



This is a repository copy of *On decomposing the 'thick' and the 'thin' for measuring cosmopolitanism in multicultural marketplaces: Why unpacking the foreign and global aspects of cosmopolitanism matters.*

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/144359/>

Version: Accepted Version

Book Section:

Kipnis, E. orcid.org/0000-0002-7976-0787 (2018) On decomposing the 'thick' and the 'thin' for measuring cosmopolitanism in multicultural marketplaces: Why unpacking the foreign and global aspects of cosmopolitanism matters. In: Emontspool, J. and Woodward, I., (eds.) *Cosmopolitanism, Markets, and Consumption: A Critical Global Perspective*. Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 39-67. ISBN 9783319641782

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-64179-9_3

This is a post-peer-review, pre-copyedit version of a chapter published in Emontspool J., Woodward I. (eds) *Cosmopolitanism, Markets, and Consumption*. Palgrave Macmillan. The final authenticated version is available online at:
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-64179-9_3

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

On Decomposing the ‘Thick’ and the ‘Thin’ for Measuring Cosmopolitanism in Multicultural Marketplaces:

Why Unpacking the Foreign and Global Aspects of Cosmopolitanism Matters

Eva Kipnis, Coventry University

1. Introduction

Among concepts representing one’s conscious openness to ‘different others’ (such as world-mindedness and internationalism), cosmopolitanism is perhaps one that continues to receive most attention from researchers investigating how such openness plays out in material fabrics of culture(s), with two main avenues of enquiry evolving. The first encompasses the study of cosmopolitanism as a phenomenon encapsulating the sociocultural dynamics towards modernity and intercultural engagement (re)produced in consumption practices (e.g., Goldstein-Gidoni, 2005; Besnier, 2004; Cannon and Yaprak, 2002). The second represents the work of international consumer behaviour scholars, concerned with examining how cosmopolitanism translates into consumption-oriented attitudes and behaviours towards non-local products and brands, to inform international business operations (Zhou, Yang and Hui, 2010; Batra et al., 2000; Okechukwu and Oneyemah, 1999). A particular contribution offered by the latter stream of studies that so far received limited consideration in the wider context of cosmopolitanism research is the development of scales measuring cosmopolitanism (e.g., Zeugner-Roth, Zabkar and Diamantopoulos, 2015; Riefler, Diamantopoulos, and Siguaw, 2012; Cleveland et al., 2011, 2009; Cleveland and Laroche, 2007; Cannon et al., 1994).

Scale development is a process of developing a research instrument that translates qualitative (abstract, unobservable) constructs into numerical units “to provide an empirical estimate of each theoretical construct of interest” (Gerbing and Anderson, 1988 p.186), following a set procedure and rules to ensure reliability and validity of obtained estimate(s). That is, a scale represents a theoretical construct discerned into a set of expressions (referred to as items) that capture the construct attributes to estimate its’ prominence and variability within a surveyed population sample. Application of scales enables consumer behaviour analysts to examine, using mathematical analyses techniques, the dynamics in and interplay between factors underlying consumption practice trends within sizeable samples of populations representative of consumer sphere in question (e.g., particular demographic group, national market overall etc). These factors can range from goods-specific preferences (such as performance expectations and quality evaluations) to broader socio-psychological stances (such as cultural values and attitudinal dispositions).

As many mass markets across borders and continents became routinely accessible to a wide range of businesses, determining and/or forecasting, at levels of national markets, factors underlying consumer expectations and responses to cultural associations assigned to products and brands gained momentum. International consumer behaviour research emerged as a discipline focused on informing businesses’ culture-based marketing practices through

profiling cross-nationally uniform and/or nationally unique factors informing these expectations and responses in consumer spheres. In pursuit of this goal scholars working in the international consumer behaviour domain widely drew and continue to draw from theorisations stemming from cross-cultural sociology, psychology, anthropology and consumer culture studies, to develop and/or validate a host of scales capturing the role and impact of such sociocultural phenomena as nationalism (Druckman, 1994; Balabanis et al., 2001), patriotism (Han, 1988), ethnocentrism (Shimp and Sharma 1987), (cultural) animosity (Klein, Ettenson and Morris, 1998) and cosmopolitanism – which is discussed in this chapter – on consumer expectations and intentions.

In relation to consumption practices cosmopolitanism has been broadly defined as a manifestation of [culturally] open consumer mindset through greater likelihood “to adopt products from other cultures” (Cleveland et al., 2009 p.120). Given this characteristic, it is unsurprising that international consumer behaviour research came to widely utilise cosmopolitanism as a determinant factor of favourable responses and intentions towards non-local perceived brands (Kaynak and Kara, 2000; Balabanis and Diamantopoulos, 2004; Reardon et al., 2005; Balabanis and Diamantopoulos, 2008; Vida and Reardon, 2008; Cleveland, Laroche and Papadopoulos, 2011). The recent decade has seen a rise of studies developing and/or utilising quantitative measures of cosmopolitanism to support researchers and managers in capturing and examining manifestation of cosmopolitan outlook in consumption contexts (e.g., Zeugner-Roth, Zabkar and Diamantopoulos, 2015; Riefler, Diamantopoulos, and Siguaw, 2012; Cleveland et al., 2011, 2009; Cleveland and Laroche, 2007).

With continually increasing volumes of international trade, development of psychometrically sound measures of consumption cosmopolitanism is indeed a valuable contribution to business research and practice. Furthermore, although developed with the primary goal of informing business operations by determining and/or forecasting consumption intentions as informed by non-local cultural associations assigned to brands, quantitative studies utilising cosmopolitanism scales emerged from international consumer behaviour research field can offer broader insights. Large-scale studies of dynamics in consumer expectations and intentions informed by cosmopolitanism and its’ interplay with related phenomena such as nationalism, (anti)globalism etc present a potent avenue for unpacking the broader sociocultural discourses of people and societies navigating and negotiating cultural differences and tensions as they occur in the marketplace. Gaining these insights can advance our understanding of whether and how major socio-political shifts such as those we observe to unfold (for instance, Brexit) can affect sustained intercultural engagement and relations in the future.

However, a major obstacle for these promising research directions is that extant cosmopolitanism measures are somewhat disconnected from the evolution of the cosmopolitanism as a sociological phenomenon. That is, so far cosmopolitanism scales have been almost solely theoretically grounded in an international viewpoint on ‘culturally different others’ (e.g., ‘others’ are assumed to be beyond national borders). Yet contemporary sociocultural realities have evolved in how, ideologically, the notion of cultures and ‘cultural

others' now exists in both unlocalised (delocalised and translocalised) and localised conceptual domains (Craig and Douglas, 2006), thus presenting impetus for unpacking and decomposing the conceptual groundings of these measures.

