

CONTEMPORARY GLOBALIZATION AND TERITORRIALISATION OF SOCIETY: IDENTITY DIMENSION IN SERBIA**

Abstract. Paper starts with the link between contemporary globalisation and processes of de-territorialisation and re-territorialisation of society, which helps understanding the separation of social from state territoriality and increasing importance of other territorial scales (both sub national and supranational) in a numerous social issues. The paper aims to analyse identity dimension of these processes in two aspects. Firstly, it focuses on changing territorial identity of individuals regarding the weakening of their attachment to the nation-state and strengthening of their attachment to other territorial scales, primarily to the immediate local environment and then to supra-national one (as EU). Secondly, re-territorialisation of citizens' identity (increasing attachment to place of living in an open and relational manner) is analysed as potentially valuable local developmental resource within globalising societies, as emphasized in EU territorial agenda. Both issues are important for Serbia, as well as for other European post-socialist societies, whose globalisation and recent de-re-territorialisation take place under the significant influence of EU. The analysis relies on empirical data obtained through questionnaire research conducted on a representative sample (N=2557) of citizens in Serbia by Institute for Sociological Research at the Faculty of Philosophy University of Belgrade, in spring 2012. The research findings show that territorial identity of citizens in Serbia develops in accordance to the principles of selective associations and multiple loyalties, but that new localism and glocalism as desirable development resources still have not been sufficiently profiled.

Keywords: globalisation, territorialisation, territorial identity, new localism, glocalism

* Mina Petrović, PhD, Associate Professor at Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade.

** The text was developed within the project "Challenges of new social integration in Serbia: concepts and actors" (number 179035 in 2011–2014 period), financed by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development, Government of Serbia.

Introduction: contemporary globalization and territorialisation

Contemporary globalization, and debates it has initiated by pointing to a series of social issues that can no longer be located within a territory of any single state, or appropriately regulated

by individual states, significantly contributed to a spatial turn in social sciences. Therefore, perception and understanding of territoriality changed in a way that separated social from state territoriality, which have long been considered synonymic notions and as such typical for modern society (Harvey, 1996; Brenner, 2004). Following the above mentioned spatial turn, a regulation theory sees contemporary globalization as a process that brings back visibility of dialectical interplay between de-territorialisation and re-territorialisation of society, which is inherently connected with spatial dynamics of capitalism (Brenner, 2004). In this respect, contemporary globalization enables quite radical separation of capital accumulation process from the territorial state, which is reflected in a transfer of tasks and responsibilities from the state to regional and local level of governance, as well as in promotion of supranational governance level, such as European Union (Swyngedouw, 2000; Brenner, 1998; 2004). Such dynamic and multi-scalar understanding of territoriality and space also means that contemporary globalization cannot be reduced to the tendency of disembedding social, economic, political, cultural relations from their local/territorial conditions (Massey, 2004). In other words, it postulates that territoriality of social life is in constant change and that social interactions in different development phases and/or in different types of society might be formed and placed at different territorial scales (global-national-regional-local) (Swyngedouw, 2004). As regarding identity changes related to the processes of globalisation and de-re-territorialisation of society, it is important to note two aspects relevant for the purpose of this paper. On one hand, territorial identity of individuals change in direction of simultaneous weakening of their attachment to the nation-state and strengthening of their attachment firstly to the immediate local environment, and then also to supranational territorial scales (transnational regions, EU, etc.) (Strassoldo, 2004). On the other hand, territorial identity (of people and places) gets more importance as valuable local developmental resource within globalising societies, the one to which special concern is given not only by the (sub)national politics but also within EU spatial development strategy (Roca and Mourão, 2004).

The outlined understanding of contemporary globalization and territorialisation of society has systemic relevance for post-socialist societies in European context because the process of EU integration is among the key aspects of their globalization and recent de-re-territorialisation, which holds

true for the society of Serbia as well. This paper aims to analyse two aspects of identity dimension related to these processes. In the first section, the analysis is focused on the changing territorial identity of citizens in Serbia in the last decade, when the process of EU integration has got wider legitimacy, while, in the second section, some aspects of citizens' territorial identity are examined as local developmental resource. In both sections the analysis relies on empirical findings obtained through questionnaire researches conducted on a representative sample (N = 2557) of citizens in Serbia by Institute for Sociological Research at the Faculty of Philosophy University of Belgrade, in spring 2012.

Citizens' identification with different territorial scales

Territorial identity entails defining of spatial boundaries that enables social actors to manage critical distances from the others and their relations to the wider society. However, in the contemporary society boundaries should be seen not only as a result of fear of the unknown and territorial closure, but also as trajectories and flows: "Boundaries are not the opposite of flows but rather the moment when flows become visible ... socially relevant phenomena. Thus drawing a boundary means drawing a line, that line is also a flow, a trajectory..." (Brighenti, 2010: 61). Such an approach contributes to understanding the dynamism of territorial identity of individuals and groups in terms of de-re-territorialisation, that is, it facilitates to view the national, regional and local identity in a less static way (Mlinar and Štebe, 2004). In fact, that supports the view that contemporary globalisation does not question the territorial character of identity, but the monopoly of the state over territory (Brighenti, 2010; Kaplan, 1999). It also means that territorial identity is formed less and less through frontal separation and more and more through selective association of different territorial scales (Mlinar, 1992; 1997), or, in other words, that different levels of territorial identifications are not mutually exclusive but lead to the so-called "multiple loyalties" (towards state, EU, region, city, etc.) (Teune, 1992).

