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Abstract

As globalization continues an inexorable reach across the world, intercultural competency and tolerance has become ever more important for all aspects of modern day life. Some societies and individuals react in defense, while others embrace a cosmopolitan outlook. Governments, corporations, education systems, and individuals have sought ways to understand the impact of different intercultural interactions and activities as well as the possibility for a cosmopolitan outlook to predict communication behavior. While the development of global orientations has been a point of interest for quite some time, there still remains no comprehensive concept or measurement instrument to examine it. This research study focuses on understanding what the cosmopolitan outlook is, how to measure it effectively, what impact it has on communication behavior, and how it can be reinforced or developed via intercultural experiences. First, the concept and theoretical relationships of cosmopolitanism are defined and scale development for measuring the cosmopolitan outlook is proposed and examined. Second, intercultural interactions via interpersonal and media experiences are tested to predict impact on the cosmopolitan outlook. This research indicates that the proposed reconceptualization and model show important promise in explaining communication behavior as well as filling in gaps from previous research. In a world fraught with intercultural tensions demanding more nuanced and tolerant interactions, this paper provides a roadmap in how to examine and develop these competencies.
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Chapter 1 - Introduction

Humanity has been adapting to new ways of life in vastly different societies for millennia, navigating connections and culture while dispersing across the world. Ideas and culture have been moving on a global scale since the exchange of products, information, politics, and people has existed. With these geographic shifts came the changing of the concepts of “global” and “local” as each successive generation tried to understand their history and future. With the invention of media and technology, the last hundred years have been particularly fruitful for creating a wholly different and modern globally-connected society. Understanding the influence these imports create and how that influence works has been the subject of much research, especially as governments, corporations, and institutions have invested heavily in using cultural and media campaigns to harness and enhance any persuasive opportunities. What those campaigns look like, how they work, and whether they are successful are all part of the examination I will undertake in this dissertation. The key to understanding all this exchange and its influence is in deciding how to consider the problem—is it about the individual person, the larger society, or somewhere in between?

Previous Theoretical Approaches to Foreign Entertainment Media Use and Effects

The history of global media flows and the cultural imperialism approach.
The advent of film corresponded with the First World War, giving America a benefit over war-torn European producers, and allowing the country to become the dominant creator of popular culture and media on a global scale (Thussu, 2007, p. 11). While America
remains the main producer of intellectual properties in music, movies, television, and cultural products, there are instances of contra-flows, where other countries and especially those seen as “non-Western” have created their own cultural products to be exported into the global media markets. Especially with the advent and widespread adoption of the internet, the multi-faceted nature of cultural and media flows has only become more complex.

Prior to the commercialization of media systems, most media was focused on providing information with some entertainment (p. 12). However, once most countries followed America’s lead, media systems transformed from focused on informing citizens to driving economic consumers. It also created a shift from locally-centered to transnational aims, especially observable since the advent of the internet. This abandonment of state-centered markets allowed the influence of the West to grow. Continuing this influence, the creation of behemoth, multi-national media conglomerates cultivated an atmosphere ripe for the furthering of Western media content (Thussu, 2007, p. 13). As the dominant media flow exporter, the U.S. is the largest producer of content, including news, youth programming, children’s television and films, feature films, television content, and the Internet.

There are a number of theories on how this Western-dominated flow of media, and especially of soft, popular culture products, influences the rest of the world and America. Certainly, the U.S. enjoys an economic benefit from the billions of dollars the media entertainment industry creates. But some scholars worried that the domination of one manufacturer of cultural products would create a cultural imperialism, where a singular world culture—one reinforcing the culture of the powerful—would overwrite
cultural diversity (e.g., Gudykunst and Kim, 1992; Inglehart and Norris, 2009; Waisbord, 2004). The main tenets of hegemony and cultural imperialism within media imperialism is that through an uneven ownership and control of media sources and production, the ruling powers can force cultural perspectives that serve their interests on everyone else (McPhail, 2010, p. 22).

With the rise of multinational corporations who favor cultural perspectives that endorse consumerism rather than a ruling class of a nation, according to these theories, there is an underlying insistence of standardization and often sanitization of cultural media products, where uniformity of production reduces TV programs or movies to universalized products devoid of cultural significance and meaning in order to make the most money globally (Waisbord, 2004, p. 360). The proposed result is a ‘McDonaldization’ of media content—wherever you go, it is all the same (p. 378). The threat of this global homogenization means that cultural diversity disappears in favor of a global elite cultural shorthand proffered by a vast global media market. For example, Moran (1998, 2009) insisted that the format of television programs, like a template, creates franchising opportunities where localizing is still possible though the content is somewhat homogenized.

One reaction to the globalization process has been a phenomena called ‘glocalization,’ where media content is still produced by the West, but has a localized flavor, possibly in the form of language or location (Thussu, 2007, p. 27). Though glocalization allows for a less hegemonic transformation of cultures, it is not a local production of media. While this homogenization is viewed as a negative outcome, other researchers view it through the lens of modernization, whereby modernity is transferred
via the free flow of information in the media (Thussu, 2006, p. 42). However, the designed reliance on the dominant media flow source or country in order to maintain control is another theorized negative response possible through media imperialism (p. 46). These varying ways of examining the impact of media flows are not just differences of nuance, but directly impact the proposed effect on global consumers of media flows. Each approach dictates how to analyze and contextualize any observed effects of dominant and contra-flows.

