Measuring Citizen Attitudes Toward Globalization

Thesis Submitted to the College of Graduate Studies and Research

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of Master of Arts

in the Department of Political Studies

University of Saskatchewan

Saskatoon

By Juanita - Dawne Bacsu

PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Graduate degree from the University of Saskatchewan, I agree that the Libraries of this University may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying of this thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor or professors who supervised my thesis work or, in their absence, by the Head of the Department of Political Studies or the Dean of the College of Graduate Studies and Research. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this thesis or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of Saskatchewan in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis.

Requests for permission to copy or to make other use of material in this thesis in whole or part should be addressed to:

Head of the Department of Political Studies
University of Saskatchewan
9 Campus Drive
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7N 5A5

ABSTRACT

To date, most public opinion surveys on globalization have placed little emphasis on studying globalization as a multidimensional phenomenon. The dominant approach used in most public opinion surveys on globalization is to focus primarily on its economic aspects, particularly as change in international trade flows. However, many academics recognize that globalization has political and cultural dimensions, which raises the question: can citizen attitudes toward globalization be explained merely by studying its economic dimension?

This study proposes that including definitions relating to globalization's cultural and political aspects produces richer opinion poll data that, along with economic definitions, allows for more valid interpretation of public attitudes towards globalization. This proposition was tested in a national, SSHRC-funded public opinion survey conducted in January of 2007 among 1,505 Canadians. This study probes both the different dimensions of globalization and people's different conceptualizations of globalization. Drawing upon recent work by Kenichi Ohmae, Philip Cerny and others, the respondent pool was divided in half and then competing paired definitions of cultural and political globalization were tested. The results suggest that citizens possess significantly different attitudes toward the political, cultural and economic aspects of globalization, and so operationalizing the concept in terms of its economic effects alone is insufficient for most survey and public policy purposes.
.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

One of the most important research areas in modern social science is the study of globalization. Social scientists from a variety of disciplines probe its history, processes, effects and implications. There is ongoing debate about the potentially detrimental effects of globalization, and so collecting information about globalization has become imperative for policy makers who seek to inform public policy. Public opinion research may help government agencies to better understand how citizens are responding to this new phenomenon, and help to develop workable public policy options concerning globalization's effects.[1] However, globalization is a complex concept that has been defined in many ways. For example, Anthony Giddens defines globalization as a decoupling between space and time, highlighting that with modern communication technology, knowledge and culture can be spread around the world simultaneously.[2] Leslie Sklair defines globalization as "the emergence of a globalized economy based on new systems of production, finance and consumption," whereas Ulrich Beck asserts that "Globalization- however the word is understood - implies the weakening of state sovereignty and state structures." [3] How we define globalization has important implications for research on this subject, because definitions set the parameters of study.

Currently, public opinion surveys on globalization have placed little emphasis on studying globalization as a multidimensional process. To date, most surveys have operationalized the concept of globalization in terms of its economic aspects only, particularly as change in international trade flows.[4] However, many academics study the economic, political and cultural dimensions of globalization.[5] We can usefully question whether an economic interpretation of globalization is the correct one on which to focus singular attention. Can citizen attitudes toward globalization be explained merely by studying only its economic dimension?

As previously mentioned, the dominant approach used in most public opinion surveys on attitudes to globalization focuses primarily on its economic dimension. Studying a single dimension, however, simply cannot fully explain public attitudes towards this complex phenomenon. Further, defining such a multifaceted phenomenon so narrowly may produce partial and invalid results. This study tests the accuracy of the widely held assumption that attitudes toward globalization can be understood by studying only its economic dimension. In this study it is proposed that including definitions relating to globalization's cultural and political aspects in opinion research produces richer public opinion data that, along with economic definitions, allows for more valid interpretation of public attitudes towards globalization.[6]

This proposition was tested in a national, Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada - funded opinion survey conducted in January of 2007 among 1,505 Canadians. Drawing upon recent work by Kenichi Ohmae, Philip Cerny and others, the respondent pool was divided in half and then competing

definitions of cultural and political globalization were tested. The results suggest that citizens possess significantly different attitudes toward the political, cultural and economic dimensions of globalization, and so operationalizing the concept in terms of its economic aspect alone is insufficient for most survey and public policy purposes. This study provides important information about the significance of definitional indicators when studying public attitudes to globalization. Further, because no other study to date has tested competing definitions for globalization in such a large national sample, this study provides original research that is useful to academics and practitioners studying attitudes about globalization in Canada and elsewhere.

1.2 Research Objectives and Questions

The main research objectives here are to move beyond conceptualizing globalization in terms of its economic dimension, and to inform future globalization research by testing how including definitions relating to globalization's cultural and political dimensions produces more valid data. The primary research question is: does defining globalization in terms of its cultural and political aspects allow for more a comprehensive and valid measure of public attitudes toward globalization? The secondary research question is: do co-operative members' attitudes toward globalization differ from non-members? These questions are examined in the following chapters.

1.3 Organizational Structure

The thesis consists of six chapters. The present chapter provides a general introduction to the topic of attitudes toward globalization, and the scope and purpose of the current research study. It identifies the purpose of the study, and the central research questions. Chapter two reviews the existing literature on public opinion surveys concerning attitudes toward globalization, and the definitions of globalization widely employed in these studies. The literature review examines English language public opinion survey research on globalization over the past ten years. It provides a brief review of the survey research related to the central objectives and research questions considered here. It also probes the different conceptualizations of globalization, and discusses some problems concerning issue framing, word choice and question order.

The theory and methodology utilized in this study is reviewed in Chapter three. This chapter describes the inherent complexities found in defining and measuring globalization, describes existing definitions, and proposes alternative definitions of globalization for survey research purposes. As well, the method of data collection is reviewed, along with the parameters of the sample population. The results from testing the competing globalization definitions are described in Chapter four. In addition, this chapter also briefly examines how attitudes toward globalization vary according to the level of education.

In Chapter five, attitudes of co-operative members and non-members toward globalization are compared to test whether membership in such organizations matters. This chapter addresses two specific questions: how do co-operative

members' attitudes toward globalization differ from those of non-members; and do co-operative member responses vary according to alternative definitions of globalization's dimensions? Chapter six provides the reader with a summary of the findings and conclusions drawn from the analyses, and it delineates this study's contribution to the existing globalization literature. It reiterates the objectives of the study and the core research questions. This chapter also addresses the importance of undertaking survey research on attitudes toward globalization and provides some recommendations for further public opinion research on globalization.

[1] For the purposes of this study, public opinion research refers to public opinion polls and public opinion surveys.

[2] Anthony Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity,* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990), 64.

[3] Leslie Sklair, "Competing Conceptions of Globalization," *Journal of World-Systems Research* 5 (1999), 146; Ulrich Beck, "The Cosmopolitan Perspective: Sociology of the Second Age of Modernity", *British Journal of Sociology* 51, no.1 (2000), 86.

[4] Robert Wolfe and Matthew Mendelsohn, "Values and Interests in Attitudes toward Trade and Globalization: The Continuing Compromise of Embedded Liberalism," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 38, no.1 (2005), 51.

[5] Doreen Starke-Meyerring, "Meeting the Challenges of Globalization: A Framework for Global Literacies in Professional Communication Programs," *Journal of Business and Technical Communication* 19, no. 4 (2005), 470; Manfred B. Steger, *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 16.

[6] The term "valid" refers to the extent to which the research measures what it is intended to measure. For more information see Earl Babbie, *The Practice of Social Research: 10th Edition* (Toronto: Nelson, 2004), 143.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

How does the public perceive globalization? A useful starting point for understanding attitudes toward globalization is to examine public opinion surveys that make reference to globalization. Accordingly, this paper examines questions concerning globalization currently used in public opinion polls. This review specifically focuses on the wording used to describe the process of globalization in survey research.

Questions concerning globalization in public opinion surveys must be viewed carefully, as their phrasing can influence the surveys' findings. Many academics acknowledge that there is a causal relationship between word choice and its influence on the formation of public opinion.[1] Pamela Arleck and Robert Settle explain that many sources of bias and error in public opinion surveys result from the composition of questions.[2] Thus, the purpose of this review is to investigate questions currently being used in public opinion polls on globalization to help develop an improved survey instrument.

This literature review examines the English language literature on globalization and public opinion in North America. The words "public opinion" and

"attitudes" were each searched electronically with the term "globalization." The terms "survey," and "poll" were also used as key terms. Materials were sorted based on their relevance to the topic by electronically searching for keywords, as well as by the date of production. This search was undertaken by using a variety of databases including: the University of Saskatchewan main library books and periodicals; online catalogues; the Canadian Policy Research Networks; Library and Archives Canada; the National Library of Canada for theses and dissertations; and the PEW Global Attitudes Project. The following public opinion poll websites were also searched: The Centre for Research and Information on Canada (CRIC); Environics Canada; Institute for Research on Public Policy (IRPP); the Canadian Opinion Research Archive (CORA); the Roper Centre; and the Gallup Poll.[3] The following databases were also consulted, but yielded little content: Proquest ABI/INFORM Global; Cambridge Journals Online; EBSCOhost Academic Search Premier; GaleGroup InfoTrac Expanded Academic ASAP; and JSTOR Arts and Science Collection.[4]

The review identified seventeen leading globalization surveys administered between 1999 and 2005. These surveys provided significant insight into how attitudes toward globalization were being studied. Of the seventeen surveys, ten described globalization as an economic process, two surveys described multiple aspects of globalization and five surveys provided no definition in the survey; these are discussed in more specific detail below. Thus, this examination is important because it revealed that survey research on globalization is extremely limited.

Globalization in survey research is at best defined poorly and narrowly, or not defined at all.

It is difficult to discuss specific opinion survey questions without first discussing some key concerns surrounding public opinion surveys. Below is a brief discussion on the challenges regarding survey wording. This is divided into three parts: the first section examines surveys that provide no definition of globalization; the second section addresses surveys that group the different aspects of globalization (social, economic, and political) together into one broad definition; and the third and final section focuses on surveys that provide only economic descriptions of globalization.

2.2 Potential Limitations of Public Opinion Surveys

Surveys are an important means to understanding public attitudes. However, the results ultimately depend on which specific attitudinal measures are employed. Public opinion polls generally are not infallible in practice and may suffer from several sorts of methodological errors. Bias and error in survey research is problematic because it can result in inaccurate survey findings.[5] According to the large body of literature on public opinion methodology, bias and error problems are usually introduced by way of issue framing according to word choice, question-order effects and non-attitudes. Surveys of attitudes toward globalization may be especially susceptible to respondent bias because globalization is often regarded as a complex issue about which citizens lack information.[6] Accordingly, some globalization surveys may present imperfect findings. The objective of this discussion is to be cognizant of potential sources of error, and to try and avoid

9

common methodological problems in future survey research. The next sections provide a brief overview of the problems presented by issue framing, word choice, question-order effects and non-attitudes.

In the literature on the manipulation of public opinion, many academics acknowledge that one of the most significant problems about a question is how it is initially worded.[7] The problem of using "qualitatively different yet potentially relevant considerations…to describe the same issue" is defined as "issue framing".[8] In summary, the theory behind issue framing by word choice suggests that key words produce responses that are favorable to a certain position.[9] Key words known as "code words" or phrases evoke a particular meaning to certain respondents and thus may strongly influence or bias responses on particular issues. Gray and Guppy explain the effects of word choice in surveys and assert that "by changing a single word in a question, you can significantly alter the responses people give."[10] Accordingly, researchers must use caution in their choice of words in survey questions so that no particular response is favored over another.[11]

Another problem concerns what is known as "question-order effects". Numerous academics acknowledge that the order in which items appear in a questionnaire can affect responses to the questions.[12] Problems encountered from question-order effects are known by several other names, including: carryover effects, context effects and question order effects. The notion of question-order influence suggests that each question in a survey triggers certain attitudes in a respondent's memory, making those attitudes more accessible. Often, because "survey questions are not asked in isolation, but as part of a continuous flow of items, the context in

which any question appears, or its position in a sequence of items, may conceivably influence" the respondents' answers.[13]

Arleck and Settle explain that the sequence of survey questions readily will affect the responses to questions.[14] Responses are influenced by the conscious thought prompted by the previous questions in the survey: "from a cognitive perspective, when people are asked to form a judgment about a matter, they first need to determine some standard of comparison by which to evaluate the matter."[15] Thus Bishop, Odendick, and Tuchfarber assert that usually "respondents do not perform an exhaustive search of memory, but instead, answer questions in terms of the first thing that comes to mind."[16] Typically, responses to survey questions are most sensitive to question-order effects when two or more questions are perceived to be related and are more cognitively accessible.[17]

Problems of question-order influence can be reduced through pre-testing the survey instrument. It is often difficult to predict in advance whether word choice or question order effects will bias the survey. The meaning that pollsters intend for many survey questions is often not the meaning that the respondents consider.[18] Accordingly, pre-testing the survey instrument is important because it can help identify potential sources of bias and error.

A final source of error that may be found in survey research is non-attitudes. "Non-attitudes" is a term used to describe citizens who are unfamiliar with the topic and therefore have no genuine attitudes or opinion. Existing research shows that respondents often do not want to reveal their ignorance toward current issues: "few people in an interview want to admit they are uniformed, particularly on a popular or

timely issue."[19] Thus, most people are tempted to answer questions even if they are uninformed. Many citizens are uninformed on the various policies and data that underlie the indicators used in globalization surveys, and are thus prone to the problem of non-attitudes. This is problematic because public opinion survey based on non-attitudes can be misleading and produce invalid results.[20] Surveys of attitudes toward globalization are especially prone to the problem of non-attitudes because citizens are often uninformed about economic trade policies that are used to indicate underlying attitudes to globalization.[21]

As this section has demonstrated, there are many potential sources of bias and error in survey research. Survey questions may suffer from: issue framing by word choice; question-order; and non-attitudes. The objective of this discussion is to recognize potential sources of error and potential problems in undertaking survey research. A key question that arises from this dialogue is whether current surveys on globalization utilize question wording that might bias the way individuals respond to survey questions? The answer to this question is critical to our current understanding of public attitudes toward globalization. The following section examines the question-wording of globalization used in current surveys.

2.3 Public Opinion Surveys on Globalization

There is a growing body of public opinion surveys that examine attitudes toward globalization. As revealed in the seventeen core surveys collected, there are three primary descriptions of globalization that are found within current surveys. First, some survey questions provide no definition of globalization. Second, some surveys group the different dimensions of globalization into one broad definition.

Third, the majority of surveys provide a very narrow economic definition of globalization.

Globalization is a very complex concept. It has become a "catch-all" term with several different meanings.[22] On the one hand authors like Nitza Berkovitch, in her article entitled "The Emergence and Transformation of the International Women's Movement," discusses globalization in terms of women's equality.[23] On the other hand, authors like Jessica T. Matthews conceptualize globalization in terms of the role of international non-governmental organizations (INGOs).[24] Thus, this concept is complex as there is no established, common definition.

The literature review identified several surveys that did not define globalization at all for respondents. The first one, *Perspectives on Trade and Poverty Reduction* was a survey conducted by the German Marshall Fund's Trade and Development Program. Interviews were conducted between September 16, 2005 and October 3, 2005. This survey focused on international trade, poverty reduction and economic development. It examined opinions toward agricultural subsidies, development aid, and the impact of free trade domestically and internationally. The survey asked the following: "Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable or very unfavorable opinion of globalization?"[25] This survey did not define what is being referred to when the term "globalization" is employed. Perhaps the ambiguity associated with this question explains why eighteen percent of the survey respondents reported that they did not know and/or refused to answer this particular survey.[26]

A second key survey is the *What NGO Leaders Want for the Year 2020: NGO Leaders' Views on Globalization, Governance and Sustainability* survey, which was conducted by GlobeScan Inc., from May to September, 2003. It focused on the "stakeholder's ideal visions of governance and globalization in the year 2020 and the initiatives, policies, and institutional actors that they think can best facilitate the transition to their ideal."[27] The survey questions focused on topics including: global governance, the United Nations, globalization, the transition to ideal globalization, development models and goals, and the role of the private sector. The survey did not provide a definition of globalization; it asked respondents to rate the "ways to achieve the ideal vision of globalization."[28] This question assumes that there is an ideal vision of globalization, and that every respondent possesses such a vision.

Third, the *Canadian Attitudes Toward International Trade* survey was conducted by Ekos Research Associates Inc., from February 27 to March 7, 2003. The survey was commissioned by the Government of Canada's Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT). Although DFAIT refers to this research when discussing globalization, this survey only had one question that used the term "globalization". The survey asked the following question: "What would you say is the main reason Canada's influence has increased? Increased trade; government actions… lower dollar… globalization (global forces)… other… DK/NR."[29] Although the term "globalization" is not found in the question, it is used in the response category.

Fourth, the Commission on the Future of Health Care: *Public Input on the Future of Health Care Results from the Issue/ Survey Papers* research was conducted by Pollara. Although the section entitled, "Wave 3: Globalization, Medically Necessary, Human Health Resources," sounds focused and specific, but the content on globalization is lacking. The questions in this survey focused on international trade and medicare, treatment abroad, and healthcare professionals. Although this section provides a "Summary: Globalization" section, none of the questions in the survey used the term "globalization."[30] An example of a question used by the commission to gauge citizen attitudes toward healthcare in an era of globalization reads: "Healthcare in Canada would improve if the federal government protected our single-payer medicare system in all international trade negotiations."[31] This question seems to have used the concept "international trade" as a proxy for the concept of globalization, and the study explicitly made conclusions about "globalization" in the summary of the survey's results.[32]

Fifth, the "Global Attitudes: 44- Nation Major Survey" was conducted for the Pew Research Centre for the People and the Press under the Princeton Research Associates in 2002. An example of its question on globalization states: "There has been a lot of talk about globalization these days. Do you think that globalization is a very good thing, somewhat good, somewhat bad or a very bad thing?"[33] This survey ignored the complexity of the term and provided no description of what was meant by the term "globalization". Interestingly, this survey received a fifteen percent response rate of "don't know" and/or "refused" in the United States.[34] This is relatively high rate for "don't know" responses.

So, the survey questions reviewed above all assume that the respondent is aware of what is meant by the term "globalization". However, with no description of "globalization" available to respondents, the results of the survey may not be extremely reliable because people probably interpreted the term quite differently. In their work on poll design, Converse and Presser suggest that meanings of terms should be provided in opinion poll questions to avoid the respondent's own subjective definition influencing the response.[35] Where no specific meaning is provided, respondents frequently misinterpret the intended meaning of the survey questions.[36] Therefore, an operational definition of globalization would have helped to make the surveys more reliable.

The second type of description found in the public opinion poll literature search were surveys that try to group different aspects of globalization within one very broad definition. This can create additional problems such as a double-barreled question. Take for example a question that asks: "Globalization is the cultural, political and economic integration of all countries and do you agree with globalization?" Although a person may agree with the cultural aspects of globalization, a person may perceive political globalization quite negatively; therefore, a person may respond that he or she disagrees with globalization, when really he or she disagrees only with political globalization. There are two surveys that provide cluster definitions of globalization. First, the *Globalization Survey* was conducted in 1999 by the Roper Center for the Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA). The survey provides the following definition of globalization:

> Globalization refers to the increasing connections
> between countries that have come with the growth of

> international travel and cross border shipping, and increases in communications, such as through the Internet. This has led to an increase in world trade and the flow of investments between countries. It has also made it more likely that conditions in one country will affect conditions in other countries, and has led to a more international culture in such areas as music, movies and fashion.[37]

Although this description of globalization incorporates different dimensions of globalization it leaves out many other aspects of increasing connections between countries, such as immigration and the addition of popular cultural identities.

