13 Different modes of openness and tolerance in Europeans' cultural participation

Riie Heikkilä, Sylvia Holla, Željka Zdravković, and Giuseppe Lamberti

Contents

1. Introduction

Cultural participation is tightly linked to cultural capital and the enduring reproduction of inequality (Bourdieu, 1984; Reeves & De Vries, 2019). We know from previous research that people with privileged backgrounds participate in culture in highly different ways than less privileged people. Participating actively in traditionally defined culture, such as attending the theatre or reading books, is connected to high education and class status across different national contexts (Bennett et al., 2009; Purhonen et al., 2014; Reeves, 2019; Weingartner & Rössel, 2019). High education's strong predicting effect for engagement in "highbrow" culture also holds for everyday forms of culture, such as going to the cinema or library (Heikkilä & Lindblom, 2023).

Apart from being connected to cultural capital and status distinctions, cultural participation also has significant connections to openness and tolerance. Empirical studies on the link between cultural practices and openness and tolerance have typically focused on specific national contexts and primarily relied on quantitative data (Lindblom, 2022; Prieur & Savage, 2013; Rössel & Schroedter, 2015). The qualitative work on the interconnection between cultural participation and openness and tolerance is mostly interview-based, like ours (e.g., Jarness & Friedman, 2017;

DOI: 10.4324/9781003460497-17

Ollivier, 2008; Pedersen et al., 2018; Yalvaç & Karademir Hazır, 2021). This chapter sheds light on the relationship between cultural participation and openness and tolerance by using rich qualitative interview data from four different European national contexts: Croatia, Finland, the Netherlands, and Spain. The data cover a broad range of cultural practices and attitudes, and the sample includes locals and migrants with various cultural and ethnic backgrounds who reside in both urban and rural areas. In this way, we connect the existing scholarly debate to the current policy and societal debates on inclusivity and sociocultural integration and show how cultural participation can contribute to these matters. We ask: What kinds of combinations of cultural participation and openness and tolerance are found across the four countries studied?

In this chapter, we understand cultural openness and tolerance as attitudes linked to appreciating others' cultural practices and, often, attempting to expand one's cultural practices towards them in the spirit of diversity and exhibiting an interest in engaging with culturally foreign practices (Hanquinet et al., 2014; Rössel & Schroedter, 2015). We believe that the distinction between openness and tolerance is subtle and not always easy to discern in empirical data. We shall thus use the concepts a priori interchangeably.

2. Previous research on how cultural participation intersects with attitudes of openness and tolerance

What do we know about cultural participation and openness and tolerance so far? According to several empirical studies, cultural participation and tolerance are highly related (Anheier et al., 2017; Leroux & Bernadska, 2014; Leung & Lee, 2005). In the following, we briefly introduce the main theoretical debates that connect cultural practices with openness and tolerance: cultural omnivorousness, cultural cosmopolitanism, and political openness.

An important starting point for the debate on the openness and tolerance of cultural practices was the conceptualisation of the *omnivorous* cultural consumer. The omnivore scholars claimed that the cultural practices of previously snobbish educated groups were gradually becoming more open and tolerant and that this openness and tolerance and the ability to combine "high" and "low" cultural practices were becoming distinctive traits (Peterson & Kern, 1996). For instance, Lizardo and Skiles (2012) have argued that having omnivorous practices could be considered a form of cultural capital in itself.

The context of globalising economic and cultural production and consumption has created more complex relations between cultural and social stratification at global, national, and local levels, paving the way for a new cosmopolitan style of openness. This has typically signalled openness towards culture in the broader sense, linked to an interest in global culture (cf. Katz-Gerro et al., 2024; Rössel Schroedter, 2015; Saito, 2011; Verboord, 2017). For instance, in a Serbian study, local cultural activities such as religious and family celebrations, folkloric music, or dance were associated with more strongly expressed nationalistic attitudes. On the other hand, cosmopolitan taste in food and music, as well as more liberal political attitudes, were associated with a distancing from national cultural

forms (Cvetičanin & Popescu, 2011). In Denmark, an opposition between local and global was found in TV, musical, and food preferences (Prieur et al., 2008).

However, the concept of cosmopolitanism has been the subject of discussion and redefinition. Whereas cultural cosmopolitanism was previously seen as a characteristic reserved only for middle to higher-class inhabitants of globally connected cities, today, it is considered less distinctive and potentially applicable to both globally and locally oriented citizens. Notably, Motti Regev (2019) argues that cultural cosmopolitanism nowadays is an all-embracing term, depicting the condition of world culture in late modernity. Regev states that the distinction between cosmopolitans and locals in world culture, previously made by Hannerz (1990), is no longer relevant. Pichler (2008) found that, indeed, a considerable proportion of Europeans see themselves as what could be called cosmopolitan. However, he also argues that these views are socially stratified and do not necessarily go hand in hand with open-mindedness. Further research on cosmopolitanism confirms this stratified nature of cosmopolitanism. Focusing on how Europeans define themselves in terms of citizenship – as national citizens, European citizens, or even citizens of the world, Verboord (2017) demonstrates that a small but significant part of Europeans combines identification with the national context with European identity. Higher educated people are most likely to display such diversity and breadth in attachment and can hence be defined as cosmopolitans.