A common tie-in with cultural imperialism is Hofstede’s (1991) cultural dimensions theory, whereby cultures are similar or different along six dimensions, and are therefore considered in close “proximity” if they are more similar. For instance, Straubhaar (1991) insisted that media imperialism grew by way of cultural proximity, as a means by which close cultures began consuming each other’s cultural products, pushing the market to produce more broadly culturally appealing media.

Many of these scholars test their hypotheses with an assumption of truth, rather than take on the complicated and monumental task of actually measuring the presence of mediated cultural hegemony. However, Fu and Govindaraju (2007) employed a content analysis as well as an analysis of global box office ticket sales to examine whether global tastes in movies were becoming homogenized and whether countries of close cultural proximity to the U.S. were most closely mirroring consumption rates of the US. They did find a small positive correlation suggesting their hypotheses were validated. But when Trepte (2008) used cultural proximity to examine the acceptance of U.S. primetime TV shows across eight countries, they found that the cultural dimensions of difference were
not significant, and not as good at predicting positive evaluations as basic geographical distance.

When looking at cultural proximity, language also becomes central to this consideration. Mendez-Otero (2014) found that most Spanish viewers of U.S. television programs still preferred to view them in dubbed format in accordance with cultural proximity, despite the general low-quality of dubbing, the cultural losses encountered with the process of dubbing, and the ability to speak English. Researchers have also examined the effect diasporas have on global media flows and the cultural adaptation that comes with changing demographics (Sinclair, Jacka, and Cunningham, 1991; Sinclair and Cunningham, 2000). Benstead and Reif (2013) found that Algerian youth who cited French as their main language of communication were more likely to foster positive attitudes about American culture and cultural products like clothing and media than those who favored Arabic or Berber.

Focusing on large media systems, required for theoretical approaches like hegemony, cultural adaptation, cultivation, and cultural proximity, can inherently provide small results, and inconsistent ones from ill-devised studies. Cultural imperialism does not allow for cultural diversity that still exists (Inglehart and Norris, 2009, pp. 19-22), nor is it consistent in its claims about attitudes (DeFleur and DeFleur, 2003; Fullerton et al, 2007). Presenting one of many criticisms of cultural imperialism, Appiah (2006) contends that globalization necessitates some pockets of homogeneity among populations, but within those pockets, people inevitably create their own differences via cultural adaptations. He insists that “No one could say that the world’s villages are—or are about to become—anything like the same” (p. 103). He also echoes a common complaint made
against cultural imperialism, and a familiar one to media scholars who remember the “powerful effects” era: “Talk of cultural imperialism structuring the consciousnesses of those in the periphery treats […] people as *tabulae rasae* on which global capitalism’s moving finger writes its message. It is deeply condescending. And it isn’t true” (p.111).

**Social identity theory.**

Another popular theory researchers ground themselves in was Tajfel and Turner’s (1986) social identity theory (SIT). This theory focuses on identity threat and in-group/out-group association and is rife throughout the literature. It is also imperative for the identity-consistent media selection behavior as proposed in selective exposure theory (Klapper, 1960). For example, Van den Bulck (2001) explores the way in which the public broadcasting in Belgium was connected to identification with a particular Flemish culture and identity, where the consumption of the channel influenced the strength in identity and the push for Flemish independence for both Flemish and non-Flemish viewers. SIT is particularly popular in the case of positive or negative attitudes toward the media producer, and gained a certain spotlight in foreign entertainment media research after DeFleur and DeFleur (2003) claimed that exposure to American entertainment media created negative views of Americans for teenagers across 12 countries, and was largely the driving cause behind anti-Americanism. However, outside of some findings amongst Arab and Middle Eastern nations (Barber, 1996; Inglehart and Norris, 2009, pp. 17-19; Kiwanni, 2006), most other researchers have found this premise to be false. Hao and Teh (2004) demonstrated that the consumption of Japanese media changed the perception of Japan and Japanese goods toward a more positive light, as well as perpetuated the values of Japanese culture for Singaporean youth. Meanwhile,
Fullerton, Hamilton, and Kendrick (2007) surveyed Singaporean college students about their attitudes toward Americans and their consumption of U.S. entertainment media, where they found a positive correlation. Similarly, Zhu and Christie (2015) examined the relationship between U.S. movie viewing among Chinese college students and positive attitudes of Westerners, showing a positive relationship.

National identity and foreign outgroup also played into several other studies, though the implications are different than the previous studies. Ishii (2013) found that nationalistic sentiments were correlated with preferences for domestic animation among Chinese viewers, though the preference for Japanese animation was not associated with anti-government attitudes. But when Trepte and Kramer (2008) attempted to use national identity to show preferences for domestic media across four different nations, the results did not substantiate this claim. In an interesting study, as the identity of the South Korean elite changed over time, Lo and Kim (2012) found that the depictions of multilingual South Koreans in TV dramas also changed in favor of South Koreans capable of speaking several languages rather than the idea of a foreigner or foreign-born South Korean national. These varied results would seem to push against the typical social identity theory perspective of in-group threat as a strong predictor of media preference or use.