Second, the *2020 Global Stakeholder Panel: Towards the Future We Want for Our Children* was a survey conducted by GlobeScan Inc. The questionnaire consists of six main questions which use a semantic scale and an item analysis where the index scores often range from zero to five. The topics of the survey include: globalization; governance; civil society; and non-governmental organizations. Although globalization is included in this survey, the questions regarding globalization are rather vague. For example, in the survey, the following definition of globalization is provided: globalization is defined as the increased movement of goods, services, and capital between countries, which can also include an increase in the worldwide flow of information, culture and technology.[38] This survey contains a very broad, multidimensional definition of globalization which can lead to inconsistency within attitudes.

The third and final type of survey found within the public opinion polls is those that define globalization strictly in terms of its economic effects or international trade. However, existing research suggests that citizens do not see "globalization as merely the same as trade liberalization."[39] Despite this well-

documented research, the literature review identified ten key surveys that define

globalization as a purely economic process. For example, the *Trade, Globalization*

and Canadian Values survey was conducted in 2001 by Centre de recherche sur

l'opinion publique (CROP Inc) for the Center for Research and Information Canada

(CRIC). CRIC is a division of Council for Canadian Unity, a non-profit and non-

partisan organization. The survey was created by Matthew Mendelsohn, Robert

Wolfe and Andrew Parkin in conjunction with CRIC.[40] The questionnaire consists

of twenty-five questions based on a semantic differential scale. The questions

include areas related, but not limited to: the World Trade Organization (WTO);

Seattle protest demonstrations; international trade agreements; and confidence in the

national government, the United Nation, multinational corporations, and

Americanization. The *Trade, Globalization and Canadian Values* Survey employs

the following wording when asking about globalization:

> Many people say we are presently experiencing a
> process of globalization which means that the
> economies of all of the countries of the world are
> becoming more and more linked. Do you strongly
> support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose, or
> strongly oppose Canada encouraging more rapid
> globalization, or do you have no opinion on this?[41]

While this survey was designed to assess the views of Canadians towards

globalization, it narrowly defines globalization as an economic linkage.

The *How Canadians Feel About Globalization* survey conducted by Leger

Marketing in 2002 does not provide any definition of globalization, but employs

questions that describe the economic aspects of globalization. The survey consists of

fairly general questions relating to globalization, the economy, big business,

multinationals, and the United States. The survey consists of about ten closed-ended

questions and uses a Guttman scale. Although every question contains the term

globalization, it is striking that no definition of globalization is provided. For

example, the survey states:

> Globalisation opens up many markets to Canadian business.
> Generally-speaking, do you think the globalisation of the
> economy is a good opportunity for Canadian business since
> it opens up many markets or is a threat to our jobs and
> Canadian business or don't know?[42]

The *19 Nation Poll on Global Issues* is another survey that indicates

globalization in terms of trade, and was conducted by Globescan in 2004. The

survey used a Likert scale to measure the relative intensity of responses to different

items. Its questions focus on exploring globalization and trust in institutions. The

question that defines globalization in the survey reads as follows:

> As you may know, there are both positive and
> negative impacts from increasing globalization
> occurring in the world. By globalization, I mean the
> increased trade between countries in goods, services
> and investment. Thinking of you and your family's
> interests, do you think the overall effect of
> globalization is very positive, somewhat positive,
> somewhat negative or very negative?[43]

This question defines globalization as international trade. In this respect, the

definition is quite narrow as it probes only the economic dimension of globalization.

Similarly, the *Issues in the 2000 Election: The Economy* survey was

conducted for the *Washington Post*, Kaiser Family Foundation and Harvard

University in October 2000. The survey asks: "Based on what you know or may

have heard, do you think the globalization of the world economy is mostly good for

the United States, mostly bad for the United States, or it doesn't make much

difference?"[44] Although the survey does not provide a single, direct definition of globalization, it associates globalization with economic processes.

The *World Views 2002* Survey was conducted for the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations and the German Marshall Fund of the United States by Harris Interactive in 2002. The survey questionnaire is very general, focusing more on international trade and security rather than globalization. Only three questions are directly focused on this subject. The following question on globalization is asked in the survey: "do you believe that globalization, especially the increasing connections of our economy with others around the world, is mostly good or mostly bad for the United States?"[45] This question makes specific reference to globalization's relationship to the domestic economy.

The *Political Landscape, Economic Outlook, and Globalisation: Creeping Continentalism or 21ˢᵗ Century Nationalism* survey was conducted by Ekos Research Associates. The survey was conducted during May 24 - April 22, 2001 and it was commissioned by the *Toronto Star.* Some of the respondents are surveyed on questions that use the term "North American integration" while the other respondents receive questions where North American integration is replaced with the term "globalization". For example, the survey asked the following: "What impact would you say globalization is having on Canada's economic well-being?"[46] It again focused very narrowly on globalization's economic facets while ignoring other dimensions.

The *Fifth Annual Survey of Public Opinion on International Trade* for the

Women in International Trade Charitable Trust (WIIT) was conducted in 2001. The

survey asked the following question on globalization:

> "Globalization" is a term that is frequently heard these
> days and one that is often linked to trade issues. Which
> of the following two statements comes closer to your
> view about globalization? Globalization has a positive
> impact because it enables the U.S. (United States) to
> increase trade in services, manufacturing, agricultural
> and food products, it enables Americans to buy cheaper
> and more abundant consumer goods, and it creates
> more U.S. jobs. Globalization has a negative impact
> because it exploits the developing world, denigrates the
> world's environments, and results in U.S. jobs being
> transferred to other countries.[47]

Although the survey provides two different response options, both of these

options deal primarily with the economic aspects of globalization. Perhaps the

survey should have specified that it was making reference to the economic effects

of globalization when asking respondents which definition more closely fit their

view. Similar to many of the previous surveys, this question focused very narrowly

on the economic aspects of globalization.

The *American Public Opinion and US Foreign Policy* Survey was sponsored

by the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations (CCFR). The poll was conducted by

Harris Interactive from June 1st until June 30th, 2002. This question asks respondents

the following question regarding globalization: "Turning to something else, do you

believe that globalization, especially the increasing connections of our economy

with others around the world, is mostly good or mostly bad for the United States?"[48]

Similarly, the *American Public Opinion and US Foreign Policy*, was

conducted by Knowledge Networks and was sponsored by the Chicago Council on

Foreign Relations (CCFR). The poll was conducted from July 6th to 12th, 2004. The survey asks respondents: "Turning to something else, do you believe that globalization, especially the increasing connections of our economy with others around the world, is mostly good or mostly bad for the United States?"[49] Interestingly, this is the same question that was asked in the *American Public Opinion and US Foreign Policy* survey conducted by Harris Interactive in 2002. So, again, globalization is defined narrowly in economic terms.

The Harris Poll entitled, *American and Japanese Attitudes Very Different On* was conducted from March 19 to 23, 1999. The survey questions focus on U.S./Japan relations, the role of U.S. troops in Japan, the future of U.S. bases in Japan, and attitudes toward globalization. The survey asked the following question on globalization:

> Nations compete with each other in a global economy. Do you think (READ LIST)? A global economy makes all countries better off…. A global economy makes some countries better and some countries worse off than others…. A global economy does not necessarily work everywhere because each country has its own economic situation…. Don't know/refused.[50]

Although this section of the survey was entitled "Attitudes Toward Globalization," the question asked focused primarily on the economy."[51] Similarly to the previous surveys, this survey focused very narrowly on globalization's economic effects while ignoring other dimensions.

2.4 Conclusion

To date, there are three main approaches used to study attitudes toward globalization in current public opinion polls; however, as previously discussed there

are at least three major problems with these methods. First, although globalization is a complex concept, many surveys provide no description of what is meant by the term "globalization" which creates problems of question ambiguity and non-attitudes in the responses. Second, some surveys group the different aspects of globalization into one very broad definition. This is problematic because people may possess different attitudes about globalization's different aspects, and so responses may not reflect those complex attitudes. Third, a majority of the surveys provide a very narrow, economically oriented description of globalization, while ignoring its other dimensions. This is problematic in that it is an insufficient indicator of a complex multidimensional phenomenon.

Unfortunately, no surveys to date specifically examine individual attitudes toward non-economic dimensions of globalization, such as cultural and political globalization. The only surveys that the literature review uncovered in this regard have attempted to examine some of the other aspects of globalization through grouping the different dimensions of globalization together within one broad definition. As mentioned earlier, this may create inconsistency in attitudinal responses. In view of this, future survey research on globalization needs to be substantially altered to examine some of its other dimensions, if we are to validly gauge individuals' attitudes toward this phenomenon. The following chapter examines the complexity of globalization and its many dimensions, and reviews some key definitions proposed by leading globalization scholars.

[1] William A. Belson, *Validity in Survey Research: with Special Reference to the Techniques of Intensive Interviewing and Progressive Modification for Testing and Constructing Difficult or Sensitive Measures for Use in Survey Research* (Brookfield: Gower Publishing Company, 1986); Herbert H. Clark and Michael F. Schober, "Asking Questions and Influencing Answers," *Questions About Questions: Inquiries into the Cognitive Bases of Surveys,* ed. Judith M. Tanur (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1991); James Druckman, "Political Preference Formation: Competition, Deliberation, and the (Ir)relevance of Framing Effects," *American Political Science Review* 98, no. 4 (2004); Michael J. Hiscox, "Through a Glass and Darkly: Attitudes Toward International Trade and the Curious Effects of Issue Framing," *International Organization* 60, no.3 (2006).

[2] Pamela L. Alreck and Robert B. Settle, *The Survey Research Handbook: Third Edition*. (Montreal: McGraw-Hill Irwin, 2004), 19.

[3] "Surveys and Analysis," *The Centre for Research and Information on Canada*, Online. <http://www.cric.ca/en_re/analys/index.html> (accessed 20 March 2006); "Environics Analytics," *Environics,* Online.http://www.environicsanalytics.ca/ (accessed 20 March 2006); "FASTTRAK Publication Search," *Institute for Research on Public Policy,* Online. http://www.irpp.org/fasttrak/index.htm> (accessed 16 March 2006); *Canadian Opinion Research Archive (CORA),* Online. < http://www.queensu.ca/cora/> (accessed 16 March 2006)*;* "Search for Datasets," *Roper Centre*, Online. <http://roperweb.ropercenter.uconn.edu/cgi-bin/hsrun.exe/Roperweb/Catalog40/Catalog40.htx;start=HS_> (accessed 20 March 2006); "Gallup Brain," *the Gallup Poll,* Online. < http://brain.gallup.com/> (accessed 16 March 2006).

[4] *ABI/Inform Global ProQuest* (Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan Library, 2006), Online. <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb> (accessed 16 March 2006); *Cambridge Journals Online* (Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan Library, 2006), Online. <http://journals.cambridge.org> (accessed 18 March 2006); *Academic Search Elite EbscoHost* (Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan Library, 2006),Online. <http://search.ebscohost.com> (accessed 20 March 2006); GaleGroup InfoTrac Expanded Academic ASAP (Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan Library, 2006), Online. <http://infotrac.galegroup.com> (accessed 16 March 2006); *JSTOR* (Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan Library, 2006), Online. <http://www.jstor.org> (accessed 16 March 2006).

[5] Alreck and Settle, 99.

[6] Druckman, 672; Hiscox, 756.

[7] Dudley Duncan and Howard Schuman, "Questions about Attitude Survey Questions." *Sociological Methodology*, 5 (1973-1974): 232-251; Howard Schuman and Stanley Presser, *Questions and Answers in Attitude Surveys: Experiments on Question Form, Wording, and Context* (New York, Academic Press, 1981); Michael C. Saykaly, *Optima Guide to Public Opinion Research: Third Edition* (Ottawa: Optima, 1985); Jean M. Converse and Stanley Presser, "Survey Questions: Handcrafting the Standardized Questionnaire," *Series: Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences* (London: Sage Publications, 1986); Louise H. Kidder and Charles M. Judd, *Research Methods in Social Relations* (Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1986); George Gray and Neil Guppy, *Successful Surveys: Research Methods and Practice* (Toronto: Harcourt Brace & Co., 1994); Susan Herbst, *Reading Public Opinion: How Political Actors View the Democratic Process* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998).

[8] Druckman, 672.

[9] Arleck and Settle, 98.

[10] Gray and Guppy, 85.

[11] Gray and Guppy, 89.

[12] George F. Bishop, Robert W. Oldendick, and Alfred J. Tuchfarber, "Political Information Processing: Question Order and Context Effects," *Political Behavior,* 4 (1982); John A. Krosnick and Howard Schuman, "Attitude Intensity, Importance, and Certainty and Susceptibility to Response Effects," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 54 (1988); Stanley Feldman, "Measuring Issue Preferences: The Problem of Response Instability," *Political Analysis* 1(1989); Edwin J. Benton and John L. Daly, "A Question Order Effect in a Local Government Survey," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 55 (1991); George F. Bishop, "Qualitative Analysis of Question-Order and Context Effects: The Use of Think-Aloud Responses," *Context Effects in Social and Psychological Research*, eds. Norbert Schwartz and Seymour Sudman (New York: Springer-Verlag, 1992); Krosnick, John A.

"The Impact of Cognitive Sophistication and Attitude Importance on Response-Order and Question-Order Effects," *Context Effects in Social and Psychological Research*, eds. Norbert Schwartz and Seymour Sudman (New York: Springer-Verlag, 1992); Leonard L. Martin and Thomas F. Harlow, "Basking and Brooding: The Motivating Effects of Filter Questions in Surveys," in *Context Effects in Social and Psychological Research*; Fritz Strack, "Order Effects in Survey Research: Activation and Information Functions of Preceding Questions," in *Context Effects in Social and Psychological Research*; John Tarnai and Don A. Dillman, "Questionnaire Context as a Source of Response Differences in Mail and Telephone Surveys," in *Context Effects in Social and Psychological Research*, and John A. Krosnisk and Matthew K. Berent, "Comparisons of Party Identification and Policy Preferences: The Impact of Survey Question Format." *American Journal of Political Science* 37 (1992).

[13] Schuman and Presser, 24.

[14] Arleck and Settle,103.

[15] David W. Moore, "Measuring New Types of Question-Order Effects: Additive and Subtractive," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 66 (2002), 81.

[16] George F. Bishop, Robert W. Oldendick, and Alfred J. Tuchfarber, 178.

[17] McKee J. McClendon and David J. O'Brien, "Question-Order Effects on the Determinants of Subjective Well-Being," *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 52, no.3 (1988); Tom Smith, "Thoughts on the Nature of Context Effects," *Context Effects in Social and Psychological Research*, eds. Norbert Schwartz and Seymour Sudman (New York: Springer-Verlag, 1992).

[18] Belson, 395.

[19] Asher, 27.

[20] Asher, 27.

[21] James N. Druckman, "The Implications of Framing Effects For Citizen Competence," *Political Behavior* 23, no.3 (2001), 227.

[22] Vsevolod Aves, "Why Everyone Hates Globalization," *Journal of International Affairs* 58, no.2 (2005), 297.

[23] Nitza Berkovitch, "The Emergence and Transformation of the International Women's Movement," in Frank J. Lechner and John Boli eds. *The Globalization Reader* (Victoria: Blackwell Publishing, 2004), 251-254.

[24] Jessica T. Matthews, "Power Shift," in Frank J. Lechner and John Boli eds. *The Globalization Reader* (Victoria: Blackwell Publishing, 2004), 270-276.

[25] *Perspectives on Trade and Poverty Reduction A Survey of Public Opinion: Key Findings Report 2005* (Washington, DC: The German Marshall Fund of the United States, 2005): p.5 of 9. Online. <http://www.gmfus.org/doc/Final%20Survey%20Report%201205.pdf> (accessed 20 March 2006).

[26] *Perspectives on Trade and Poverty Reduction,* 5.

[27] *What NGO Leaders Want for the Year 2020: NGO Leaders' Views on Globalization, Governance and Sustainability* (Toronto: GlobeScan Inc., 2004): p.17 of 45. Online <http://www.2020fund.org/downloads/GSP_2_report.pdf > (accessed 15 May 2006).

[28] *What NGO Leaders Want for the Year 2020: NGO Leaders' Views on Globalization, Governance and Sustainability,* 11.

[29] *Canadian Attitudes Toward International Trade* (Ekos, 2003):p.22 of 36.Online <http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/tna-nac/documents/DFAIT_2002-en.pdf#search='Ekos%20globalization%20survey> (accessed 10 March 2006).

[30] "Wave 3: Globalization, Medically Necessary, Human Health Resources," *Commission on the Future of Health Care: Public Input on the Future of Health Care Results from the Issue/ Survey Papers* (Pollara, 2002): p.177-118 of 157. Online. <http://www.pollara.ca/Library/Reports/3461_pollara_english.pdf > (accessed 10 March 2006).

[31] "Wave 3: Globalization, Medically Necessary, Human Health Resources,"119.

[32] "Wave 3: Globalization, Medically Necessary, Human Health Resources,"117.

[33] *Global Attitudes: 44- Nation Major Survey* (Pew Research, 2002): p.T41 of 161. Online. <http://people-press.org/reports/pdf/185topline.pdf > (accessed 20 May 2006).

[34] *Global Attitudes: 44- Nation Major Survey*, T-41 of 161.

[35] Converse and Presser, 17.

[36]William A. Belson, *The Design and Understanding of Survey Questions* (Aldershot: Gower Publishing Company, 1981), 395.

[37] *Globalization Survey* (Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, 1999): p.41 of 73. Online. <http://prod.library.utoronto.ca:8090/datalib/codebooks/roper/usumary/usumary1999-globe/global.pdf#search='Globalization%20survey%201999%20Roper%20Center'> (accessed 26 May 2004).

[38]*2020 Global Stakeholder Panel: Towards the Future We Want for Our Children* (Toronto: GlobeScan Inc., 2003): p.7 of 46. Online. <http://www.2020fund.org/downloads/GSP_wave1.pdf#search='2020%20Global%20Stakeholder%20Panel%3A%20Towards%20the%20Future%20We%20Want%20for%20Our%20Children'> (accessed 19 May 2006).

[39] Robert Wolfe and Matthew Mendelsohn, "Values and Interests in Attitudes toward Trade and Globalization: The Continuing Compromise of Embedded Liberalism," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 38, no.1 (2005), 51.

[40] Wolfe and Mendelsohn, 51.

[41] Wolfe and Mendelsohn, 51.

[42] *How Canadians Feel About Globalization* (Montreal: Leger Marketing, 2002): p.2 of 9. Online. <http://www.queensu.ca/cora/polls/2002/October7-Globalization.pdf > (accessed 04 August 2004).

[43] *19 Nation Poll on Global Issues* (Globescan, 2004): p.5 of 17. Online. <http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Other%20Studies/GlobalIss_Jun04/GlobalIss_Jun04_quaire.pdf > (accessed 19 May 2006).