Recently emerged stream of research on multicultural marketplaces (Demangeot, Broderick and Craig, 2015; Rojas Gaviria and Emontspool, 2015; Seo, Buchanan-Oliver, and Cruz, 2015; Kipnis, Broderick and Demangeot, 2014) highlights that many contemporary national markets are intra-nationally diverse and interconnected, whereby multiple types of cultures can co-exist and interact with consumers in the forms of physically localised (through market/workplace/personal interactions) and virtual/imaginary (through media/art) experiences. In a similar vein, contemporary perspectives on cosmopolitanisation of societies (see chapter 1 by Woodward and Emontspool) – and, consequently, adoption of a cosmopolitan outlook by individuals and groups in these societies – indicate that cosmopolitanism as such evolved to encompass transnational and intra-national dimensions that are not necessarily dependable on and simultaneous with one another (i.e. Beck, 2000; Roudometof, 2005; Woodward, Skribs and Bean, 2008).

From this premise, this chapter examines the face validity of the existing approaches to measuring cosmopolitanism in multicultural marketplaces and proposes directions for further advancement of cosmopolitanism studies across qualitative and quantitative consumer research domains of enquiry. It begins with a review of the recent sociological perspectives on the evolved conceptual groundings of cosmopolitanism. Next, the existing cosmopolitanism measures in marketing literature are examined, considering the degree these measures represent the contemporary philosophical underpinnings of cosmopolitanism theory. In light of this synthesis, the chapter proposes the concept of multicultural marketplaces as a paradigm enabling better understanding of the disconnects that exist in extant theorisations and scale operationalisations of cosmopolitanism in consumer research and calls for decomposing dimensions of cosmopolitanism evidenced in sociological research.

2. Contrasting the evolved nature of cosmopolitanism construct and its operationalisations in consumer behaviour research

As theories in social sciences evolve, so does the need for refinement of the existing approaches to their measurement to better capture the construct of interest (Netemeyer, Bearden and Sharma, 2003). This section considers recent insights from sociology literature that point to a notable shift in how cosmopolitanism as a phenomenon and the notion of one being cosmopolitan can be manifested amidst environments, and contrasts these insights with the extant operationalisations of cosmopolitanism construct in the context of consumption through measurement scales. This synthesis shows that, although making several valuable contributions to advancing our understanding of how cosmopolitanism is manifested in consumption environments, approaches to operationalising consumer cosmopolitanism through measurement scales may require further refinement to capture its evolved nature.

2.1. The evolved cosmopolitanism construct: contemporary sociological insights

The last decade and a half of sociological inquiries into cosmopolitanism indicate a substantial shift to the qualitative nature of the construct. The review presented in this section focuses on four key pieces that present conceptually and/or empirically derived suppositions that cosmopolitanism construct evolved such that it becomes salient in two domains with distinctly different conceptual boundaries. This review is not meant to concern itself with the historical evolution of cosmopolitanism notion (for a comprehensive overview see Woodward and Emontspool's chapter 1). Rather, it aims to show that, collectively, recent sociological stream of research into cosmopolitanism presents with a common thread of thought questioning whether cosmopolitanism, as a construct reflecting an individual disposition of intellectual and aesthetic openness and readiness to make way into and engage with different cultures, should be assumed only characteristic for persons who transcend, whether corporeally or in their imaginary, national spaces and borders. Importantly, these sources point to the need for going beyond Tomlinson's (1999) reworked notion of 'glocalized cosmopolitanism' as one's willingness and capacity to simultaneously live between and construct integrated meanings of the global and the local (national) cultural domains, and examining whether more than one face of cosmopolitanism exist.

A decade and a half after his influential piece 'Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture' (1990), Hannerz (2005) revisits his thinking on cosmopolitanism to distinguish and posit two interconnected 'faces' cosmopolitanisms. He draws parallels with the research on nationalism that distinguishes 'ethnic' (that assumes ethnocultural homogeneity as a criterion of individuals making a nation) and 'civic' (that assumes individuals' commitment to a nation as a criterion that overrides cultural backgrounds) faces of nationalism, to interrogate whether the political and cultural cosmopolitanism should be considered as two facets of cosmopolitanism construct. He argues that one main aspect required to be overcome by cosmopolitanism theorists is the sense that a 'rooted cosmopolitan' is somehow an oxymoron. Although Hannerz (2005) neither elaborates this idea much further nor offers a definition of a 'rooted cosmopolitan', his point problematizes one of the key current controversies in contemporary cosmopolitanism discourse: are willingness to encounter, appreciate and engage with diverse cultural experiences and commitment to the idea of 'global citizenship' both necessary pre-requisite characteristics of a cosmopolitan outlook?

In a similar vein, Szerszynski and Urry (2002) present empirical findings to highlight that the notion of 'global' has different salience and meanings for different population groups within one nation. Some groups, while engaging in localised openness and care, express cultural hostility to immigrants as 'others' crossing their national borders. At the same time, they suggest that some of their findings point to evidence of emerged 'cosmopolitan civil society' in minds of some groups that integrates awareness of shrinking world with the ethics of "care based upon various proximate groundings" (Szerszynski and Urry, 2002 p.478). While stressing that their findings are exploratory, authors suggest that "there is no one form of

cosmopolitanism” (Szerszynski and Urry, 2002 p.469) and call for acknowledgement of the changes in the context within which social and political life need to be understood.

Woodward, Skribs and Bean (2008) further test the question of whether and how cosmopolitanism is related to globalisation. This study showcases that the relationship between cosmopolitan outlook and views on globalisation is complex and at times somewhat troubled. In particular, some of their findings parallel those by Szerszynski and Urry (2002) by uncovering a series of defensive anxieties concerned with whether, for a nation, ‘being global’ poses risks for jobs, culture, diversity and environment. To this end, authors suggest that one form of cosmopolitanism can encompass openness to ‘others’ from different communities within a locale (for instance, a different ethnic or regional group) and question the universality of cosmopolitan outlook as a social phenomenon, calling for further research into ‘multiple cosmopolitanisms’. However, although identifying the complexity of cosmopolitanism phenomenon, the studies reviewed above fall short of offering a coherent approach to conceptually unpacking the cosmopolitanism construct. Indeed, if multiple (and possibly mutually exclusive) cosmopolitanisms exist, how should one attempt to capture and analyse them? And how should cosmopolitanism theory move beyond the premise of strive for ‘citizenship of the world’ (whether integrated with national belonging or not) being one of the core underpinnings of cosmopolitanism?