While the previous studies used SIT as their main background, some only had it peripherally operating, with their focus more on motivation and uses or gratifications for viewing. Much of this has to do with acculturation and a third or multi-cultural identity. For example, Jiang and Leung (2012) looked at the motivations to view American or Korean TV dramas among Chinese audiences, including lifestyle, narrative appeal,
viewing habits, and gender. People who were interested in learning or thinking about other cultures were the highest users of American media, where the narrative is more complex, and also indicated they watched all or most of their media online, where choice is strongest. This single study in particular seems to point at the ineffectiveness of relying on the typical identity markers like nationality, ethnicity, and gender.

Acculturation, though, remains one of the strongest areas for examining motivations for media use. For people living in another culture, the research indicates that media can bolster acculturation attempts. Zohoori (1988) found that foreign children who were living in the U.S. used television more for learning, were more interested in the programs they watched, and spent more time watching TV, in what they ascribe as an attempt to acculturate. Cui, Hauiting, Ma, and Southwell (2004) looked at the effects of viewing U.S. media on acculturation and attitudes towards the United States for Chinese students studying in the US. They found that a desire or need to acculturate into the United States predicted the use and selection of U.S. media.

What becomes apparent in this research review is that in operationalizing social identity theory, most social scientists aim for easy to implement identity markers, but these may not be accurate in assessing a full picture of someone’s identity traits, making it a woeful predictor. Typical identity markers like nationality, ethnicity, or gender are unreliable (DeFleur & DeFleur, 2003; Fullerton et al, 2007; Ishii, 2012; Trepte and Kramer, 2008). While Cui et al (2004) implied that values may hold a better predictor, their findings, too, were inconsistent, though motivations for consumption may hold the key. The problem with this previous research is that, while it claims to try to identify who was choosing foreign media or what effect foreign media had on consumers, it
largely identifies who wasn’t choosing foreign media, and how media wasn’t having an impact. The focus on systems theories, simplistic identity markers, and unsubstantiated norms set many of those researchers up for small powered, inconsistent results. There are limitations to the research that has been done, and it is largely due to limitations of the theoretical bases. There are many problems that are leading this research astray: the assumption that change in the environment automatically changes a person; the inability to measure the differences in influences from exposure; and the lack of accounting for underlying motivation as a part of the selection and exposure process.

Due to the failings of previous research and thinking, there are still key questions that remain unanswered or unpredictable. What is the process of cultural consumption and interaction? Does the consumption of intercultural products change attitudes and opinions of the culture consumed? Does the type of cultural product or interaction change any influence that is created? Who consumes foreign media, and does selection matter? If so, what underlying mechanism is being triggered by this media consumption?

By far, the two most common theoretical approaches in which this research is grounded are cultural imperialism and social identity theory. However, the relative failure of this respectably large line of inquiry leads one to ask: if these theoretical premises cannot provide the necessary insight, which one(s) can?

**New Conceptual and Theoretical Approaches to Foreign Media Use and Effects**

**Cosmopolitanism.**

In searching for something to provide a better understanding of the underlying processes, I also sought a link between identity and values to provide a clearer picture of their relationship with each other and their impact on intercultural interactions and
foreign media consumption. Considering the lack of explanatory or inconsistent results found in previous research, I suggest a new grounding, shifting from the traditional theoretical backdrops to more individual-difference and explanatory underpinnings, as well as condensing previously disparate constructs and research. As Briedenbach, Nyeri, and Nyeri (2011) suggested, “A process centered view that provides information not about “cultures” but about the forces that stand behind cultural claims is not only better for understanding the world, it is also practically useful” (p. 24). For this connection, I suggest cosmopolitanism.

There is a storied past with the concept of cosmopolitanism and entire libraries of international relations dedicated to the understanding and research of cosmopolitanism as a force in global politics. But like Appiah (2006) in his search for the “correct” term in examining globalization and intercultural attitudes, I ended up at “cosmopolitanism” as well. In particular, I suggest the cosmopolitan outlook as the key concept. According to Ulrich Beck (2006), philosophical cosmopolitanism, as originally conceived, is based in an idealized prescriptive utopia, where international and intercultural interaction is met with growing interdependence and mutual appreciation, and has garnered a large amount of criticism with its unfortunate associations with failed strategies and unavoidably imperfect implementation (pp. 1-3). When explaining his cosmopolitan outlook, Beck called it a “global sense, a sense of boundarylessness; an everyday, historically alert, reflexive awareness of ambivalences in a milieu of blurring differentiations and cultural contradictions” (p. 3). He also claimed it was “simultaneously a skeptical, disillusioned, self-critical outlook,” where paradoxes abound. But as Beck said, “if the normative
questions of what cosmopolitanism should be is put to one side […], that does not mean that it could or should be ignored altogether” (p. 44).

Appiah (2006) insisted that cosmopolitanism consists of two strands: that of obligation to others, and the valuing of both life itself and way of life (p.xv). In particular, he defended not the abolition of nations or local identities, but rather the idea of a “partial cosmopolitanism,” whereby one is both part of local communities and a broader human community. And most importantly, the cosmopolitan recognizes the need to “develop habits of coexistence” (p.xix). This concept of cosmopolitanism should also answer problems with cultural imperialism and the lack of homogenized universalization: pluralism abounds without the doomsday clash of cultures and imperialism with cultural conflict. Cosmopolitanism is “the search for, and delight in, the contrasts between societies rather than a longing for superiority or for uniformity” (Szerszynski and Urry, 2002, p. 468). As Beck (2006) describes it, cosmopolitanism embraces differences without the need to compress them into one triumphant culture (p. 32).