[44] *Issues in the 2000 Election: The Economy* (Washington Post/ Kaiser Family Foundation/ Harvard University, 2000): p.24 of 41. Online. <http://www.kff.org/kaiserpolls/upload/KHPR_Oct00_Topline_release.pdf> (accessed 27 May 2006)

[45] *WorldViews 2002: U.S. General Population Topline Report* (Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, 2002):p.151 of 167. Online. <http://www.worldviews.org/detailreports/usreport/public_topline_report.pdf > (accessed 27 May 2006).

[46] *Political Landscape, Economic Outlook, and Globalisation: Creeping Continentalism or 21st Century Nationalism* (Ekos, 2001): p.25 of 28. Online. <http://www.ekos.com/admin/articles/1june01.pdf#search='Ekos%20globalization' > (accessed 10 March 2006).

[47] Fifth *Annual Survey of Public Opinion on International Trade* (Women in International Trade Charitable Trust, 2001): p.11 of 12. Online. <http://www.wiittrust.org/pdfs/trade_news01.pdf#search='Women%20in%20International%20Trade%20Charitable%20Trust%20Survey'> (accessed 19 May 2006).

[48] *American Public Opinion and US Foreign Policy* (Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, 2002): p.39 of 74. Online. <http://thechicagocouncil.org/UserFiles/File/2002_US_Report.pdf CCFR> (accessed 21 May 2006).

[49] *American Public Opinion and US Foreign Policy* (Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, 2004): p.42 of 60. Online. <http://thechicagocouncil.org/UserFiles/File/Global_Views_2004_US.pdf > (accessed 19 May 2006).

[50] Harris Interactive, *American and Japanese Attitudes Very Different On:* (Harris Interactive, 1999): p.1. Online. < http://www.harrisinteractive.com/harris_poll/index.asp?PID=28> (accessed 19 May 2006).

[51] Harris Interactive, *American and Japanese Attitudes Very Different On:*, 1.

CHAPTER 3

THEORY, CONCEPTUALIZATION AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

Social scientists often test different theories through direct observation. However, globalization is complex to study and cannot be directly observed. Therefore, social scientists develop indicators that can measure abstract concepts and the theories that surround them. Before we can begin to develop such indicators for globalization, we must first determine how to define globalization.

The term "globalization" can have many different meanings depending on which of its dimensions are being discussed. Carlson and Hyde state that in defining concepts, it is very important to be extremely thorough in articulating possible dimensions or meanings.[1] To date, most public opinion surveys define globalization only as an economic phenomenon. As discussed in more detail below, these studies are based on the assumption that citizen attitudes toward globalization can be accurately studied by only surveying a single dimension of globalization. However, this method of study contradicts the growing body of literature that describes globalization as a multidimensional phenomenon.

3.2 Background

Currently, and as discussed in detail in the preceding chapter, most public opinion surveys on public attitudes to globalization study globalization primarily in terms of its economic dimension. However, globalization is a multidimensional phenomenon and many definitions of globalization have been proposed to capture each of its dimensions. Thus, defining a multidimensional phenomenon so narrowly may produce survey results that are somewhat invalid. This study's main purpose is to test definitions relating to globalization's cultural and political dimensions, along with economic interpretations, toward developing a more valid interpretation of public attitudes towards globalization.

Many academics have made significant contributions toward conceptualizing globalization in terms of several different dimensions. For example, political scientist Manfred B. Steger conceptualizes globalization in terms of four distinct dimensions: economic, political, cultural, and ideological.[2] Similarly, Doreen Starke-Meyerring of McGill University describes globalization as "the increasing interdependence and integration of social, cultural, political, and economic processes across national, regional, and global levels."[3]

The multidimensional nature of globalization is further probed by the International Network on Cultural Policy (INCP) which was initiated by the Canadian government in June of 1998. The INCP is an "international venue where national ministers responsible for culture can explore and exchange views on new and emerging cultural policy issues and develop strategies to promote cultural diversity."[4] The INCP website states:

> Globalization - through the increasing mobility of people, trade liberalization, new communications technologies and industry consolidation - is highlighting the importance of cultural diversity within and between states. While globalization offers great opportunities for cultural expression, it also poses fundamental challenges to governments, civil society and the private sector in nurturing this diversity.[5]

A final example of efforts to identify and define globalization's multiple dimensions can be found in the work of David Held and Tony McGrew. They suggest "that globalization involves a *stretching* of social, political and economic activities across political frontiers, regions and continents [and] it suggests the *intensification*, or the growing magnitude, of interconnectedness and flows of trade, investment, finance, migration, culture, etc."[6]

In summary, most efforts to identify globalization's multiple dimensions identify three broad types: economic, cultural and political dimensions. Thus, for the purposes of studying attitudes toward globalization, it is preferable to define it in terms that reflect its multiple dimensions. The following section considers the theoretical basis for defining cultural and political globalization.

3.3 Conceptualizing Cultural and Political Globalization

3.3.1 Cultural Globalization

Cultural globalization research has focused predominantly on two mainstream approaches. The first approach describes cultural globalization as a fairly neutral and internationally shared process in which values and ideas are spread worldwide among various cultures. According to this view, globalization is a process of cultural transmission where no one culture dominates other cultures. Rather, it is a shared process of cultural transmission that promotes cultural

tolerance, understanding and diversity on a worldwide scale. This view is recognized

by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

UNESCO's *World Culture Report,* for example, refers to cultural globalization as a

process in which ideas, behaviours and beliefs are exchanged and disseminated

worldwide through travel, migration and mass media.[7] Several other examples of

this approach can be found in the work of influential authors including Jan Aarte

Scholte, Manfred B. Steger and Peter Berger. [8]

The second main approach used to describe cultural globalization is

somewhat more controversial than the first approach. This perspective is more

cynical in its description, and it is often characterized by depictions of Western

domination, American hegemony and the inevitability of cultural homogenization.

An example of this view can be found in Benjamin Barber's book, *Jihad vs

McWorld*. Here, Barber describes cultural globalization as leading to an

increasingly homogeneous 'McWorld' in which American- inspired popular culture

overwhelms all others and societies lose capacity to govern themselves

democratically.[9] He predicts that "in the long-run, the forces of 'McWorld' are the

forces underlying the slow certain thrust of Western civilization and as such may be

unstoppable."[10] Another example of this perspective can be found on the website of

the Canadian Law Commission of Canada (CLCC), an independent departmental

corporation that is accountable to the Parliament of Canada through the Minister of

Justice. The CLCC provides the following definition of cultural globalization:

"Cultural globalization [refers to] the growing global domination of American (and

to a lesser extent European) entertainment industries and cultural products."[11] This

definition is referenced by S. Clarkson and S. Wood in *Governing Beyond Borders: Law for Canadians in an Era of Globalization,* an unpublished background paper written for the Law Commission of Canada in 2005.[12] Other examples of this approach can be found in the work of Tyler Cowen, George Ritzer and Alan Bryman.[13] In this perspective, cultural globalization is defined as a process leading to the potential take-over of all other cultures by American culture.

3.3.2 Political Globalization

Similarly to cultural globalization, two common approaches are employed to understand political globalization. The first approach describes political globalization as the changing role of the nation-state in terms of the loss of autonomy and independence. However, this approach does not anticipate the abolition or retreat of the nation-state. Rather, it is simply reshaped as globalization advances. An example of this perspective can be seen in the work of Philip Cerny, author of "Political Globalization and the Competition State." Cerny states that:

> Globalization as a political phenomenon basically means that the shaping of the playing field of politics itself is increasingly determined not within insulated units, i.e. relatively autonomous and hierarchically organization structures called states; rather it derives from a complex congeries of multilevel games played on multilayered institutional playing fields, above and across, as well as within, state boundaries.[14]

Cerny's description of political globalization focuses on the transfer of power away from the nation-state. Here, political globalization refers to the changing nature of the nation-state. This view acknowledges that there is an increased role for non-governmental actors and organizations among and within nation-states. Other examples of this approach can found in the work of the political scientist David

31

Held, as well as publications by the Law Commission of Canada.[15] From this perspective, political globalization involves the emergence of political organizations, relationships and policies that may transcend the borders of the nation-state, and yet the state remains an important actor.

The second approach is less certain about the role and future of the nation-state. This approach questions the future role of the nation state and focuses on the growing irrelevance of the nation-state. The power of the nation-state is held to be decreasing, with the increasing expansion of transnational corporatism and resource interdependence. Political scientist Sidney Pobihushchy explains that in the past, people saw "government regulation as a corrective to the illogical results of the market…[however,] globalization of the economy has rendered such a political option meaningless."[16] Thus, the nation-state is losing its ability to function as an autonomous entity, and is at risk of becoming irrelevant. An example of this perspective can be found in Kenichi Ohmae's book *The End of the Nation State*. Here, Ohmae's description focuses on the decreasing effectiveness of the modern nation-state system. Ohmae asserts that "the nation state is increasingly a nostalgic fiction."[17] Ohmae further states that, "in terms of real flows of economic activity, nation states have already lost their role as meaningful units of participation in the global economy of today's borderless world."[18]

Here, political globalization refers to the increasing irrelevance of the institutions and boundaries of the nation state in an era of economic integration.[19] Other examples of this approach can be found in Manfred B. Steger's book *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction* and in Ulrich Beck's article, "The Cosmopolitan

Perspective: Sociology of the Second Age of Modernity."[20] In this perspective, political globalization is characterized by the decreasing autonomy and relevance of the nation-state created from the increasing expansion of transnational corporatism and international trade.

As noted earlier, the majority of opinion surveys on public attitudes to globalization study only its economic dimension. Thus, to develop a more valid interpretation of public attitudes towards globalization this study focused on testing the public's perceptions toward two mainstream definitions of cultural and political globalization. The cultural globalization definitions used in this study are drawn from those employed by the Law Commission of Canada (LCC) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). These definitions were chosen because they represent two different mainstream views of cultural globalization. In UNESCO's view, it is a shared process of global cultural transmission, and in the LCC's view it stands for American cultural imperialism.

Second, the political globalization definitions used in the study were drawn from the work of Philip Cerny and Kenichi Ohmae. These definitions were chosen because each represents a widely held perspective on political globalization. Cerny's definition describes political globalization as a process concerning the changing relations of the nation-state. Ohmae's definition of political globalization in contrast, describes it in terms of the erosion and the increasing irrelevance of the nation-state.

3.4 Theory

Globalization is a difficult phenomenon to study as it is not directly observable. In the existing social science research, social scientists have developed representative indicators to study this phenomenon. To date, the dominant approach used in most public opinion surveys on people's attitudes to globalization focuses primarily on its economic dimension. However, studying a single dimension does not encompass the entire spectrum of public attitudes toward globalization. Furthermore, defining such a multifaceted phenomenon so narrowly may produce survey results that are unduly constricted and somewhat invalid. Thus in this study, the cultural and political dimensions of globalization, along with economic interpretations, are examined to facilitate a more comprehensive and valid interpretation of people's attitudes toward globalization. This study is based on three core hypotheses.

The first hypothesis is that public attitudes toward globalization cannot be explained merely by studying only economic definitions of globalization. In the literature, there is a widely held assumption that attitudes toward globalization can be understood by studying only its economic dimension. This research proposes that this assumption is faulty and that other aspects of globalization need to be included in order to understand public attitudes toward this phenomenon.

The second core hypothesis of this study is that defining globalization in terms of its cultural and political aspects allows for a more comprehensive and valid interpretation of public attitudes toward globalization. A key assumption of this study is that globalization is a multidimensional phenomenon. This study anticipates

that respondents possess varying attitudes toward globalization's different

dimensions. Accordingly, each dimension should be defined when probing people's

attitudes toward globalization.

The third hypothesis examines whether co-operative members' attitudes

toward globalization differ from non-members. The globalized economy is

characterized by "increasingly powerful and mobile corporate capital, increasingly

docile governments, and increasingly insecure workers and local residents".[21]

Consequently, many co-operatives have been created because small-scale producers

seek protection from the more powerful players in the marketplace.[22] Thus, co-

operatives often are described as an ally for local control and autonomy.[23] However,

increasing global economic competition is placing much pressure on co-operatives.

The global acceleration and expansion of international markets, communication

technology, and intense global competition challenge the co-operative sector.[24]

Birgegaard and Genberg state that:

> Unless the cooperatives can meet this competition, they will
> end up in down-turn spirals of decreasing volumes of
> business, deteriorating profitability of their operations,
> reduced capacity to pay remunerative and competitive prices
> and provide useful services to their members, continued
> flight of members, still further decline in volumes of
> business... .[25]

Global competition is potentially threatening to the future of co-operatives.

Thus, based on the literature, one may assume that co-op members generally would

feel threatened by globalization and would be more likely to oppose globalization

than non-members. This study tests this notion by hypothesizing that co-operative

members are less likely to support globalization than non-members.

3.5 Survey Methodology

To facilitate the study of public attitudes toward the cultural, political and economic dimensions of globalization, this section provides information on the survey methodology used to test alternative definitions of globalization.

Public opinion surveys can probe citizens' views of complex constructs, such as globalization. Henry E. Brady states that "surveys are powerful collectors and accurate magnifiers of information."[26] To examine how people perceive globalization's multiple dimensions, and how they respond to alternate definitional indicators of globalization's political and cultural dimensions in particular, this study accessed data collected by the Globalization and Co-operative Membership Survey (GCMS).

The Globalization and Co-operative Membership Survey (GCMS) was a project designed at the Centre for the Study of Co-operatives at the University of Saskatchewan. This study was part of a larger study led by Dr. Brett Fairbairn entitled *Co-operative Membership and Globalization: Creating Social Cohesion through Market Relations,* which was funded by the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada. This project was the largest study ever undertaken on Canadian Co-operatives.[27] The GCMS survey was a collaborative, interdisciplinary research project based at the Centre for the Study of Co-operatives; its principal investigator was Professor C. de Clercy.

The survey questionnaire was designed to test several hypotheses about globalization and social cohesion. Several questions for this study were placed on the master GCMS instrument. Several revisions were made to the survey instrument

prior to pre-testing to clarify response ranges and question language. The GCMS then was administered by a randomized sample telephone survey of Canadians eighteen years of age and older. Environics, a leading Canadian polling firm, fielded the survey between January 15 and January 26, 2007.

The population sample was drawn using the 2001 census distribution of the provinces' populations. One hundred respondents were removed from Ontario and fifty respondents were added both to Saskatchewan and Manitoba, in order to increase the proportion of co-operative members, and to allow for a larger regional sample. The total survey sample size was 1505 persons. The demographic weighting parameters were configured from the 2001 census. This analysis produced population parameters for the demographic characteristics of households with adults eighteen and older, which were then compared with the sample characteristics to construct sample weights. The sample design includes stratification by community size groupings, and for males and females based on the 2001 census distribution.

The survey was conducted in two waves of seven hundred and fifty respondents each. After the first wave, the frequency of co-operative members in the sample was examined in order to make adjustments to the sample design to ensure that the prevalence of co-operative membership was adequate for testing some hypotheses. No such adjustments were deemed necessary, so the second wave was conducted two days after the first wave was completed.[28]

The survey was administered by telephone for a number of reasons. Surveys by telephone are time efficient and allow for the information to be collected within a short time span. In addition, surveying by telephone allowed us to develop sampling

parameters that ensured representative data. For example, sample quotas were maintained in terms of key variables such as gender, age, geographic regions and other variables, allowing the results to be more representative of the population.

Other steps were taken to ensure the survey instrument was as reliable and accurate as possible. For example, in the design stage, existing surveys were reviewed to avoid errors such as respondent fatigue. Respondent fatigue, also referred as "fatigue effects," is a well-documented problem within public opinion surveys. Schuman and Presser state that, "Fatigue effects can hardly be doubted in the sense that after enough questions respondents should begin to tire and perhaps answer with less deliberate thought."[29] Thus, to avoid the problem of fatigue effects, the length of this survey was constructed similarly to that of existing globalization surveys, such as the CRIC Globalization Survey.

Questions from existing globalization surveys were also used as models for some of the survey questions utilized in the study. By using questions that have been previously studied, one can avoid unnecessary error. Some questions replicate questions from Robert Putnam's 2000 Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey.[30] Other questions were drawn from questions in the Statistics Canada, 2003 General Social Survey, Cycle 17: Social Engagement,[31] and the 2001 National Co-operative Business Association survey on co-operatives.[32] The GCMS survey definition of economic globalization replicates the definition used in Wolfe and Mendelsohn's study, which was designed for the Globalization Survey for the Centre for Research and Information on Canada (CRIC).[33] To date, no survey questions on cultural and political globalization exist to replicate. Thus, cultural and

political globalization survey response questions were developed based on mainstream definitions. With some help from Environics, the cultural and political globalization definitions were rephrased into more accessible language, so that they could easily be understood by respondents.

The globalization questions were administered using a Likert scale that probed how strongly the respondents supported or opposed the indicators used.[34] A five-element Likert scale was used for these questions. The scale was employed to rate the intensity of the responses.

3.6 Summary

Globalization is a complex concept that can have many different meanings depending on which dimension is being discussed. Academics study its economic, political and cultural dimensions, and there are differing definitions employed within each sub-category. Just as it is difficult to describe globalization in a single sentence, studying a single dimension such as its economic dimension simply cannot encapsulate public attitudes towards this phenomenon. However, as was illustrated in the previous chapter, the few existing opinion surveys concerning public attitudes to globalization focus primarily on economic globalization. In this study, definitions relating to globalization's cultural and political aspects are tested, along with economic interpretations, to facilitate a deeper and more informed interpretation of public attitudes towards globalization. So, the objective of this study is to test alternative definitions of globalization in a public opinion survey to develop a more valid understanding of citizen attitudes toward globalization. The next chapter discusses how the data collected from the survey administration was analyzed.

[1] James M. Carlson and Mark S. Hyde, *Doing Empirical Political Research* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2003), 148.

[2] Manfred B. Steger, *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 16.

[3] Doreen Starke-Meyerring, "Meeting the Challenges of Globalization: A Framework for Global Literacies in Professional Communication Programs," *Journal of Business and Technical Communication 19* no. 4 (2005), 470.

[4] Canada, "International Network on Cultural Policy," *International Affairs*. Online. <http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/ai-ia/rir-iro/ripc-incp/index_e.cfm> (accessed 12 April 2007).

[5] Canada, "International Network on Cultural Policy (INCP)," *International Affairs and Policy Development*. Online. <http://www.canadianheritage.gc.ca/progs/ai-ia/ridp-irpd/04/index_e.cfm> (accessed 31 July 2006).

[6] David Held, Anthony McGrew, David Goldblatt and Jonathan Paraton, "Researching Globalization," *The Global Transformations Website*. Online. <http://www.polity.co.uk/global/research.asp> (accessed 14 March 2006).

[7] UNESCO, *World Culture Report 1998: Culture, Creativity and Markets* (Paris: UNESCO Publishing, 1998), 253.

[8] Steger, 69; Peter L. Berger, "Introduction," in Berger and Huntington, *Many Globalizations: Cultural Diversity in the Contemporary World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 16.

[9] Benjamin Barber, *Jihad vs. McWorld*, (New York: Ballantine Books 1995), 19-20.

[10] Barber, 20.

