterpose markets and consumption practices as profane and in opposition to the ethics of care, hospitality and progressive social change embedded in cosmopolitan ideals. We do not seek to

take the opposite point of view and argue for the inherent goodness of market processes, far from it, but we do at least wish to explore scientifically and from various actor and network positions the complexities, contradictions, and relational processes embedded within global markets and consumption practices. Forcefully adopting a similar position in his review of the relationship between conceptions of civic life and consumption, Schudson critiques this anomaly, stating that ‘marketers may romanticize consumers, but social critics are unlikely to’, and that the default tendency is to suggest that ‘either consumption is in itself unvirtuous because it seeks the individual’s own pleasures, or its displacement of political activity has unfortunate consequences for the social good’ (Schudson, 2007, p. 237). He concludes that ‘it is high time to put both of these notions in the trash rather than the recycling bin’ (Schudson, 2007, p. 237).

The myopic pattern which finds markets, consumption, and ethics to be mutually exclusive categories is found repeatedly in the field of cosmopolitanism studies, where the political and ethical dimensions of the idea are assumed to be unattainable through anything except an unlikely utopian combination of pure thought, world government, and reflexive ethical deliberation. Researchers have tended, for example, to passively endorse Calhoun’s well-known, searing critique of the class basis and naive optimism of cosmopolitanism: ‘food, tourism, music, literature and clothes are all easy faces of cosmopolitanism, but they are not hard tests for the relationship between local solidarity and international civil society’ (Calhoun, 2002, p. 105). Calhoun’s argument about the easy and soft faces of cosmopolitanism seems straightforward, and in some contexts is undoubtedly correct, as a range of empirical evidence can show. In its appeal to critical values it is also certainly politically viable, but it doesn’t necessarily make for good social science. By working with a contrastive distinction about the inherent incompatibility between cosmopolitan solidarity and democracy on the one hand, and everyday forms of cosmopolitanism on the other, his argument is destined never to find the truth about either. We are steadfastly against making such assumptions, and wish to at least leave open our research imaginations to identifying the cosmopolitan possibilities – and points of closure of cosmopolitan values and practices - afforded via various types of consumption practices and market arrangements.

Our argument is based on the understanding that transnational flows of things, people and images not only create possibilities for cosmopolitan consumption scapes, but that in various ways – both positive and negative as explored by authors in this collection - consumer practices and market systems might mediate, network and perform cosmopolitan ethics. In their important empirical reflection on this topic, Szerszynski and Urry (2002) suggested that the selling of mundane forms of cosmopolitan style may go hand-in-hand with more fundamental and progressive social-structural changes. Rather than being mere surface features, and apparently trivial aspects of globalization, they do, in fact, have an important symbolic value and are harbingers of wider social changes. On the side of leisure and lifestyle, we have travel shows and newspapers based around food, adventure and dimensions of luxury and mobile discovery; on the political and economic side, daily news devotes itself to international events, traumas and dramas, which can either suggest to us the need to cocoon and insulate ourselves further from the world, or can also encourage us to take actions which confirm our own investment in the global meaning of social events.

In this chapter, we begin by discussing these processes as they are based in research literatures within the fields of sociology and business and marketing studies, offering an overview of existing research linking cosmopolitanism and consumption. Additionally, we further delineate current challenges and questions emerging from the cosmopolitan agenda in global marketplaces.

PHILOSOPHICAL ROOTS OF AN AESTHETIC AND ETHICAL CONCEPT: THE IDEA IN ANTIQUITY

It would be incorrect to understand the interest in cosmopolitanism as something novel, forged solely from late-globalisation processes around mobilities and media. Undoubtedly the renewed interest in cosmopolitanism emerges from awareness of the ethical possibilities afforded by such flows and globally networked scapes. As sociologists alert to the historical origins of the cosmopolitanism concept have shown (Inglis, 2012, 2013; Turner, 2006), it has a noteworthy lineage and although in modern terms its essence is inherently about forms of social solidarity, the cosmopolitan ideal can be traced back to antiquity, specifically having its origins in the philosophical thought of the Cynics and Stoics. In ancient Greece, Diogenes of Sinope, founder of the Cynic school, provides a foundational statement on the meaning of the concept which continues to provide a key reference point for contemporary understandings. Diogenes declared himself to be *a-polis* (without a city), *a-oikos* (without a home) and *kosmopolites* (a citizen of the universe) (Inglis, 2012). Advocating a radical universal position, Diogenes's statement provided a challenge to the meaning of citizenship in ancient Greece, resonating today as an ideal standing as a significant challenge to contemporary conceptions of citizenship. In the first place, his statement denied the value of an exclusive belonging to the Greek polis. In addition, as a related principle which is at the core of cosmopolitan ethics, the statement emphasises that an individual might feel a sense of belonging to the community of the world as a whole. The question of what such a sense of belonging might entail, and the extent of its commitment to distant others in the world, is a – or, perhaps *the* - essential cosmopolitan question. The simplicity of Diogenes's statement, in its attractive combination of freedom to have mobility around the world coupled with a strong sense of commitment to universal values of humanity, still resonates as an *ur*-statement on the meaning of cosmopolitanism. As illustrated by Inglis (2012), Roman Stoics such as Marcus Aurelius and Cicero further developed the sentiment of a universal brotherhood within the context of the Roman empire by advancing the idea that there was a common citizenship and that the world was to be understood as a single state or city so that care could be extended to people everywhere, regardless of borders or nationalities.