There is also an important connection between cosmopolitanism and mass media (Appadurai 1995; Beck, 2006; Schiller, 1989; Caglar, 2002). In a plethora of media channels and programs that allow access to other cultures and experiences, the awareness of a growing everyday cosmopolitanism may strengthen the interdependence on media for information as well as media creating and reinforcing the cosmopolitan outlook (Beck, 2006, p. 42). Szerszynski and Urry (2002) specifically proposed the importance of the ‘televisual flow’ in creating and developing the cosmopolitan orientation in the modern age (p. 470). This methodological redefinition of cosmopolitanism in relation to nationalism and internationalism should reflect an ability to predict communication
behavior, both interpersonal and media-related, as well as predicting possible media effects that have previously remained unexplained. The cosmopolitan outlook should also be identifiable due to individual-level markers.

**Defining the cosmopolitan outlook.**

The concept of cosmopolitanism as an identity, trait, value-system, or outlook is not novel, yet the research into cosmopolitanism has been almost entirely qualitative in nature. It has been largely neglected by empirically-oriented social scientists, in part because of a sliding definition across scholars. Many qualitative researchers have listed a myriad of qualities they identify as a part of the cosmopolitan outlook. In their conceptualization, Szerszynski and Urry (2002) differentiated several key aspects and predispositions:

- extensive *mobility* in which people have the right to ‘travel’ corporeally, imaginatively, and virtually and for significant numbers they also have the means to so travel
- the capacity to *consume* many places and environments en route
- a *curiosity* about many places, peoples, and cultures and at least a rudimentary ability to locate such places and cultures historically, geographically, and anthropologically
- a willingness to take *risks* by virtue of encountering the ‘other’
- an ability to ‘map’ one’s own society and its culture in terms of a historical and geographical knowledge, to have some ability to reflect upon and judge aesthetically between different natures, places, and societies
- *semiotic* skill to be able to interpret images of various others, to see what they are meant to represent, and to know when they are ironic

- an *openness* to other peoples and cultures and a willingness/ability to appreciate some elements of the language/culture of the ‘other’. (p. 470)

This combination of traits, characterized as an ‘empty signifier’ where openness and flexibility are prized, shows predispositions, skills, and traits (p. 469). Hannerz (1990) also made some important distinctions for the concept, especially regarding what a cosmopolitan is and is not. He suggests that a cosmopolitan seeks out interactions, information, and cultural competency, while maintaining an identity that is integrated within and above non-cosmopolitans (p. 239). The focus for Hannerz was on mastery, appreciation, and self-reflection. In this way, he states that cosmopolitanism is different from cultural voyeurism, or dilettantes, because the interest is in mastery, or didacticism, rather than just a cursory interest in other cultures. They are not mutually exclusive, however.

Hannerz does insist that, because there is a focus on learning, there is an element of sophistication to cosmopolitanism. While experiences can lead to this sophistication, they are not required. Rather, a willingness to explore the underlying issues is what creates a cosmopolitan (p. 240). The focus on knowledge, competency, curiosity, and openness also point to a large problem within this area of research: the critique of cosmopolitanism as “elitism,” that, in turn, forced many researchers to abandon the term in favor of other terminology. Within the intercultural communication field, there were many attempts to identify an individual trait or orientation that was in essence the cosmopolitan outlook. They usually ended up with terminology revolving around
‘culture’ or ‘global’ perspectives. Though the definitions of these predispositions vary, there are underlying similarities.

Adler (1987) defined a ‘multicultural person’ as having respect for other cultures, as well as having a self-consciousness of change and fluid identities. His focus on awareness of self compared with others is an important difference from other concepts, and leads to a direct examination of the role of identity. Meanwhile, Walsh (1973) defined a ‘universal person’ by three aspects: respect for other cultures, understanding of others and perspective-taking, and appreciation for different cultures. Regrettably, Walsh’s definition does not differentiate between a person seeking any type of competency or mastery or someone simply seeking the experience of exposure to another culture. Neither Adler nor Walsh’s concepts are fully fleshed out, making empirical study difficult, and both are lacking in underlying insight.

In the intercultural communication world, the heavyweights of Gudykunst and Kim also weighed in with their ‘intercultural person’ (1992). This ideal was described as someone with a greater circle of identification, tolerance of other cultures, intercultural communication skills, and intercultural empathy. While their definition is both the most encompassing and concise, their conceptualization is a normative ideal, and their theorizing and modeling of it relies on cultural imperialism and acculturation. Taking these varied concepts and identifying the theoretical bonds has led me to single out four key markers for the cosmopolitan outlook. By defining cosmopolitanism along these dimensions, it creates an individual-level conceptualization that should provide a predictive variable for communication behavior. Critically, this conceptualization marries an identity marker, a value-system, and attitude orientation.
Four dimensions of cosmopolitanism.

Superordinate identification.

Superordinate identification is the ability of a person to claim identification at a human or global level. This does not preclude the option of having lower level identities like nationality, ethnicity, or religion, but it also does not require a hierarchical or linear relationship. Appiah (2006) explains that this is acknowledging “the connection not through identity but despite differences” (p.135). By instead focusing on a within and inclusion approach, superordinate identification implies a sophistication of understanding higher-order connections (Beck, 2006; Hannerz, 1990; Szerszynski and Urry, 2002). In the case of cosmopolitanism, superordinate identification is exemplified by a demonstrated awareness of interconnectedness and a voluntary identification with a global or international community.