For better understanding of the meaning of "multiple loyalties" it should bear in mind that territorial identity is formed under the influence of two processes: group (self) identification (with emphasis on similarities between group members and a sense of community) and social categorization (where a group is identified from the outside, and does not necessarily imply group identification) (Jenkins, 1996: 86-89). The imagine communities, such as nation or EU, develop primarily through the process of categorization (Anderson, 1992), while the identification process goes through gradual socialization and various cycles of collective experience (Cifrić and Nikoden, 2008). In this respect, introduction of new territorial categories

(EU, administratively defined regions, etc.) does not necessarily correspond developing of individual/group attachment (loyalty) to that territorial scales, as the fluctuations in territorial identification is much slower than in territorial categorization. Besides that, the formation of multiple loyalties might be jeopardized at the point when demands made by each identity level come into conflict (Kaplan, 1999), while the significance of lower territorial scales may increase when there is a strong feeling that the impacts from the upper scales (supranational, or national) cannot be controlled (Castells, 1991).

Changes in territorial identity that refers to individual's attachment to the local scale are analysed from the perspective of old and new localism. This ideal-type dichotomy is introduced by Strassoldo (1992), who describes old localism as "necessary and natural", oriented towards minimizing contacts with the outside world and maintaining a strong enclosed boundary. On the other hand, new localism is seen as voluntary and intentional (rational), aware of the outside world and ready to interact with it (*ibid*: 46-47). The above distinction significantly alters the perception of the local as backward and reactionary, and associates localism with factors that are typical for modern societies (*ibidem*). In this respect, the question if the new localism is still localism seems reasonable. Strassoldo justifies the use of the term relying on the "multiple loyalties" argument, indicating that the small-scale local community becomes the most important level of territorial attachment, nation-state seems to be ranked a distant second, while the regional and especially the European level tend to generate weaker sense of belonging (Strassoldo, 2004).

There is a complex constellation of contextual factors that are rather unfavourable for changing citizens' territorial identity towards a new localism in Serbian society (Petrović, 2010; 2014). As in other ex-Yugoslav republics, society in Serbia went through very complex process of de-re-territorialisation in recent decades. Not only the borders of the national state were redefined in several steps, but the inclusion of Serbia into global relations had radical discontinuities during the 1990s. In a historically compressed time, citizens of Serbia directly witnessed territoriality as a social/relational construct of identity boundaries, but that has not favoured the development of a new localism. On the contrary, during the 1990s, the experience of war and international sanctions strengthened nationalism and authoritarian values (Lazić, 2011). Thus, feeling of isolation intensified the attachment to the national state, taken as an appropriate point from which to resist external marginalisation (Castells, 1996). It also contributed to the public perception of state identity in a binary manner (of "us" and "them"), in accordance to the "identity as an island" (Mlinar and Štebe, 2004; Mlinar, 1992).

It could be said that Serbia entered the first phase of institutional transition to the market society only after 2000, while the transition has been

slowed down once again due to the global economic crisis in 2008. The low labour and geographical mobility, low IT literacy of population (Cvejić, Babović, Pudar, 2010), and other indicators point to the slow pace of constituting Serbian society as an open and dynamic one. Therefore, substantial changes in territorial identification towards the type of identity metaphorically expressed as “identity of crossroads” (Mlinar, 1992; Mlinar and Štebe, 2004) could not be expected. However, research conducted since the beginning of 2000s refer to a noticeable decline in acceptance of authoritarian and traditional values, while the individual rights and liberties gradually get more support compared to the nationalist and collectivist values (Pavlović, 2009; Pešić, 2006).

The issue of Kosovo’s status slows down the pace of Serbia’s accession to the EU¹, which causes fluctuations in acceptance of the accession process itself, both by the political elite and the general public. On the other hand, since the character of the accession process is predominantly focused on state actors (harmonisation and adoption of laws) (Borzel, 2009), even the EU accession itself contributes to the importance of identification with the national state. However, the harmonization with EU standards and expected use of EU funds impose initial steps in strengthening of sub national territorial scales of governance and changes in their categorization (for example, employing of NUTS regions in 2009). All of these gradually modifies citizens’ territorial identity, even if Serbia is still very centralized state (Avlijaš & Bartlett, 2011), with large segment of the population who is still looking to the state as a main guarantor of their economic security (Cvejić, 2010).