In the writings of Enlightenment philosopher Immanuel Kant, we see a complex, idealised sense of cosmopolitan values related to the governing role of states, cooperation amongst nations, and conditional forms of hospitality to citizens from outside the nation. For Kant, world peace is associated with free states, the equality of citizens, and with rational forms of freedom where people subject themselves to reasonable lawful constraints in the interests of community good. In relation to his cosmopolitan vision, Kant saw world history as driven by a principle of peaceful evolution, where war and hostility were eventually deemed incompatible with meeting human and social interests and so peaceful means of cooperation were required and especially facilitated through commercial exchange and contract. The history of the world was associated with the flow and spread of people across the planet and the inherent potential for conflict based on cultural differences such as language or religion. With the growth of international trade and the spirit of commerce, over time what necessarily develops is a system of peaceful relations between states, and between cooperating individuals. From this arise the grounds for a 'universal cosmopolitan condition', such that a violation of the rights of people in one part of the world is experienced as a violation of human rights, as if the population were an entity with universally agreed human values. While globalization processes provide the opportunity for exploitation and conflict, for example via colonial processes and processes

of economic extraction, a normative philosophy of cosmopolitan virtues provides a potential counterpoint to such processes and an implicit valuing of universal human values.

Thinkers in classical sociology and social philosophy such as Marx, Durkheim, Saint-Simon, and Comte all explored aspects of cosmopolitanism, the effects of global capitalism on the formation of forms of international solidarity, possibilities for the formation of a world society, the balance between national and cosmopolitan forms of social belonging, and the changing character of obligations to others. In the *Communist Manifesto*, Marx famously commented on the cosmopolitan character of capitalist production and consumption, yet his suggestion served to show how systems of economic extraction and exploitation required cosmopolitan outlooks for strategic purposes. It was not until the 1990s that cosmopolitanism once again became a topic of intense research interest and philosophical speculation, spurred on partly by the extensive, growing literatures on globalization and their suggestion that the opportunities for global connections might foster renewed possibilities for identities and solidarities beyond the local and national. Important works by Nussbaum (1996), Beck (2002a; 2006), Cohen (1996), Appiah (1996), Vertovec and Cohen (2003) and Held (1995), all consolidated the growing interest in cosmopolitanism and sparked debates and research innovation across the social sciences and humanities more broadly.

COSMOPOLITANISM: DEFINITION AND DIMENSIONS

Cosmopolitanism as a field of research continues to effervesce and evolve dynamically in a range of disciplinary areas, yet as Skrbiš, Kendall, and Woodward (2004) argued in their sociological take on the topic, definitional variations, empirical fuzziness, and conceptual gaps and contradictions still characterise the field. Such diversity of approaches gives the field vitality and relevance, but also demands additional definitional clarity. To this end, the fundamental distinction made by Beck between cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitanisation allows us to differentiate between cosmopolitanism as a political and cultural philosophy and ideal, and cosmopolitanisation as a social process. Such a distinction, though basic, helps us to heuristically distinguish normative and philosophical elements from complexities of socio-cultural interactions and practices. In the following discussion we elaborate this distinction with an eye on key positions in existing consumer research on the topic.

On the one hand, we can understand cosmopolitanism as a political philosophy and ethical ideal of openness and connection to others who are distant to, or different from ourselves, by virtue of important identity markers such as nationality, ethnicity, or religiosity, for example. In sociological research and in the context of the framing power of consumption practices, the study by Woodward, Skrbiš, and Bean (2008) operationalized cosmopolitanism in such a way, weighing-up preferences for consumer cosmopolitanism in terms of choice, variety and self-enhancement against anxieties about threats to national identity and the perceived health of the national economy posed by global processes. This field of research is by now very large. 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). As a cultural phenomenon, cosmopolitanism is defined by an engagement with and 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 amongst citizen-publics that are grounded in cultural-symbolic competencies founded in a type of ‘code-switching’ capacity (Bernstein, 1972; Chaney, 2002; Emmison, 2003; Hall, 2000), and an expanded, inclusive ethical core emphasizing worldliness and communitarianism (Hannerz, 1990; Nussbaum, 1996; Tomlinson, 1999). Now the literatures defining these characteristics are relatively well-established, new questions arise about their robustness, stability across social settings, and their basis in networks, spaces, materials and zones of social performativity.

On the other hand, and developing the previous point, we can highlight the process of cosmopolitanisation, which refers to the gradual process of social, cultural and political change whereby individuals and social institutions orient themselves to the challenges and opportunities posed by new forms of transnational, global mobility and interconnections. The strong theoretical approach is best exemplified in the work by Beck and colleagues (2006; see also Beck and Sznaider, 2006 and Beck, 2012), who present a vision of cosmopolitanism fitted with an epistemological core that challenges the basis of mainstream social scientific 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, p. 4). The newly emerging interdependencies of culture, politics, environment and economy call for a radical break with the nation-state centric tradition of doing social science research.

Because it reminds us that cosmopolitanism is both a social fact attributable in part to increased global mobilities, and also a process of socio-cultural change that it is neither guaranteed nor complete, this distinction between the mechanics and processes of movements of people and things on the one hand, and on the other the ethical, political and cultural modes for responding to such processes is important. More broadly, this conceptual distinction comes to constitute the central difference between theories of globalization conceived as the study of the mechanics of mobilities and fluidities unfixed from constraints of time and space, in contrast to the ethical, normative challenge of how these processes affect socio-cultural and political structures of social solidarity. Though the former group of processes provide the background and substance for cosmopolitan possibilities, they are neither necessary, nor sufficient, for it to happen. On the other hand, this latter ethical dimension is probably the essence of cosmopolitanism theory and its expression in forms of everyday practice, paralleling broader studies about ethical consumption (Littler, 2008).

When we examine existing studies around cosmopolitanism and markets, we can see that they have predominantly approached cosmopolitanism from two main directions, detailed in the following sections: (1) market-driven intercultural exchanges taking their roots in transnationalism and globalization studies as well as other theories of cultural contact, and (2) linkages of cosmopolitan consumption with status, mobilities and power.