[11] Law Commission of Canada, "Part One: Globalization and its Challenges," Research *Projects: Governance Beyond Borders*.(2005): p5 of 56. Online. *http://dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/Collection/JL2-25-2006E.pdf* (accessed 31 July 2006).

[12] Law Commission of Canada, 5.

[13] Tyler Cowen, *Creative Destruction: How Globalization is Changing the World's Cultures* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002); George Ritzer, *The McDonaldization of Society* (Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press. 2000); Alan Bryman, *The Disneyization of Society* (Sage Publications, New Delhi, 2004).

[14] Philip G. Cerny, "Paradoxes of the Competition State: The Dynamics of Political Globalization," *Government and Opposition* 32, no.2 (1997), 253; Philip G. Cerny, "Political Globalization and the Competition State," Richard Stubbs and Geoffrey R.D. Underhill ed. *Political Economy and the Changing Global Order* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 301.

[15] David Held, *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance* (Polity Press and Stanford University Press, 1995), 16; Law Commission of Canada, *Research Projects: Governance Beyond Borders*.

[16] Sidney Pobihushchy, " Towards a People's Economy: A Co-operative Paradigm," eds., Brett Fairbairn, Ian MacPherson and Nora Russell, *Canadian Co-operatives in the Year 2000: Memory, Mutual Aid, and the Millennium* (Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 2000), 306.

[17] Kenichi Ohmae, *The End of the Nation-State: The Rise of Regional Economies* (Toronto: The Free Press, 1995), 13.

[18] Ohmae, 11.

[19] Ohmae, 11.

[20] Steger, 56-65; Ulrich Beck, "The Cosmopolitan Perspective: Sociology of the Second Age of Modernity", *British Journal of Sociology* 51, no.1 (2000), 86.

[21] Darrin Qualman, "Corporate Hog Farming: The View From the Family Farm," eds., Roger Epp and Dave Whitson, *Writing off the Rural West: Globalization, Governments, and the Transformation of Rural Communities* (Edmonton: The University of Alberta Press, 2001), 33.

[22] Micheal Gertler, *Rural Cooperatives and Sustainable Development* (Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives), 5.

[23] Brett Fairbairn, "Cohesion, Adhesion, and Identity in Co-operatives," eds., Brett Fairbairn and Nora Russell, *Co-operative Membership and Globalization* (Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 2004), 19.

[24] The Canadian Co-operative Association, le Conseil Canadiende la Cooperation and Co-operative Secretariat, Government of Canada, "Co-operatives in Canada: An Overview," eds., Brett Fairbairn, Ian MacPherson, and Nora Russell, *Canadian Co-operatives in the Year 2000* (Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 2000), 138.

[25] Lars-Erik Birgegaard and Bjorn Genberg, Cooperative Adjustment in a Changing Environment in Sub-Saharan Africa: Report Commissioned by ICA Europe (International Co-operative Alliance, 1994), 1.

[26] Henry E. Brady, "Contributions of Survey Research to Political Science," *Political Science and Politics* 33 (2000), 47.

[27] Brett Fairbairn, "SSHRC Award Press Release," *Co-operative Membership and Globalization: Creating Social Cohesion through Market Relations* (Centre for the Study of Co-operatives: Saskatoon, 2002) Online. <http://www.socialcohesion.coop/news/remarks.php> (accessed 20 April 2007), 1.

[28] As many as two attempts were made to obtain an interview at every sampled telephone number. The calls were distributed over times of day and days of the week to maximize the chances of contacting the potential respondent. The analysis only included households in Canada with access to a telephone.

[29] Howard Schuman and Stanley Presser, *Questions and Answers in Attitude Surveys: Experiments on Question Form, Wording and Context* (Toronto: Academic Press, 1981), 50.

[30] *Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey Instrument* (Cambridge: Harvard Kennedy School of Government, 2000) Online. <http://www.cfsv.org/communitysurvey/docs/survey_instrument.pdf > (accessed 15 May 2006).

[31] *2003 General Social Survey, Cycle 17: Social Engagement* (Toronto: Statistics Canada, 2003) Online. <http://www.statcan.ca/english/sdds/instrument/5024_Q1_V1_E.pdf> (accessed 15 May 2006).

[32] *National Cooperative Business Association: Survey Finding* (NCBA, 2001) Online. <http://www.ncba.coop/pdf/PressKitSurveyFindings.pdf> (accessed 20 May 2006).

[33] *Globalization](* Centre for Research and Information on Canada (CRIC), 2001) Online. <http://www.cric.ca/pdf/cahiers/cricpapers_april2001.pdf> (accessed 22 May 2006); Wolfe and Mendelsohn, 51.

[34] A Likert scale is a composite measure developed by Rensis Likert. The scale uses standardized response categories such as strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree to determine the intensity of the different responses; Earl Babbie, *The Practice of Social Research: 10th Edition* (Toronto: Nelson, 2004), 169.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter reports the findings from public opinion survey questions that were designed to gauge citizen attitudes toward globalization's multiple dimensions. Here the core hypotheses presented in the preceding chapter are tested. This chapter begins with a discussion of the method for data analysis, followed by an analysis of the survey results. In addition, this chapter also examines how attitudes toward globalization vary by levels of education, gender, age and income.

4.2 Data Analysis

The Globalization and Co-operative Membership Survey data set was analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 15.0 for Windows. The data set was checked for coding errors and logical inconsistencies. Frequencies and cross-tabs were generated to understand the responses to the key questions.

The survey respondents were divided into two groups of approximately 750 people each. Each group was administered two different cultural and political definitions of globalization. The first group of respondents were asked about their attitudes toward cultural globalization as defined by United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization definition, while the second group was given

the Law Commission of Canada's definition. The first group also received the

political globalization definition as described by Ohmae, while the second group

received Cerny's definition of political globalization.

The Law Commission of Canada and the Wolfe and Mendelsohn definitions

were cited verbatim in the survey. However, United Nation Educational, Scientific

and Cultural Organization, Kenichi Ohmae and Philip Cerny's definitions used in

the survey were based on our interpretation of these authors' descriptions of

globalization. The specific definitions were subject to interpretation because the

original language was too complex for use in the survey. To avoid internal

contamination such as by code words the polling firm, Environics, provided its

expertise in the word choice and sentence structure used in the globalization

definitions.[1] The final wording of each definition used in the survey is shown below:

- Q25 (Wolfe and Mendelsohn)- "Many people say we are presently experiencing a process of globalization which means that the ECONOMIES of all the countries of the world are becoming more and more linked."[2]

- Q26a (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization)- CULTURAL globalization refers to a process in which ideas, behaviors and beliefs are exchanged and dispersed worldwide through travel, migration and the mass media.[3]

- Q26b (Law Commission of Canada)- "CULTURAL globalization refers to the growing global domination of American and to a lesser extent European entertainment industries and cultural products."[4]

- Q27a (Kenichi Ohmae)- POLITICAL globalization refers to the increasing irrelevance of the institutions and boundaries of the nation state in an era of economic integration.[5]

- Q27b (Philip Cerny)- POLITICAL globalization refers to the growing global expansion of political interrelations beyond the borders of the nation.[6]

As discussed in the preceding chapter, currently, in public opinion research, there is a prevalent assumption that public attitudes toward globalization can be explained merely by studying its economic dimension. If this is true, that attitudes toward globalization can be described by studying only the economic dimension, then respondents should view cultural and political globalization the same as economic globalization. There should be no difference in attitudes toward the different definitions of globalization's dimensions, and so, overall there should be little difference in the frequency distributions of response to the different definitions of globalization administered. This study tests this assumption by hypothesizing that respondents would have different attitudes to the different definitions of globalization.

To test this hypothesis the frequency distribution tables for each definition of globalization were examined (refer toTables 4.2 to 4.6, page 62-64).[7] The frequency distributions were noticeably different in the degrees of support for each of the different dimensions of globalization. For example, in Table 4.2, Wolfe and Mendelsohn's economic definition of globalization received less valid support than both of the political globalization definitions, as depicted in Table 4.5 (15.7%) and Table 4.6 (14.4%).

To allow for clearer comparison among the definitions, attention was focused on studying the valid percentages, which exclude "No opinion" and "Don't know" responses. Then, the response categories were "collapsed" by combining respondents who answered "Strongly support" and "Somewhat support" into a "Support" category, and those who answered "Strongly oppose" and "Somewhat

oppose" into an "Oppose" category. Combing the responses into a smaller number of categories allowed for a clearer (but less nuanced) interpretation of attitudinal response to the different definitions of globalization.

The results suggest that people hold different attitudes about globalization's many dimensions. The levels of support expressed varied significantly across the economic, cultural and political dimensions of globalization, as depicted in the summary in Table 4.1 (refer to page 47). For example, a majority of the respondents opposed economic globalization as defined by Wolfe and Mendelsohn: over 60% (60.2%) of respondents stated that they opposed a "process of globalization which means that the economies of all of the countries of the world are becoming more and more linked." Whereas in Table 4.1, almost 60% (56.5%) of respondents stated that they support globalization as defined by Ohmae. These results suggest that measuring citizen attitudes only in terms of the economic dimension of globalization is limited. Hence, the first hypothesis is supported by the data, and these results raise doubts about the widespread assumption that globalization is best indicated by economic definitions.

Further, unlike some prominent surveys on globalization (most notably the Wolfe and Mendelsohn survey which based its conclusions on studying only the economic dimension of globalization) these results suggest that people hold different attitudes about globalization's alternative dimensions. For example, in Table 4.2, when asked about Wolfe and Mendelsohn's definition of economic globalization, 14.7% of respondents stated that they "strongly support" globalization (refer to page 62). However in Table 4.3 when asked about UNESCO's description of cultural

globalization only 4.2% of respondents replied they "strongly support" cultural globalization (refer to page 62). In Table 4.5, when asked about Ohmae's description of political globalization, 15.7% of respondents stated they "strongly support" it (refer to page 63). These findings raise significant concerns as to whether one can make valid inferences about attitudes toward globalization by focusing on only one dimension of globalization. The range of responses to globalization's different dimensions suggests that globalization cannot be properly understood by defining it solely in economic terms.

Consistent with this hypothesis, the frequency distributions tables suggest there are notable differences between not only the competing definitions of globalization, but also among all of the globalization definitions (refer to pages 62-64). For instance, there are considerable differences in response frequencies to the Law Commission of Canada and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization definitions of cultural globalization definitions. While 12.5% of respondents in Table 4.4 who received Law Commission of Canada's definition "strongly supported" globalization, only 4.2% of respondents in Table 4.3 "strongly supported" cultural globalization as defined by UNESCO (refer to page 62-63).

Significant differences can also be discerned in Table 4.1 where the response options were collapsed to allow for more significant comparison amongst the definitions. For example, there are considerable differences between the responses toward the Law Commission of Canada and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization descriptions of cultural globalization.

In particular, respondents who received the Law Commission of Canada's definition of cultural globalization were 26.6% more supportive towards globalization than the respondents who received the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization's definition of globalization, as depicted in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Percentage of respondents who support/oppose globalization based on the different globalization definitions

Definition of Globalization	Support	Oppose
Q25 Wolfe and Mendelsohn (economic)	39.7%	60.2%
Q26a United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (cultural)	20.5%	79.5%
Q26b Law Commission of Canada (cultural)	47.1%	52.9%
Q27a Kenichi Ohmae (political)	56.5%	43.6%
Q27b Philip Cerny (political)	47.0%	53.0%

Similarly, an overwhelming majority of the respondents opposed cultural globalization as described by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Over 79% (79.5%) of respondents opposed the process of cultural globalization "in which ideas, behaviors and beliefs are exchanged and dispersed worldwide through travel, migration and the mass media," while only 20.5% supported it. This question received a significantly less favorable response than the Law Commission of Canada's description of cultural globalization. When asked if they support "the growing global domination of American and to a lesser extent European entertainment industries and cultural products," 47.1% of respondents stated that they supported cultural globalization, and 52.9% opposed it as illustrated in Table 4.1.

There was also a notable difference in opinions among respondents who received Kenichi Ohmae's political globalization definition in comparison to those who received Philip Cerny's definition of political globalization. As depicted in Table 4.1, respondents who received Ohmae's description were 9.5% more supportive towards globalization than the respondents who received Cerny's definition (refer to page 47). A clear majority (56.5%) of respondents said they support Ohmae's description of political globalization as "the increasing irrelevance of the institutions and boundaries of the nation state in an era of economic integration," while 43.6% were opposed to this description of political globalization. This description received somewhat more support than Cerny's description: When questioned if they support the "global expansion of political interrelations beyond the borders of the nation," 47.0% supported political globalization, while 53.0% opposed it.

To better understand the importance that definitional wording has on respondents' attitudes toward globalization, wording differences were compared with varying levels of support for the competing definitions of cultural and political globalization. This study found that respondents were more supportive of cultural globalization as defined by LCC and political globalization as defined by Ohmae. Surprisingly, respondents communicated more support to the less neutral definitions of cultural and political globalization. The Law Commission of Canada and Ohmae's definitions are considered to be less neutral in comparison to their competitors because of their word choices. For example, the Law Commission of Canada's definition of cultural globalization uses words such as "global domination

48

of American…," which could be interpreted as American domination over other world cultures. Ohmae's definition of political globalization also used less neutral language. Ohmae's definition states "increasing irrelevance of the institutions and boundaries of the nation state…" marks political globalization, and this could be interpreted as signaling a threat to the future existence of the nation-state. Why are respondents more supportive of globalization when it is defined in less neutral terms?

A possible explanation for the higher levels of support toward Law Commission of Canada and Ohmae's definitional indicators may suggest difference in the quality of the definition. The increased support for these definitions suggests that definitional indicators are somewhat variable and that the content of questions is significant. Thus, the Law Commission of Canada and Ohmae's definitional indicators may better indicate the phenomenon and so generate more supportive results toward globalization than their more neutral counterparts. However, this explanation is difficult to test in the absence of additional information. What these results do confirm is that definitional indicators and wording do matter, and how citizens respond to questions about globalization depends to some degree on how the broad concept is defined.

4.3 "No Opinion" and "Don't Know" Responses

All of the questions posed allowed each respondent to choose to answer that he or she had no opinion about the question or did not know an answer to the question.[8] The "no opinion" response option allows respondents to state that they

have no opinion or have not thought about an issue. Thus, the "no opinion"

responses help researchers to test for, and so avoid the problems of non-attitudes,

where the respondent has no opinion toward an issue. In contrast, the "don't know,"

response aims to collect a response from people who do not understand the question,

or who have no knowledge on the subject. In both cases, these response options

may be chosen by people who do not want to answer particular questions for a

variety of reasons.

As demonstrated in Table 4.8, the survey responses of "don't know" were

generally very low for the different definitions (refer to page 51). Ohmae's

definitions received the highest frequency of "don't know" responses at 2.3%,

whereas UNESCO's definition received the lowest frequency at 1.2% as depicted in

Table 4.8. The Law Commission of Canada's definition, as well as Wolfe and

Mendelsohn's definition also received low response rates of "don't know" at 1.3%

each. The cultural globalization definitions received similar response rates of "don't

know." For example, UNESCO's definition of cultural globalization received a

"don't know" response of 1.2%, and the Law Commission of Canada's cultural

definition received a response rate of 1.3%. However, there was a more significant

difference in responses between the political globalization definitions.

Ohmae's definition of political globalization received a "don't know"

response rate of 2.3%, whereas Cerny's definition received a response rate of only

1.7%. The lower "don't know" response rate to Cerny's political definition suggests

that it may be more easily interpreted than Ohmae's definition. Interestingly, the

political globalization definitions received a slightly higher percentages of "don't

know" than the Law Commission of Canada and UNESCO's definitions of cultural globalization.

Table 4.8: Percentage of respondents who responded "No Opinion" or "Don't Know"

Question	No Opinion	Don't know
Q25 Wolfe and Mendelsohn (economic)	31.6%	1.3%
Q26a United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (cultural)	23.1%	1.2%
Q26b Law Commission of Canada (cultural)	31.9%	1.3%
Q27a Kenichi Ohmae (political)	35.4%	2.3%
Q27b Philip Cerny (political)	26.2%	1.7%

There are several potential reasons for the low percentages of "don't know" responses. Generally, low response rates of "don't know" provide good indicators of clarity in the questions. High response rates of "don't know" may identify issues with question comprehension and interpretation. A high response rate of "don't know" raises questions about the reliability and validity of the questions.[9] Overall, the globalization definitions received very low response rates of "don't know". This may indicate that the respondents were easily able to comprehend the different globalization definitions, particularly in comparison to similar surveys on globalization that recorded extremely high "don't know" response rates, as discussed above in Chapter two.

Another plausible explanation for the low response rates of "don't know" toward the different definitions of globalization is that it may signify respondents' feeling pressured to respond a certain way. For example, Phillip Converse states that respondents may feel pressured to respond to survey questions because they assume

that interviewers want them to respond or because persons with opinions are viewed in higher esteem than those without opinions.[10] Thus, rather than appear ignorant on a topic, respondents will respond "no opinion" rather than "don't know". It is worth noting that perhaps the very low response rates of "don't know" toward these different definitions of globalization may be accounted for in the significantly higher response rates of "no opinion".

In comparison to the "don't know" responses, the "no opinion" responses were significantly higher and showed considerable differences in the frequencies among the five different definitions that were administered. As demonstrated in Table 4.8 (refer to page 51), UNESCO's definition of cultural globalization received the lowest response rate of "no opinion" of 23.1%, whereas the Law Commission of Canada's definition received 31.9%. There was an even larger difference found in the response rate of "no opinion" toward political globalization. Ohmae's definition of political globalization received 35.4% "no opinion", in comparison to Cerny's defintion that received a "no opinion" response of only 26.2%. Why are the response rates of "no opinion" significantly lower for the UNESCO's cultural globalization definition and Cerny's political globalization definition?

A potential explanation for the lower response rates of "no opinion" in UNESCO's and Cerny's definitions is that this may signal differences in the quality of the definitional indicators. Thus, perhaps the definitional indicators employed in UNESCO's and Cerny's definitions made the respondents more motivated and impassioned to express an opinion. However, this explanation is difficult to rationalize as both UNESCO's cultural definition and Cerny's political definition are

considered here as more neutral definitions than Law Commission of Canada and Ohmae's definitions. So, it may be that respondents shied away from the more provocative definitions and chose "no opinion" positions. Further research is needed to examine "no opinion" responses and public attitudes on globalization.

As previously mentioned, the "no opinion" response option helps researchers to avoid problems of non-attitudes, where the respondent has no opinion toward an issue but is forced to take a position owing to limited response options. Interestingly, the response rates of "no opinion" in this study are very similar to the response frequencies of "no opinion" reported in the CRIC and Wolfe and Mendelsohn study.[11] Overall, the "no opinion" response rates in this study are not substantial enough in size to signify a problem in the different globalization definitions.