Importantly, superordinate identification is not about strength of identity, which many researchers who came from the social identity theory approach used in their work. Many scholars incorrectly assumed that strength of identity or even identity salience is the most effective way of understanding global identities (e.g. Knobloch-Westerwick & Hastall, 2010; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992; Trepte & Kramer, 2008). This reliance on strength of identity is an incorrect focus that creates an inaccurate dichotomy. For example, if one looks at strength of national identity, one is measuring nationalism, transnational identity, or national pride. But that is significantly different from superordinate identification, and as Beck (2006) reminded, they are not mutually exclusive (p. 42). Szerszynski and Urry (2002) dismissed the idea of a “citizen of the world” type measurement as inadequate, but instead proposed a measure of knowledge
and awareness of nested identities and interconnectedness (p. 472). This also allows for a focus on connections rather than a focus on strength or salience of identity, which gets to the root of the marker and does not conflate it with other concepts.

*Intercultural empathy.*

Intercultural empathy is a key variable in cosmopolitanism due to its connection with a person’s interaction with the ‘other’ (Beck, 2006; Hannerz, 1990). The other is a person who is seen as outside someone’s own self or in-group (Szerszynski and Urry, 2002, p. 462). This interaction between self or in-group and others is central to the idea of a cosmopolitan interacting with other cultures. Cosmopolitans are expected to take an empathetic approach to foreignness, searching for understanding rather than pushing it away or going into a self-protective mode. Many scholars looking at intercultural interactions have identified intercultural empathy and related skills like perspective-taking as necessary. Gudykunst and Kim (1992) identified the obligation for empathy and perspective taking with the other as necessary for effective intercultural interactions (p. 183). Calloway (2010) found that empathy as a trait is necessary for interpretive interactions, with a prime skill being the ability of perspective-taking, or seeing through the eyes of others. The interpretive interaction is the only way to share meanings and create understanding between two different cultures. There has also been research that ties empathy to cultural competence, which ties this trait into the next on the list for cosmopolitanism (DeTurk, 2002).

*Cultural competency.*

Hannerz (1990) proposed that simply consuming culture makes one a dilettante, rather than a cosmopolitan (p. 239), and what placed cosmopolitans beyond dilettantes
was a desire and achievement of competency or mastery of different cultures. While someone may take an interest in culture, the focus of cultural competency is on an appreciation for it, much like a work of art (p. 240). The appreciation pushes for an understanding of it. When considering the concepts in Szerszynski and Urry’s cosmopolitan predispositions, they point out three concepts—curiosity, mapping one’s own society and culture, and semiotic skill—which all point to a latent idea of competency and knowledge. While cultural competency does not require complete fluency with another culture, it does require a mindset that bends toward being able to comfortably interact with other cultures and a tendency to advocate for a mastery in at least one other culture, if not an appreciation for all cultures (Hannerz, 1990, p. 239). The difference is in the presumption and focus on mastery.

*Pluralism.*

Pluralism is a key component of the traditional concept of cosmopolitanism. Levinas (1969) expanded on the subject of cosmopolitanism as an ‘obligation to the Other,’ or willingness to recognize others as different but equal (p. 8). Appiah (2006) also defined his cosmopolitanism as both an obligation to others as well as their alternative ways of life (p.xvii). Specifically, pluralism is the tolerance and acceptance of others cultural experiences and traditions. This ties into the openness trait of Szerszynski and Urry (2002) and the recognition of differences described by Beck (2006, p. 30). Pluralism goes beyond empathy, where interaction is expected to be interpretive, and instead focuses on whether the other can be accepted without expectations to adapt their culture to another. Other scholars have identified this underlying concept in a variety of work on intercultural communication. On the global scale, often defined as ‘world-
mindedness’ (Sampson & Smith, 1957), people who value pluralism seek to better understand others by exploring and respecting differences, be it through geographic, ethnic, religious, or social structures. Pluralism, cultural tolerance, and respect are all interrelated concepts with many of the prolific terms used in place of cosmopolitanism (Clark and Corcoran, 2000; Wilnat and Wilkins, 1998).

There is an important distinction to be made between pluralism and universality. Many of the normative ideals of cosmopolitanism or interculturalism suggest an underlying universalism, where there is in fact one right way to live, and the allowance for difference is only in the details (Appiah, 2006, p.144). The distinction is that true cosmopolitan pluralism and tolerance is about universality and difference. Cosmopolitan tolerance doesn’t require that everything be tolerated, but it also doesn’t require a universal and precise morality, where only insignificant details vary. Importantly, “a tenable cosmopolitanism tempers a respect for difference with a respect for actual human beings” (p.113).

**Theoretical model of cosmopolitanism and latent variables.**

With these four latent variables, the cosmopolitan outlook can be now seen as a set of identities, skills, and values which interact and influence each other (see Figure 1). This conceptualization provides an operationalizable translation of some high-quality qualitative work within intercultural communication, while also providing the depth and interaction missing from many previous quantitative studies in the field. This conceptualization could be the answer to why so many other attempts were unreliable when trying to decipher who was choosing and viewing foreign media content (see DeFleur & DeFleur, 2003; Fullerton et al, 2007; Ishii, 2012; Knobloch-Westerwick &
Hastall, 2010; Trepte and Kramer, 2008). It particularly demonstrates new research possibilities when considered in terms of its impact on motivations for media selection, information processing, and reinforcement.