In accordance with the aforesaid, we could presume that territorial identity of citizens in Serbia is still dominated by a feeling of attachment to the nation-state, although increasingly in combination with other territorial scales, primarily within national territory and less with supranational scales, both EU or Balkan/South East European region. Foreign research indicate that attachments to supranational scales tend to be increasingly important the higher the education, urbanisation and the younger the age of an individual and its experience in travelling abroad, and in using foreign languages and computer skills in everyday activities (Mlinar and Štebe, 2004; Stassoldo, 1992). Similar distinctions should be expected in Serbia as well. The biggest differences, however, might be expected with respect to the value orientations of citizens, that is, their attachment to supranational scales should be increasingly frequent the lower level of authoritarianism and higher level of tolerance of a respondent.

¹ Serbia has been granted candidate status, and negotiations about accession started in January 2014.

In the following text, these assumptions are tested on data obtained through questionnaire² research conducted on a representative sample³ (N=2557) of citizens in Serbia by Institute for Sociological Research at the Faculty of Philosophy University of Belgrade, in spring 2012. These data are compared to the findings of South East European Social Survey Project conducted by the same Institute in Serbia in 2003 (on the sample⁴ of 2997 respondents), in order to provide an insight into changes in the territorial identity of Serbian citizens since the beginning of a more intensive process of socio-economic transformation and EU integration in the post-socialist period. In both surveys, the question 'How attached do you feel to...?' was asked, and respondents were allowed to rank their feelings of attachment to their home town (village, town or city), their region (within national territory), Serbia, South Eastern Europe or the Balkan region, and Europe. The following analysis is based on descriptive and analytical statistics, the latter used to measure statistical significance and strength of connection between the observed variables.

As can be seen from Table 1, at observed points in time there are no significant differences between respondents' attachment (affiliation) to home town, home region, and Serbia. Also, there are no significant differences between the intensity of attachment that citizens feel to each of the territorial scales listed above, thus the level of attachment to home town and to Serbia is almost equal.

By comparison, the findings obtained in Slovenia in 2003 showed a somewhat stronger attachment of respondents to all the scales mentioned above, while the level of attachment to Slovenia was ranked first relatively clear-cut (as many as 95% of respondents felt attached to Slovenia, 88% to home town, and 82% to home region/county) (Mlinar and Štebe, 2004). It can be concluded that in both ex-Yugoslavia republics the post-socialist experience of de-re-territorialisation of national identity has caused a high level of attachment to the national territory, while the observed differences can be attributed to the degree of success in constituting and maintaining the territorial integrity of the newly formed states, which is undoubtedly lower in Serbia and shows a kind of ambivalence in citizens' attitude towards the state.

² The questionnaire was conducted face to face in the respondent's home.

³ The sample was multi-step stratified (Serbia was divided in four stratum: Voivodina, Belgrade, South/East Serbia and West/Central Serbia, in each of them settlements were selected randomly, households within the settlements were chosen systemically and individual respondents within the households were randomly selected). The structure of the sample represented adequately age, gender, education and working status of the population in Serbia.

⁴ Same sample type and procedure.

Table 1: RESPONDENTS' ATTACHMENT TO DIFFERENT TERRITORIAL SCALES

'How close do you feel to...?'		very close	Close	not very close	not close at all	don't know	Total	Mean	Std. Deviation
Town or city	2012	39,7%	40,9%	13,8%	3,9%	1,8%	100%	3,1845	,81719
	2003	45,3%	34,7%	15,0%	3,2%	1,9%	100%	3,2437	,82729
Region/ county	2012	28,6%	45,8%	16,8%	6,4%	2,4%	100%	2,9903	,85238
	2003	30,9%	43,2%	18,7%	4,8%	2,4%	100%	3,0262	,83918
Serbia	2012	31,8%	44,9%	15,7%	5,4%	2,2%	100%	3,0541	,83938
	2003	37,9%	43,4%	14,1%	3,9%	1,9%	100%	3,1671	,79589
SEE/Balkan	2012	7,9%	28,1%	34,5%	23,5%	6,0%	100%	2,2177	,91598
	2003	15,2%	31,2%	33,4%	14,2%	6,1%	100%	2,5032	,93627
Europe	2012	7,3%	25,7%	30,4%	29,9%	6,7%	100%	2,1118	,94717
	2003	18,7%	34,4%	25,3%	15,8%	5,8%	100%	2,5937	,98711

The number of respondents who feel an attachment to supra national territorial scales in Serbia is significantly lower than the level of attachment to state or sub national territories, at both points of time. There is also a noticeable tendency of a decrease in respondents' attachment to supranational territorial scales. Thus, for example, the number of respondents who expressed their attachment to Europe (attached and very attached) comprised 53.1% of the sample in 2003, while in 2012 it decreased by as much as 20 percentage points and amounted to 33% of respondents. A similar trend, but with a slightly lower intensity, has been observed as regards attachment to the immediate transnational region (Table 1). By comparison, in 2003, a stronger feeling of respondents' attachment to Europe was noticed in Slovenia than in Serbia (66% of those attached and very attached in comparison with 53.1%) (Mlinar and Štebe, 2004), which should be related to the success that Slovenia had in approaching the EU.