Finally, when speaking about cultural practices and forms of openness and tolerance, we should consider that political attitudes and valuations are increasingly making their way to different spheres of life, including cultural practices (DellaPosta et al., 2015). This development sparked debates about a politically defined openness. Here, the direction is similar to other phenomena reviewed previously. Open and tolerant attitudes are typically connected to wide patterns of cultural practices, and traditional, conservative attitudes to narrow patterns of cultural practices. Cultural omnivores and people participating actively in culture tend to be more liberal than those with narrow cultural practices (Chan, 2019; Cvetičanin & Popescu, 2011; DiMaggio, 1996). Many scholars have pointed out that this might be a simplification that requires more shades of grey: It could be that political 'tastes' form certain lifestyles (Harrits, 2013) and that outward liberal values might not point to both cultural and political openness and tolerance but on the contrary to harsh attitudes towards groups that fail to comply with these ideals (Pedersen et al., 2018). This further underlines a need to understand better the relationship between cultural practices and open and tolerant attitudes.

In sum, a broad consensus of the scholarly literature thus indicates that openness and tolerance, as attitudes directing cultural practices, are distinctive in themselves (e.g., Peterson & Kern, 1996; Warde et al., 2007; Purhonen et al., 2010). Cultural tolerance and openness are recognised as social status symbols (Lamont, 1992); in this scenario, openness can be understood as "a new status marker and, therefore, may function as a means of distinction" (Roose et al., 2012, p. 497). A logical counterpoint for high levels of openness and tolerance is found in the lowest status groups: low socio-economic status is associated with a large number of cultural dislikes (Bryson, 1996), as well as having a defiant attitude towards highbrow culture in general (Heikkilä, 2022).

3. Methods

For this chapter, we used the INVENT project's interviews (n = 103) from Croatia, Finland, the Netherlands, and Spain (cf. the Methodological Appendix of this volume). Through the selection of these four countries, we aimed at a rich sample with countries from both Northern (Finland, the Netherlands) and Southern (Croatia, Spain) Europe with different cultural policy regimes and levels of globalisation and migration, none of which has either an extremely central or extremely peripheral location in the global or European cultural systems (Appadurai, 1996). The participants were recruited using survey respondents who had indicated that they were willing to participate in follow-up interviews and provided their contact details. Our interview data slightly overrepresented highly educated interviewees (see Table 13.1). In this chapter, we do not aim at a country comparison but analyse our material as data on all kinds of Europeans.

Out of all the interview material, we used the questions that would include discussions of openness and tolerance; these were mainly the questions on the respondents' free time, what they considered important for their life and well-being, what role cultural activities played for good and bad times during their lives, what they appreciated about the culture of the place they lived in, and whether there were things they appreciated in other European cultures or beyond. As the team included one author from each studied country, each author first read all the interview material from their national context to discern different types of combinations of cultural participation and attitudes of openness and tolerance. After that, we discussed recurring themes and translated suitable interview excerpts into English. Our final step was a collective content analysis through which we organised the interview material into recurrent combinations of specific repertoires of cultural participation and certain attitudes of openness and tolerance. We differentiated between broad and narrow cultural participation (understanding broad cultural participation as encompassing both highbrow and popular culture as well as non-national or non-local culture and narrow as its opposite) and between different modes of openness and tolerance.

Our analysis of the interviews resulted in three commonly utilised ways to combine cultural participation and attitudes reflecting openness and tolerance. Here, our idea is not to cluster individual interviewees into categories but to show how people are capable of mobilising multiple attitudes. In the next section, we present each pattern in detail with empirical examples.

Table 13.1 Overview of Interview Participants

Country	*N Interviewees*	*Men/ Women*	*Age: 18–30/ 31–45/46–60/60+*	*Level of Education: Low/Middle/High*
Croatia	34	16/18	1/13/14/6	1/12/21
Finland	20	11/9	3/6/6/5	0/13/7
Netherlands	25	13/12	6/9/5/5	0/5/20
Spain	24	12/12	7/12/5/0	0/12/12
Total	103	52/51	17/40/30/16	1/42/60

4. Results

Cultural openness

The first pattern, which we labelled "cultural openness", is characterised by a combination of broad cultural participation and an idea of broad cultural practices as a vehicle for achieving openness, which has intrinsic value. Interviewees linked to this pattern usually have broad cultural participation, encompassing both highbrow and popular culture and engagement with non-local culture. At the same time, they speak about cultural participation as enabling a better understanding of others and, more broadly, as a way of enhancing communication across cultures. There is also a trust that culture is "good for you" and helps you develop yourself. In the interviews, there is thus a strong "reflexive appropriation" "in a spirit of openness" (Bennett et al., 2009, p. 194).