MARKET-DRIVEN INTERCULTURAL EXCHANGE

Cosmopolitanism studies inscribe themselves within the larger field of research regarding contacts between cultures in a global market, approached in sociology, in marketing and consumer research as well as in other disciplines. Studies about cross-cultural consumption (Howes, 1996; Miller, 1995; Brewer and Trentmann, 2006; Steiner, 1994) have provided valuable insights relative to the ways in which global flows of people, products, money and information shape contemporary societies (Appadurai, 1990). In addition to directing our focus on a multiplication of cultures in contact, which

can be part of cross-cultural consumption studies but is not automatically included, adopting a cosmopolitanism lens allows for a focus on ideological and ethical consequences of the conscious adoption of consumption behaviour centred on cultural diversity.

In marketing and consumer research, this linkage between cross-cultural consumption and cosmopolitanism has been explored in such a way, addressing how cosmopolitan adoption of other cultures' products relates to and contrasts with consumer ethnocentrism rejecting such products (Carpenter et al., 2013; Zeugner-Roth, Zabkar, and Diamantopoulos, 2015; Cleveland, Laroche, and Papadopoulos, 2009; Roth, 2006; Lee and Mazodier, 2015). In this context, the concept of consumer cosmopolitanism has mostly been used as a characteristic determining consumer product choice, purchasing behaviour, and responses to brand origin (Yoon, Cannon, and Yaprak, 1986). Consumer cosmopolitanism thereby represents a socio-cultural trait, understood as a set of habits, practices and tastes, influencing consumers' purchase and consumption decisions (Cleveland, Laroche, and Papadopoulos, 2009). The construct of consumer cosmopolitanism then becomes an index or variable constituted by three key dimensions: (1) open-mindedness, (2) diversity appreciation, and (3) consumption transcending borders (Riefler, Diamantopoulos, and Siguaw 2012).

Chapter 3 in this book, written by Eva Kipnis, critically discusses the contributions and limitations of such an approach. It proposes avenues for updating current studies in consumer behaviour such as described in the previous paragraph using advances in the field of sociology. Furthermore, it offers a specific focus regarding cosmopolitan consumption in multicultural marketplaces (Demangeot, Broderick, and Craig, 2015), where cultural diversity becomes commonplace, and where we might observe a shifting landscape of the production and consumption of difference.

STATUS, MOBILITY AND DISTINCTION. CONSUMING OTHERNESS AND ENHANCING SELF

Research into cosmopolitanism tends to enact and reproduce important skeins in the field of sociological consumption studies, addressing cosmopolitan consumption as a form of cultural appropriation in a global world, as a mode of distinction, and as a way of acquiring and performing cultural capital. In both the sociological field of consumption, and consumption in marketing and business studies, the figure of Bourdieu directly and indirectly looms large when considering the links between consuming difference, social status and cultural capital. Working from this tradition, the strongest and most visible framework for making sense of cosmopolitanism is by conceiving it as a practice related to the performance and acquisition of social status and cultural capital. This skein is founded upon a Bourdieusian logic of the social distributions and uses of taste and analysis of the marketised field dynamics of cultural production which also draw upon and shape relations of cultural and economic capital (Bourdieu, 1984). Building on this field more directly, it develops from more recent research literatures on omnivorous consumption which extended Bourdieu's insights to take account of shifting social structures and opportunities around class, locality and global mobility. In these literatures, the underlying assumption is that cosmopolitanism is a practice which asserts specialised, globally-oriented tastes as a means of demonstrating cultural superiority, or as a badge of distinction (Cappellini, Parsons, and Harmanj 2016; Emontspool and Georgij 2016) . The cosmopolitan has a breadth of knowledge and experience within diverse cultural and consumption settings, the technical and intellectual resources or 'capital' to gain employment across national boundaries, and typically has an ability to traverse, consume, appreciate and empathize with cultural symbols and practices that originate outside their home country (Hannerz, 1990; Skrbis and Woodward, 2011).

In this sense, we could think of the cosmopolitan as similar to the cultural omnivore identified in literatures on aesthetic tastes, who has an ability to appreciate and discern rules and repertoires associated with cultural symbols or forms that originate across cultural boundaries (Peterson, 1992; Peterson and Kern, 1996). Within sociology, it is from Peterson's research on omnivorous cultural consumption that the groundwork has emerged for this understanding of the emergence of the cosmopolitan consumer. Originally operationalized as a means of working with Bourdieu in different social and historical contexts, Peterson (1990) asserted the importance of newly marketised global and world musics for cultural consumption patterns amongst elites. Taking quite a radical departure from Bourdieu, if not in methodology and approach but in terms of conceptualisation and findings, Peterson and his colleagues assembled evidence to show the situation had quite strongly shifted from univorous consumption which mapped closely onto cultural location and class, towards omnivorous consumption and the intermingling of diverse aesthetic genres and consumption styles across social and taste groups. In Peterson's case, such a process was explained in part by reference to diversifying music markets and the globalisation of musical genres (for a later interpretation, see Regev, 2013). Whatever the modes of aesthetic circulation, omnivorousness also becomes a symbol of specialised cultural knowledge and appreciation, linked more broadly to enhanced social status and moral worthiness. Thus, while the omnivore is generally understood through the diversity or range of consumption preferences, by musical genre or cuisine types for example, cosmopolitanism crucially, and perhaps problematically in terms of measurements of linkages between practices, attitudes, and values, addresses the ethical dimensions of such processes. It is a particular type of cultural capital that demonstrates one is able to appreciate the cultural products and practices of others, suggesting openness, awareness, and flexibility which are 'important resources in a society that requires social and geographical mobility, "employability", and "social networking"' (Van Eijck, 2000, p. 221). Such a credential is understood as an important emergent form of capital in a globalising world, as Peterson and Kern (1996, 906) argued in their seminal piece on the topic:

"While snobbish exclusion was an effective marker of status in a relatively homogeneous and circumscribed WASP-ish world that could enforce its dominance over all others by force if necessary, omnivorous inclusion seems better adapted to an increasingly global world managed by those who make their way, in part, by showing respect for the cultural expressions of others."