The work of Roudometof (2005) offers a number of important contributions for unpacking these controversies further. First, Roudometoff (2005) refocuses the debate concerning the philosophical nature of cosmopolitanism from the notion of globalisation to transnationalism. Importantly, transnationalism differs from the idea of ‘global village’ as it accounts for the possibility of multiple social spaces and communities that can be constructed and exist – some through globalisation channels – in global, transnational and/or local domains. Such multiplicity suggests that, for some, cultural diversity and cosmopolitanisation can be conceived ‘from within’ national borders (Beck, 2000). Next, Roudometof (2005) offers a categorisation of ‘thin’ cosmopolitanism as a detachment from locale combined with openness to and acceptance of cultural diversity on a global scale and ‘thick’ or ‘rooted’ cosmopolitanism as an expression of commitment to a particular locale (country/region) combined with willingness to engage with some of the ‘cultural others’ but not necessarily on a global scale. Finally, Roudometof (2005) stresses the importance of acknowledging the notion of pluralised borders, whereby “the simple fact that two individuals live in the same state does not necessarily mean the same social borders bind them [...they...] can inhabit markedly different ‘life-worlds’ and be closer to or farther from people who live outside the borders of the state they live in.” (p.116). Hence, the notion of ‘one local and one global world’ for all individuals in a given nation becomes contrived when considered from the perspective of transnationalism, necessitating further inquiry into both: 1) dimensions of cosmopolitanism (as suggested by Hannerz, 2005 and Woodward and colleagues, 2008) and 2) changes in the context within which cosmopolitanism as a phenomenon should be understood (as suggested by Szerszynski and Urry, 2002).

Taken together, the works reviewed in this section present impetus for re-examining operationalisations of cosmopolitanism construct in consumer research, and interrogate

whether and how contextual and sociological changes evoking greater complexity and divergence of cosmopolitan outlook play out in consumption. With this in mind, the next section revisits the extant cosmopolitanism measures in international consumer behaviour literature and puts forward an argument for the need of a paradigm within which the ‘thick’ and ‘thin’ dimensions of cosmopolitanism can be decomposed in light of sociocultural changes in national contexts and individuals’ conceptions of cultural self and ‘others’.

2.2. Cosmopolitanism in consumer research: current perspectives and measurement approaches

In comparison to sociological and anthropological research, the interest of marketing and consumer scholars to cosmopolitanism is relatively new. Although dating back to just under 25 years to the seminal work of Cannon, Yaprak and colleagues (Cannon and Yaprak, 1993, 2002; Cannon et al. 1994) and Thompson and Tambyah (1999), it continues to receive a steadily growing attention as one of the theories pertinent to the study of consumption in conditions of globalised marketplace. Over the history of its presence in the marketing and consumer behaviour body of knowledge, several notable advancements have been made in conceptualising and operationalising cosmopolitanism as a construct relevant to consumption research. In light of space limitations and the purpose of this chapter, this section will predominantly focus on considering contributions concerned with developing cosmopolitanism measurement scales for use of marketing researchers and managers.

Table 1 below presents a summary review of extant consumer behaviour studies offering measures of cosmopolitanism and examining the nomological relationships of cosmopolitanism construct with other constructs relevant to marketing and consumer research. It shows that, while making a number of valuable discoveries concerning the manifestation of cosmopolitan outlook in consumption tendencies and patterns, when considered together, these studies’ findings present with disconnects that somewhat parallel the evolved complexity of cosmopolitanism phenomenon identified in sociological school of cosmopolitanism thought discussed in section 2.1. Broadly, the work of Cleveland and colleagues (e.g., Cleveland and Laroche, 2007; Cleveland et al., 2009, 2011) links cosmopolitanism with the idea of ‘citizenship of the world’ manifested in preference of global perceived brands; while Diamantopoulos and colleagues (e.g., Riefler et.al., 2012; Zeugner-Roth et.al., 2015) identify the relationship between cosmopolitanism and a more general openness to cultures of foreign countries manifested in willingness to buy foreign perceived produce. It is important to note that these disconnects are highlighted not as a criticism of validity of the studies reviewed here but as an illustration of the evolved complexity and lack of unanimity concerning theoretical groundings of cosmopolitanism in broader literature being reflected in empirical findings emerging from operationalisation of cosmopolitanism in consumer behaviour research literature. In fact, remaining lack of coherence and clarity in sociopsychological underpinnings of cosmopolitanism theory is

recognised in both streams of studies reviewed in Table 1 when drawing their conceptualisations and operationalising measure development. For instance, Riefler et al. (2012) note that “regrettably, contemporary literature uses the term ‘cosmopolitanism’ very loosely and unsystematically, frequently neglecting to provide a theoretical definition of its underlying meaning in the particular context” (p.286), while similarly, Cleveland et al. (2011) highlight that “no definition for cosmopolitanism has achieved consensus” (p.935).

Importantly however, both streams of work provide valuable empirical support to the notions of ‘thick’ (rooted) and ‘thin’ cosmopolitanism uncovered by sociological studies. Riefler et al. (2012) and Zeugner-Roth et al. (2015) demonstrate consistent presence of two sizeable segments of populations that harbour cosmopolitan outlook in different ways whereby ‘pure cosmopolitans’ are moderately attached to the locales of these studies and ‘local (or national) cosmopolitans’ are highly attached to locales of these studies while also presenting with cosmopolitan outlook. Cleveland et al. (2009, 2011) uncover that contextual (such as national cultural values) and circumstantial (such as product category, visibility of consumption and usage) consumption influences can increase or decrease salience of localised versus globalised appeals for individual consumers, impacting their behavioural tendencies towards brands. Furthermore, all studies identify a range of future research directions stressed as pertinent to further unpacking the implications of cosmopolitanism and its complexity for consumption studies. A particularly significant identified direction is the need to recognise and examine the role of intra-national cosmopolitanism in consumption decisions. That is, acknowledging that globalisation and cultural homogenisation are “neither interchangeable nor inevitable” (Cleveland et al., 2009 p.139), these studies point out that in multicultural national markets where multiple ethnocultural groups co-reside together it is likely that consumers may differ in terms of their cultural outlook and consumption as they transcend their “own ethnic group’s cultural boundaries” (Zeugner-Roth et al., 2015 p.301).