Changes in the political conjuncture can also be related to the observed differences in the research findings in Serbia in 2003 and 2012. Namely, in 2003 there was no clear understanding of the significance that the issue of Kosovo would have for the process of Serbia's accession to the EU, and pro-European parties had substantial public support and participated in the republican government. At the end of 2003, the highest public support to EU accession was recorded, as 72% of citizens supported the process. On the other hand, in June of 2012 that support dropped to only 41% of citizens⁵ as

⁵ The Office for European integrations of Republican Government makes a survey on public support to Serbia's accession to EU twice a year, regularly from 2002. (<http://www.euractiv.rs/srbija-i-eu>)

the issue of Kosovo became an essential stumbling block to the process of Serbia's accession to the EU. This has intensified the feeling that the territorial integrity is under threat and was also reflected on results of the elections in the spring of 2012, won by the national-oriented Serbian Progressive Party (whose pro-European course was set forth in public just after the elections), while pro-European Democratic Party lost them. The same context, i.e. recognition of Kosovo by some neighbouring states, might influence a decrease in the feeling of attachment of Serbian citizens to the SEE region and the Balkans.

Data analysed in Table 1, however, do not confirm that the feeling of attachment to the state is dominant in the territorial identity of Serbian citizens, as they are attached to sub national territorial scales with the same intensity. Analysis of combinations of scales to which respondents feel close or very close offers a better insight in the respondents' feeling of attachment to different territorial scales. Such analysis is conducted on data from 2012, and findings are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: COMBINATIONS OF TERRITORIAL SCALES TO WHICH RESPONDENTS FEEL ATTACHED AND FREQUENCIES OF ATTACHMENT TO CERTAIN TERRITORIAL SCALES

Closeness to - combinations	Percentage
Only one territorial scale	9,3%
National and subnational scale(s)	39,5%
National, subnational and supranational scales	44,7%
Supranational scale(s)	1,5%
No attachment to any scale	5,0%
TOTAL	100,0%
Frequencies of attachment to certain territorial scales	
Place of living - town, city	82%
Region - within Serbia	76%
Serbia	78%
SEE/Balkan	38%
Europe	35%

The number of respondents who feel attached to only one scale is rare (all scales appear, most often place of living - 4,2%, followed by Serbia - 3,6%, while all others appear in less than 1%), as well as those not attached to any territorial level. Further, there is still a significant part of respondents who feel attached only to territorial levels within the national frame, while less than half of respondents combine these levels with supranational ones. Although these findings show rather significant presence of territorial identities based on selective associations, only 18% of respondents do not feel

attached (close or very close) to their place of residence, 22% to Serbia, and 24% with region they live in, compared to 65% of respondents who do not feel attached to Europe and 62% to SEE/Balkan region, respectively.

For the purpose of testing correlations between respondents' attachment to supranational territorial scales⁶ and various socio-demographic variables⁷, and values⁸, the Spearman test was applied (Table 3).

Table 3: CORRELATIONS: RESPONDENTS' ATTACHMENT TO SUPRANATIONAL SCALES WITH SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES.

	AT	SET	REG ¹	AGE	EDU	MAT	TRAV	FLEN	COM	AUT	TOL
Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,075**	,093**	-,034	,108**	,112**	,062**	,099**	,100**	-,073*	,083**
Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,000	,109	,000	,000	,004	,000	,000	,027	,001

¹ The Belgrade region was singled out due to a high concentration of businesses and jobs, as well as investments, which is why it is believed that the social reality of this region does not correspond to the reality in the rest of Serbia (Vujošević et al, 2012).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Except for the age, each of the observed variables show statistically significant correlation of expected direction with the AT variable (attachment to supranational scales): higher share of respondents attached to supranational scales among those who live in cities, in Belgrade region, who are more educated, less authoritarian, more tolerant, who travel abroad more often, use computers and speak foreign language in everyday activities, who

⁶ AT variable: the respondents are divided in two groups: 1. those attached to supranational levels (either only to them or in combination with national/sub national levels); 2. those attached only to national and/or sub national scales (separately or in combination). The respondents who did not feel attached to any territory are excluded from the analysis.

⁷ The following socio-demographic variables are included: SET - type of settlement (two categories: 1. city; 2. village); REG - region (two categories: 1. Belgrade region; 2. other regions); EDU - education (4 categories: 1. without elementary school; 2. elementary school; 3. secondary school; 4. college and university education); MAT - material position (5 categories: 1. low; 2. lower middle; 3. middle; 4. higher middle; 5. high); TRAV - often travelling abroad (two categories: 1. no; 2. yes); FLEN - using foreign language (two categories: 1. no; 2. yes); COM - often using computer (two categories: 1. no; 2. yes).