The interviewees exhibiting this cultural openness pattern are typically women from all over the studied countries, consolidating the finding that female gender is an important predictor of active cultural participation in general and across many national contexts (Christin, 2012; Purhonen et al., 2011). Many have high levels of education, another factor known to predict active participation (Katz-Gerro & Meier Jæger, 2015; Purhonen et al., 2014; Reeves & De Vries, 2019; Weingartner & Rössel, 2019).

The sole most common feature of the first pattern is that cultural participation is genuinely broad, encompassing highbrow-oriented, popular, and everyday culture such as sports, and that cultural participation entails engagement with non-national culture as well. There is thus a strong undercurrent of cultural cosmopolitanism and also omnivorousness. A good example is a Spanish middle-aged woman with higher education who actively reads, visits museums, goes hiking, dancing, and more, and who reflects upon the capabilities of cultural participation in advancing communication between different cultures, enhancing ideals of respect, and, eventually, providing well-being:

> The more cultural knowledge and respect you have, the better you can communicate with other people from different cultures, the better you can understand and respect them, and the more comfortable they can be with you.
>
> (ES08)

A highly similar account is provided by a Finnish interviewee, a woman in her 60s who has had a successful professional career and is currently retired (FI01). A general feeling of being active marks her whole life: she goes to the opera and live concerts, participates in various associations, and travels around the world. Additionally, she bikes, swims, and even fishes in the nearby lake. Now that she is retired, she spends much of the year at her countryside cabin. She is open minded regarding culture and wants to broaden her cultural horizons: she specifically mentions having "learned" to listen to opera and will participate in technically any event she comes across ("of course, if I happen to be in a city in which something is going on, I will be engaged in those activities"). She reflects upon openness as

something that frames her entire life: she loves to meet new people, looks at things "first globally and then on a smaller scale", and, in general, culture means for her "civilisation".

A similar example is a retired Finnish female in her 70s. She laments the pause in cultural activities caused by the COVID-19 restrictions but has, in general, an active lifestyle: She goes to her cabin, attends different sports classes such as pilates and yoga, and, at the time of the interview, declares that she misses the cinema, the theatre, and concerts. When talking more directly about openness, she connects it directly to the positive and enlightening power that international culture festivals have had for Finland, such as the World Village Festival ("Maailma kylässä"), organised yearly in Helsinki and presenting global culture but also standing for causes such as sustainable development:

> We have opened ourselves more towards Europe and the world than before. There are so many more options, of course, there is also so much more information from the world. . . . There is so much more culture, there are, for instance, all the World Village Festival events and these kinds of things, very broadly and from around the world, there is also the Helsinki arts festival and all that, there are so many things. It has broadened things so much.
>
> (FI03)

Finally, a Croatian male interviewee with a university degree (HR26) exemplifies well a common combination of a wide cultural participation palette and broad openness, although the emphasis is on participation in popular culture. Regarding cultural participation, he states that he is interested in old buildings and mostly meets friends, attends football matches, and takes his children to different sports activities. Regarding openness, he speaks at great length about the importance of respecting all kinds of cultures: "You should respect every culture, religion, people, their customs that belong to some vision of Europeans, you should respect everything". A highly similar case, again focused on participation in popular culture, is a 30-something expat from the UK living in Amsterdam who does football and boxing and sometimes likes to go for a beer after these activities. He has a wide idea of openness, emphasising again the importance of understanding people from other cultures and learning from them:

> Always been very interested in other cultures, to be honest, always and still remain exactly the same. Now, I think my experience is the more that you understand other cultures, the more you see that human beings are pretty much the same everywhere. We just tend to make these generalisations about other countries et cetera. But generally speaking, people are people and you find very similar people to yourself everywhere and people very different to you everywhere, and that's just a reality.
>
> (NL14)

Political openness

The second pattern is characterised by a wide palette of different kinds of cultural participation, just like the first one, but it leans more towards popular forms of culture. Whereas, in the first pattern, the main understanding of openness is expressed through cultural terms and tones inherent to cultural omnivorousness and cosmopolitanism, the second one features openness as based on and articulated through phenomena related to the spheres of politics and even morals, hence the label "political openness". Important identity labels for interviewees displaying this pattern are anti-racism, the welcoming of different minorities, and social solidarity (expressed, for instance, through support for a large welfare state).