In sum, while providing valuable insights into cosmopolitanism in consumption contexts, these studies highlight a number of important avenues for further investigation, particularly with regard to continuing unpacking measurement of cosmopolitanism construct. First, it is necessary to understand how the notion of ‘localism’ should be understood in the context of multicultural, intra-nationally diverse locales. Extant cosmopolitanism measures integrate items using terms ‘countries’ and ‘cultures’ either together or interchangeably. From face validity perspective such integration of these two notions can be somewhat problematic in intra-nationally culturally diverse consumer spheres. Multiple cultures now extend over and are present in several national locales, posing questions to conceptual meanings of ‘localness’ and ‘non-localness’ of cultures other than global (Demangeot et al., 2015; Rojas Gaviria and Emontspool, 2015; Seo et.al., 2015; Kipnis et al., 2014). Second, and more specifically relative to consumption, it is necessary to examine together the relationship between cosmopolitanism and global versus foreign cultural preferences. Extant conceptualisations and measures provide little basis for differentiating consumer responses to and preferences of brands assigned with global versus foreign meanings. However, such a broad operationalisation may be problematic when considered from perspective of brand positioning decisions. Global and foreign cultural meanings have been demonstrated to be

“nomologically different and evaluated differently” by consumers (Nijssen and Douglas, 2011 p.114). Indeed, other consumers have been shown to seek acquisition of world citizenship, or belonging to global community, through consumption of global brands (Strizhakova et al., 2008). Conversely, other consumers view global products as a threat to cultures all over the world losing individuality, embarking on a quest for authenticity – strive for strengthening of social bonds to a particular culture established through possession of objects with symbolic characteristics perceived to legitimately and uniquely characterise this culture (Leigh, Peters and Shelton, 2006). Hence, it is logical to assume that some consumers may harbour preference for brands that are perceived as foreign but not global, and vice versa. Adding another layer of complexity, in intra-nationally diverse environments a culture foreign to a locale itself can be localised in minds of consumers if such culture is seen to become an integral part of the social fabric of a given society: for example, Cheung-Blunden and Juang (2008) argue that it is necessary to appreciate the historical evolution of several colonial and post-colonial nations whereby multiple cultures have ‘made roots’ into these locales. From consumption perspective, this complexity may translate into selective openness to brands and products associated with localised foreign cultures only.

A paradigm helpful for redressing the imbalances in conceptions of cultures’ situatedness in country environments is one of multicultural marketplaces (e.g., Kipnis et al., 2016, 2014, 2012; Demangeot et al., 2015; Rojas Gaviria and Emontspool, 2015; Seo et.al., 2015). As outlined in the next section, it re-defines evolved conceptions of culture(s) and unpacks implications of this dynamics for individuals’ construal of cultural self and others, thus making way for refining the conceptual groundings and boundaries of consumer cosmopolitanism.

Table 1: Summary of key extant studies offering operational measures of cosmopolitanism

Source	Brief study description	Conceptualisation of cosmopolitanism	Key findings and conclusions
Riefler and Diamantopoulos (2009)	Review and replicate the CYMYC scale by Cannon et al. (1994) as the first scale developed for operationalising cosmopolitanism in consumption context.	Based on identified inconsistencies of CYMYC, propose a definition of cosmopolitan consumer as “an open-minded individual whose consumption orientation transcends any particular culture, locality or community and who appreciates diversity including trying products and services from the variety of countries” (p.415).	Identify a number of conceptual shortcomings of CYMYC scale, namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lack of an explicit conceptual definition of cosmopolitanism as a consumption orientation construct; • problematic content validity of a number of items comprising CYMYC scale; • polarity of cosmopolitanism-localism continuum.
Riefler, Diamantopoulos and Siguaw (2012)	Develop and validate a three-dimensional C-COSMO scale (12 items), examples of items measuring each dimension as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dimension 1 – open mindedness: “When travelling, I make a conscious effort to get in touch with the local culture and traditions”; “I like having the opportunity to meet people from different countries”. • Dimension 2 – diversity appreciation: “Having access to products from many different countries is valuable to me”; “The availability of foreign products in domestic market provides valuable diversity”. • Dimension 3 – consumption transcending borders: “I like watching movies from different countries”; “I like trying things that are consumed elsewhere in the world”. Combine operationalisation of C-COSMO scale and a scale measuring ‘consumer localism’ defined as “consumer’s engagement and interest in local activities, events, and products” (p. 296).	Building on Riefler and Diamantopoulos (2009), conceptualise consumer cosmopolitanism as “a three-dimensional, second-order construct capturing the extent to which consumer: 1) exhibits an open-mindedness toward foreign countries and cultures; 2) appreciates the diversity brought about by the availability of products from different national and cultural origins; and 3) is positively disposed to consuming products from different countries” (p.287).	Identify presence of two types of cosmopolitan outlooks in different population segments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Pure cosmopolitan’: moderately attached to locale of study; • ‘Local cosmopolitan’: highly attached to locale of study while also highly cosmopolitan. Identify cosmopolitanism as a predictor of consumers’ general willingness to purchase foreign products (without distinguishing between global or specific foreign associations).

Continued on the next page

Source	Brief study description	Conceptualisation of cosmopolitanism	Key findings and conclusions
Zeugner-Roth, Zabkar and Diamantopoulos (2015)	Adopting a social identity theory approach combine operationalisation of C-COSMO scale (Riefler et al., 2012) with measures of national identity, consumer ethnocentrism and country attitudes, to examine the relationship of in/out-group sociopsychological orientation traits with product judgement and willingness to buy foreign vs domestic products.	Adopt conceptualisation by Riefler et al. (2012)	<p>Demonstrate consumer cosmopolitanism, along with consumer ethnocentrism and national identity serving as predictors of domestic vs foreign perceived products.</p> <p>Similarly to Riefler et al. (2012), identify two consumer segments harbouring different cosmopolitan outlooks, i.e., ‘pure cosmopolitans’ and ‘national cosmopolitans’. Conclude that in different consumer segments either in/out-group favourable orientation toward own nation and other foreign countries can prevail or be harboured together, differentially affecting consumption patterns.</p>
Cleveland and Laroche (2007)	<p>Develop a measure of cosmopolitanism (12 items) as a dimension of acculturation to global consumer culture (AGCC), example items for cosmopolitanism as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “I am interested in learning more about people who live in other countries”; • “I enjoy exchanging ideas with people from other cultures or countries”; • “I like to observe people of other cultures, to see what I can learn from them”. • “I enjoy trying foreign food”; • “When travelling, I like to immerse myself in the culture of the people I am visiting”. 	“The term cosmopolitan loosely describes just about any person that moves about in the world, but beyond that and more specifically, the expression refers to a specific set of qualities held by certain individuals, including a willingness to engage with the other (i.e., different cultures), and a level of competence towards alien culture(s)” (p.252).	Validate AGCC scale with a view to develop a model linking AGCC as a construct capturing global cultural influence and ethnic identification as a construct capturing local cultural influence on consumption behaviours: “...AGCC scale has components that reflect personal traits and qualities that are associated with outward, worldly orientation (COS [cosmopolitanism])” (p.257).