One of the first to cross the sociology and marketing studies divide within this area was sociologically-inspired marketing scholar Douglas Holt, working within and also somewhat against key traditions in US-based sociological studies of culture. One of the first references to cosmopolitanism in consumer research finds itself in his studies concerning consumption differences between consumers of high- and low cultural capital (Holt, 1998). Consumers possessing high cultural capital tend to engage in a conscious search for cultural diversity and exotic experiences. They are thereby often 'early adopters of novel, exotic or otherwise sophisticated social trends' (Holt, 1998, p. 61). In its earlier conceptualizations, consumer research therefore attributes local and cosmopolitan orientations to individuals of lower and higher cultural capital respectively, high cultural capital enabling individuals to incorporate multiple cultures in their lifestyle and develop a taste for the exotic (Holt, 1998).

Along with linkage to high cultural capital, cosmopolitanism has been connected to mobility, privilege and power. Thompson and Tambyah (1999) for instance frame consumer cosmopolitanism as a set of consumptive and identity opportunities which are afforded as remnants of colonialism (Thompson and

Tambyah, 1999). This colonial legacy of expatriation and cosmopolitanism is illustrated through the travels by expatriates from more privileged regions of the world to emerging economies (Tambyah and Subrahmanyam, 2001; Hutchings, Michailova, and Harrison, 2013). In such a view, we can see a progressive cosmopolitanisation of global elites, and their desire to perform cosmopolitan detachments from local context. Such a sentiment also continues to frame sociological theory and research, notably promoted by Calhoun (2002) in his piece on the cosmopolitan ‘class-consciousness’ of frequent flyers. The motif of the cosmopolitan as privileged, globally mobile, and in possession of surplus capitals has thereby become one dominant motif in cosmopolitan studies: for example, Kanter’s (1995) ‘world class’, Kirwan-Taylor’s (2002) ‘cosmocrats’, Calhoun’s (2002) ‘frequent travelers’, or Hannerz’s (2004) ‘foreign correspondents’.

Cosmopolitan consumption practices and their expression as cosmopolitan ethics thereby relate in complex ways to mobilities. Temporary migrants, sometimes also called ‘sojourners’, are mostly seen as cosmopolitan (Luedicke, 2011; Visconti et al., 2014). Sojourners’ temporary stay is assumed to encourage them to live out their cosmopolitan ideals by exploring the diversity of multiple host environments in addition to home and host cultures (Jafari and Visconti, 2014; Thompson and Tambyah, 1999). Especially migrants with high cultural capital are more readily conceptualized as cosmopolitans (Grinstein and Wathieu, 2012; Hutchings, Michailova, and Harrison, 2013). In this type of approach, the cosmopolitan is then identified as a relatively privileged social actor, distinguished by a command of resources – financial, cultural and social - that enhance mobility of various kinds and allow, if desired or needed, a capacity for detachment from local settings.

This important tradition of empirical research into the rise of the so-called ‘global consumer’ has extended into more critical and generalized reflections on the power relationships inherent in ‘consuming the other’. Critically developing Bourdieu’s approach, Skeggs (2004) argued that to command such cultural resources and to ‘consume’ them, or become entangled with them for the purposes of building or enhancing self, amounts to a subjectivity of entitlement which once again alerts us to the power relations inherent in some forms of cosmopolitan consumption. If cosmopolitans are indeed particular types of ‘symbolic specialists’ (Kendall, Woodward, and Skrbis, 2009) who are culturally equipped with specialised ways of consuming and appropriating or using cultural difference to enhance status, then cosmopolitan forms of consumption represent a type of social power. It may indeed be a way of ‘eating the other’ (Hooks, 1992), which is imbued with a politics of domination. As Hage (1998) has also argued forcefully, this style of participatory, pleasurable ‘cosmo-multiculturalism’ (Hage, 1998), complete with the indulgence of fantasies of authenticity, fosters an individual’s accumulation of transnational symbols, and his or her experience of another culture, such as food, or way of life. Here there is an observable dual process occurring: such consumption purports to suggest that otherness is valued on its own terms, but at the same time it tends to value certain forms of otherness, frequently for the purpose of enhancing self, and through categories established via legitimated means of cultural authority (Warde, Martens, and Olsen, 1999). In this sense, it is an appropriation based upon certain moral attributions: it knows what is to be valued, it knows what is culturally useful and it knows what potential uses such resources could be put. In short, being a type of claim for refinement or superior knowledge, such practices becomes incorporated into games of status.

The links between social class and cosmopolitan practices, at least in terms of various forms of convivialities, practicalities and cultural repertoires of ‘getting along’, have thus been argued to be less clear than first imagined (Datta, 2009; Werbner, 1999; Lamont and Aksartova, 2002; Chytкова

and Kjeldgaard, 2011). It might be the case that exposure and access to cosmopolitan scripts and outlooks is becoming more open and free, though the way these scripts are expressed and the power one has to make them work in particular ways becomes the key question and matter of interest. Chapter 4 by Cicchelli and Octobre provides some first answers in this respect, studying aesthetic cosmopolitan consumption among younger generations of consumers (18-29 years). Expanding the work on cosmopolitanism into the realm of cultural products such as comic strips, movies, magazines and games, they detail how generations who grew up with globalization consume in a cosmopolitan way. The authors find that cosmopolitan consumption among young people remains socially stratified in France, but that socio-cultural differentiations of upbringing, linguistic competence and gender give rise to new configurations of cosmopolitan consumption.