⁸ The scale on authoritarianism (reliability test with Cronbach's alpha = 0.724) is derived from 7 statements evaluated by Lickert's scale. In Table 3 it is presented as variable AUT (5 categories: 1. very not authoritarian; 2. moderately not authoritarian 3. volatile; 4. moderately authoritarian; 5. very authoritarian). The scale shows still relatively high level of authoritarianism (26,7% of respondents is volatile, 32,5% is moderately authoritarian while 19,8% is very authoritarian). The scale on tolerance (reliability test with Cronbach's alpha = 0.712) is derived from 6 statements evaluated by Lickert's scale. In Table 2 it is presented as variable TOL (5 categories: 1. very intolerant; 2. moderately intolerant; 3. volatile; 4. moderately tolerant; 5. very tolerant). The scale indicates relatively low level of tolerance (27,6% of respondents is moderately tolerant and only 7,5% is very tolerant, while even 41% is volatile).

have higher material position (Table 3). However, generally low intensity of obtained correlations show that the openness towards supranational scales has not been profoundly set up either in respondents' structural or value characteristics, which makes it rather subjected to fluctuations in political conjecture. In terms of territorial identity, it might be concluded that the war experience with ex-Yugoslav republics during the 1990s still does not make Balkan as close region, in spite of similarities in language, faith, historic legacy, etc. On the other hand, the EU accession process becomes a kind of socialization route through which citizens of Serbia (will) develop their attachment to EU (and indirectly to Balkan/SEE region), but in a slow and oscillating manner due to the recent collective experience of being endangered by key EU member states (during NATO bombing and related to Kosovo status) and multiple conditionality of the accession process itself.⁹

Therefore, the analysed data illustrate well that multiple loyalties could not be significantly developed in the circumstances when conflicting demands come from different territorial scales, i.e., when impacts of supranational levels are not perceived as dominantly positive. In this respect Serbia differs from other post-socialist countries not only because of Balkan wars and Kosovo issue, but also because the post-socialist period is not viewed as a period of desirable independence (compared with other former Yugoslav republics), nor as a return to Europe (as in most CEE countries), or as a period of emancipation from the socialist system (Lazic, 2011). How dissatisfied are the citizens of Serbia with events that have unfolded after 1991 might be illustrated by the findings obtained in the research from 2012. According to this research, to the question of what kind of attitude they have towards Yugoslavia, as many as 58.1% of the respondents answered that neither Yugoslavia nor socialism should have collapsed (24.2% of them believe that socialism should have collapsed but not Yugoslavia, while only 13.7% think that both socialism and Yugoslavia should have collapsed).

The significant impediments to more developed multiple loyalties of citizens in Serbia stem also from the fact that they still do not feel significant effects of approaching to EU, or to more global networks, on the level of their everyday life, or at the local level. That favours the separation between the local and the global, and does not generate new localism or glocalism perceived as local development resource, to which we turn our focus in the next section.

⁹ *Global economic crisis since 2008 has influenced significantly the EU attitude towards the possibilities and conditions of its further enlargement.*

Re-territorialisation of identity as a development resource

In this section, territorialisation as the process that generates transformation of territorial identity is linked to the concepts of glocalism and new regionalism. Let us start first with new regionalism as a broader concept, and the way it distinguishes from the old regionalism. Namely, new regionalism emerges with the de-re-territorialisation of the governance process and increased importance of multi-scalar relations. It presupposes that territorial development should be based on identifying and exploiting internal local resources and potentials (Storper, 1997). Local environment resource are covered by the notion of territorial capital, which, includes not only fixed goods, such as public utilities and social infrastructure, natural and human resources, material culture, living standards, but also “soft factors” that refer to relations between the actors (local institutions and culture, social capital and cooperative networks within the local community and beyond), and their abilities to invent best strategies how to use endogenous development potentials and combine them with exogenous developmental forces and incentives (Storper, 2011, 1997; Camagni, 2008). Such approach represents a significant change in comparison to old regionalism, which was in force until the 1980s and relied heavily upon the principle of homogenisation of the national territory through reproduction of basic/standard socio-economic and infrastructural conditions, under the jurisdiction of the central government. Place-based development strategy in the EU territorial agenda (Barca, 2009) relies on concept of new regionalism, especially in peripheral regions that lag in achieving competitive position on (global) market (Roca, & Mourão, 2004).

For the purpose of this article, it is important to note how new regionalism relates to the identity issues. Namely, it postulates that both place identity and territorial identity of citizens should be turned into a developmental resource, because that helps places and regions to become distinguishable and economically attractive in the progressive expansion of globalisation (Amin and Thirft, 1994). Such task presumes that local actors should have strategic vision about what they can or want to do with local resources in globalised social relation, i.e, how they want to be perceived by the others/ outer world (Horlings, 2012). In other words, it assumes that actors' attachment to the local level should be developed in accordance to new localism or glocalism. Strassoldo (2004) uses both terms to emphasize dialectical relation between localism and globalism, or simultaneous processes of de-territorialisation and re-territorialisation of identity. Such approach tends to transcend asymmetry of the global (as distant, abstract source of power and dominance, predatory and dangerous) and the local (as direct and near but passive and traditional) (Amin, 2004; Escobar, 2001), indicating that

any territory is generated by both near and distant factors (Massey, 2004). The successful strategies of re-territorialisation are directly linked to the territorial identity of local actors: if it has more qualities of new localism the contextualization of externally generated innovation processes will be more successful. Besides that, the citizens' attachment to the place of living implies complex process of place evaluation that includes various social and physical aspect of its territorial capital (institutional, cultural, natural, etc.), assuming that the better evaluation score the stronger attachment to place and interest of citizens for local development will be (Kendall, Woodward & Skrbic, 2009).