Continued on the next page

Source	Brief study description	Conceptualisation of cosmopolitanism	Key findings and conclusions
Cleveland, Laroche, and Papadopoulos (2009)	<p>Develop a measure of cosmopolitanism (6 items), reducing the measure by Cleveland and Laroche (2007), example items as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “I enjoy exchanging ideas with people from other cultures or countries”; • “I enjoy being with people from other countries to learn about their views and approaches”; • <i>“I find people from other cultures stimulating”</i>*. <p>Combine operationalisation of developed cosmopolitanism measure with scales measuring consumer ethnocentrism (Shimp and Sharma, 1987) and materialism (Richins and Dawson, 1992) to examine adoption of globalised (conceptualised to be represented by cosmopolitanism and materialism) versus localised (conceptualised to be represented by consumer ethnocentrism) consumption tendencies across a range of product categories.</p>	<p>Build on Hannerz (1992) and (Skrubs et al., 2004) to define a cosmopolitan label to describe “people who frequently travel, are routinely involved with other people in various places elsewhere” (p.119) and harbour a conscious openness to the world, cultural differences and willingness to engage with the ‘other’.</p>	<p>Demonstrate that contextual/circumstantial influences (such as product category, usage, visibility) can increase salience of localised (appealing to local cultural traditions), cosmopolitan (connoting membership in transnational communities) and materialistic tendencies. Building on this discovery, argue that globalisation and cultural homogenisation are “neither interchangeable nor inevitable” (p.139).</p>
Cleveland et al. (2011)	<p>Utilise a reduced (6 items) version of Cleveland and Laroche’s (2007) scale. 5 items as in measure validated by Cleveland et al. (2009), 1 item (in italics below) from the original 12 item scale. Examples of items as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “I enjoy exchanging ideas with people from other cultures or countries”; • “I enjoy being with people from other countries to learn about their views and approaches”; • <i>“Coming into contact with people of other cultures has greatly benefitted me”</i>*. <p>Combine operationalisation of cosmopolitanism measure with measures of individual and national cultural values (Schwartz, 1999), and Hofstede’s (1980, 1991) national cultural value indices to test “links between individual/cultural value systems and cosmopolitanism—a construct allied to global culture and the intensification of cultural flows across borders” (p.941).</p>	<p>Distinguish cosmopolitan outlook (in contrast to pluralist outlook) as “an ethos of cultural openness” that favours “loose, multiple cultural narratives” (p.935) and holds universal aspirations and less allegiance to any particular community.</p>	<p>Identify links between cosmopolitanism and such values as autonomy, universalism, and harmony**. Propose linking of cosmopolitanism and values as an approach to segmentation that will identify world-minded consumers that are likely to choose global perceived brands to reinforce membership of global community and/or assert a cosmopolitan self-image.</p>

*This item is included in the original 12-item scale by Cleveland and Laroche (2007) but is only present in one of the 6-item reduced versions by Cleveland et al. (2009) and Cleveland et al. (2011); ** It is important to note that the study also identifies cross-national differences in the values related to cosmopolitanism that is attributed to greater diversity within one of the two national markets included in the study (Canada).

3. Multicultural marketplaces: a paradigm for decomposing consumer cosmopolitanism

3.1. Defining a multicultural marketplace

Several recent works in psychology, sociology, human geography and consumer culture research critiqued the default assumption of cultural uniformity of national societies within the traditional paradigm of culture studies and offered alternative theorisations. For instance, Morris, Chiu and Liu (2015) propose the notion of polycultural psychology. They point out that “values vary more within countries than between countries” and attribute this variation to intercultural contact being “an age-old aspect of human existence” (p.634) whereby individuals may seek and take influences from multiple cultures and thus become conduits for cultural dynamics and transformations. In a similar vein, but also highlighting that the era of globalisation has galvanised intercultural contact and exchange to unprecedented levels of complexity and intensity, studies in human geography and sociology suggest that many contemporary societies have emerged into contexts of ‘commonplace diversity’ (Wessendorf, 2013) or ‘superdiversity’ (Vertovec, 2007) where people ‘live multicultural’ (Neal et al., 2013).

In the area of consumer research these transformed views on cultural composition of societies have been recently formulated as a concept of a multicultural marketplace (Demangeot et al., 2015; Kipnis et al., 2014). As such, the multicultural marketplace is defined as a “place-centred environment (whether physical or virtual), where the marketers, consumers, brands, ideologies and institutions of multiple cultures converge at one point of concurrent interaction, while also being potentially connected to multiple cultures in other localities” (Demangeot et al., 2015 p.122). This definition highlights that nations, as politically and geographically defined societies and markets, have evolved to host a multitude of different cultures interacting within and across their borders.

On an individual level, ongoing existence in the ‘lived multicultural’ conditions facilitates complexity and diversification of cultural identity and values dynamics whereby individuals can form/abandon/integrate links to any number of cultures and cultural groups that may or may not be confined to their ethnocultural/national backgrounds (Seo and Gao, 2015; Perracchio et al., 2014; Luedicke, 2014, 2011; Kipnis et al., 2014; Jamal, 2003). Such evolved complexity and diversification of cultural identification within geographical boundaries of a given multicultural marketplace problematizes the view of in/out-group as ‘us versus others from beyond a national border’. Indeed, in a multicultural marketplace one does not necessarily need to transcend national boundaries of own locale to experience cultural diversity and to internalise different, possibly multiple, cultures. Furthermore, in intra-nationally diverse contexts, multicultural experiences, as well as their conduits (people, brands, services, institutions), can be conceived as linked to one locale only or multiple locales, whether physically or virtually. Hence, the multicultural marketplaces paradigm dictates a necessity to re-consider how notions of culture(s) and cultural others are conceived

by people, and whether such evolved worldviews may explain the recently observed controversies in manifestations of cosmopolitanism.