The fact that political values have come closer to cultural attitudes could be interpreted as a form of what Daniel DellaPosta (2020) has called an *oil spill* to metaphorise how political and moral valuations have increasingly drifted into the realm of cultural practices. From a larger perspective, the combination of relatively broad cultural participation patterns with liberal attitudes also signals what Prieur and Savage (2013) have called *emerging, cosmopolitan* cultural capital. This interpretation is further corroborated by the fact that most interviewees linked to this pattern are young. Previous research found that moral or political positions are significant markers of distinction for younger generations (Prieur et al., 2023). Political openness was found throughout the countries studied.

A good example comes from a Finnish service worker in his 30s. He is an alternative type who likes street culture and doing graffiti and is interested in the tattoo scene ("I don't make them myself, but I like to take them. Many friends of mine are tattoo artists, and I learn from them more and more about that culture all the time"). He listens to a broad repertoire of music, including both classical and pop music, and now and then to heavy music too. He has travelled widely and praises his recent trips to Greece and Turkey as wonderful opportunities for a positive cultural clash: "different origins, different continent, different religions, all this". This is complemented smoothly by his ideals of a future with even more openness and arguments of why some people might have racist prejudices:

> I think that in Finland all kinds of cultures are in sight and are taken into consideration pretty well, and I think they are trying to improve it all the time. I think they could be even more efficient about it. When you go outside of Helsinki, it's a different situation, it's like day and night. There they might wonder at foreign peoples' lives and manners in even a bit of a racist way and wonder why these kinds of lifestyles even materialise here, but I guess it's because people don't live in the situation themselves, they look at it from afar, they are suspicious and too scared to find out more.
>
> (FI06)

Another example of broad popular culture-oriented practices paired with a politically oriented openness is offered by a Finnish male in his 20s who works in a

traditional manual blue-collar job (FI17). He has different gaming hobbies (live roleplaying games but also online games, mostly strategy and adventure games). He meets a large group of friends from around Finland online for gaming, but he also has many live, outside-home activities: He hangs with his friends, goes to the movies, or sometimes visits a museum. He follows international cultural trends keenly. For instance, he has recently started to appreciate Korean and Japanese pop culture and likes to discover international restaurants. Regarding attitudes and values, his account exemplifies the central ideals of the second pattern well: He hates "extremes" and would never attend an event with any racism involved: "It's so accusatory and even somewhat aggressive, I don't share that kind of worldview".

A very similar profile is found in a Spanish male in his 30s with lower compulsory secondary education. His cultural participation includes, for instance, playing tennis and padel, going to the cinema, listening to music and punk-rock, and going to restaurants. His account of openness as, first and foremost, a lack of prejudice is highly similar to the Finnish voices previously:

> What I appreciate most about the city where I live is the respect that there is in general with people who are not indigenous, with foreigners. It doesn't matter where you're from, people talk to you the same way, they make you feel like you're from [town], even more so if you're of a different race or religion, it's a very non-racist town, and that really makes me super proud and I really like it, it doesn't happen often.
>
> (ES03)

Some interviewees had even more clearly politically articulated tones. A Spanish interviewee, a male in his 30s with a bachelor's degree, paired his broad cultural participation palette (nature, hiking, travelling, diving, sailing, reading, acting, going to concerts, and watching films) with a very specific perspective on solidarity and the importance of a strong public sector:

> I'm not a big fan of clichés or stereotypes, but I do think that at a European level, we have this point in common, that the welfare state is important and that we show solidarity in terms of public institutions, health, education, and for me this is very important.
>
> (ES10)

Many migrants seem to embrace this political openness partly because they have had to face racism. A telling example is a 48-year-old male interviewed in Croatia with secondary education. He is active regarding culture: He attends stand-up comedies and festivals, likes computers ("I was always in the forefront of technology"), and is a fan of, among other things, Japan and samurai culture. He states being somewhat worried about possible racism because of his ethnic background. At the

same time, he is extremely open minded and mentions the Netherlands as a positive ideal of a non-prejudiced way of life:

> The Dutch, I like their open-mindedness, yeah. That's what I would single out immediately, yeah. Everyone is just free to be what they are without any judgment. So, that's why, of course, everyone knows Amsterdam for the drug culture, the red-light stuff. Walking on the main square and seeing a man in just his pants [laughter], offering flyers to something while kids are going by. Everything is visible, right. But this is genuine; it's not just pretending.
>
> (HR11)

Resisting openness

Our third pattern is characterised by slightly narrower and often more home-bound cultural participation patterns than what we have seen thus far. While the first pattern emphasised cultural participation as a means to enhance the ideal of understanding others in vein with the ideals of cultural omnivorousness and cosmopolitanism and the second one was more connected to politically oriented openness, the "resisting openness" pattern has less optimistic and positive tones and thus lacks a link to these discourses on openness.