CHANGING CONTEXTS FOR COSMOPOLITANISM

Social scientific studies exploring cosmopolitanism and consumption very often take as starting point the individual consumer, as if they alone initiate and coordinate particular avenues of consumptive choice. As the markets perspective shows, and as mainstream sociological critiques have also argued (Warde, 1994, for example), consumer choice is merely one side of the story and must be situated within relevant market and circulation structures. Cosmopolitanism, however, demands the adoption of a broader frame which can be related to two dimensions: on the one hand, cosmopolitanism requires a cosmopolitanisation not only of individual consumption practices, but also of the material and spatial structures and networks in which the consumer is embedded. On the other hand, individuals' increased reflexivity about globalization processes (Giddens, 1991; Robertson, 1992) leads them to pay more attention to ethical and moral questions related to cosmopolitan world citizenship. Each of these dimensions is detailed in the following sections, along with indications as to how the chapters in this collection contribute to each dimension.

MATERIAL AND SPATIAL IMPLICATIONS

Our take on cosmopolitanisation processes, a premise of this book, is that for most people 'being cosmopolitan' is based around and afforded by various types of consumption practices, ideals and discourses. In addition, and, alongside skills, competences and capitals, the capacity for people to 'be cosmopolitan' cannot be attained without the organization of transnational markets which provide opportunities for cosmopolitan types of exchange. Market environments such as supermarkets, for example, become increasingly cosmopolitan in their product offers, selling products originating from diverse countries in the world (Maxwell and DeSoucey, 2016). Existing research has focused on how complications and antinomies of consuming cultural difference are articulated in social contexts. Reducing intercultural exchanges to market interactions, status games and propertised processes of cultural accumulation overlooks facets of everyday or routine interaction which occur in everyday settings and domains. For example, Mica Nava's (2007) historical research shows how cosmopolitanism was organized to exist within the decoration and product range of large department stores in early twentieth century London. Promoted by commercial interests as an alternative to what certain entrepreneurs saw as stultifying and insular forms of traditional British modernism, this form of popular cosmopolitanism existed within the sphere of commerce, and was able to use the pleasures of shopping to introduce notions of exoticness and difference, and to give expression to the idea of London as a cosmopolitan city. In contemporary settings, Anderson (2004) has developed the idea of a 'cosmopolitan canopy', usefully indicating the spatial dimension of everyday cosmopolitanism where mixing occurs across the usual boundaries of class and race as routinal components of everyday

life. One might also refer to the contemporary cultural festival as a space of cultural cosmopolitanism (Delanty, Giorgi, and Sassatelli, 2011). The contemporary festival has become one principle site for representing, encountering, incorporating and understanding aspects of cultural community and cultural difference (Bennett, Taylor, and Woodward, 2014). We therefore assert that a significant yet comparatively understudied component is the underpinning of cosmopolitanism in market arrangements, production systems, symbolic representations that perform the desiring and dreaming of difference, and emergent consumption practices that allow people to ‘eat the other’.

The relevance of questions about consumption to the field of cosmopolitanism should be seen both in macro and micro contexts, and what is to be highlighted are indeed the connections between both scales which are themselves subject to instabilities and shifts. At the macro social scale, cosmopolitanism matters if we think both in terms of the glocal character of marketization processes and systems of global commodity construction, extraction and circulation. Things circulate, and as they circulate they are symbolic carriers of difference and distinction which rely on an aesthetics of difference, but they are also ‘agencements’ (MacKenzie, 2008), which articulate and shape the cosmopolitan nature of the social. Given the role of urban settings as hubs for cosmopolitanism (Yeoh, 2005), cities and rural environments gradually dissociate, global cities for instance becoming more similar to each other than to the countryside around them (Sassen, 2000; 2010). Global cities are thereby crucial nodes in a global world, where creativity and innovation, the excitement cosmopolitans long for, is widely accessible (Yeoh, 2005; Rojas Gaviria and Emontspool, 2015). These places promote contact with multiple cultures (Kipnis, Broderick, and Demangeot, 2013), encouraging cosmopolitanism possibilities. Riegel (Chapter 5) provides a further perspective on this theme, illustrating cosmopolitan consumption in Brazil, which dissociates cosmopolitan consumption from its colonial heritage of expatriation and cosmopolitanism highlighted in previous studies (Thompson and Tambyah, 1999).

Beyond this, and what extends such processes well beyond globalization, is that the nature of what people consume and how they consume it, including the meanings they assign, is consciously or unconsciously changed by such regimes. With the increase and acceleration of global mobility (Appadurai, 1990; Robertson, 1992), consumers nowadays have the ability to ‘interact with the people, products and norms of multiple cultures in a variety of marketplace situations’ (Demangeot et al., 2014, p. 3). Multicultural marketplaces where a large cultural diversity co-exists in one place thereby become increasingly common (Demangeot and Sankaran, 2012). Thus, we can talk of various types of global consumers, and consumers of difference, from omnivores, to polyvores, to cosmopolitans. For example, using the case of the restaurant ‘Red Rooster’ in Harlem, Figueiredo, Bean and Larsen (chapter 6) develop an exploration of how the material setting of a service environment supports cosmopolitan consumption. They find that the material semiotics of objects in a place enable cosmopolitan performances, activated differentially by the restaurant’s clientele.

As a consequence, multiple levels of analysis (co-)exist for research about cosmopolitan consumption. These levels can be micro-societal (individual level), meso-societal (cosmopolitan communities of consumption) or macro-societal (a cosmopolitan world system of societies taking inspiration from Robertson [1992]), but also reflect cosmopolitan cities, cosmopolitan companies and more. A critical global perspective on cosmopolitan consumption needn’t integrate all levels, but at the least, it should consider the potential interrelations between these levels. For instance, the study of individual consumers’ cosmopolitanism may be “moderated” by their residence in a cosmopolitan city such as Singapore (Yeoh, 2005), and differ from individual consumption behaviour in rural environments, or

less cosmopolitan cities. De la Fuente's chapter in this collection, Chapter 7, extends this argument even further by exploring the material surfaces that communicate and afford cosmopolitan ambience and performance. Moving beyond material culture studies' interest in object or thing circulation, de la Fuente applies this analysis of surfaces to consider how texture, surface, and the 'skins' of social experience can circulate moral and ethical values.