4.4 Socio-Demographic Variables

4.4.1 Education Level

In addition to testing public attitudes towards the alternative definitions of globalization, the survey also examined the potential relationship between globalization attitudes and educational levels. Wolfe and Mendelsohn's study of public attitudes toward globalization found that "education and income have no impact on opinions on globalization."[12] Another study on economic globalization, conducted by Hainmueller and Hiscox, found that opposition to globalization is highest among respondents with the lowest levels of education.[13] Hainmueller and Hiscox hypothesized that exposure to information among educated individuals plays a part in influencing attitudes toward globalization.[14] Thus, Hiscox's measure of

education was replicated in the survey analysis to test whether education is correlated with attitudes toward globalization?[15]

For the purposes of comparison the results were grouped into similar categories used in the Hiscox study: "highly educated" (i.e., respondents who have completed a Bachelors, Masters Degree or higher); "some post-secondary"; and "less educated" (i.e., respondents with no college level education). The results are summarized in Table 4.9 and Table 4.10.

Table 4.9: Respondents who SUPPORT globalization by education level

Question	Highly Educated	Some Post Secondary	Less Educated
Q25 Wolfe and Mendelsohn (economic)	39.9%	38.4%	41.7%
Q26a United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (cultural)	19.2%	21.3%	20.2%
Q26b Law Commission of Canada (cultural)	55.7%	43.6%	35.2%
Q27a Kenichi Ohmae (political)	59.3%	54.7%	52.0%
Q27b Philip Cerny (political)	42.0%	48.4%	52.6%

Table 4.10: Respondents who OPPOSE Globalization based on education level

Question	Highly Educated	Some Post Secondary	Less Educated
Q25 Wolfe and Mendelsohn (economic)	60.1%	61.6%	58.3%
Q26a United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (cultural)	80.8%	78.8%	79.8%
Q26b Law Commission of Canada (cultural)	44.3%	56.4%	64.8%
Q27a Kenichi Ohmae (political)	40.7%	45.3%	48.0%
Q27b Philip Cerny (political)	58.0%	51.6%	47.4%

There were some distinct differences found in attitudes to globalization among respondents with different levels of education. For instance, 52.6% of the "less educated" respondents were supportive of Cerny's definition of political globalization, whereas only 42.0% of "highly educated" respondents support this definition as depicted in Table 4.9 (refer to page 54). To allow for more detailed and accurate break-down of levels of globalization support by education level, the results were grouped into four categories: "highly educated (degree of higher)," "some post-secondary," "completed high school," and "less than high school." When grouped into these categories, there were some interesting similarities found across the different levels of education. For example, all education levels expressed generally low levels of support of around 20% toward UNESCO's description of cultural globalization as demonstrated in Table 4.11.

Table 4.11: Respondents who SUPPORT globalization based on education level

Question	Highly educated (degree or higher)	Some Post Secondary	Completed High School	Less than High School
Q25 Wolfe and Mendelsohn (economic)	39.9%	38.4%	44.2%	36.4%
Q26a United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (cultural)	19.2%	21.3%	20.5%	19.4%
Q26b Law Commission of Canada (cultural)	55.7%	43.6%	37.1%	31.0%
Q27a Kenichi Ohmae (political)	59.3%	54.7%	56.9%	41.7%
Q27b Philip Cerny (political)	42.0%	48.4%	57.6%	41.9%

There are also similarities in support toward the competing dimensional definitions. For example, the education levels are all significantly more supportive

towards the Law Commission of Canada definitions than UNESCO's definition, as per Table 4.9 and 4.11. Similarly, almost all levels of education are more supportive toward Ohmae's definition than Cerny's definition. For example, respondents from all levels of education except "completed high school" are more supportive of Ohmae's political globalization definition.

The most notable divergence in attitudes based on education level is found in the results of respondents who have not completed high school, compared with those who have completed high school or more education. On almost all of the different definitions of globalization, respondents who had not completed high school were less supportive in their attitude to globalization. For instance, as depicted in Table 4.11, respondents who had not completed high school were 15.7% more opposed to Cerny's definition than respondents who had completed high school (refer to page 55). Moreover, respondents who have completed high school or received higher education were more apt to support all dimensions of globalization than respondents who had not completed high school. Overall, our study found that education levels broadly do correlate positively with support for globalization across all three dimensions examined here.

Previous attitudinal studies on public opinion surveys suggest that "women, younger adults, and less educated know less about political issues than men, older adults, and the more educated."[16] The data were briefly analyzed to test the predictive value of other demographic variables including gender, age and income.

4.4.2 Gender

Previous research suggests that women are more likely than men to hold more protectionist views toward international trade and economic globalization and thus have more negative attitudes toward globalization's economic dimension.[17] However, our results suggest that gender is not an adequate predictive variable concerning attitudes toward globalization.

Table 4.12: Respondents who SUPPORT globalization based on gender

Definition of Globalization	Female Support	Male Support
Q25 Wolfe and Mendelsohn (economic)	41.7%	37.9%
Q26a United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (cultural)	18.0%	22.9%
Q26b Law Commission of Canada (cultural)	48.9%	45.1%
Q27a Kenichi Ohmae (political)	57.6%	55.6%
Q27b Philip Cerny (political)	52.9%	41.6%

For example, as demonstrated in Table 4.12 and Table 4.13, no patterns of difference by gender were discovered regarding attitudes toward globalization (refer to page 57 and 64).[18] The only significant difference was toward Cerny's definition of political globalization: 52.9% of women supported globalization when defined in this way whereas only 41.6% of men supported it, as illustrated in Table 4.12. Overall, these results find gender does not correlate with attitudes about globalization. Thus, women and men share similar attitudes to the different definitions of globalization.

4.4.3 Age

Our findings suggest that age does not provide a good indicator of

respondent attitudes toward globalization. There was little consistency across the age

categories to indicate a relationship. However, unique to the youngest and oldest age

groups, it appears that for some globalization definitions support is correlated with

certain age groups.

Table 4.14: Age and SUPPORT for Globalization

Question	18-29 years	30-44 years	45-59 years	59 years & older
Q25 Wolfe and Mendelsohn (economic)	36.5%	40.6%	37.6%	43.3%
Q26a United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (cultural)	23.2%	20.8%	20.5%	19.0%
Q26b Law Commission of Canada (cultural)	49.2%	48.0%	45.9%	47.1%
Q27a Kenichi Ohmae (poltical)	48.1%	55.3%	56.9%	59.2%
Q27b Philip Cerny (poltical)	36.0%	43.6%	48.3%	55.6%

As demonstrated in Table 4.14, respondents fifty-nine years of age and older

had the highest degrees of support toward Mendelsohn and Wolfe, Ohmae, and

Cerny's globalization definitions, while the youngest respondents 18 to 29 years of

age had the highest degrees of support toward the Law Commission of Canada and

UNESCO's definition. This was not found in any of the other age groups in this

study. However, the small differences that were found by age difference and

attitudes toward globalization are probably attributable to other correlates of the

variable such as education level. Overall, there was little difference in attitudes

toward globalization based on age.

4.4.4 Income

There are different academic views regarding the relationship between respondents' income and public attitudes toward globalization. On the one hand, Wolfe and Mendelsohn argue that income has no relationship to opinions on globalization.[19] On the other hand, some academics such as Michael Hiscox suggest that respondents with more income are more supportive of globalization because they are better able to compete in open markets.[20]

Since income has been identified in previous research as being linked to particular attitudes toward globalization, we included a measure to test for correlations between income levels and attitudes toward globalization. Overall, there were too many inconsistencies in the results to draw any conclusions about income levels and attitudes toward globalization.

4.5 Conclusion

This chapter reported the findings from questions pertaining to this study's core hypotheses, which were drawn from the Globalization and Co-operative Membership Survey. The primary research questions sought to determine if economic definitions are sufficient to indicate globalization; and whether defining globalization in terms of its cultural and political aspects allowed for a more valid interpretation of public attitudes toward globalization. As discussed in Chapter two, the majority of existing opinion surveys concerning people's attitudes to globalization focus primarily on globalization's economic aspects. However, this study proposes that globalization has several complex dimensions, and people hold

varying attitudes toward each. So, each dimension should be defined when probing

people's attitudes toward globalization.

To examine the cultural dimension of globalization, two different definitions

were employed. The first definition by authored by UNESCO, was not supported

very strongly by the respondents. The second definition of cultural globalization,

authored by the Law Commission of Canada, was supported by a majority of the

respondents. This finding is interesting in that the Law Commission definition was

defined in less neutral and more provocative terms than that of the UNESCO

definition.

Similar findings were evident when examining the political definitions of

globalization. More respondents supported Ohmae's definition of political

globalization which also employed less neutral and more provocative terms than that

of Cerny's definition. Surprisingly respondents communicated more support toward

the less neutral definitions of cultural and political globalization, regardless of the

specific dimension under study.

In order to better understand public attitudes toward globalization our study

also examined the education level, gender, age and income of respondents. Our

survey revealed that respondents with a higher level of education were more likely

to support globalization. The results suggest that gender, age and income level do

not provide reliable indictors of attitudes toward globalization. This study probed

the accuracy of the widely held assumption that attitudes toward globalization can be

understood by studying only globalization's economic dimension. The results

discussed here suggest this assumption is faulty. Further, this is study found that

including globalization's cultural and political aspects when defining this phenomenon produces richer public opinion data which facilitates a more valid interpretation of public attitudes towards globalization. In the next chapter, attention turns to studying one more key variable- co-operative membership- and whether it correlates with respondent attitudes to globalization.

[1] Code words are key words or phrases that evoke a particular meaning to certain respondents and thus may strongly influence and bias responses on particular issues.

[2] Robert Wolfe and Matthew Mendelsohn, "Values and Interests in Attitudes toward Trade and Globalization: The Continuing Compromise of Embedded Liberalism," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 38, no.1 (2005), 51.

[3] UNESCO, *World Culture Report 1998: Culture, Creativity and Markets* (Paris: UNESCO Publishing, 1998), 253.

[4] Law Commission of Canada, "Part One: Globalization and its Challenges," Research *Projects: Governance Beyond Borders* (2005): p5 of 56. Online. *http://dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/Collection/JL2-25-2006E.pdf* (accessed 31 July 2006).

[5] Kenichi Ohmae, *The End of the Nation-State: The Rise of Regional Economies* (Toronto: The Free Press, 1995), 13.

[6] Philip G. Cerny, "Paradoxes of the Competition State: The Dynamics of Political Globalization," *Government and Opposition* 32, no.2 (1997), 253; Philip G. Cerny, "Political Globalization and the Competition State," Richard Stubbs and Geoffrey R.D. Underhill ed. *Political Economy and the Changing Global Order* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 301.

[7]**Table 4.2:** Frequency Distribution of Q25-Wolfe and Mendelsohn's Economic Globalization Definition

Do you strongly oppose, somewhat oppose, somewhat support, or strongly support Canada encouraging more rapid globalization, or do you have no opinion on this?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly support	148	9.8	9.8	9.8
	Somewhat support	253	16.8	16.8	26.6
	Somewhat oppose	455	30.2	30.2	56.9
	Strongly oppose	154	10.2	10.2	67.1
	No opinion	475	31.6	31.6	98.7
	DK/NA	20	1.3	1.3	100.0
	Total	1505	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.3: Frequency Distribution of Q26A- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization's Cultural Globalization Definition

Please tell me if you strongly oppose, somewhat oppose, somewhat support, or strongly support cultural globalization, or do you have no opinion on this?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly support	32	2.1	4.2	4.2
	Somewhat support	86	5.7	11.3	15.5
	Somewhat oppose	276	18.3	36.3	51.8
	Strongly oppose	182	12.1	23.9	75.7
	No opinion	176	11.7	23.1	98.8
	DK/NA	9	.6	1.2	100.0
	Total	761	50.6	100.0	
Missing	System	744	49.4		
Total		1505	100.0		

Table 4.4: Frequency Distribution of Q26B- -"Law Commission of Canada's Cultural Globalization Definition
Please tell me if you strongly oppose, somewhat oppose, somewhat support, or strongly support cultural globalization, or do you have no opinion on this?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly support	93	6.2	12.5	12.5
	Somewhat support	141	9.4	19.0	31.5
	Somewhat oppose	192	12.8	25.8	57.3
	Strongly oppose	71	4.7	9.5	66.8
	No opinion	237	15.7	31.9	98.7
	DK/NA	10	.7	1.3	100.0
	Total	744	49.4	100.0	
Missing	System	761	50.6		
Total		1505	100.0		

Table 4.5: Frequency Distribution of Q27A- Kenichi Ohmae's Political Globalization Definition
Please tell me if you strongly oppose, somewhat oppose, somewhat support, or strongly support political globalization, or do you have no opinion on this?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly support	115	7.6	15.7	15.7
	Somewhat support	143	9.5	19.5	35.1
	Somewhat oppose	163	10.8	22.2	57.4
	Strongly oppose	36	2.4	4.9	62.3
	No opinion	260	17.3	35.4	97.7
	DK/NA	17	1.1	2.3	100.0
	Total	734	48.8	100.0	
Missing	System	771	51.2		
Total		1505	100.0		

Table 4.6- Frequency Distribution of Q27B- Philip Cerny's Political Globalization Definition
Please tell me if you strongly oppose, somewhat oppose, somewhat support, or strongly support political globalization, or do you have no opinion on this?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly support	111	7.4	14.4	14.4
	Somewhat support	150	10.0	19.5	33.9
	Somewhat oppose	227	15.1	29.4	63.3
	Strongly oppose	68	4.5	8.8	72.1
	No opinion	202	13.4	26.2	98.3
	DK/NA	13	.9	1.7	100.0
	Total	771	51.2	100.0	

Missing System	734	48.8	
Total	1505	100.0	

Table 4.7: Intensity of respondents' attitudes toward the different definitions

Definitions	Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Somewhat Oppose	Strongly Oppose
Q25 Wolfe and Mendelsohn (economic)	14.7%	25.0%	45.0%	15.2%
Q26a United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (cultural)	5.6%	14.9%	47.9%	31.6%
Q26b Law Commission of Canada (cultural)	18.7%	28.4%	38.6%	14.3%
Q27a Kenichi Ohmae (political)	25.2%	31.3%	35.7%	7.9%
Q27b Philip Cerny (political)	20.0%	27.0%	40.8%	12.2%

[9] Reliability of the question means that the same results would be collected if the survey was repeated and validity is the extent to which the research measures what it claims to measure. For more information see Earl Babbie, *The Practice of Social Research: 10th Edition* (Toronto: Nelson, 2004), 141-143.

[10] Phillip E. Converse, "The Nature of Belief Systems in the Mass Public," *Ideology and Discontent,* ed., D.D. Apter (New York: Free Press, 1964), 206-61.

[11] Robert Wolfe and Matthew Mendelsohn, "Values and Interests in Attitudes toward Trade and Globalization: The Continuing Compromise of Embedded Liberalism," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 38, no.1 (2005): 45-68, 57.

[12] Robert Wolfe and Matthew Mendelsohn, "Values and Interests in Attitudes toward Trade and Globalization: The Continuing Compromise of Embedded Liberalism," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 38, no.1 (2005), 57.

[13] Jens Hainmueller and Michael J. Hiscox, "Learning to Love Globalization: Education and Individual Attitudes Toward International Trade," *International Organization* 60, no.2 (2006): 469-498, 470.

[14] Hainmueller and Hiscox, 471.

[15] Michael J. Hiscox, "Through a Glass and Darkly: Attitudes Toward International Trade and the Curious Effects of Issue Framing," *International Organization* 60, no.3 (2006), 770.

[16] Sherry Devereaux Ferguson, *Researching the Public Opinion Environment: Theories and Methods* (London: Sage Series Publications, Inc., 2000), 157.

[17] Michael J. Hiscox, "Through a Glass and Darkly: Attitudes Toward International Trade and the Curious Effects of Issue Framing," *International Organization* 60, no.3 (2006), 763.

[18]

Table 4.13: Respondents who OPPOSE globalization based on gender

Definition of Globalization	Female Opposition	Male Opposition
Q25 Wolfe and Mendelsohn (economic)	58.3%	62.1%

Q26a United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (cultural)	82.0%	77.1%
Q26b Law Commission of Canada (cultural)	51.5%	54.9%
Q27a Kenichi Ohmae (political)	42.2%	44.4%
Q27b Philip Cerny (political)	47.1%	58.4%

[19] Wolfe and Mendelsohn, 57.
[20] Wolfe and Mendelsohn, 50.

CHAPTER 5

CO-OPERATIVE MEMBERSHIP AND ATTITUDES TOWARD GLOBALIZATION

5.1 Introduction

The preceding chapter discussed the survey results concerning people's attitudes towards globalization's different dimensions. As well, some key variables such as age, gender, income and education level were discussed concerning their level of correlation with respondent attitudes. In this chapter, it is proposed that certain sorts of citizens may hold a particular set of views about globalization. This study probed how citizens who belong to co-operatives perceive globalization as compared to those who are not co-operative members.[1]

As Darrin Qualman suggests, the globalized economy is characterized by "increasingly powerful and mobile corporate capital, increasingly docile governments, and increasingly insecure workers and local residents".[2] As a result, many co-operatives have been created because local producers seek protection from the more powerful producers in the economy.[3] Thus, co-operatives are often described as an ally for local control and autonomy.[4] Co-operatives are also described as advantageous because of their democratic structure. Paul Lambert states that the democratic principle of "one member-one vote, allows for member control and representative action in the interests of its members."[5] Co-operatives are able to

66

help local communities by focusing on the local economy and directly addressing its members' needs. At the same time, global competition is placing much pressure on co-operatives. As Karen Philips and others have noted, many co-operative members do not express much enthusiasm for globalization when the phenomenon is described primarily by its economic aspects.[6] Further, Tom Webb notes that,

> Globalization has been relentless! Today the family grocers and wholesalers are history. The competition facing the co-operatives is comprised of two multi-national corporations, each of which is vertically integrated more than the co-operatives and horizontally diversified as well.[7]

Thus, based on the literature, this study established a working hypothesis that members of co-operatives would perceive globalization less favorably than those who did not belong to co-operatives.

Currently, little public opinion research examines cooperative membership and attitudes toward globalization, although some larger research projects (such as the *Co-operative Membership and Globalization: Creating Social Cohesion through Market Relations* study) have contributed knowledge.[8] This study provides some important information about the significance of definitional indicators when studying globalization. As with the results reported in the preceding chapter, public attitudes among co-operative members and non-members to globalization varies considerably depending upon the definition of globalization employed.

5.2 Co-operative Membership and Globalization

As discussed in section 3.4 of the third chapter, there is evidence to assume that some members of social groups are more threatened by globalization than non-

members or other groups. In this section the hypothesis that members of co-operatives are more threatened by globalization is tested. As well, the assumption that economic definitions provide comprehensive indicators of globalization is also tested here.

Approximately 50% of the total survey respondents were co-operative members. From the 1505 survey respondents, approximately 726 respondents belonged to co-operatives. To provide a more statistically reliable analysis of co-op members' attitudes toward globalization we analyzed two different groups of co-operative membership. First, we looked at respondents who belonged to only one co-operative, and then respondents who belonged to two or more co-operatives were examined to test whether there was any significant difference in attitudes between these two different groups of co-operative membership. As demonstrated in Tables 5.1 to 5.12, the response frequencies of the two groups were very similar, demonstrating that either group provides a reliable measure of co-operative members' attitudes toward globalization (refer to pages 69, 76-80).[9] For the purposes of this analysis, the focus in on the more intense measure of membership: co-operative members who belong to two or more co-operative organizations.