3.2. Culture, cultural identification and cosmopolitanism in multicultural marketplaces

Multicultural marketplaces literature (e.g., Kipnis et al., 2016, 2014, 2012; Kipnis, 2014; Craig and Douglas, 2006) distinguishes four following processes of culture (re)appropriation in relation to the locale: 1) localisation (whereby uniqueness of a culture is defined exclusively through its origins in a locale); 2) delocalisation (whereby a culture linked to a particular geographical locale is re-appropriated to be distinctly present in multiple locales); 3) translocalisation (whereby a homogenous, translocally-universal new type of culture is conceived to represent the idea of global unity); 4) hybridisation (whereby two or more cultures are converged to make a new culture). On an individual level these processes are considered to inform evolved conceptions of cultures. Consider the following definitions of the three types of cultures' conceptions present in a multicultural marketplace (see Steenkamp, 2014; Kipnis et al., 2014):

Local culture (LC): values, beliefs, material objects (products) and symbols *characteristic of one's locale of residence* that originate in the locale and uniquely distinguish this locale from other locales

Foreign culture (FC): values, beliefs, lifestyle, products, and symbols originating from and represented by an identifiable overseas source (country or group of people) and is known to individuals either as culture-of-origin, diasporic culture of ethnic ancestry or a culture of an aspired-to source with no ancestral link

Global culture (GC): translocally universal values, beliefs, lifestyle, products, and symbols that are developed through contributions from knowledge and practices in different parts of the world and symbolise an ideological connectedness with the world regardless of residence or heritage.

It is now relevant to remind the reader of the notion of pluralised borders by Roudometof (2005). This notion pinpoints that, while globalisation, as a political-economic process, resulted in emergence of multicultural marketplaces that are characterised by intra-national diversity and transnational interconnectedness through migration and convergence of media, technology, and market channels, from cultural dynamics perspective it brought about an unprecedented change and complexity in how cultures evolve and inform individual worldviews. The definitions of LC, FC and GC given above indicate that GC, as a culture emerged through translocalisation, is the only type of culture likely to consistently hold 'from beyond borders' associations. Conversely, FC definition indicates that, while the origin of a given foreign culture is acknowledged to be from overseas, its' conduits (for example, group of people) can be localised physically. Hence, it is reasonable to assume that, when deriving a

sense of cultural identity, the notion of cultural others may become disentangled from the notion of nation-based locality (Holliday, 2010). That is, since individuals can interact with, and possibly internalise, localised, translocalised and delocalised cultures through contact with (multi)cultural conduits either present in or remote from the locale, their conceptions of 'cultural others' will also differ.

Such a perspective provides an explanation for the emerged multiple forms of cosmopolitan outlook uncovered by sociological research (e.g., Woodward, Skrips and Bean, 2008; Hannerz, 2005), as well as for the dual nomological linkages between cosmopolitanism and global and/or foreign brand preferences identified by international consumer behaviour studies (e.g., Cleveland and Laroche, 2007; Cleveland et al., 2009, 2011; Riefler et al., 2012; Zeugner-Roth et al., 2015) summarised in section 2. It also highlights a need for refinement of consumer cosmopolitanism theorisations and measurement approaches to reflect these emerged complexities, thus opening several pertinent directions for future research. Indeed, from consumption viewpoint, evaluations of consumers within one national marketplace can be underpinned by either 'thin' or 'rooted' cosmopolitanism will inform different expectations and responses to products and brands and will necessitate marketing decisions to position brands on either translocalised (global) or delocalised (foreign) set of cultural meanings. Thus, measurement scales that reflect these two emerged dimensions are necessary. Furthermore, it is necessary to explore whether 'rooted cosmopolitanism' may take form of openness to and solidarity with 'certain cultural others' within boundaries of one's locale, while opposing the ethos of openness to and solidarity with 'all cultural others' on an international/global scale. Recent anecdotal evidence suggests that such forms of selective openness can be harboured, as exemplified in immigrant/diasporic votes in Brexit referendum (Shackle, 2016) and USA presidential elections (Bierman, 2016). Hence, consumer cosmopolitanism may not necessarily reflect appreciation of diversity on an international scale. By examining the relationships between the 'rooted' cosmopolitanism and constructs such as nationalism and/or globalism in national consumer spheres consumer behaviour research can offer new insights into evolving dynamics of international and intercultural relationships.

Conclusions

This chapter reviews and contrasts evidence of evolved conceptual nature of cosmopolitanism construct emerged from sociological body of knowledge with the approaches to measuring cosmopolitanism in consumption contexts developed by consumer behaviour scholars. It identifies that a number of conceptual disconnects remain in theorisations of cosmopolitanism that may be particularly significant in the contexts of multicultural marketplaces whereby the notion of 'border crossing' transitioned from geographical (national) to cultural boundaries whether in inter or intra-national sense. In particular, the chapter highlights that unpacking whether different 'faces' of cosmopolitanism (e.g., 'thin' versus 'thick') may be informing different preferences of global versus foreign perceived brands is relevant. Also, it indicates that future work is needed to further examine

whether 'rooted' cosmopolitanism may be manifested as appreciation of diversity and openness to intercultural contact, but on an intra-national scale.

Overall, the chapter highlights a need for greater inter-disciplinary consolidation of cosmopolitanism research in general, and consumer cosmopolitanism in particular, to advance our understanding of the evolution of cosmopolitanism phenomenon in contemporary realities. That is, while versatility of cosmopolitanism construct has been recognised by scholars across social sciences, ongoing synthesis of findings by inquiries approaching examination of cosmopolitanism from different perspectives can uncover less obvious controversies and underlying tensions in its manifestations. This work is particularly pertinent in today's world whereby conceptions of cultural 'us' and 'others' varies dramatically within and across national societies. Indeed, as many national markets emerged as intra-nationally diverse and interconnected environments, concerted efforts across the social science disciplines and methodological traditions to examine the drivers and outcomes of borders' pluralisation (Roudometof, 2005) are required.