ETHICAL AND MORAL COSMOPOLITANISMS

Cosmopolitanism as a political and cultural program is partly about politics, governance, ethical outlooks, inclusive policies, boundaries and porousness of the nation-state. The idea of cosmopolitanism describes a social, cultural and political process whereby people can feel connection not only to local and national others and territories of belonging, but to the world as a whole. Cosmopolitanism also is often taken to refer to a general orientation of openness, including an open and receptive attitude towards the geographically, culturally, and embodied Other, and the possibility of some form of connection and dialogue with people and things that are culturally different to oneself. Cosmopolitanism thus also involves a process of decentring oneself and one's own socio-cultural values in favour of understanding points of universal human commonality, and reflexively seeing cultural differences as an opportunity for growth, dialogue and connection, rather than separation.

All these things form part of the intellectual universe of discussions about cosmopolitanism. The development of cosmopolitanism is in large part enabled by transnational mobilities of people and things and is thus an idea apparently well suited to a super-diverse global age. However its' ethical demands are complex and not necessarily directly tied to such processes. Indeed, they might develop in ways which directly counter such directions. Studies about cosmopolitanism and consumption have laid a large accent on aesthetic cosmopolitanism. Yet cosmopolitanism also includes a political perspective with a view to planetary implications, considering 'global governance, world democracy and moral debates regarding human rights' (Germann Molz, 2011, p. 33). Cosmopolitanism involves a universal responsibility towards other inhabitants of this world (Appiah, 2007). From such a perspective, equality and solidarity across nations become increasingly relevant (Nowicka and Rovisco, 2009), also in the marketplace. Previous research has addressed the role of aesthetic and moral cosmopolitanism in consumption behaviour, highlighting that consumers may use brands such as 'Starbucks' and 'Second Cup' to display both interest for foreign (coffee) cultures and a concern for fair trade with coffee farmers (Bookman, 2013). Further, humanity becomes increasingly aware that it is part of a global risk community. Environmental risks, global financial risks and social risks such increasing social inequality render consumers more concerned about the influence of global events on their lives (Beck, 2002a; Beck and Levy, 2013). First studies, for instance, established links between the desire to adopt environmental sustainability and cosmopolitanism (Dobson, 2005; Grinstein and Riefler, 2015). Cosmopolitan citizenship may therefore involve a concern for the environment in a global world (Stevenson, 2002). Existing research for instance illustrates this point by demonstrating how consumers may combine discourses about aesthetic and moral cosmopolitan ideals in their adoption of food trends such as New Nordic Food, which gain global popularity by providing an aesthetic spin on local consumption, deemed to be more sustainable (Emontspool and Georgi, 2016).

Aside from considering ethical consumption behaviour, the morality of cosmopolitan consumption more generally can benefit from further study, addressing what makes a certain type of consumption behaviour right or good on the scale of a global humanity. For instance, marketers' advertisement of

products targeted at cosmopolitan consumers may simultaneously involve silencing the working conditions of the producers of these products. Studying the morality of cosmopolitan consumption behaviour thereby offers a critical perspective on the potential problems of the cosmopolitan consumption ideology. Three chapters in this collection offer such a critical perspective. Rojas Gaviria (chapter 8) discusses the moral intricacies of philanthropic peer-to-peer lending. She argues that moral cosmopolitanism finds its translation in the marketplace when individuals integrate global moral considerations with concrete elements of their everyday life. Solidarity with strangers becomes then an act of banal cosmopolitanism (Beck, 2002b), where everyday actions engage global moral ideals. Verderame (chapter 9) proposes that festivals such as the Festival of Europe in Florence can serve as incubators for cosmopolitan culture but struggle to fully generate a cosmopolitan imagined community of Europe. When it comes to the creation of a European community of belonging, much progress can therefore still be made in order to create a cosmopolitan culture, a goal for which the author identifies future opportunities. Fozdar (chapter 10) finally provides a critical perspective on consumers' dilemmas between moral ideals of human equality and those of protecting the wellbeing of local workers, where nationalism and cosmopolitanism compete for moral superiority.

CONCLUSION: A FRAMEWORK FOR CONSOLIDATING INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACHES

This chapter offered a diverse discussion of cosmopolitanism research through the adoption of perspectives centred on material, spatial, as well as ethical and moral articulations of the concept. In their totality, the chapters included in this collection combine to illustrate these perspectives, reflecting the pioneering efforts in sociology and consumer research to provide a multi-level study of cosmopolitan consumption and markets, which incorporates both aesthetic and ethical ideals. Such an approach allows for expanding research about cosmopolitan consumption beyond the individual (and often Western) consumer, and for the adoption of a truly critical, global perspective on cosmopolitanism, markets and consumption.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, E. (2004). The Cosmopolitan Canopy. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 595(1), pp. 14-31.
- Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 7(2), pp. 295-310.
- Appiah, K. A. (1996). Cosmopolitan Patriots. In: J. Cohen, ed., *For Love of Country*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Appiah, K. A. (2007). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