**Theoretical impacts of the cosmopolitan outlook.**

**Self-determination theory and motivation.**

Self-determination theory (SDT) identifies three psychological needs that are essential to a person’s self-motivation and personality integration for growth, development, and well-being: competence, relatedness, autonomy (Deci and Ryan, 2000). SDT provides not only a valuable way to think of people’s interaction with globalization, but also provides a way to understand how that shifts their engagement with foreign or intercultural media. People who felt that intercultural competence was an important part of their self-efficacy would be more likely to have intrinsic motivation for engaging with
intercultural media. Similarly, a person whose society or peer group embraces cultural openness would be more likely to have intrinsically motivated cosmopolitanism.

SDT offers an insightful framework to view the spectrum of cosmopolitan according to levels of motivation. People high in intrinsic motivation on the cosmopolitan outlook would be considered “motivated cosmopolitans,” and would display interest, enjoyment, and inherent satisfaction from engaging with intercultural media. Those with extrinsic motivations for their cosmopolitan outlook would have varying ways of regulating their interaction with intercultural media, but could all be considered, as Beck (2006) called them, “banal cosmopolitans” (p.4). These high to low levels of extrinsic motivation are (respectively): synthesis with self, valuing, ego-involvement, and compliance (Deci and Ryan, 2000). Meanwhile, those who are amotivated would be who Appiah (2006) coined as the “counter-cosmopolitans,” whereby their interaction with intercultural media only increases their feelings of lack of control and incompetence, causing them to reject the main tenets of the cosmopolitan outlook in favor of their own self-assured identities and values (p.137).

Motivated cosmopolitanism implies an active aspiration to expose oneself to intercultural materials and experiences. This desire places the motivated cosmopolitan into an important category, where intercultural interactions are given more attention and used for eudaimonic purposes as prescribed by SDT to enhance concepts of self, identity, culture, and even human nature. Though this form of the cosmopolitan outlook is also a side-effect of globalization, it is also a choice rather than a forced condition.

Conversely, banal cosmopolitanism is a reaction to the reality of living in a globalized world (Beck, 2006, p.4). It is rooted in the everyday pervasive and latent, and
even sometimes unconscious and passive, presence of globalization. Just like the idea of banal nationalism (Billig, 1995), there are signs and reinforcements of the cosmopolitan reality and identity throughout modern society. As predicted, globalization is in part producing cosmopolitanism (Szerszynski and Urry, 2002, p. 464). The everyday banal version of cosmopolitanism is not the enjoyable engagement with cultural others, but rather the unavoidable pressure to play nice with all our neighbors in a world that is constantly under global threat (Beck, 2006, p. 23).

This perception of threat to both identity and way of life provides the mechanism to understanding why banal cosmopolitans and counter-cosmopolitans would react differently to intercultural media than intrinsically motivated cosmopolitans. Terror management theory (TMT) explains that self-esteem and cultural worldviews are tied to an identity protection response against mortality salience (Greenberg, Solomon, Pyszczynski, 1997). In this case, due to their extrinsic motivation for engaging with intercultural interactions, banal cosmopolitans, who see globalization as a threat, would change not only the frequency but also the depth of engagement with intercultural interactions. Yet if this were universally true, no one would ever change their views or advance from one level of cosmopolitanism to another. Culling from intercultural theories, there is a possible explanation for how viewing intercultural media could influence motivations and levels of cosmopolitanism.

Uncertainty management through mindful engagement.

In Gudykunst’s (2005) anxiety/uncertainty management (AUM) theory, he argues that because competent intercultural communicators are focused on understanding and learning, they are more intent on the interaction, are aware of cultural differences, seek to
minimize misunderstandings, and engage strongly in the actual act. He specifies this trait as ‘mindful’ intercultural communication. Underlying cosmopolitanism is the concept of mindful awareness of intercultural difference. While not a marker of the cosmopolitan outlook, this aspect of engagement is indicative of the motivational effect on communication behavior. This provides the clearest demarcation for levels of cosmopolitanism. This focus on attention and engagement with intercultural differences during intercultural communication behavior correlates to the effects attention and engagement have on persuasion, narrative, and message understanding (see Petty and Cacioppo, 1986, and Busselle and Bilandzic, 2009). Awareness of the pressures of understanding in interactions reinforces other cosmopolitan traits like empathy, while a focus on learning also ties in with cultural competency. Mindfulness should also provide mechanism exploration for the predictive power of the specific effects of intercultural communication.