Instead, there is an air of criticality towards others' perceived lifestyles. Across the national contexts studied here, this critical attitude appears related to the typically low education of the interviewees concerned. The critical tones are associated with the sentiments of anger and betrayal that previous studies have described as elementary features of the contemporary lower classes (De Keere, 2020; Hochschild, 2016). Skeggs and Loveday (2012) talk about "value struggles" that different underprivileged groups face, seeing their own lifestyles as less worthy. Some studies observed an outright negative or hostile attitude towards culture and openness among low-status groups. For instance, Heikkilä (2022) found that certain underprivileged groups had a "resistance discourse" towards culture, characterised by defiance of the entire concept of culture. In the third pattern, we see that combined with a relatively narrow palette of cultural participation. Additionally, we observe somewhat conservative attitudes in this interpretation of openness – a tendency already documented in the literature (Chan, 2019; Heikkilä et al., 2020). To some extent, the third pattern also resembles the "practical openness" mode which Ollivier (2008) found in her Canadian interview data. People displaying practical openness valued things like practical intelligence and resilience instead of speaking in cultural terms.

A common feature of the third pattern is an emphasis on popular and mundane activities and an aversion towards culture perceived as highbrow. A good example is a Croatian 50-something female interviewee with secondary education whose cultural participation is composed of spending time with her grandson and cleaning ("When I clean, I get rid of anger and somehow it calms me down"), television,

movies and series, and going out as a larger group ("but again it's not cultural, we just hang out and talk"). Her rather anti-cultural attitudes come out when speaking about what she considers highbrow culture. Opera is a stellar example:

> [laughs] Well, it bothers me, that. . . . I just don't like it. I don't like anything, I don't like when they sing like that. I don't like that. . . . I don't like it. Because they are pointless and nonsensical. That's just what you do when you're drunk. To relax, but nothing clever.
>
> (HR13)

Also, many cultural participation activities are mainly unstructured solo activities, within-home rather than outside-home activities. A good example is a Finnish interviewee, a 20-something woman who has left her specialist workplace and started to study for a manual job. She is mostly interested in gardening; in addition, she mostly does only handicrafts and reading. She reflects on her parents as having been narrow-minded: "Neither of my parents are very curious or try new things, for instance, something like yoga . . . it might be that I could not make them try it out whatever I do, they have certain prejudices". A similar attitude is reflected in the interviewee's own cultural practices characterised by prudence and slightly conservative tones, emphasising Finnishness over different kinds of globalised cultural practices:

> While we are here kind of surrounded by the sea and a bit in the periphery, we still get influences from elsewhere. Well, I think it's OK, or I have a neutral stand towards it. I don't have an opinion, I just wish that we won't maybe forget our own roots and for instance our own language . . . that we would not forget our own core, our Finnish gist, our nuclear self.
>
> (FI15)

Interviewees who appear to "resist openness" sometimes express more directly moral tones. This moral emphasis is similar to what is found in the second pattern, but is aimed in the opposite direction: conservative instead of progressive. For instance, a Croatian 40-something male interviewee with secondary education, whose cultural participation consists of football, playing Fortnite with his son, and driving his children to different places, criticises the cultural industry heavily for unnecessarily politicising things he finds uncomfortable, for instance, LGTB issues:

> In Europe, I notice . . . international films, are all financed from these funds today, and 70% deal with the same topic. That is, with gay issues. And then, I think that now it starts to create even greater and greater aversion toward these things in people. . . . I don't like it when something is imposed; I immediately consider it worthless altogether.
>
> (HR18)

Finally, the last example from the Netherlands shows that not all interviewees who resist openness necessarily engage in lowbrow or popular cultural participation. Rather than "browness", the decisive feature seems to be a relative narrowness of cultural participation. This 63-year-old Dutch man living in a rural town visits Amsterdam often to attend classical music concerts and galleries. He knows many artists personally and attends different kinds of art trips. At the same time, he is critical of excessive immigration and expresses opinions that are conspicuous in their absence in the other two patterns:

> I think it's getting too busy in the Netherlands, let's put it this way. A large proportion are economic refugees. I don't blame them, and I still think if people's existence is threatened by their political convictions or their beliefs, you have to offer them something. But we are just dealing with a lot of people who are very badly off in terms of provision, in terms of food and living, and you name it in their own country, and then they come here. The most extreme are the Algerian and Moroccan youths who have been declared criminals in their own country and come to seek asylum here.
>
> (NL08)