A few research founded on the concepts of new regionalism show a significant tendency of decrease in value and potentials of territorial capital in Serbia since the end of 1980s (Vujošević et al., 2010: 8). As the inflow of foreign investment has been relatively modest and concentrated in the major cities, high absorption of physical and human capital in the major urban centres intensifies the problems of devastated smaller and peripheral cities (unsuccessful privatisations and economic restructuring, low attraction of investments). Lacking political will and institutional capacities for decentralised governance further contribute to territorial capital disadvantages (Petrović 2009, 2014).

Some aspects of citizens' attachment to their place of living and their attitudes related to the notion of glocalism as a kind of local developmental resource in Serbia might be illustrated by data from the 2012 research, with the assumption that glocalism has not been either significantly widespread or profoundly set up in respondents' structural and value characteristics. It should be mentioned that research in question was not focused particularly on territorial identity aspects or glocalism. The fact that it contained just a few related questions made further analysis entirely exploratory. Besides that, it was the first attempt to collect citizens' attitudes on these issues in Serbia, hence there are no data with which these findings could be compared.

The majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed (45,3% and 23,5%, respectively) with the statement that "A strong place attachment is an important prerequisite for local development", which, related to the fact that 82% of respondents felt very close or close attachment to their place of living (Table 2), suggests positive identity aspects of local development. Subsequent data, however, indicate attachment which is based more on emotional identification (rationalized by a long experience of living in the same place - a few generations, strong attachment to people, etc.) than on identification developed on the high scores of quality of life/territorial capital assessment (Jaššo & Finka, 2010). Namely, the respondents were asked to evaluate the basic socio-demographic, economic and ecological characteristics as key dimensions of territorial capital of their place of residence.

The respondents' ranking is rather unfavourable and in accordance to long term economic crisis and degradation of quality of life in almost all settlements except in the biggest cities. As much as 62,2% of respondents scored the characteristics and development potentials of their place of residence as very low and low, while only 14,3% of respondents scored them as high or very high. It is important to note that the lowest rated dimensions concern typical "soft dimensions" of the territorial capital (such as responsible and capable local government, economic entrepreneurship), while the best rated dimensions are natural resources, cultural heritage and education of the population, resources that irresponsible or incapable social actors and unfavourable socio-economic situation have endangered the least.

Data presented in Table 4 show a level of respondents' agreement to the statements defined with the intent to reflect a degree of sensitivity to local specificities in the age of globalization (attitudes 2 i 4), but also to overcoming local closure (attitude 3), and heavy reliance on external stimuli without taking into account local specificities (attitudes 1 i 4), therefore, to measure glocalism as prerequisites of the new regionalism¹⁰. Data show relatively moderate inclination of respondents towards glocalism (the higher level of glocalism the lower level of respondents' agreement with the statements). Based on the level of the respondents' agreement with the above presented statements the scale of glocalism was constructed¹¹. Majority of respondents concentrated in the middle of the scale, among those wavering (42.6%). At the part of the scale with low end moderately low scores there are 5,2% and 27.4% of respondents, respectively, while the least respondents are concentrated on the upper end of the scale, with a moderately high (21.5%) and high scores (only 3.4%) of glocalism.

Table 5 provides the correlations between the respondents' scores on the scale of glocalism (variable GL)¹² and a number of socio-demographic characteristics¹³, respondents' ranking of their home place territorial capital (variable TC)¹⁴, importance given to place attachment in local development

¹⁰ In defining these statements, the research conducted in Portugal with actors involved in local development (Roca, & Mourão, 2004) was consulted, but complete downloading of attitudes, and consequently their comparability, was not possible due to different target groups and differences in the level of involvement of participants in the process of globalization and glocalization through direct experience.

¹¹ The reliability test gave relatively low Cronbach's Alpha (Alpha=0.515), but after the factor analysis only one factor was extracted, whose eigenvalue is higher than 1 (1.454). The extracted factor explains 48.457% of total variance. Correlations of the main component with the separate statements are the following: 0.733, 0.694, 0.703, and 0.683.

¹² GL- variable: scores on scale of glocalism (5 categories: 1. low glocalism; 2. moderate glocalism; 3. volatile; 4. high glocalism; 5. very high glocalism).

¹³ Except for the variables specified in the text, all other variables are the same as in the Table 3.

¹⁴ TC- scores of home place territorial capital (5 categories: 1. very low; 2. low; 3. middle; 4. high; 5. very high).