5.3 Survey findings

The survey results suggest that co-operative members are more supportive of globalization than non-members. First, as demonstrated in Table 5.1, the results suggest that co-operative members are more supportive toward Wolfe and Mendelsohn's definition of economic globalization than non-members. On the one

hand, 47.1% of co-operative members support this definition while, on the other

hand, only 36.5% of non-members support Wolfe and Mendelsohn's economic

definition of globalization. These findings suggest that co-operative members are

10.6% more supportive toward economic globalization than non-members.

Table 5.1: Reports the response frequencies of co-operative members and non-co-operative members and SUPPORT towards globalization.

Question	Co-op members with more than one membership	Non-Member
Q25 Wolfe and Mendelsohn (economic)	47.1%	36.5%
Q26a United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (cultural)	23.4%	21.1%
Q26b Law Commission of Canada (cultural)	49.6%	42.1%
Q27a Kenichi Ohmae (political)	64.7%	52.3%
Q27b Philip Cerny (political)	52.4%	43.4%

Second, the survey results suggest that co-operative members are more

supportive toward cultural globalization than non-members. Interestingly, both co-

operative members and non-members showed low levels of support toward

UNESCO's definition of cultural globalization as depicted in Table 5.1, among all

five definitions. Co-operative members were more supportive toward the

UNESCO's definition, but not by a significant amount: 23.4% of co-operative

members favored this definition, compared with 21.1% of non-members.

There was a larger difference in opinion toward the Law Commission of

Canada's definition of cultural globalization. For example, in Table 5.1 the results

suggested that co-operative members are more supportive than non-members toward

the Law Commission of Canada's definition. Almost 50% (49.6%) of co-operative

members supported the Law Commission of Canada's cultural globalization definition, versus 42.1% of non-members. Co-operative members were 7.5% more supportive toward the Law Commission of Canada's definition than non-members, suggesting that co-operative members were slightly more supportive toward cultural globalization than non-members.

As well, concerning Kenichi Ohmae and Philip Cerny's definitions of political globalization, there was a significant difference between co-operative members and non-members attitudes toward globalization. For example, as suggested in Table 5.1, 64.7% of co-operative members supported Ohmae's definition whereas only 52.3% of non-members supported this definition. Co-operative members were 12.4% more supportive toward Ohmae's definition than non-members. Similarly, co-operative members were also more supportive of Cerny's definitions of political globalization: 52.4% of co-operative members supported it, whereas only 43.4% of non-members supported it. Thus, our findings suggest that co-operative members are more supportive toward political globalization than non-members.

It is worth examining levels of opposition to globalization as well. In Table 5.13, the results demonstrate that co-operative members are less likely to oppose globalization (refer to page 71). For example, only 52.9% of co-operative members opposed Wolfe and Mendelsohn's definition of economic globalization, compared with 63.5% of non-members. Similarly, co-operative members were also much less opposed to the political definitions of globalization. Co-operative members were 35.3% opposed to Ohmae's definition whereas 47.7% of non-members opposed his

definition. In addition, co-operative members only opposed Cerny's definition of political globalization by 47.6%, compared with 56.6% of non-members.

Table 5.13: Response frequencies of co-operative members and non-co-operative members who OPPOSE towards globalization

Question	Co-op members with more than one membership	Non-Member
Q25 Wolfe and Mendelsohn (economic)	52.9%	63.5%
Q26a United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (cultural)	76.6%	78.9%
Q26b Law Commission of Canada (cultural)	50.4%	57.9%
Q27a Kenichi Ohmae (political)	35.3%	47.7%
Q27b Philip Cerny (political)	47.6%	56.6%

Similar to the other respondents in the survey, co-operative members seem to have slightly different attitudes toward globalizations' dimensions. Overall, co-operative members are consistently more supportive than non-members toward economic, cultural and political globalization. Responses to every definition, except the Law Commission of Canada's definition of cultural globalization, demonstrate that co-operative members were noticeably more supportive than non-members toward globalization. Surprisingly, these results are the opposite of what was initially hypothesized in that co-operative members are less likely to oppose globalization than non-members. Thus, how exactly do we interpret this positive correlation between co-operative membership and support for globalization?

One potential explanation for co-operative members' increased support for globalization lies in the principles and values upon which these organizations are based. Co-operatives are known for their educational training and promotion of co-

operative principles and values that they provide to their members.[10] For example, the International Co-operative Association states that, "by putting the Co-operative Principles and ethics in practice they promote solidarity and tolerance... ."[11] Thus, perhaps co-operative education tends to socialize co-op members to have more tolerant views of the world which helps to explain the difference in levels of support toward globalization between co-operative members and non-members.

A second potential explanation for members' increased support toward globalization concerns the relationships and networks which these organizations promote. Co-operatives can help to foster tolerance and solidarity by developing external networks and social bonds within different groups. For example, as Brett Fairbairn states, "They [Co-ops] are a worldwide movement, connected to communities everywhere."[12] Furthermore, he notes, "A co-operative is defined by, and draws strength from, its relationships."[13] As well, he notes that the "difference in a co-operative is the closeness and multidimensionality of the relationships with members…."[14] Further, if co-operatives work together- "worker co-operatives, credit unions, consumer co-operatives, and producer co-operatives- they can create a democratic economy with global linkages".[15] The co-operative sector is international, which means that there are many networks that co-operatives can work within, or form alliances with other co-operatives to help compete with other global corporate businesses. Creating networks is important for self help; networks provide people with connections to others in order to help themselves solve problems.[16] Accordingly, these relationships may allow co-operative members to feel more secure about globalization and its effects.

A third plausible explanation is that there is a growing interest amongst co-operative members for using co-operatives as a means to perform global exchange. Hence, co-operatives provide people with a tool to gain leverage in the marketplace when the forces of competition pose few alternatives.[17] Michael Gertler states that:

> Co-operatives often benefit from the strong links among producers, processing activities and consumers…Direct vertical integration and related forms of vertical co-ordination allow co-operatives to exert considerable influence over steps involved in primary production, processing and marketing.[18]

Co-operatives utilize a variety of financing alternatives, including joint ventures and the new generation structure.[19] Co-operatives allow people to combine their resources of capital and labour in order to capture greater benefits from an enterprise, than if the business were undertaken individually.[20] Unlike corporate enterprise, a cooperative is a specific form of economic co-operation that embodies a wider kind of social co-operation.[21] Co-operatives create an increased sense of social cohesion, as the whole community works together to ensure that the co-operative project survives.[22] The co-operative's activities promote the economic success or well-being of the members' household or income: "there is a close connection between the success of the co-operative and of the member, if one does well, the other shares in the success".[23]

So, perhaps the most plausible explanation for co-operative members' higher level of support to globalization is that co-operatives provide opportunities to participate in global exchange without sacrificing local control.[24] As Fairbairn notes, "In co-ops, people can express what is local and distinctive, even while situating what they value within a global and competitive economy."[25] Co-operatives allow

communities to retain their local control and autonomy in decision-making. Thus co-operative members enjoy more local control, and so perhaps are less afraid of globalization's negative repercussions. Fairbairn further states that:

> [a local co-operative] is stable and diversified
> because its head office, is in the local community…
> It is not likely to be bought out by a competitor…It
> can be flexible, innovative, and entrepreneurial
> because it does not receive its orders from a far-
> away corporate head office.[26]

Unlike corporate business, a co-operative's structure of member-owner control makes it possible for decisions to be made by the co-operatives member-owners. This may act as a countervailing force to top-down corporate decision making. Thus, co-operative members may be more supportive toward globalization because they view co-operatives as vehicles to work with globalization, without having to sacrifice their autonomy to globalization's influential pressures. This explanation that co-operatives are able to retain local autonomy in an era of increasing globalization carries some important implications for public policy.

Specifically, in an era where governments are described as losing control and local autonomy is diminishing co-operatives may play an important role in maintaining local autonomy.[27] The co-operative model may grant people the ability to maintain control over some of the economic decisions directly affecting them.[28] Thus, in order to realize this opportunity, there is utility in informing government and public policy officials about the potential role for co-operatives to play in an increasingly global society.[29]

Although there are different plausible explanations as to why co-operative members are more supportive of globalization, it is difficult to ascertain the exact

nature of this relationship. The basis for this difference in attitudes between co-operative and non-co-operative members toward globalization is not entirely clear, nor is it evident whether it is a function purely of co-operative membership or other confounding variables. This remains an important question to be examined in future studies. However, it is very clear that co-operative membership is more strongly correlated with attitudes to globalization than the other demographic variables discussed in Chapter four.

5.4 Conclusion

Contrary to the initial assumption that co-operative members are more likely to oppose globalization than non-members, the results suggest that co-operative members view globalization much more favorably than non-members. Overall, respondents who belong to co-operative organizations are more likely to support cultural, political and economic globalization than non-members, and less likely to oppose globalization.

At present, little public opinion research exists on how co-operative members view globalization. Our study provides the most detailed analysis of co-operative membership and its relationship to globalization to date. This research provides pertinent information for academics and practitioners studying co-operative members' attitudes about globalization. Future research on co-operative membership and attitudes toward globalization should focus on probing exactly how co-operative members perceive their group participation in view of the pressures generated by globalization.

[1] The International Co-operative Alliance defines a co-operative as "an autonomous association of persons united voluntarily to meet their common economic, social, and cultural needs and aspirations through a jointly-owned and democratically-controlled enterprise." For more information please refer to the International Co-operative Alliance website: *What is a Co-operative* (Geneva: International Co-operative Alliance, 2007). Online. http://www.ica.coop/coop/index.html (accessed 10 June 2007).
[2] Darrin Qualman, "Corporate Hog Farming: The View From the Family Farm," eds., Roger Epp and Dave Whitson, *Writing off the Rural West: Globalization, Governments, and the Transformation of Rural Communities* (Edmonton: The University of Alberta Press, 2001), 33.
[3] Micheal Gertler, *Rural Cooperatives and Sustainable Development* (Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives), 5.
[4] Brett Fairbairn, "Cohesion, Adhesion, and Identity in Co-operatives," eds., Brett Fairbairn and Nora Russell, *Co-operative Membership and Globalization* (Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 2004), 19.
[5] Paul Lambert, "Election of Directors in Saskatchewan Co-operatives: Processes and Results," *Occasional Papers: An Interdisciplinary Publication of the University of Saskatchewan Centre for the Study of Co-operatives* (Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 1987), 1.
[6] Karen Philip, "The Challenges of Co-operative Membership, Social Cohesion and Globalization," eds., Brett Fairbairn and Nora Russell, *Co-operative Membership and Globalization* (Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 2004), 66; The Canadian Co-operative Association, le Conseil Canadiende la Cooperation and Co-operative Secretariat, Government of Canada, "Co-operatives in Canada: An Overview," eds., Brett Fairbairn, Ian MacPherson, and Nora Russell, *Canadian Co-operatives in the Year 2000* (Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 2000), 138; Gargi Parsai, "Co-operatives Must Face Challenges of Globalisation," *The Hindu: On-line Edition of India's National Newspaper*, 2004. Online. <http://www.hindu.com/2004/02/03/stories/2004020305961200.htm> (accessed 8 June 2007).
[7] Tom Webb, "Atlantic Canadian Co-ops Meet Globalization, Plan Merger," *Co-operative Grocer* 91, 2000. Online. <http://www.cooperativegrocer.coop/articles/index.php?id=278> (accessed 6 June 2007).
[8] *Co-operative Membership and Globalization: Creating Social Cohesion through Market Relations* (Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 2004). Online. <http://www.socialcohesion.coop/> (accessed 20 March 2006).

[9] **Table 5.2:** Frequency Distribution Table of Co-op members who belong to one co-operative

Q25. Wolfe and Mendelsohn- Do you strongly oppose, somewhat oppose, somewhat support, or strongly support Canada encouraging more rapid globalization, or do you have no opinion on this?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly support	87	12.0	12.0	12.0
	Somewhat support	134	18.5	18.5	30.4
	Somewhat oppose	227	31.3	31.3	61.7
	Strongly oppose	69	9.5	9.5	71.2
	No opinion	201	27.7	27.7	98.9
	DK/NA	8	1.1	1.1	100.0
	Total	726	100.0	100.0	

Table 5.3: Frequency Distribution Table of Co-op members who belong to one co-operative
Q26a.   Please tell me if you strongly oppose, somewhat oppose, somewhat support, or strongly support cultural globalization, or do you have no opinion on this?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly support	11	1.5	3.2	3.2
	Somewhat support	44	6.1	12.7	15.9
	Somewhat oppose	135	18.6	39.0	54.9
	Strongly oppose	86	11.8	24.9	79.8
	No opinion	66	9.1	19.1	98.8
	DK/NA	4	.6	1.2	100.0
	Total	346	47.7	100.0	
Missing	System	380	52.3		
Total		726	100.0		

Table 5.4: Frequency Distribution Table of Co-op members who belong to one co-operative
26b.   Please tell me if you strongly oppose, somewhat oppose, somewhat support, or strongly support cultural globalization, or do you have no opinion on this?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly support	55	7.6	14.5	14.5
	Somewhat support	78	10.7	20.5	35.0
	Somewhat oppose	93	12.8	24.5	59.5
	Strongly oppose	31	4.3	8.2	67.6
	No opinion	122	16.8	32.1	99.7
	DK/NA	1	.1	.3	100.0
	Total	380	52.3	100.0	
Missing	System	346	47.7		
Total		726	100.0		

Table 5.5: Frequency Distribution Table of Co-op members who belong to one co-operative
27a.   Please tell me if you strongly oppose, somewhat oppose, somewhat support, or strongly support political globalization, or do you have no opinion on this?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly support	72	9.9	21.1	21.1
	Somewhat support	73	10.1	21.4	42.5
	Somewhat oppose	79	10.9	23.2	65.7
	Strongly oppose	17	2.3	5.0	70.7
	No opinion	94	12.9	27.6	98.2
	DK/NA	6	.8	1.8	100.0
	Total	341	47.0	100.0	
Missing	System	385	53.0		

		Frequency	Percent		
Total		726	100.0		

Table 5.6: Frequency Distribution Table of Co-op members who belong to one co-operative

27b. Please tell me if you strongly oppose, somewhat oppose, somewhat support, or strongly support political globalization, or do you have no opinion on this?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly support	66	9.1	17.1	17.1
	Somewhat support	78	10.7	20.3	37.4
	Somewhat oppose	114	15.7	29.6	67.0
	Strongly oppose	30	4.1	7.8	74.8
	No opinion	91	12.5	23.6	98.4
	DK/NA	6	.8	1.6	100.0
	Total	385	53.0	100.0	
Missing	System	341	47.0		
Total		726	100.0		

Table 5.7: Frequency Distribution Table of Co-op members who belong to more than one co-operative

25.   Do you strongly oppose, somewhat oppose, somewhat support, or strongly support Canada encouraging more rapid globalization, or do you have no opinion on this?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly support	54	14.4	14.4	14.4
	Somewhat support	77	20.5	20.5	34.8
	Somewhat oppose	124	33.0	33.0	67.8
	Strongly oppose	23	6.1	6.1	73.9
	No opinion	97	25.8	25.8	99.7
	DK/NA	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	376	100.0	100.0	

Table 5.8: Frequency Distribution Table of Co-op members who belong to more than one co-operative

26a. Please tell me if you strongly oppose, somewhat oppose, somewhat support, or strongly support cultural globalization, or do you have no opinion on this?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly support	8	2.1	4.5	4.5
	Somewhat support	25	6.6	14.0	18.4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Somewhat oppose	66	17.6	36.9	55.3
	Strongly oppose	42	11.2	23.5	78.8
	No opinion	36	9.6	20.1	98.9
	DK/NA	2	.5	1.1	100.0
	Total	179	47.6	100.0	
Missing	System	197	52.4		
Total		376	100.0		

Table 5.9: Frequency Distribution Table of Co-op members who belong to more than one co-operative

26b.   Please tell me if you strongly oppose, somewhat oppose, somewhat support, or strongly support cultural globalization, or do you have no opinion on this?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly support	32	8.5	16.2	16.2
	Somewhat support	34	9.0	17.3	33.5
	Somewhat oppose	47	12.5	23.9	57.4
	Strongly oppose	20	5.3	10.2	67.5
	No opinion	63	16.8	32.0	99.5
	DK/NA	1	.3	.5	100.0
	Total	197	52.4	100.0	
Missing	System	179	47.6		
Total		376	100.0		

Table 5.10: Frequency Distribution Table of Co-op members who belong to more than one co-operative

27a.   Please tell me if you strongly oppose, somewhat oppose, somewhat support, or strongly support political globalization, or do you have no opinion on this?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly support	43	11.4	23.1	23.1
	Somewhat support	43	11.4	23.1	46.2
	Somewhat oppose	38	10.1	20.4	66.7
	Strongly oppose	9	2.4	4.8	71.5
	No opinion	50	13.3	26.9	98.4
	DK/NA	3	.8	1.6	100.0
	Total	186	49.5	100.0	
Missing	System	190	50.5		
Total		376	100.0		

Table 5.11: Frequency Distribution Table of 1 Co-op members who belong to more than one co-operative

27b.   Please tell me if you strongly oppose, somewhat oppose, somewhat support, or strongly support political globalization, or do you have no opinion on this?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly support	33	8.8	17.4	17.4
	Somewhat support	42	11.2	22.1	39.5
	Somewhat oppose	59	15.7	31.1	70.5
	Strongly oppose	9	2.4	4.7	75.3
	No opinion	44	11.7	23.2	98.4
	DK/NA	3	.8	1.6	100.0
	Total	190	50.5	100.0	
Missing	System	186	49.5		
Total		376	100.0		

Table 5.12: Respondents SUPPORT based on different measures of co-op membership

Question	Co-op members with more than one membership (Q17a =>2)	Co-op members only (select if Q17=1)	Non Members (select if Q17=2)
Q25 Wolfe and Mendelsohn	47.1%	42.7%	36.5%
Q26a United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	23.4%	19.9%	21.1%
Q26b Law Commission of Canada	49.6%	51.8%	42.1%
Q27a Kenichi Ohmae	64.7%	60.2%	52.3%
Q27b Philip Cerny	52.4%	50.0%	43.4%

[10] Sidney Pobihushchy, "Towards a People's Economy: A Co-operative Paradigm," eds. Brett Fairbairn, Ian MacPherson, Nora Russell eds. *Canadian Cooperatives in the Year 2000: Memory Mutual Aid and the Millennium* (Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Cooperatives, 2000), 308.
[11] International Co-operative Alliance, "What is a co-operative?" Online. <http://www.ica.coop/coop/index.html> (accessed 4 March 2006).
[12] Brett Fairbairn, *Cohesion, Consumerism, and Co-operatives: Looking Ahead for the Co-operative Retailing System* (Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 2004), 14.
[13] Brett Fairbairn, *Three Strategic Concepts for the Guidance of Co-operatives: Linkage, Transparency, and Cognition* (Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 2003), 5.
[14] Brett Fairbairn, *Three Strategic Concepts for the Guidance of Co-operatives: Linkage, Transparency, and Cognition*, 5.

[15] Claude Beland, "The Future of Co-operation," Brett Fairbairn, Ian MacPherson, Nora Russell eds. *Canadian Cooperatives in the Year 2000: Memory Mutual Aid and the Millennium* (Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Cooperatives, 2000), 276.