Specifically, integrating qualitative and quantitative perspectives on cosmopolitanism manifestations in consumption contexts can bring to the fore dynamics of intercultural relations underpinning cosmopolitanism evolution and progress refinement of consumer cosmopolitanism theory. That is, although extant consumer cosmopolitanism measurement scales are grounded in the broader cosmopolitanism theory, remaining lack of coherence and clarity on conceptual boundaries of cosmopolitanism construct pose challenges to operationalising cosmopolitanism in this field of study (Riefler et al., 2012; Cleveland et al., 2011). Findings of extant international consumer behaviour studies that developed cosmopolitanism scales demonstrate linkages between cosmopolitanism and both translocalised (e.g., Cleveland and Laroche, 2007; Cleveland et al., 2009, 2011) and delocalised (e.g., Riefler et.al., 2012; Zeugner-Roth et.al., 2015) cultures informing consumption preferences. Yet, while this may be the case, these preferences are not necessarily harboured simultaneously and dependable on one another. Further qualitative investigations are therefore required for discerning the decomposing nature and dimensions of cosmopolitanism. In a similar vein, qualitative consumer cosmopolitanism inquiry would benefit from building on discoveries by international consumer behaviour studies to examine in greater depth the nomological linkages between cosmopolitanism and other phenomena encapsulating people's attitudes to intercultural and international engagement, such as globalisation and multiculturalism, and conceptions of cultural 'others' such as nationalism and cultural prejudice. No other than Hannerz himself (2005) points out that "to be "at home in the world" may be as much a question of breadth as of warmth – it may entail having a similar range of experiences out there, of others and of oneself, personally or vicariously, as one has closer at hand, in a local community or in a nation" (p.212). Therefore, recognising the diversification and variation in the very notion of cosmopolitanism may inform more nuanced examinations and interpretations of culture-informed plurality in consumption.

References

- Alden, D. L., Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M., and Batra, R. (2006). Consumer attitudes toward marketplace globalization: Structure, antecedents and consequences, *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 23(3), pp. 227-239.
- Balabanis, G., and Diamantopoulos, A. (2004). Domestic Country Bias, Country-of-Origin Effects, and Consumer Ethnocentrism: A Multidimensional Unfolding Approach, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 32(1), pp. 80-95.
- Balabanis, G., and Diamantopoulos, A. (2008). Brand Origin Identification by Consumers: A Classification Perspective, *Journal of International Marketing*, 16(1), pp. 39-71.
- Batra, R., Ramaswamy, V., Alden, D.L., Steenkamp, J-B.E.M., Ramachander, S. (2000). Effects of Brand Local and Nonlocal Origin on Consumer Attitudes in Developing Countries, *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 9(2), pp. 83-95.
- Beck, U. (2000). *What is Globalization?* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Besnier, N. (2004). Consumption and Cosmopolitanism: Practicing Modernity at the Second-Hand Marketplace in Nuku'alofa, Tonga, *Anthropological Quarterly*, 77(1), pp. 7-45.
- Bierman, N. (9th November 2016). Not all immigrants are voting against Donald Trump, *Los Angeles Times*, [online]. Available at: <http://www.latimes.com/nation/politics/trailguide/la-na-election-day-2016-not-all-immigrants-are-voting-against-1478621533-htmlstory.html> [Accessed 8 January 2017].
- Cannon, H.M., and Yaprak, A. (1993). Toward a theory of cross-national segmentation. In: Annual meeting of the Academy of International Business, Hawaii, USA, October 1993.
- Cannon, H.M., Yoon, S.J., McGowan L., and Yaprak, A. (1994) In search of the global consumer. In: Annual meeting of the Academy of International Business, Boston, USA, March 1994.
- Cannon, H. M., and Yaprak, A. (2002). Will the Real-World Citizen Please Stand Up! The Many Faces of Cosmopolitan Consumer Behavior, *Journal of International Marketing*, 10(4), pp. 30-52.
- Cheung-Blunden, V. L., and Juang, L. P. (2008). Expanding acculturation theory: Are acculturation models and the adaptiveness of acculturation strategies generalizable in a colonial context? *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 32(1), pp. 21-33.
- Cleveland, M., and Laroche, M. (2007). Acculturaton to the global consumer culture: Scale development and research paradigm, *Journal of Business Research*, 60(3), pp. 249-259.
- Cleveland, M., Laroche, M., Pons, F., and Kastoun, R. (2009). Acculturation and Consumption: Textures of Cultural Adaptation, *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 33(3), pp. 196-212.
- Cleveland, M., Papadopoulos, N., and Laroche, M. (2011). Identity, demographics, and consumer behaviors: International market segmentation across product categories. *International Marketing Review*, 28(3), pp. 244-266.
- Craig, S. C., and Douglas, S. P. (2006). Beyond National Culture: Implications of Cultural Dynamics for Consumer Research, *International Marketing Review*, 23(3), pp. 322-342.
- Demangeot, C., Broderick, A.J., and Craign, S. (2015). Multicultural marketplaces: New territory for international marketing and consumer research, *International Marketing Review*, 32(2), pp. 118-140.

- Douglas, S.P., and Craig, C.S. (2005). *International Marketing Research* (3rd ed.), Chichester, UK: Wiley and Sons.
- Fornell, C., and Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), pp. 39-50.
- Gerbing, D.W. and Anderson, J.C. (1988). An Updated Paradigm for Scale Development, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 25(2), pp. 186-192.
- Goldstein-Gidoni, O. (2005). The Production and Consumption of 'Japanese Culture' in the Global Cultural Market, *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 5(2), pp. 155-179.
- Hannerz, U. (1990). Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture. In M. Featherstone, ed., *Global Culture*, London: Sage, pp. 295-310.
- Hannerz, U. (2005). Two Faces of Cosmopolitanism: Culture and Politics, *Statsvetenskaplig Tidskrift*, 107(3), pp. 199-213.
- Holliday, A. (2010). Complexity in cultural identity, *Language & Intercultural Communication*, 10(2), pp. 165-177.
- Jamal, A. (2003). Marketing in a multicultural world: the interplay of marketing, ethnicity and consumption, *European Journal of Marketing*, 37(11/12), pp. 1599-1620.
- Kaynak, E., and Kara, A. (2000). Consumer perceptions of foreign products. An analysis of product-country images and ethnocentrism, *European Journal of Marketing*, 36(7/8), pp. 928-949.
- Kipnis, E. (2014). *Consumer Multiculturalization: Consequences of Multicultural Identity Dynamics for Consumption*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Durham University.
- Kipnis, E., Broderick, A. J., and Demangeot, C. (2014). Consumer multiculturalization: consequences of multi-cultural identification for brand knowledge, *Consumption Markets and Culture*, 17(3), pp. 231-253.
- Kipnis, E., Demangeot, D., Pullig, C., and Broderick, A. (2016). *Consumer Multicultural Identity Affiliation: A Framework for Segmentation in Multicultural Marketplaces*. Working paper: Coventry University.
- Kipnis, E., Emontspool, J., and Broderick, A. J. (2012). Living Diversity. Developing a Typology of Consumer Cultural Orientations in Culturally Diverse Marketplaces: Consequences for Consumption, *Advances in Consumer Research*, 40, pp. 427-435.
- Klein, J.G., Ettenson, R., and Morris, M.D. (1998). The Animosity Model of Foreign Product Purchase: An Empirical Test in the People's Republic of China. *Journal of Marketing*, 62(1), pp. 89-100.
- Leigh, T. W., Peters, C., and Shelton, J. (2006). The Consumer Quest for Authenticity: The Multiplicity of Meanings Within the MG Subculture of Consumption, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34(4), pp. 481-493.
- Luedicke, M. K. (2011). Consumer acculturation theory: (crossing) conceptual boundaries, *Consumption, Markets and Culture*, 14(3), pp. 223-244.
- Luedicke, M.K. (2015). Indigenes' Responses to Immigrants' Consumer Acculturation: A Relational Configuration Analysis, *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol.42, pp. 109-129.
- Malhotra, N. K. (1996). Methodological issues in cross-cultural marketing research. A state-of-the-art review, *International Marketing Review*, 13(5), pp. 7-43.