(variable PA)¹⁵ as well as with respondents' scores on value scales. In this case, high score on the scale of authoritarianism might be interpreted also as high expectations from the state (in accordance to old regionalism), while the high score on the scale of tolerance refers to the openness to global capital, global flows of ideas, values, goods, people (new regionalism and glocalism).

Table 5: CORRELATIONS: RESPONDENTS' SCORES ON THE SCALE OF GLOCALISM WITH SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES (SPEARMAN COEFFICIENT)

	GL	SET	REG	AGE	EDU	MAT	TC	PA	AUT	TOL
Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,106**	,131**	-,081**	,221**	,145**	,075**	-,114**	-,276**	,302**
Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Except for the age, all of the observed socio-demographic characteristics have a statistically significant correlation with the GL variable (scores on scale of glocalism). In accordance to conceptual postulation, there is significant (although of low intensity) positive correlation between the scores on evaluating territorial capital and scale of glocalism. Negative correlation found between the scores on the scale of glocalism and PA variable (importance given to place attachment) might be related to the assumed domination of the emotionally based identifications of the respondents in this respect. The respondents' education and their scores on scales of authoritarianism and tolerance show somewhat higher (but still moderate) intensity of correlation with scores on the scale of glocalism. Therefore, it might be concluded that analysed indication of glocalism appeared not significantly rooted even among social groups that should be its forerunners.

Concluding remarks

The observed fluctuations in territorial identity of citizens in Serbia might be seen as typical for contemporary society in which globalisation constantly causes simultaneous processes of de-territorialising and

¹⁵ LA – level of agreement with the statement „A strong place attachment is an important prerequisite for local development“ (5 categories: 1. strong disagreement; 2. disagreement; 3. neither agreement nor disagreement; 4. agreement; 5. strong agreement).

re-territorialising of identity and related changes in importance and meanings that individuals attach to certain territories (territorial scales). Although the elements of old and new localism might coexist in more or less (un)easy partnership, depending on a specific social context (Keating, 2008), the observed findings suggest that new localism and glocalism still are not significantly set up either in citizens' structural or value characteristics in Serbia. Besides that, the citizens' territorial identity seems more under the influence of political categorizations than identification process based on citizens' own experience of the interplay between global and local forces in their immediate surroundings (at the level of everyday life, their place of living). This significantly diminishes the ability of citizens to place themselves in local-global relations and think about global impacts as adaptable to specific local resources. It also deprives the needed glocalised strategies of massive mobilization, as required by concept of new regionalism (Storper, 1997). In Serbia, as in other countries accessing to EU, the issues of de-re-territorialising identity and profiling of new localism/glocalism seem as strategically important for successful adaptation to EU standards. In this respect, EU programs might serve as specific agents of socialization, which implies better information and greater involvement of citizens, particularly in programs intended to foster local development. Unfortunately, other research suggest that political and even civil society actors are not willing to support significant participation of citizens, due to which EU programs remain invisible and without the expected effects on de-re-territorialisation of citizens' identity (Petrović, 2014).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amin, A. (2004): "Regions Unbound: Towards a New Politics of Place", *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography*, Vol. 86, No. 1, Special Issue: The Political Challenge of Relational Space (2004), pp. 33-44.
- Amin, A. and N. Thrift (1994): "Living in the Global", in A. Amin and N. Thrift (eds.) *Globalisation, Institutions and Regional Development in Europe*. Oxford University Press, pp. 1-22.
- Anderson, B. (1991): *Imagined Communities*, London: Verso.
- Avlijaš, S., W. Bartlett (2011): *The Political Economy of Decentralisation and Regional Policy in Serbia: Choices and Outcomes*, LSEE Papers on Decentralisation and Regional Policy, Research Paper No. 3, str. 1-32.
- Barca, F. (2009): *An Agenda for a Reformed Cohesion Policy: A Place-based approach to meeting European Union challenges and expectations*, Independent report, European Commission.
- Brenner, N. (1998): "Global cities, glocal states: global city formation and state territorial restructuring in contemporary Europe", *Review of International Political Economy* 5: 1, Spring 1998, 1-37.