Mindful attention and engagement during intercultural communication correlates to the effects attention and engagement have on persuasion, narrative, and message understanding (see Petty and Cacioppo, 1986, and Busselle and Bilandzic, 2009). This conceptualization of cosmopolitanism and its effects suggests a moderating relationship on interest and central processing with intercultural communication. Slater’s extended elaboration likelihood model (E-ELM) (1997) offers a way to examine cosmopolitanism as the reason why there would be varying attention leading to didactic processing (information gathering found with motivated cosmopolitanism), information scanning (low-involvement implying cultural voyeurism typical of banal cosmopolitans), or hedonic processing (using intercultural interactions for entertainment only) (p.132). For
example, a motivated cosmopolitan consuming a foreign film like *Amélie* would be drawn to note the cultural differences between the French setting and their own. While enjoying the film, they would also be processing the cultural prompts (the references to Princess Diana dying in a French traffic tunnel, the eventual meeting between the two lovers at Montmartre, the significance of the Renoir painting her neighbor relentlessly copies, etc.) and registering them for further exploration or consideration. Conversely, a banal or counter-cosmopolitan engaging in non-mindful, hedonic processing might simply ignore these cultural artifacts and take the film simply on its face, missing some of the cultural depth of the movie, or registering the cultural differences but without any interest or information behind them. This advanced processing of information in entertainment media could provide pathways to stronger attitudes as well as impact future information seeking (Bartsch and Schneider, 2014).

**Selective exposure and reinforcing spirals.**

In examining who chooses to consume foreign entertainment media, the theory of selective exposure offers a natural insight. Based in Festinger’s (1957) cognitive dissonance theory, selective exposure suggests that attitudes influence decisions toward media exposure and consumption, and specifically that people will prefer media that aligns with their choices and attitudes over those that do not (Klapper, 1960). While largely the domain of political media research (Chaffee, Saphir, Graf, Sandvig, and Hahn, 2001; Garrett, 2009; Valentino, Banks, Hutchings, and Davis, 2009), entertainment media research is often done combining the concept with uses and gratifications, or mood-management theory (Zillman and Bryant, 1985; Knobloch-Westerwick, 2007; Reinecke, Tamborini, Grizzard, Lewis, Eden, and Bowman, 2012). Selective exposure has become
especially interesting on a global scale since the rapid growth and availability of media via the Internet.

Applying this theory with the concept of the cosmopolitan outlook provides new avenues of exploration. According to SDT, with a driving interest in foreign media, motivated cosmopolitans should show a preference for seeking out and consuming it. This choice to consume media is an active selection, rather than default consumption, like in banal cosmopolitans. Selective exposure research has recently delineated the difference between a selective approach and a selective avoidance (Garrett, 2009). For motivated cosmopolitans, the choice of consumption would align with selective approach. Considering the pluralistic, tolerant, and open-minded traits inherent in cosmopolitanism, it would be expected that cosmopolitans of either banal or motivated natures would be highly unlikely to engage in selective avoidance, in order to bolster their self-conceptualization as open-minded and tolerant of other cultures (p. 680). Alternatively, counter-cosmopolitans might be expected to engage in selective avoidance, though this effect would be smaller (Frey, 1986). If the media landscape is one where foreign entertainment media is prolifically available, banal consumption of foreign media out of default does not necessarily display selective approach. The choice should be deliberate, though the motivation behind it may be either intrinsic or extrinsic. For example, in a media system like that found in South Korea, where Western- and foreign-produced media is broadcast on national television, watching a dubbed rerun of House, or a subtitled Japanese drama would not necessarily be indicative of motivated selective exposure.
The reinforcing spirals model (RSM) (Slater 2007, 2015) at its roots is based in attitude accessibility and its effects on identity creation and maintenance (Slater, 2015, p. 377). The active, on-going selection of attitude and identity consistent content creates and reinforces the accessibility of the attitudes and identities that prompted selective choice. One of the key tenets of the RSM is the role of identity threat and response to threat. As noted before, banal and counter-cosmopolitans view globalization as a threat to identity and way of life. In contrast, motivated cosmopolitans do not see it as a threat, and instead have an inherent interest in intercultural interactions. The RSM also accounts for social factors in reinforcing attitudes that are important in analyzing the effect of the cosmopolitan outlook and media use. Societies with more open attitudes toward other cultures, more experience with diverse populations, and a more open media environment would influence the individual’s process. Societies that value conformity over individualism may negatively impact this process. Similarly, a person from a family which is more open, tolerant, and pluralistic in their attitudes as well as more open in their discussion of other cultures and consumption of intercultural media will positively influence the process, whereas a more close-minded, ethnocentric family or friend group would be expected to negatively impact.

The temporarily expanded boundaries of the self (TEBOTS) perspective offers an explanation for how those whose psychological needs as identified by SDT are constrained by threat would engage more with narratives to provide a release from the task of identity defense (Slater, Johnson, Cohen, Comello, and Ewoldsen, 2014, p. 441). This can also explain how an upwards spiral, moving someone from banal to motivated cosmopolitanism, may develop over time as the depletion of self-regulatory resources
from a worldview or cultural identity constantly under threat from globalization will engage more deeply in a narrative. This increased engagement could possibly create an expansion of self-identification with outside cultures, peoples, and values through intercultural narratives. Research has shown that exposure to alternative opinions can foster political tolerance (Mutz, 2002; Price, Capella, & Nir, 2002) as well as stimulate more in-depth information seeking and critical examination of opposing viewpoints (Mendelberg, 2002, Nemeth, 1986). Meanwhile, intercultural relationships, international experiences, and foreign entertainment media consumption have been shown to foster openness toward other cultures as well as a decrease in stereotyping (Delwiche, 2004; Zhu and Christie, 2015).