- Morris, M.W., Chiu, C., and Liu, Z. (2015). Polycultural Psychology, *Annual Review of Psychology*, 66, pp. 631-660
- Neal, S., Bennet, K., Cochrane, A., and Mohan, G. (2013). Living multicultural: understanding the new spacial and social relations of ethnicity and multicultural in England, *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 31(2), pp. 308-323.
- Netemeyer, R. G., Bearden, W. O., and Sharma, S. (2003). *Scaling Procedures: Issues and Application*, Thousand Oaks: CA: Sage.
- Nijssen, E. J., and Douglas, S. P. (2011). Consumer World-Mindedness and Attitudes Toward Product Positioning in Advertising: An Examination of Global Versus Foreign Versus Local Positioning, *Journal of International Marketing*, 19(3), pp. 113-133.
- Oberecker, E. M., and Diamantopoulos, A. (2011). Consumers' Emotional Bonds with Foreign Countries: Does Consumer Affinity Affect Behavioral Intentions? *Journal of International Marketing*, 19(2), pp. 45-72.
- Okechukwu, C., and Oneyemah, V. (1999). Nigerian Consumer Attitudes Toward Foreign and Domestic Products, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 30(3), pp. 611-22.
- Peracchio, L. A., Bublitz, M. G., and Luna, D. (2014). Cultural Diversity and Marketing: The Multicultural Consumer. In: V. Benet-Martinez and Y.-Y. Hong, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Multicultural Identity*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 438-461.
- Reardon, J., Miller, C., Vida, I., and Kim, I. (2005). The effects of ethnocentrism and economic development on the formation of brand and ad attitudes in transitional economies, *European Journal of Marketing*, 39(7-8), pp. 737-754.
- Riefler, P., and Diamantopoulos, A. (2009). Consumer cosmopolitanism: Review and replication of the CYMYC scale, *Journal of Business Research*, 62(4), pp. 407-419.
- 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.
- Rojas Gaviria, P, and Emontspool, J. (2015). Global citires and cultural experimentation: cosmopolitan-local connections, *International Marketing Review*, 32(2), pp. 181-199.
- Roudometof, V. (2005). Transnationalism, Cosmopolitanism and Glocalization, *Current Sociology*, 53(1), pp. 113-135.
- Seo, Y., Buchanan-Oliver, M., and Cruz, A.G.B. (2015). Luxury brand markets as confluences of multiple cultural beliefs, *International Marketing Review*, 32(2), pp.141-159.
- Seo, Y., and Gao, H. (2015). Towards a value-based perspective of consumer multicultural orientation, *European Management Journal*, 33, pp. 30-36.
- Skrbis, Z, and Woodward, I. (2007). The ambivalence of ordinary cosmopolitanism: Investigating the limits of cosmopolitansim openness, *The Sociological Review*, 55(4), pp. 530-547.
- Shakle, S. (25th August 2016). Meet the immigrants who voted for Brexit. [online] Available at: <http://www.politico.eu/article/immigrants-who-voted-for-brexit-luton-migration/> [accessed 8 January 2017].
- Steenkamp, J-B. (2014). How global brands create firm value: the 4V model, *International Marketing Review*, 31(1), pp. 5-29.
- Szerszynski, B., and Urry, J. (2002). Cultures of cosmopolitanism, *The Editorial Board of The Sociological Review*, Oxford UK: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 461-481.

- Strizhakova, Y., Coulter, R. A., and Price, L. L. (2008). Branded Products as a Passport to Global Citizenship: Perspectives from Developed and Developing Countries, *Journal of International Marketing*, 16(4), pp. 57-85.
- Tabachnik, B. G., and Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (5th ed.) Boston: Pearson.
- Thompson C.J., and Tambyah, S.K. (1999). Trying to be cosmopolitan, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 26(3), pp. 214–41.
- Tomlinson, J. (1999). *Globalization and Culture*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Van de Vijver, F. (2001). The Evolution of Cross-Cultural Research Methods. In D.Matsumoto, ed., *The Handbook of Culture and Psychology*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 77-97.
- Verlegh, P.W. J., and Steenkamp, J.-B.E. M. (1999). A review and meta analysis of country-of-origin research, *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 20(5), pp. 521-46.
- Vida, I., and Reardon, J. (2008). Domestic consumption: rational, affective or normative choices? *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 25(1), pp. 34-44.
- Woodward, I., Skrbis, 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.
- Yaprak, A. (2003) Measurement problems in cross-national consumer researcher: the state-of-the-art and future research directions. In S. C. Jain, ed., *Handbook of Research in International Marketing*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 175-189.
- Zeugner-Roth, K., Zabkar, V., and Diamantopoulos, A. (2015). Consumer Ethnocentrism, National Identity, and Consumer Cosmopolitanism as Drivers of Consumer behavior: A Social Identity Perspective, *Journal of International Marketing*, 23(2), pp. 25-54.
- Zhou, L., Yang, Z., and Hui, M.K. (2010). Non-local or local brands? A Multi-level investigation into confidence in brand origin identification and its strategic implications, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 38(2), pp. 202-218.