- Brenner, N. (2004): *New State Spaces Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brighenti, A. M. (2010): *On Territorology Towards a General Science of Territory, Theory, Culture & Society* (SAGE, Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, and Singapore), Vol. 27(1): 52-72.
- Borzel, T. (2009): "New Modes of Governance and Accession: The Paradox of Double Weakness", in: T- Borzel (ed.), *Coping with Accession to the European Union, New Modes of Environmental Governance*. London & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 7-31.
- Camagni R. (2008): "Regional competitiveness: Towards a concept of territorial capital", In *Modelling Regional Scenarios for the Enlarged Europe*, ed. R. Capello, R. P. Camagni, B. Chizzolini, and U. Fratesi, Berlin: Springer, pp. 33-47.
- Castells, M. (1996): *The Rise of the Network Society, The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture Vol. I. Information Age, Economy, Society and Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Catells, M. (1991): Local and global: cities in the network society, *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* - 2002, Vol. 93, No. 5, pp. 548-558.
- Cifrić, I. Nikoden, K. (2008): *Koncept i dimenzije socijalnog identiteta*, U: Cifrić, I. (ur). *Relacijski identiteti: Prilozi istraživanju identiteta hrvatskog društva*, Zagreb: Hrvatsko sociološko društvo, Institut za društvena istraživanja, str. 53-75.
- Cvejić, S. (2010): "Post-tranziciona Srbija; izbor ili nužnost", U: Cvejić, S. (ed) *Suživot sa reformama: Građani Srbije pred izazovima tranzicijskog nasleđa*, Beograd: Čigoja, ISI FF. str. 11-36.
- Cvejić, S., M. Babović, G. Pudar (2010): *Studija o humanom razvoju - Srbija 2010*, Beograd: UNDP.
- Escobar, A. (2001): Culture sits in places: reflections on globalism and subaltern strategies of localization, *Political Geography* 20 (2001): 139-174.
- Harvey, D. (1996): Globalization in question, *Rethinking Marxism*, 8(4): 1-17.
- Horlings, G. L. (2012): Place branding by building coalitions, *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, 8: 295-309.
- Jaško, M., M. Finka (2010): Selected Aspects of Territorial Cohesion in Slovakia under the Recent Crisis. *Spatium International Review*, 23: 17-21.
- Jenkins, R. (1996): *Social Identity*. Routledge.
- Kaplan, D. H. (1999): Territorial Identities and Geographic Scale In: Herb, G. and Kaplan D.: *Nested Identities: Nationalism, Territory, and Scale*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 31-49.
- Keating, M. (2008): 'Thirty years of territorial politics', *West European Politics*, 31: 1-2, pp. 60-81.
- Kendall, C., I. Woodward, Z. Skrbic (2009): *The Sociology of Cosmopolitanism: Globalization, Identity, Culture and Government*, Palgrave MacMillan.
- Lazić, M. (2011): *Čekajući kapitalizam: nastanak novih klasnih odnosa u Srbiji*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik.
- Massey, D. (2004): 'Geographies of Responsibility', *Geografiska Annaler* 86B(1): 5-18.

- Mlinar, Z. and J. Štebe (2004): Mobility and Identification in the Context of Globalisation, Paper presented at: ISA - TG06 International conference Theme: The Sociology of Local-Global Relations, Pultusk, Poland; September 18-19, 2004.
- Mlinar, Z. (1997): Territorial Diversification and/or Homogenization? From Identities as Islands to Identities as Crossroads, In: Tuuli Forsgreen (ed.). Cultural Crossroads in Europe, Omslagsbild: FRN Swedish council for planning and coordination of research.
- Mlinar, Z. (1992): "Introduction", In: Mlinar, Z. (ed.) Globalization and territorial identities. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Pavlović, Z. (2009): «Is There a Socio-demographic Model of Acceptance of Post-materialist Values? The Case of Serbia», Sociologija, Vol. LI, No. 2: 177-88.
- Petrović, M. (2014): Društvo i gradovi: između lokalnog i globalnog. Beograd: ISI FF- Čigoja.
- Petrović, M. (2010): "O izazovima lokalnog i regionalnog razvoja", Sociologija, Vol. LII, No 2. str. 211-215.
- Petrović, M. (2009): Transformacija gradova: ka depolitizaciju urbanog pitanja, Beograd: ISI FF.
- Pešić, J. (2006): "Persistence of Traditionalist Value Orientations in Serbia", Sociologija, Vol. XLVIII, No. 4: 289-307.
- Roca, Z. & J. Mourão (2004): Territorial Identity and Sustainable Development: from Concept to Analysis, Campus Social, 1, pp. 85-103.
- Storper, M. (2011): Justice, efficiency and economic geography: should places help one another to develop? European Urban and Regional Studies, 18.1: 3-21.
- Storper, M. (1997): The Regional World. New York: Guilford.
- Strassoldo, R. (2004): The meaning of localism in a global world, Paper presented at the conference on: "The global and the local in mobile communication", Budapest, June 10-12.
- Strassoldo, R. (1992): Globalism and Localism: theoretical reflections and some evidence, In: Mlinar, Z. (ed.) Globalization and Territorial Identities, Avebury: Aldershot-Brookfield-Hong Kong-Singapore-Sidney, pp. 15-34.
- Swyngedouw, E. (2000): Authoritarian governance, power, and the politics of rescaling, Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 18: 63-76.
- Teune, H. (1992): Multiple group loyalties and the security of political communities. In Mlinar, Z. (ed.) Globalization and Territorial Identities, Avebury: Aldershot-Brookfield-Hong Kong-Singapore-Sidney, 105-114.
- Vujošević, M. et al. (2010): Postsocijalistička tranzicija u Srbiji i teritorijalni kapital, stanje, neki budući izgledi i predvidivi scenariji. Beograd: IAUS.