5. Conclusion

In this chapter, we considered what combinations of cultural participation and openness and tolerance are found in our interview data. Through a thematic analysis of the interview data from Croatia, Finland, the Netherlands, and Spain (n = 103), we identified three main patterns in how interviewees combined cultural participation and attitudes reflecting openness and tolerance, which we labelled cultural openness, political openness, and resisting openness. The first pattern is a combination of broad cultural participation and attitudes of openness that emphasise culture as a way of understanding others – thus including elements of cultural omnivorousness and cosmopolitanism. We typically found this pattern in interviews with highly educated women. The second pattern combines wide cultural participation – skewed more towards popular forms of culture than the first – and liberal attitudes of openness that emphasise politics and even moral judgements. This pattern emerged particularly in interviews with younger people. Finally, the third pattern, typically found in interviews with low-status groups, is a combination of slightly more limited forms of cultural participation and narrower ideas of openness, which we interpret as tolerance rather than openness – implying that the concepts are not synonymous after all. We thus also decipher a difference between openness – viewed as attitudes linked to appreciating others' cultural practices, also beyond the national/global divide, and being interested in practising them – and tolerance – viewed as a much narrower mindset inclined to literally only tolerate or silently accept others' cultural practices (instead of directly opposing oneself to them), but without any expressed interest to embrace them.

Our analysis thus shows that openness and tolerance cannot be categorised as one attitude. Rather, we should distinguish between a purely culturally oriented openness and a more politically oriented openness, while there is also an attitude with little openness in whichever way. This reflects the argument of Katz-Gerro et al. (2024), who found cultural, interpersonal, and political dimensions of cosmopolitanism in their quantitative data on nine European countries. This division also points to the fact that openness is not only a property of the high-status groups. Whereas the first pattern of "cultural openness" was associated with a high educational background, the second pattern of "political openness" was linked to young age and people in different (including relatively low) socio-economic positions, mirroring previous work (e.g., Nault et al., 2021) that situated omnivorous cultural practices in the middle regions of the social space instead of the upper layers. The political and moral orientation of our second pattern resonates with other studies. For instance, Pedersen et al. (2018) showed that young Norwegians use political and moral valuations in distinction-oriented ways. The second pattern is also the one for which exposure to both personal and mediatised foreign global culture seems to have shaped open and tolerant attitudes the most, reflecting again the findings of Katz-Gerro et al. (2024), who demonstrated that exposure influences tolerance even beyond sociodemographic factors.

While attitudes of openness are located in both the upper and middle classes, anti-openness is clearly a property of the lower status groups – as is visible in the third pattern of resisting openness. The latter finding accords with recent studies emphasising the feelings of anger, and the belief of the lower classes that established forms of culture and cultural participation do not serve or speak to them (Heikkilä, 2022; Hochschild, 2016). Many interviewees who display this resistance to openness seem to have adopted what De Keere (2020) has termed a fatalistic worldview: "The way to counteract and survive this situation is by not abiding by the rules and instead emphasising one's own hedonism, straightforwardness and non-hypocrisy" (p. 5). Our third pattern demonstrates how moral standards can become vehicles for demonstrating self-worth and dignity even in a setting of little economic and cultural resources (Jarness & Flemmen, 2019; Lamont, 2000).

Space constraints prevented us from analysing country differences in detail. Yet it is interesting that we detect such similar patterns of cultural participation, openness, and tolerance across our four societies. This is in line with Katz-Gerro et al.'s (2024) finding that individual-level characteristics contribute more to differences in European citizens' cosmopolitanism than country characteristics.

Another important limitation is the skewness of our data towards more educated profiles. We were unable to recruit interviewees with extremely negative or hostile attitudes towards cultural participation or with little cultural participation in general. People with this profile are often reluctant to be interviewed and, therefore, more difficult to reach (Heikkilä, 2022). Finally, a significant limitation is that we are studying peoples' narratives about their cultural participation – we know that these might be highly performative rather than reflect deep dispositions of openness and that it is risky to interpret interview talk as indicators of actual behaviour

(Jerolmack & Khan, 2014). It might thus be a different thing to "talk openness" than to really "do openness".

Openness in cultural participation thus connects to openness in attitudes. People with broader cultural participation show broader openness than people with narrower participation. This general tendency of a certain openness or liberality going together with broader cultural participation has been documented in the literature (Chan, 2019; Cvetičanin & Popescu, 2011; DiMaggio, 1996; Ollivier, 2008). We nuance this debate by pointing out that openness and tolerance are at the heart of all expressions of cultural participation: It just comes out differently, being either culturally or politically motivated and linked to actual cultural participation, or, as in our third pattern, it is met with a defiant and critical attitude and linked to less actual cultural participation. We also saw that the different patterns are at least partly linked to specific socio-economic characteristics – the first one to highly educated women, the second to younger people, and the third to groups with lower levels of education. We can, therefore, conclude that openness and tolerance as catalysts of cultural participation boil down to strong societal boundaries.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the European Union Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under grant agreement no. 870691. The authors would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their careful reading of the chapter and their helpful feedback.