- Beck, U. (2002a). The Cosmopolitan Perspective: Sociology of the Second Age of Modernity. In: S. Vertovec and R. Cohen, eds., *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism – Theory, Context, Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Beck, U. (2002b). The Cosmopolitan Society and Its Enemies. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 19(1-2), pp. 17-44.
- Beck, U. (2006). *The Cosmopolitan Vision*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Beck, U., and Levy, D. (2013). Cosmopolitanized Nations: Re-Imagining Collectivity in World Risk Society. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 30(2), pp. 3-31.
- Bennett, A., Taylor, J. and Woodward, I. (2014). *The Festivalisation of Culture*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Bookman, S. (2013). Branded Cosmopolitanisms: ‘Global’ Coffee Brands and the Co-Creation of ‘Cosmopolitan Cool’. *Cultural Sociology*, 7(1), pp. 56-72.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London: Routledge.
- Brewer, J., and Trentmann, F. (2006). *Consuming Cultures, Global Perspectives: Historical Trajectories, Transnational Exchanges*. Oxford, UK: Berg Publishers.
- Calhoun, C. (2002). The Class Consciousness of Frequent Travelers: Toward a Critique of Actually Existing Cosmopolitanism. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 101(4), pp. 869-897.
- Cappellini, B., Parsons, E. and Harman, V. (2016). ‘Right Taste, Wrong Place’: Local Food Cultures, (Dis)Identification and the Formation of Classed Identity. *Sociology*, 50(6), pp. 1089-1105.
- Carpenter, J. M., Moore, M., Alexander, N. and Doherty, A. M. (2013). Consumer Demographics, Ethnocentrism, Cultural Values, and Acculturation to the Global Consumer Culture: A Retail Perspective. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 29(3-4), pp. 271-291.
- Chytкова, Z., and Kjeldgaard, D. (2011). The Modern Woman Myth as a Means of Cosmopolitan Cultural Capital Accumulation: A Gendered Acculturation Perspective. *Research in Consumer Behavior*, 13, pp. 199-216.
- Cleveland, M., Laroche, M. and Papadopoulos, N. (2009). Cosmopolitanism, Consumer Ethnocentrism, and Materialism: An Eight-Country Study of Antecedents and Outcomes. *Journal of International Marketing*, 17(1), pp. 116-146.
- Cohen, J. (1996). *For Love of Country*. In. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Datta, A. (2009). Places of Everyday Cosmopolitanisms: East-European Construction Workers in London. *Environment and Planning-Part A*, 41(2), pp. 353-370.
- Delanty, G., Giorgi, L. and Sassatelli, M. (2011). *Festivals and the Cultural Public Sphere*. London: Routledge.
- Demangeot, C., Broderick, A. J., and Craig, C. S. (2015). Multicultural Marketplaces. *International Marketing Review*, 32(2), pp. 118-140.

- Demangeot, C., Broeckerhoff, A., Kipnis, E., Pullig, C. and Visconti, L. M. (2014). Consumer Mobility and Well-Being among Changing Places and Shifting Ethnicities. *Marketing Theory*, 15(2), pp. 271-278.
- Demangeot, C., and Sankaran, K. (2012). Cultural Pluralism: Uncovering Consumption Patterns in a Multicultural Environment. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 28(7-8), pp. 760-783.
- Dobson, A. (2005). Globalisation, Cosmopolitanism and the Environment. *International Relations*, 19(3), pp. 259-273.
- Emontspool, J, and Georgi, C. (2016). A Cosmopolitan Return to Nature: How Combining Aesthetization and Moralization Processes Expresses Distinction in Food Consumption. *Consumption Markets & Culture*, pp. 1-23.
- Germann Molz, J. (2011). Cosmopolitanism and Consumption. In: M. Rovisco and M. Nowicka, eds., *Ashgate Research Companion to Cosmopolitanism*. Farnham, Surrey, GBR: Ashgate, pp. 33-52.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Grinstein, A., and Riefler, P. (2015). Citizens of the (Green) World? Cosmopolitan Orientation and Sustainability. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 46(6), pp. 694-714.
- Grinstein, A., and Wathieu, L. (2012). Happily (Mal)Adjusted: Cosmopolitan Identity and Expatriate Adjustment. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 29(4), pp. 337-345.
- Hage, G. (1998). *White Nation. Fantasies of White Supremacy in a Multicultural Society*. Annandale: Pluto Press.
- Hannerz, U. (2004). *Foreign News. Exploring the World of Foreign Correspondents*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Held, D. (1995). *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Nation-State to Cosmopolitan Governance*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Holt, D. B. (1998). Does Cultural Capital Structure American Consumption? *Journal of Consumer Research*, 25(1), pp. 1-25.
- Hooks, B. (1992). Eating the Other: Desire and Resistance. In: *Black Looks: Race and Representatio*. Boston: South End Press.
- Howes, D. (1996). *Cross-Cultural Consumption: Global Markets Local Realities: Global Markets, Local Realities*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Hutchings, K., Michailova, S., and Harrison, E. C. (2013). Neither Ghettoed nor Cosmopolitan: A Study of Western Women's Perceptions of Gender and Cultural Stereotyping in the Uae. *Management International Review*, 53(2), pp. 291-318.
- Inglis, D. (2012). Alternative Histories of Cosmopolitanism: Reconfiguring Classical Legacies. In: G. Delanty, ed., *Routledge Handbook of Cosmopolitanism Studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Jafari, A., and Visconti, L. M. (2014). New Directions in Researching Ethnicity in Marketing and Consumer Behaviour: A Well-Being Agenda. *Marketing Theory*, 15(2), pp. 265-270.