[16] "A Conversation about Community Development." *Community Development Workshop* (Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 1997), 6.

[17] "An Action Plan for the 21st Century," *Agricultural Adaptation: A Co-operative Approach*. The Canadian Co-operative Association, Online. [http://www.coopscanada.coop/CCA.Gapp/agricoops/Final%20ACTION%20PLAN%20November%202001.pdf> (accessed 4 March 2006).

[18] Gertler, 14.

[19] Shermain Hardesty, Positioning California's Agricultural Cooperatives for the Future. Online. <http://www.agecon.ucdavis.edu/uploads/update_articles/v8n3_4.pdf> (accessed 16 March 2006).

[20] Brett Fairbairn et al., *Cooperatives and Community Development: Economics in Social Perspective*, 21.

[21] Brett Fairbairn et al., *Cooperatives and Community Development: Economics in Social Perspective*, 20.

[22] Larry Martin and Kate Stiefelmeyer, "Strategic Alliances and Cooperatives Aiding in Rural Development in North America," *Proceedings – Rural Conferences* (Sep. 2001), 88.

[23] Brett Fairbairn, "Cohesion, Adhesion and Identities in Coops." 31.

[24] Lou Hammond Ketilson, Michael Gertler, Murray Fulton, Roy Dobson, and Leslie Polsom, *Economic and Social Importance of the Co-operative Sector in Saskatchewan* (Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 1998), 3.

[25] Brett Fairbairn, *Cohesion, Consumerism, and Co-operatives: Looking Ahead for the Co-operative Retailing System*, 19.

[26] Brett Fairbairn, "Cohesion, Adhesion and Identities in Coops," 19.

[27] Pobihushchy, 306.

[28] Philip, 67.

[29] The Canadian Co-operative Association et al., 139.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

6.1 Introduction

As discussed in the preceding chapters, the dominant approach used in most opinion surveys defines globalization only in terms of its economic dimension. However, this thesis takes the position that this approach is faulty, and that defining such a multifaceted phenomenon so narrowly is insufficient for survey research purposes. To develop a more informed and valid interpretation of public attitudes towards globalization, this study surveyed public perceptions toward the cultural and political dimensions of globalization, along with the economic dimension. This study provides pertinent information about the significance of definitional indicators when studying globalization. Furthermore, because no other study to date has tested competing definitions of globalization in such a large national sample, this study provides original research that is helpful to academics and practitioners studying attitudes about globalization. Towards summarizing the thesis's objectives, this chapter discusses the broader relevance of public opinion surveys on globalization and public policy. In addition, this chapter also provides a few recommendations for further public opinion research on globalization.

Globalization is recognized as a multidimensional phenomenon but, to date, it has received relatively little empirical study. There is a gap between the literature

on globalization and the empirical study of globalization. On the one hand, academics and researchers describe globalization as a multidimensional process; while, on the other hand, most public opinion surveys empirically study only the economic dimension of globalization. One of the objectives of this study was to move beyond the limitation of conceptualizing globalization only as an economic phenomenon. In this study, definitions relating to globalization's cultural and political aspects were drawn from the extant literature and then tested, along with an economic definition, toward establishing a more valid and informed method of studying public attitudes to globalization.

6.2 Broader Relevance of Thesis

Globalization is a complex phenomenon that impacts all facets of society.[1] The power and influence of globalization is of particular concern due to its growing economic, social, and political dominance in individual countries. Scholars and policy makers face large challenges in trying to understand the potential effects of this complex phenomenon on society. More specifically, scholars question the impact of globalization on citizens, particularly in terms of their trust in economic and political institutions. Opinion surveys can offer insight into answering complex questions such as how citizens perceive the benefits of globalization. Probing citizen attitudes toward globalization has important implications for Canadian politics and public policy, because surveys are an important means to understanding public attitudes and they have much power to capture the views of large populations. A well-designed probability sample of 1,000 persons can "accurately reflect… the opinions of 100 million or more people".[2] Government officials and scholars use

public opinion surveys to acquire important information on societal issues affecting

the general public, such as globalization.

Governments undertake public opinion research to "understand the opinions,

attitudes, perceptions, judgments, feelings, ideas, reactions and views of the

public."[3] As well, public opinion polls also provide an important means for citizens

to communicate with their elected representatives. As Scott Althaus suggests,

> Surveys can become a channel for political representation
> when leaders use opinion polls as descriptions of what
> the people think and feel. Because polls provide
> information that is both prescriptive and descriptive, the
> use of collective preferences in democratic politics
> should be guided by the quality of representation they
> provide.[4]

Although public opinion is relevant to the climate in which policy decisions

are made, opinion poll results are not transformed directly into public policy because

opinions are more transient and dynamic than attitudes and values.[5] Rather,

governments use public opinion research to help establish priorities, develop

policies, and evaluate and monitor programs for Canadians.[6] Many government

officials view public opinion research as the most effective way to capture public

perception of government policy.[7] Thus, opinion surveys studying public attitudes to

globalization may have important implications for Canadian politics and public

policy. However, much literature on public opinion research suggests that citizen

responses toward policy issues generally are influenced by the emphasis placed on

particular aspects of the issue and the wording of the question.[8] Therefore, to

develop a more valid interpretation of public attitudes towards globalization this

study finds that public perceptions about globalization's cultural and political

dimensions, along with its economic aspects, must be probed to ensure survey results adequately capture public attitudes. In turn, public policy decisions may be enhanced by generating more comprehensive survey data on globalization.

6.3 Recommendations for Future Research

The results of this survey suggest some possible ways to improve public opinion surveys on globalization. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to examine all of the potential ways to improve public opinion research; accordingly, this section focuses on two strategies. First, as argued above, studying the cultural, political and economic aspects of globalization is important to understanding the general phenomenon of globalization. In order to develop a more comprehensive understanding of attitudes toward globalization it is necessary to adopt more inclusive definitions of globalization in future public opinion surveys. Thus, one of the key implications of this study is that future public opinion surveys on attitudes toward globalization need to include indicators of the cultural and political dimensions of globalization, along with the economic dimension, to allow for a more valid interpretation of attitudes toward globalization. Further, a priority in future public opinion research should be to improve the current understanding among researchers of globalization as a multidimensional process.

Second, another area for further research is to examine attitudes toward globalization using other methods of study. Public opinion surveys have several well-recognized limitations. For example, because surveys are undertaken by the surveyor rather than the surveyed, the agenda reflects only the interests of the survey interviewer. Surveys may provide people with a chance to express their views and

concerns, but only on the topics that the researcher considers important.[9] Thus, the use of public opinion research in combination with other research methods may allow for the research process to balance between the perspectives of the researchers and the subjects.

There are various methods for collecting viewpoints and expectations of the populace. Some of the other methods used may include – focus groups, interviews, talk shows, internet, web blogs, discussion groups, public hearings, roundtables and royal commissions. Roundtables and royal commissions provide people with the opportunity to raise important issues and have their concerns addressed. Methods that collect citizens views in a non-structured way, such as in royal commissions, presentations and hearing are beneficial because they play a significant educational role by promoting the discussion of issues among the public, policy-makers and commissioners.[10] Participatory research that involves the subject in structuring the content of the study is beneficial because it is flexible and allows the researcher to conduct discussion on many topics.[11] Participatory research that employs strategies such as focus groups also offers the possibility for more natural and spontaneous discussion than is possible in public opinion surveys.[12] Thus, participatory research methods provide the opportunity for more detailed information to be acquired. Research conducted using participatory methods in combination with public opinion surveys will contribute to fuller knowledge about complex phenomenon such as globalization. So, government may produce more informed public policy if they take care to study globalization's many dimensions through a variety of research approaches.

Third, another recommendation is that governments should pursue research on the co-operative model and its potential role in global society. Co-operatives provide people with the opportunity to maintain control and autonomy over some of the economic decisions directly affecting them.[13] In an era where governments are described as losing control and power, co-operatives may play an important role in maintaining local autonomy. [14] The survey results clearly demonstrate that co-operative members are less opposed to globalization than non-members. Thus, it is important that public policy officials consider the potential role for co-operatives in an increasingly global society.

6.4 Conclusion

Most opinion surveys on people's attitudes to globalization study only its economic dimension. However, this study takes the position that defining a multidimensional phenomenon so narrowly simply cannot explain public attitudes towards this phenomenon. Furthermore, studying only the economic aspects of globalization may produce invalid survey results on public opinion toward globalization. Thus, to develop a more informed interpretation of public attitudes towards globalization this study tested the public's perceptions of cultural, political and economic globalization.

The first hypothesis of this study proposed that public attitudes to globalization can not be validly explained merely by studying its economic dimension. The survey results showed significant differences in the response frequencies toward the different definitional indicators of globalization, suggesting that the first hypothesis was correct. As predicted, data drawn from the

Globalization and Co-operative Membership survey reported significant differences in response frequencies toward the different definitional indicators of globalization, which may suggest that public attitudes to globalization are not adequately represented by studying it in terms of only its economic dimension. This is not to say that economic definitions are not important in understanding attitudes toward globalization, but that public attitudes toward globalization are not based on only one dimension. Globalization is a complex and a multidimensional process, whose essence cannot easily be captured by an indicator representing a single dimension.

The second hypothesis examined whether defining globalization in terms of its cultural and political dimensions would allow for a more valid interpretation of public attitudes to globalization. As predicted, this study found that respondents possessed varying attitudes toward globalization's different definitional indicators. Thus, probing public attitudes toward the different dimensions of globalization provides a more valid interpretation of attitudes toward this phenomenon. Accordingly, each dimension should be defined when probing people's attitudes toward globalization.

The third hypothesis of this study examined whether co-operative members' attitudes to globalization differ from non-members. Global competition is often described as being potentially threatening to the future of co-operatives.[15] Thus, based on the literature, this study hypothesized that co-op members generally would feel threatened by globalization and would be more likely to oppose globalization than non-members. However, the results of this study found the

opposite, and suggest that co-operative members are more likely to support globalization than non-members.

After examining earlier survey results on globalization, the extant literature on globalization, and then analyzing a national opinion survey data on public attitudes toward globalization, it is apparent that studying the cultural, political and economic aspects of globalization are imperative to understanding globalization. In order to develop a more valid understanding of attitudes toward globalization it is necessary to adopt more inclusive indicators of globalization such as the ones employed here in future public opinion surveys. Future public opinion surveys on public attitudes toward globalization need to capture attitudes about cultural and politic valid interpretations of attitudes toward globalization, particularly for public policy purposes.

[1] William D. Coleman, "Globalization and Co-operatives," eds. Brett Fairbairn and Nora Russell, *Co-operative Membership and Globalization* (Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 2004), 7.

[2] B. Hennessy, *Public opinion* (Monterey: Brooks/Cole, 1985), 73.

[3] Canada, Office of the Auditor General of Canada, *Management of Public Opinion Research* (Ottawa: Office of the Auditor General, 2004). Government of Canada Website. Online. <http://www.oag-bug.gc.ca/domino/reports.nsf/html/20031105ce.html > (accessed 02 September 2005).

[4] Scott L.Althuas*, Collective preferences in democratic politics : opinion surveys and the will of the people* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 281.

[5] Robert Wolfe and Matthew Mendelsohn, "Values and Interests in Attitudes toward Trade and Globalization: The Continuing Compromise of Embedded Liberalism," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 38, no.1 (2005), 51.

[6] Claude Emery, *Public Opinion Polling in Canada* (Ottawa: Political and Social Affairs Division, 1994). Government of Canada Website. Online. <http://www.parl.gc.ca/information/library/PRBpubs/bp371-e.htm> (accessed 25 August 2005).

[7] Emery, *Public Opinion Polling in Canada.*

[8] William A. Belson*, Validity in Survey Research: with Special Reference to the Techniques of Intensive Interviewing and Progressive Modification for Testing and Constructing Difficult or Sensitive Measures for Use in Survey Research* (Brookfield: Gower Publishing Company, 1986); Herbert H. Clark and Michael F. Schober, "Asking Questions and Influencing Answers," *Questions About Questions: Inquiries into the Cognitive Bases of Surveys,* ed. Judith M. Tanur (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1991); James Druckman, "Political Preference Formation: Competition, Deliberation, and the (Ir)relevance of Framing Effects," *American Political Science Review* 98, no. 4 (2004), 671-685, and Michael J. Hiscox, "Through a Glass and Darkly: Attitudes Toward International Trade and the Curious Effects of Issue Framing," *the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association* (2004).

[9] Sidney Verba, "The Citizen as Respondent: Sample Surveys and American Democracy Presidential Address, American Political Science Association, 1995," *The American Political Science Review* 90 (1996), 1.

[10] Canada, Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, *Striking the Balance: A Five Year Strategy for the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada 1996-2001* (Ottawa: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, 1996), 5.

[11] Sherry Devereaux Ferguson, *Researching the Public Opinion Environment: Theories and Methods* (London: Sage Series Publications, Inc., 2000), 216.

[12] Devereaux Ferguson, 216.

[13] Karen Philip, "The Challenges of Co-operative Membership, Social Cohesion and Globalization," eds., Brett Fairbairn and Nora Russell, *Co-operative Membership and Globalization* (Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 2004), 66.

[14] Sidney Pobihushchy, "Towards a People's Economy: A Co-operative Paradigm," eds. Brett Fairbairn, Ian MacPherson, Nora Russell eds. *Canadian Cooperatives in the Year 2000: Memory Mutual Aid and the Millennium* (Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Cooperatives, 2000), 306.

[15] Karen Philip, "The Challenges of Co-operative Membership, Social Cohesion and Globalization," eds., Brett Fairbairn and Nora Russell, *Co-operative Membership and Globalization* (Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 2004), 66.

Survey Questions on Globalization

ECONOMIC GLOBALIZATION
 (All respondents)

(Wolfe and Mendelsohn Definition)

25. Globalization has several different aspects to it. "Many people say we are presently experiencing a process of globalization which means that the ECONOMIES of all the countries of the world are becoming more and more linked". Do you strongly oppose, somewhat oppose, somewhat support, or strongly support Canada encouraging more rapid globalization, or do you have no opinion on this?

    01 – Strongly oppose
    02 – Somewhat oppose
    03 – Somewhat support
    04 – Strongly support
    05 – No opinion
    06 – Refused

CULTURAL GLOBALIZATION
 (Split sample; half of sample receives Question 26A and the other half Question 26B)

(United Nations, Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization Definition)

26. A) Globalization has several different aspects to it. CULTURAL globalization refers to a process in which ideas, behaviours and beliefs are exchanged and dispersed worldwide through travel, migration and the mass media. Please tell me if you strongly oppose, somewhat oppose, somewhat support, or strongly support cultural globalization, or do you have no opinion on this?

    01 – Strongly oppose
    02 – Somewhat oppose
    03 – Somewhat support
    04 – Strongly support
    05 – No opinion
    06 – Refused

(The Law Commission of Canada Definition)

26. B) Globalization has several different aspects to it. "CULTURAL globalization refers to the growing global domination of American and to a lesser extent European entertainment industries and cultural products." Please tell me if you strongly oppose, somewhat oppose, somewhat support, or strongly support cultural globalization, or do you have no opinion on this?

> 01 – Strongly oppose
> 02 – Somewhat oppose
> 03 – Somewhat support
> 04 – Strongly support
> 05 – No opinion
> 06 – Refused

POLITICAL GLOBALIZATION
(Split sample; half of sample receives Question 27A and the other half Question 27B)

(Kenichi Ohmae Definition)

27. A) Globalization has several different aspects to it. "POLITICAL globalization refers to the increasing irrelevance of the institutions and boundaries of the nation state in an era of economic integration." Please tell me if you strongly oppose, somewhat oppose, somewhat support, or strongly support political globalization, or do you have no opinion on this?

> 01 – Strongly oppose
> 02 – Somewhat oppose
> 03 – Somewhat support
> 04 – Strongly support
> 05 – No opinion
> 06 – Refused

(Philip Cerny Definition)

27. B) Globalization has several different aspects to it. "POLITICAL globalization refers to the growing global expansion of political interrelations beyond the borders of the nation. "Please tell me if you strongly oppose, somewhat oppose, somewhat support, or strongly support political globalization, or do you have no opinion on this?

    01 – Strongly oppose
    02 – Somewhat oppose
    03 – Somewhat support
    04 – Strongly support
    05 – No opinion
    06 – Refused

BIBLIOGRAPHY

19 Nation Poll on Global Issues. Globescan, 2004. Online. <http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Other%20Studies/GlobalIss_Jun04/GlobalIss_Jun04_quaire.pdf> (accessed 19 May 2006).

2003 General Social Survey, Cycle 17: Social Engagement. Toronto: Statistics Canada, 2003. Online. <http://www.statcan.ca/english/sdds/instrument/5024_Q1_V1_E.pdf> (accessed 15 May 2006).

2020 Global Stakeholder Panel: Towards the Future We Want for Our Children. Toronto: GlobeScan Inc., 2003. Online. <http://www.2020fund.org/downloads/GSP_wave1.pdf#search='2020%20Global%20Stakeholder%20Panel%3A%20Towards%20the%20Future%20We%20Want%20for%20Our%20Children'> (accessed 19 May 2006).

ABI/Inform Global ProQuest. Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan Library, 2006. Online. <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb> (accessed 16 March 2006).

Academic Search Elite EbscoHost. Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan Library, 2006. Online. <http://search.ebscohost.com> (accessed 20 March 2006).

 "A Conversation about Community Development." *Community Development Workshop.* Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 1997.

Alreck, Pamela L., and Robert B. Settle. *The Survey Research Handbook: Third Edition*. Montreal: McGraw-Hill Irwin, 2004.

American Public Opinion and US Foreign Policy. Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, 2002. Online. <http://thechicagocouncil.org/UserFiles/File/2002_US_Report.pdf CCFR> (accessed 21 May 2006).

American Public Opinion and US Foreign Policy. Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, 2004. Online. <http://thechicagocouncil.org/UserFiles/File/Global_Views_2004_US.pdf > (accessed 19 May 2006).

"An Action Plan for the 21st Century." *Agricultural Adaptation: A Co-operative Approach.* The Canadian Co-operative Association, 2001. Available Online: [http://www.coopscanada.coop/CCA.Gapp/agricoops/Final%20ACTION%20PLAN%20November%202001.pdf] (Retrieved 16 March 2006).

Althuas, Scott L. *Collective Preferences in Democratic Politics: Opinion Surveys and the Will of the People.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Alreck, Pamela L. and Robert B. Settle. *The Survey Research Handbook: Third Edition.* Montreal: McGraw-Hill Irwin, 2004.

Aves, Vsevolod . "Why Everyone Hates Globalization." *Journal of International Affairs* 58, no.2 (2005): 297-298.

Asher, Herbert. *Polling and the Public: What Every Citizen Should Know.* Washington: CQ Press, 2001.

Babbie, Earl . *The Practice of Social Research: 10th Edition.* Toronto: Nelson, 2004.

Barber, Benjamin. *Jihad vs. McWorld.* New York: Ballantine Books 1995.

Beck, Ulrich. "The Cosmopolitan Perspective: Sociology of the Second Age of Modernity." *British Journal of Sociology* 51, no.1 (2000): 79-105.