References

Anheier, H. K., List, R. A., Kononykhina, O., & Cohen, J. L. (2017). *Cultural participation and inclusive societies: A thematic report based on the indicator framework on culture and democracy*. Council of Europe.

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. University of Minnesota Press.

Bennett, T., Savage, M., Silva, E., Warde, A., Gayo-Cal, M., & Wright, D. (2009). *Culture, class, distinction*. Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1984/1979). *Distinction. A social critique of the judgment of taste*. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Bryson, B. (1996). "Anything but heavy metal": Symbolic exclusion and musical dislikes. *American Sociological Review*, *61*(5), 884–899. https://doi.org/10.2307/2096459

Chan, T. W. (2019). Understanding cultural omnivores: Social and political attitudes. *British Journal of Sociology*, *70*(3), 784–806. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468–4446.12613

Christin, A. (2012). Gender and highbrow cultural participation in the United States. *Poetics*, *40*(5), 423–443. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2012.07.003

Cvetičanin, P., & Popescu, M. (2011). The art of making classes in Serbia: Another particular case of the possible. *Poetics*, *39*, 444–468. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2011.09.006

De Keere, K. (2020). Finding the moral space: Rethinking morality, social class and worldviews. *Poetics*, *79*, 101415. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2019.101415

DellaPosta, D. (2020). Pluralistic collapse: The "oil spill" model of mass opinion polarization. *American Sociological Review*, *85*(3), 507–536. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122420922989

DellaPosta, D., Shi, Y., & Macy, M. (2015). Why do liberals drink lattes? *American Journal of Sociology*, *120*(5), 1473–1511. https://doi.org/10.1086/681254

DiMaggio, P. (1996). Are art-museum visitors different from other people? The relationship between attendance and social and political attitudes in the United States. *Poetics*, *24*, 161–180. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-422X(96)00008-3

Hannerz, U. (1990). Cosmopolitans and locals in world culture. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *7*(2–3), 237–251. https://doi.org/10.1177/026327690007002014

Hanquinet, L., Roose, H., & Savage, M. (2014). The eyes of the beholder: Aesthetic preferences and the remaking of cultural capital. *Sociology*, *48*(1), 111–132. https://doi.org/10.1177/00380385134779

Harrits, G. S. (2013). Class, culture and politics: On the relevance of a Bourdieusian concept of class in political sociology. *The Sociological Review*, *61*(1), 172–202. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467–954X.12009

Heikkilä, R. (2022). *Understanding cultural non-participation in an egalitarian context*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Heikkilä, R., Leguina, A., & Purhonen, S. (2020). The stratification of media usage in Finland, 2007–2018: Signs of socio-political polarization? *New Media & Society*, *24*(5), 1053–1075. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444820971612

Heikkilä, R., & Lindblom, T. (2023). Overlaps and accumulations: The anatomy of cultural non-participation in Finland, 2007 to 2018. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, *23*(1), 122–145. https://doi.org/10.1177/14695405211062052

Hochschild, A. R. (2016). *Strangers in their own land*. The New Press.

Jarness, V., & Friedman, S. (2017). 'I'm not a snob, but. . .': Class boundaries and the downplaying of difference. *Poetics*, *61*, 14–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2016.11.001

Jarness, V., & Flemmen, M. (2019). A struggle on two fronts: Boundary drawing in the lower region of the social space and the symbolic market for "down-to-earthness". *British Journal of Sociology*, *70*, 166–189. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468–4446.12345

Jerolmack, C., & Khan, S. (2014). Talk is cheap: Ethnography and the attitudinal fallacy. *Sociological Methods and Research*, *43*(2), 178–209. https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124114523396

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

Katz-Gerro, T., & Meier Jæger, M. (2015). Does women's preference for highbrow leisure begin in the family? Comparing leisure participation among brothers and sisters. *Leisure Sciences*, *37*(5), 415–430. https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400.2014.995326

Lamont, M. (1992). *Money, morals and manners: The culture of the French and American upper middle classes*. University of Chicago Press.

Lamont, M. (2000). *Dignity of working men. Morality and the boundaries of race, class, and immigration*. Harvard University Press.