- Kanter, R. M. (1995). *World Class: Thriving Locally in the Global Economy*. New York: Simon & Shuster.
- Kendall, G., Woodward, I. and Skrbiš, Z. (2009). *The Sociology of Cosmopolitanism: Globalization, Identity, Culture and Government*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kipnis, E., Broderick, A. J. and Demangeot, C. (2013). Consumer Multiculturalism: Consequences of Multi-Cultural Identification for Brand Knowledge. *Consumption Markets & Culture*, 17(3), pp. 231-253.
- Kirwan-Taylor, H. (2002). The Cosmocrats. *Harpers and Queen* (October), pp. 188-191.
- Lamont, M., and Aksartova, S. (2002). Ordinary Cosmopolitanisms Strategies for Bridging Racial Boundaries among Working-Class Men. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 19(4), pp. 1-25.
- Lee, R., and Mazodier, M. (2015). The Roles of Consumer Ethnocentrism, Animosity, and Cosmopolitanism in Sponsorship Effects. *European Journal of Marketing*, 49(5/6), pp. 919-942.
- Littler, J. (2008). *Radical Consumption: Shopping for Change in Contemporary Culture*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Luedicke, M. K. (2011). Consumer Acculturation Theory: (Crossing) Conceptual Boundaries. *Consumption Markets & Culture*, 14(3), pp. 223-244.
- MacKenzie, D. (2008). *Material Markets: How Economic Agents Are Constructed*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Maxwell, R., and DeSoucey, M. (2016). Gastronomic Cosmopolitanism: Supermarket Products in France and the United Kingdom. *Poetics*, 56 (June), pp. 85-97.
- Miller, D. (1995). *Worlds Apart: Modernity through the Prism of the Local*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Nava, M. (2007). *Visceral Cosmopolitanism : Gender, Culture and the Normalisation of Difference*. Oxford, GBR: Berg Publishers.
- Nowicka, M. , and Rovisco, M. (2009). *Cosmopolitanism in Practice*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1996). Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism. In: M. C. Nussbaum and J. Cohen. eds., *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Peterson, R. A. (1990). Audience and Industry Origins of the Crisis in Classical Music Programming: Towards World Music. In: D. B. Pankratz and V. B. Morris, *The Future of the Arts*. New York: Praeger.
- Peterson, R. A. (1992). Understanding Audience Segmentation: From Elite and Mass to Omnivore and Univore. *Poetics*, 21(4), pp. 243-258.
- Peterson, R. A., and Kern, R. M. (1996). Changing Highbrow Taste: From Snob to Omnivore. *American Sociological Review*, 61, pp. 900-907.
- Regev, M. (2013). *Pop-Rock Music: Aesthetic Cosmopolitanism in Late Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Riefler, P., Diamantopoulos, A. and Siguaw, J. A. (2012). Cosmopolitan Consumers as a Target Group for Segmentation. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 43(3), pp. 285-305.
- Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London, UK: Sage.
- Rojas Gaviria, P., and Emontspool, J. (2015). Global Cities and Cultural Experimentation: Cosmopolitan-Local Connections. *International Marketing Review*, 32(2), pp. 181-199.
- Roth, K. P. (2006). The Impact of Consumer Ethnocentrism, Consumer Cosmopolitanism and National Identity on Country Image, Product Image and Consumers' Purchase Intentions. *Paper presented at the EMAC Doctoral Colloquium*, 2006.
- Sassen, S. (2000). New Frontiers Facing Urban Sociology at the Millennium. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 51(1), pp. 143-159.
- Sassen, S. (2010). The City: Its Return as a Lens for Social Theory. *City, Culture and Society*, 1(1), pp. 3-11.
- Skeggs, B. (2004). *Class, Self, Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Skrbiš, Z., Kendall, G. and Woodward, I. (2004). Locating Cosmopolitanism: Between Humanist Ideal and Grounded Social Category. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 21(6), pp. 115-136.
- Steiner, C. B. (1994). *African Art in Transit*. Vol. 94: Cambridge University Press.
- Stevenson, N. (2002). Consumer Culture, Ecology and the Possibility of Cosmopolitan Citizenship. *Consumption Markets & Culture*, 5(4), pp. 305-319.
- Tambyah, S. K., and Subrahmanyam, S. (2001). American Expatriate Wives: Gender, Class and Nationality in Transnational Suburbia. In: M. C. Gilly and J. Meyers-Levy, eds., *Na - Advances in Consumer Research Volume 28*. Valdosta, GA: Association for Consumer Research, pp. 143-145.
- Thompson, C. J., and Tambyah, S. (1999). Trying to Be Cosmopolitan. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 26(3), pp. 214-241.
- Van Eijck, K. (2000). Richard A. Peterson and the Culture of Consumption. *Poetics*, 28(2/3), pp. 207-224.
- Vertovec, S., and Cohen, R. (2003). *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context, and Practice*: Oxford University Press, USA.
- Visconti, L. M., Jafari, A., Batat, W., Broeckerhoff, A., Özhan Dedeoglu, A., Demangeot, C., Kipnis, E. et al. (2014). "Consumer Ethnicity Three Decades After: A Tcr Agenda." *Journal of Marketing Management*, 30(17-18), pp. 1882-1922.
- Warde, A., Martens, L. and Olsen, W. (1999). Consumption and the Problem of Variety: Cultural Omnivorousness, Social Distinction and Dining Out. *Sociology*, 33(1), pp. 105-127.
- Werbner, P. (1999). Global Pathways. Working Class Cosmopolitans and the Creation of Transnational Ethnic Worlds. *Social Anthropology*, 7(1), pp. 17-35.

Woodward, I., Skrbiš, Z. and Bean, C. (2008). Attitudes Towards Globalization and Cosmopolitanism: Cultural Diversity, Personal Consumption and the National Economy. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 59(2), pp. 207-226.

Yeoh, B. S. A. (2005). The Global Cultural City? Spatial Imagineering and Politics in the (Multi)Cultural Marketplaces of South-East Asia. *Urban Studies*, 42(5-6), pp. 945-958.

Yoon, S.-J., Cannon, H. and Yaprak, A. (1986). Evaluating the Cymyc Cosmopolitanism Scale on Korean Consumers. *Advances in International Marketing*, 7, pp. 211-232.

Zeugner-Roth, K. P., Zabkar, V. and Diamantopoulos, A. (2015). Consumer Ethnocentrism, National Identity, and Consumer Cosmopolitanism as Drivers of Consumer Behavior: A Social Identity Theory Perspective. *Journal of International Marketing*, 23 (2), pp. 25-54.