Beland, Claude. "The Future of Co-operation." Brett Fairbairn, Ian MacPherson, Nora Russell eds. *Canadian Cooperatives in the Year 2000: Memory Mutual Aid and the Millennium.* Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Cooperatives, 2000.

Belson, William A. *The Design and Understanding of Survey Questions.* Aldershot: Gower Publishing Company, 1981.

Belson, William A. *Validity in Survey Research: with Special Reference to the Techniques of Intensive Interviewing and Progressive Modification for Testing and Constructing Difficult or Sensitive Measures for Use in Survey Research.* Brookfield: Gower Publishing Company, 1986.

Benton, J. Edwin and John L. Daly. "A Question Order Effect in a Local Government Survey." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 55 (1991): 640-42.

Berkovitch, Nitza. "The Emergence and Transformation of the International Women's Movement." Frank J. Lechner and John Boli eds. *The Globalization Reader .*Victoria: Blackwell Publishing, 2004

Berger, Peter L. "Introduction," in Berger and Huntington*, Many Globalizations: Cultural Diversity in the Contemporary World.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Birgegaard, Lars-Erik and Bjorn Genberg. *Cooperative Adjustment in a Changing Environment in Sub-Saharan Africa.* Report Commissioned by ICA Europe. International Co-operative Alliance, 1994.

Bishop, George F. "Qualitative Analysis of Question-Order and Context Effects: The Use of Think-Aloud Responses." *Context Effects in Social and Psychological Research*, eds. Norbert Schwartz and Seymour Sudman. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1992.

Bishop, George F., Robert W. Oldendick, and Alfred J. Tuchfarber. "Political Information Processing: Question Order and Context Effects." *Political Behavior* 4 (1982):177-200.

Brady, Henry E. "Contributions of Survey Research to Political Science," *Political Science and Politics* 33 (2000): 47-49.

Bryman, Alan. *The Disneyization of Society.* Sage Publications, New Delhi, 2004.

Cambridge Journals Online. Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan Library, 2006. Online. <http://journals.cambridge.org> (accessed 18 March 2006).

Canada. "International Network on Cultural Policy (INCP)." *International Affairs and Policy Development.* Online. <http://www.canadianheritage.gc.ca/progs/ai-ia/ridp-irpd/04/index_e.cfm> (accessed 31 July 2006).

Canada. Office of the Auditor General of Canada, *Management of Public Opinion Research.* Ottawa: Office of the Auditor General, 2004. Government of Canada Website. Online.< http://www.oag-bug.gc.ca/domino/reports.nsf/html/20031105ce.html > (accessed 02 September 2005).

Canada. Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, *Striking the Balance: A Five Year Strategy for the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada 1996-2001.* Ottawa: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, 1996.

Canadian Attitudes Toward International Trade. Ekos, 2003. Online <http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/tna-nac/documents/DFAIT_2002-en.pdf#search='Ekos%20globalization%20survey> (accessed 10 March 2006).

Canadian Co-operative Association, le Conseil Canadiende la Cooperation and Co-operative Secretariat, Government of Canada. "Co-operatives in Canada: An Overview." eds., Brett Fairbairn, Ian MacPherson, and Nora Russell, *Canadian Co-operatives in the Year 2000.* Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 2000.

Canadian Opinion Research Archive (CORA). 2006. Online. <http://www.queensu.ca/cora/> (accessed 16 March 2006).

Carlson, James M. and Mark S. Hyde, *Doing Empirical Political Research.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2003.

Cerny, Philip G., "Paradoxes of the Competition State: The Dynamics of Political Globalization." *Government and Opposition* 32, no.2 (1997): 251-274.

Cerny, Philip G., "Political Globalization and the Competition State." eds. Richard Stubbs and Geoffrey R.D. Underhill. *Political Economy and the Changing Global Order*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Clark, Herbert and Michael F. Schober. "Asking Questions and Influencing Answers." ed. Judith M. Tanur. *Questions About Questions: Inquiries into the Cognitive Bases of Surveys.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1991.

Coleman, William D. "Globalization and Co-operatives." eds. Brett Fairbairn and Nora Russell, *Co-operative Membership and Globalization*. Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 2004.

Converse, Jean M., and Stanley Presser. "Survey Questions: Handcrafting the Standardized Questionnaire." *Series: Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences*. London: Sage Publications, 1986.

Converse, Jean M. "Predicting 'No Opinion' in the Polls." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 40 (1976-1977): 515-530.

Converse, Phillip E. "The Nature of Belief Systems in the Mass Public," *Ideology and Discontent,* ed., D.D. Apter. New York: Free Press, 1964.

Cowen, Tyler. *Creative Destruction: How Globalization is Changing the World's Cultures*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Department of Canadian Heritage, "International Network on Cultural Policy (INCP)," *International Affairs and Policy Development*. Online. <http://www.canadianheritage.gc.ca/progs/ai-ia/ridp-irpd/04/index_e.cfm> (accessed 31 July 2006).

Devereaux Ferguson, Sherry. *Researching the Public Opinion Environment: Theories and Methods.* London: Sage Series Publications, Inc., 2000.

Druckman, James. "Political Preference Formation: Competition, Deliberation, and the (Ir)relevance of Framing Effects." *American Political Science Review* 98, no. 4 (2004): 671-685.

Duncan, Dudley and Howard Schuman. "Questions about Attitude Survey Questions." *Sociological Methodology* 5 (1973-1974): 232-251.

"Environics Analytics." *Environics.* Online. http://www.environicsanalytics.ca/ (accessed 20 March 2006); *FASTTRAK Publication Search* (*Institute for Research*

on Public Policy), Online. http://www.irpp.org/fasttrak/index.htm> (accessed 16 March 2006).

Fairbairn, Brett. "Cohesion, Adhesion and Identities in Coops." Brett Fairbairn and Nora Russel eds. *Co-operative Membership and Globalization.* Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 2004.

Fairbairn, Brett. *Cohesion, Consumerism and Co-operatives: Looking Ahead for the Co-operative Retailing System.* Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 2004.

Fairbairn, Brett, June Bold, Murray Fulton, Lou Hammond Ketilson, and Daniel Ish. *Co-operatives and Community Development: Economics in Social Perspective.* Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 1991.

Fairbairn, Brett. *Three Strategic Concepts for the Guidance of Co-operatives: Linkage, Transparency, and Cognition.* Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 2003.

Fairbairn, Brett. "SSHRC Award Press Release." *Co-operative Membership and Globalization: Creating Social Cohesion through Market Relations.* Centre for the Study of Co-operatives: Saskatoon, 2002. Online. <http://www.socialcohesion.coop/news/remarks.php> (accessed 20 April 2007).

"FASTTRAK Publication Search." *Institute for Research on Public Policy.* Online. http://www.irpp.org/fasttrak/index.htm> (accessed 16 March 2006).

Feldman, Stanley. "Measuring Issue Preferences: The Problem of Response Instability." *Political Analysis* 1(1989): 25-60.

Fifth Annual Survey of Public Opinion on International Trade. Women in International Trade Charitable Trust, 2001. Online. <http://www.wiittrust.org/pdfs/trade_news01.pdf#search='Women%20in%20Interna tional%20Trade%20Charitable%20Trust%20Survey'> (accessed 19 May 2006).

GaleGroup InfoTrac Expanded Academic ASAP. Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan Library, 2006. Online. <http://infotrac.galegroup.com> (accessed 16 March 2006).

"Gallup Brain." *The Gallup Poll.* Online. < http://brain.gallup.com/> (accessed 16 March 2006).

Gertler, Michael. *Rural Co-operatives and Sustainable Development.* Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 2001.

Giddens, Anthony. *The Consequences of Modernity.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990.

Global Attitudes: 44- Nation Major Survey. Pew Research, 2002. Online. <http://people-press.org/reports/pdf/185topline.pdf > (accessed 20 May 2006).

Globalization. Centre for Research and Information on Canada (CRIC), 2001. Online. <http://www.cric.ca/pdf/cahiers/cricpapers_april2001.pdf> (accessed 22 May 2006).

Globalization Survey. Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, 1999. Online. <http://prod.library.utoronto.ca:8090/datalib/codebooks/roper/usumary/usumary1999-globe/global.pdf#search='Globalization%20survey%201999%20Roper%20Center'> (accessed 26 May 2004).

Gray, George and Neil Guppy. *Successful Surveys: Research Methods and Practice.* Toronto: Harcourt Brace & Co., 1994.

Hainmueller, Jens and Michael J. Hiscox. "Learning to Love Globalization: Education and Individual Attitudes Toward International Trade." *International Organization* 60, no.2 (2006): 469-498.

Hammond Ketilson, Lou, Michael Gertler, Murray Fulton, Roy Dobson, and Leslie Polsom, *Economic and Social Importance of the Co-operative Sector in Saskatchewan.* Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 1998.

Hardesty, Shermain. *Positioning California's Agricultural Cooperatives for the Future.* Available Online: [http://www.agecon.ucdavis.edu/uploads/update_articles/v8n3_4.pdf] (Retrieved 18 March 2006).

Harris Interactive, *American and Japanese Attitudes Very Different On.* Harris Interactive, 1999. Online. < http://www.harrisinteractive.com/harris_poll/index.asp?PID=28> (accessed 19 May 2006).

Held, David Anthony McGrew, David Goldblatt and Jonathan Paraton. "Researching Globalization." *The Global Transformations Website.* Online. <http://www.polity.co.uk/global/research.asp> (accessed 14 March 2006).

Held, David. *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance.* Polity Press and Stanford University Press, 1995.

Hennessy, B. *Public opinion.* Monterey: Brooks/Cole, 1985.

Herbst, Susan. *Reading Public Opinion: How Political Actors View the Democratic Process*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Hiscox, Michael J., "Through a Glass and Darkly: Attitudes Toward International Trade and the Curious Effects of Issue Framing." *International Organization* 60, no.3 (2006): 755-780.

How Canadians Feel About Globalization. Montreal: Leger Marketing, 2002. Online. <http://www.queensu.ca/cora/polls/2002/October7-Globalization.pdf > (accessed 04 August 2004).

International Co-operative Alliance, "What is a co-operative?" Online. <http://www.ica.coop/coop/index.html> (accessed 4 March 2006).

Issues in the 2000 Election: The Economy. Washington Post/ Kaiser Family Foundation/ Harvard University, 2000. Online. <http://www.kff.org/kaiserpolls/upload/KHPR_Oct00_Topline_release.pdf> (accessed 27 May 2006)

JSTOR. Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan Library, 2006. Online. <http://www.jstor.org> (accessed 16 March 2006).

Kidder, Louise H., and Charles M. Judd. *Research Methods in Social Relations*. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1986.

Krosnick, Jon A. "The Impact of Cognitive Sophistication and Attitude Importance on Response-Order and Question-Order Effects." *Context Effects in Social and Psychological Research,* eds. Norbert Schwartz and Seymour Sudman. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1992.

Krosnick, John A. and Duane F. Alwin. "An Evaluation of a Cognitive Theory of Response-Order Effects in Survey Measurement." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 51 (1987): 201-19.

Krosnisk, John A. and Matthew K. Berent. "Comparisons of Party Identification and Policy Preferences: The Impact of Survey Question Format." *American Journal of Political Science* 37 (1992): 941-64.

Lambert, Paul. "Election of Directors in Saskatchewan Co-operatives: Processes and Results." *Occasional Papers: An Interdisciplinary Publication of the University of Saskatchewan Centre for the Study of Co-operatives.* Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 1987.

Law Commission of Canada, "Part One: Globalization and its Challenges," Research *Projects: Governance Beyond Borders.* Online. <http://www.lcc.gc.ca/research_project/gr/gbb/dp/part-one-en.asp. (accessed 31 July 2006).

Lehmer, Aaron. *The Promise of Economic Democracy in Practice: The Role of Cooperatives in Sustainable and Equitable Community Development.* Humboldt State University, 2003. Available Online: [http://www.wisc.edu/uwcc/info/cd/pedp.pdf] (Retrieved 18 March 2006).

Matthews, Jessica. "Power Shift." eds. Frank J. Lechner and John Boli. *The Globalization Reader.* Victoria: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.

Martin, Larry and Kate Stiefelmeyer. *Strategic Alliances and Cooperatives Aiding in Rural Development in North America, 2001*. Available online: [http://www.kc.frb.org/PUBLICAT/Exploring/RC01Mart.pdf] (Retrieved 20 March 2006).

Martin, Leonard L. and Thomas F. Harlow. "Basking and Brooding: The Motivating Effects of Filter Quesions in Surveys." *Context Effects in Social and Psychological Research*, eds. Norbert Schwartz and Seymour Sudman. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1992.

McClendon, McKee J. and David J. O'Brien. "Question-Order Effects on the Determinants of Subjective Well-Being." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 52, (1988): 351-364.

Moore, David W. "Measuring New Types of Question-Order Effects: Additive and Subtractive." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 66 (2002): 80-91.

National Cooperative Business Association: Survey Findings. NCBA, 2001. Online. <http://www.ncba.coop/pdf/PressKitSurveyFindings.pdf> (accessed 20 May 2006).

Nelson, Thomas E. and Donald R. Kinder. "Issue Framing and Group-Centrism in American Public Opinion." *Journal of Politics* 58, 4 (1996): 1055-1060.

Ohmae, Kenichi. *The End of the Nation-State: The Rise of Regional Economies.* Toronto: The Free Press, 1995.

Parsai, Gargi. "Co-operatives Must Face Challenges of Globalisation." *The Hindu: On-line Edition of India's National Newspaper*, 2004. Online. <http://www.hindu.com/2004/02/03/stories/2004020305961200.htm> (accessed 8 June 2007).

Perspectives on Trade and Poverty Reduction A Survey of Public Opinion: Key Findings Report 2005. Washington, DC: The German Marshall Fund of the United States, 2005. Online. <http://www.gmfus.org/doc/Final%20Survey%20Report%201205.pdf> (accessed 20 March 2006).

Philip, Karen. "The Challenges of Co-operative Membership, Social Cohesion and Globalization." eds. Brett Fairbairn and Nora Russell. *Co-operative Membership and Globalization.* Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 2004.

Pobihushchy, Sidney. "Towards a People's Economy: A Co-operative Paradigm." eds., Brett Fairbairn, Ian MacPherson and Nora Russell. *Canadian Co-operatives in the Year 2000: Memory, Mutual Aid, and the Millennium.* Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, 2000.

Political Landscape, Economic Outlook, and Globalisation: Creeping Continentalism or 21st Century Nationalism. Ekos, 2001. Online. <http://www.ekos.com/admin/articles/1june01.pdf#search='Ekos%20globalization' > (accessed 10 March 2006).

Qualman, Darrin. "Corporate Hog Farming: The View From the Family Farm." eds. Roger Epp and Dave Whitson. *Writing off the Rural West: Globalization, Governments, and the Transformation of Rural Communities.* Edmonton: The University of Alberta Press, 2001.

Ramp, William and Mustafa Koc. "Global Investment and Local Politics." Roger Epp and Dave Whitson eds. *Writing off the Rural West: Globalization, Governments, and the Transformation of Rural Communities.* Edmonton: The University of Alberta Press, 2001.

Ritzer, George. *The McDonaldization of Society.* Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press. 2000.

Saykaly, Michael. *Optima Guide to Public Opinion Research: Third Edition.* Ottawa: Optima, 1985.

Schuman, Howard and Stanley Presser, *Questions and Answers in Attitude Surveys: Experiments on Question Form, Wording and Context.* Toronto: Academic Press, 1981.

"Search for Datasets." *Roper Centre.* 2006. Online. <http://roperweb.ropercenter.uconn.edu/cgi-bin/hsrun.exe/Roperweb/Catalog40/Catalog40.htx;start=HS_ > (accessed 20 March 2006).

Sklair, Leslie. "Competing Conceptions of Globalization," *Journal of World-Systems Research* 5 (1999): 143-62.

Smith, Tom. "Thoughts on the Nature of Context Effects." eds. Norbert Schwartz and Seymour Sudman. *Context Effects in Social and Psychological Research*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1992.

Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey Instrument. Cambridge: Harvard Kennedy School of Government, 2000. Online. <http://www.cfsv.org/communitysurvey/docs/survey_instrument.pdf > (accessed 15 May 2006).

Staay, van der Adriaan. "Chapter 16. Public opinion and global ethics: a descriptive study of existing survey data," Louis Emmerij and Paul Streeten eds., *World Culture Report 1998: Culture, Creativity and Markets*. Paris; UNESCO Publishing, 1998.

Starke Meyerring, Doreen. "Meeting the Challenges of Globalization: A Framework for Global Literacies in Professional Communication Programs," *Journal of Business and Technical Communication* 19, no. 4 (2005): 468-499.

Steger, Manfred B., *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Strack, Fritz. "Order Effects in Survey Research: Activation and Information Functions of Preceding Questions." *Context Effects in Social and Psychological Research,* eds. Norbert Schwartz and Seymour Sudman. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1992.

Sudman. *Context Effects in Social and Psychological Research*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1992.

"Surveys and Analysis." *The Centre for Research and Information on Canada*. Online. <http://www.cric.ca/en_re/analys/index.html> (accessed 20 March 2006).

Tarnai, John and Don A. Dillman, "Questionnaire Context as a Source of Response Differences in Mail and Telephone Surveys." eds. Norbert Schwartz and Seymour Sudman. *Context Effects in Social and Psychological Research*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1992.

UNESCO. *World Culture Report 1998: Culture, Creativity and Markets*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing, 1998.

Verba, Sidney. "The Citizen as Respondent: Sample Surveys and American Democracy Presidential Address, American Political Science Association, 1995." *The American Political Science Review* 90 (1996): 1-7.

"Wave 3: Globalization, Medically Necessary, Human Health Resources," *Commission on the Future of Health Care: Public Input on the Future of Health Care Results from the Issue/ Survey Papers*. Pollara, 2002. Online. <http://www.pollara.ca/Library/Reports/3461_pollara_english.pdf > (accessed 10 March 2006).

What is a Co-operative. Geneva: International Co-operative Alliance, 2007. Online. <http://www.ica.coop/coop/index.html> (accessed 10 June 2007).

What NGO Leaders Want for the Year 2020: NGO Leaders' Views on Globalization, Governance and Sustainability. Toronto: GlobeScan Inc., 2004. Online. <http://www.2020fund.org/downloads/GSP_2_report.pdf > (accessed 15 May 2006).

Webb, Tom "Atlantic Canadian Co-ops Meet Globalization, Plan Merger." *Co-operative Grocer* 91, 2000. Online. <http://www.cooperativegrocer.coop/articles/index.php?id=278> (accessed 6 June 2007).

Wolfe, Robert and Matthew Mendelsohn. "Values and Interests in Attitudes toward Trade and Globalization: The Continuing Compromise of Embedded Liberalism." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 38:1(2005): 45-68.

Women in International Trade Charitable Trust. *Fifth Annual Survey of Public Opinion on International Trade.* 2001. Online.http://www.wiittrust.org/pdfs/trade_news01.pdf#search='Women%20in%20International%20Trade%20Charitable%20Trust%20Survey' (accessed 19 May 2006).

WorldViews 2002: U.S. General Population Topline Report. Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, 2002. Online. <http://www.worldviews.org/detailreports/usreport/public_topline_report.pdf > (accessed 27 May 2006).