Leroux, K., & Bernadska, A. (2014). Impact of the arts on individual contributions to US civil society. *Journal of Civil Society*, *10*(2), 144–164. https://doi.org/10.1080/17448689.2014.912479

Leung, L., & Lee, P. S. N. (2005). Multiple determinants of life quality: The roles of Internet activities, use of new media, social support, and leisure activities. *Telematics and Informatics*, *22*(3), 161–180. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2004.04.003

Lindblom, T. (2022). Growing openness or creeping intolerance? Cultural taste orientations and tolerant social attitudes in Finland, 2007–2018. *Poetics*, *93*, Part B, 101663. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2022.101663

Lizardo, O., & Skiles, S. (2012). Reconceptualizing and theorizing "omnivorousness": Genetic and relational mechanisms. *Sociological Theory*, *30*(4), 263–282. https://doi.org/10.1177/0735275112466999

Nault, J. F., Baumann, S., Childress, C., & Rawlings, C. M. (2021). The social positions of taste between and within music genres: From omnivore to snob. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, *24*(3), 717–740. https://doi.org/10.1177/13675494211006090

Ollivier, M. (2008). Modes of openness to cultural diversity. Humanist, populist, practical, and indifferent. *Poetics*, *36*(2–3), 120–147. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2008.02.005

Pedersen, W., Jarness, V., & Flemmen, M. (2018). Revenge of the nerds: Cultural capital and the politics of lifestyle among adolescent elites. *Poetics*, *70*, 54–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2018.05.002

Peterson, R. A., & Kern, R. (1996). Changing highbrow taste: From snob to omnivore. *American Sociological Review*, *61*(5), 900–907. https://doi.org/10.2307/2096460

Pichler, F. (2008). How real is cosmopolitanism in Europe? *Sociology*, *42*(6), 1107–1126. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038508096936

Prieur, A., Savage, M., & Flemmen, M. P. (2023). Distinctions in the making: A theoretical discussion of youth and cultural capital. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.13002

Prieur, A., Rosenlund, L., & Skjott-Larsen, J. (2008). Cultural capital today: A case study from Denmark. *Poetics*, *36*(1), 45–71. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2008.02.008

Prieur, A., & Savage, M. (2013). Emerging forms of cultural capital. *European Societies*, *15*(2), 246–267. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616696.2012.748930

Purhonen, S., Gronow, J., Heikkilä, R., Kahma, N., Rahkonen, K., & Toikka, A. (2014). *Suomalainen maku: Kulttuuripääoma, kulutus ja elämäntyylien sosiaalinen eriytyminen*. Gaudeamus.

Purhonen, S., Gronow, J., & Rahkonen, K. (2010). Nordic democracy of taste? Cultural omnivorousness in musical and literary taste preferences in Finland. *Poetics*, *38*(3), 266–298. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2010.03.003

Purhonen, S., Gronow, J., & Rahkonen, K. (2011). Highbrow culture in Finland: Knowledge, taste and participation. *Acta Sociologica*, *54*(4), 385–402. https://doi.org/10.1177/0001699311422092

Reeves, A. (2019). How class identities shape highbrow consumption: A cross-national analysis of 30 European countries and regions. *Poetics*, *76*, 101361. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2019.04.002

Reeves, A., & De Vries, R. (2019). Can cultural consumption increase future earnings? Exploring the economic returns to cultural capital. *The British Journal of Sociology*, *70*(1), 214–240. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12374

Regev, M. (2019). The condition of cultural cosmopolitanism. In V. Cicchelli, S. Octobre, & V. Riegel (Eds.), *Aesthetic cosmopolitanism and global culture* (pp. 27–45). Brill.

Roose, H., Van Eijck, K., & Lievens, J. (2012). Culture of distinction or culture of openness? Using a social space approach to analyze the social structuring of lifestyles. *Poetics*, *40*(6), 491–513. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2012.08.001

Rössel, J., & Schroedter, J. H. (2015). Cosmopolitan cultural consumption: Preferences and practices in a heterogenous, urban population in Switzerland. *Poetics*, *50*, 80–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2015.02.009

Saito, H. (2011). An actor-network theory of cosmopolitanism. *Sociological Theory*, *29*(2), 124–149. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467–9558.2011.01390.x

Skeggs, B., & Loveday, V. (2012). Struggles for value: Value practices, injustice, judgment, affect and the idea of class. *The British Journal of Sociology*, *63*(3), 472–490. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468–4446.2012.01420.x

Verboord, M. (2017). Internet usage and cosmopolitanism in Europe: A multilevel analysis. *Information, Communication & Society*, *20*(3), 460–481. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2016.1187193

Warde, A., Wright, D., & Gayo-Cal, M. (2007). Understanding cultural omnivorousness: Or, the myth of the cultural omnivore. *Cultural Sociology*, *1*(2), 143–164. https://doi.org/10.1177/1749975507078185

Weingartner, S., & Rössel, J. (2019). Changing dimensions of cultural consumption? The space of lifestyles in Switzerland from 1976 to 2013. *Poetics*, *74*, 101345. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2019.01.001

Yalvaç, N. S., & Karademir Hazır, I. (2021). Do omnivores perform class distinction? A qualitative inspection of culinary tastes, boundaries and cultural tolerance. *Sociology*, *55*(3), 469–486. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038520967257