Motivated cosmopolitanism implies an active aspiration to expose oneself to intercultural materials and experiences. This desire places the motivated cosmopolitan into an important category, where intercultural interactions are given more attention and used for eudaimonic purposes as prescribed by SDT to enhance concepts of self, identity, culture, and even human nature. Motivated cosmopolitans, engaged with otherness and focused on understanding, would activate intercultural mindfulness, leading to higher-level processing in E-ELM. However, banal cosmopolitans or counter-cosmopolitans who sought out deeper engagement with narratives due to self-regulatory resource depletion could also begin engaging with intercultural media creating higher-level processing of both the narrative and the intercultural content. This engagement could create a positive influence on the motivations for seeking foreign media, creating a reinforcing effect on the cosmopolitan outlook.

The Theoretical Relationships and Predictive Model of Cosmopolitanism
With an individual-level conceptualization now defined and the processes mapped out with the self-determination theory, selective exposure, and the reinforcing spirals model, cosmopolitanism will provide a predictive variable for communication behavior and effects (see Figure 2). Due to the intrinsic motivation for intercultural experience and enjoyment, motivated cosmopolitans should engage in intercultural interactions more willingly, more attentively, and more often. Banal or counter-cosmopolitans, due to threat reaction, would be expected to engage less frequently and less in-depth with intercultural media. These interactions have the possibility of reinforcing counter-cosmopolitan attitudes. However, should they engage mindfully with the narrative, there is the possible pathway to create a reinforcement of the cosmopolitan outlook. To view the iterative process in its entirety, it would be best to study it through longitudinal review of attitude change over time and consumption habits to demonstrate reinforcement processes. Overall, understanding this process should explain the question of who is viewing foreign media and what impact that has on their view of other cultures. It should also demonstrate why previous research, using piecemeal markers and a lack of mechanism exploration, found inconsistent or small effect sizes with foreign media selection and its effects.
Figure 2. Theoretical effects of cosmopolitanism on foreign media consumption and reinforcement of the cosmopolitan outlook.
**Propositions.**

These theorized relationships between variables presented here create explorable propositions about the role and type of cosmopolitanism and the selection and effect of foreign media consumption.

**Proposition 1:** Cosmopolitanism is a cross-culturally valid trait.

**Proposition 2:** Cosmopolitanism has three forms (motivated, banal, and counter-cosmopolitanism) based on intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivation.

**Proposition 3:** Banal and counter-cosmopolitans react to globalization as a perceived threat to their identity or way of life.

**Proposition 4:** Motivated cosmopolitans engage more often in intercultural interpersonal interactions and consume more intercultural media than banal or counter-cosmopolitans.

**Proposition 5:** Motivated cosmopolitans engage more mindfully in intercultural interactions and with intercultural media products than banal or counter-cosmopolitans.

**Proposition 6:** The more mindfully someone engages with intercultural media products, the stronger the reinforcement of the cosmopolitan outlook.

**Proposition 7:** Over time, the positive spiraling reinforcement of the cosmopolitan outlook will create an opportunity for a banal or counter-cosmopolitan to switch to a motivated cosmopolitan.

These propositions are theoretically-driven understandings of the proposed processes and relationships with intercultural interactions and the cosmopolitan outlook.
**Soft Power’s Global Influence**

One of the major theories about globalization is soft power, which Joseph Nye defined as the attraction of culture and values, rather than the hard power tactics like military or economic might (2004, p. 7). In particular, Nye cited the use of soft power as a moderator on the need, costs, and implementation of hard power tactics (p.33). The appeal of using “pull” diplomacy, where attraction persuades and influences, is particularly tantalizing to countries which are lacking in traditional hard power (p. 8). This does not mean that “strong” nations are not playing the soft power game; the U.S. has arguably the strongest case of soft power influence in the world, sometimes seen as even larger than their economic and military assets (p. 11). Countries which invest in soft power create a “force multiplier,” whereby the intrinsic attraction created using soft power techniques decreases the money needed to be spent on both the positive and negative consequences in a diplomatic situation. This interplay between soft power and hard power and the strategic use of both to maximize returns is often called “smart power” (p.32). However, the success or size of influence via soft power is still hard to quantify (Nye, 2004, p. 12; Lee and Melissen, 2014, p. 2). This reality has done little to deter attempts to harness soft power influence.

There are many ways in which the appeal of soft power can influence public diplomacy. Trade agreements, for example, are commonly wrought with considerations of soft power. The highly contentious Trans-Pacific Partnership recently agreed upon by 12 nations in the Pacific Ocean region including the U.S. is a poignant illustration. Much of America’s reported gains in this agreement are largely in the prospect of access—especially to East Asia and the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN)—and
the hope that soft power influence will make the region more amenable to American policies and products (Talton, April 14, 2015). In the same turn, those Asian nations, too, are seeking further access and influence via cultural products in the United States (Lee and Melissen, 2014, p. 1). While the Trump Administration’s rejection and withdrawal from the agreement was ostensibly because of a concern for economic fairness and actual benefit for the U.S., the strategic implications of the failure of the deal has many Asian policymakers very nervous. The Congressional Research Service noted that it could be seen as “a symbol of declining U.S. interest in the region and inability to assert leadership” (Fergusson, McMinimy, and Williams, 2016, p.3). More significantly, the failure of the TPP “could, in effect, allow China to shape regional rules of commerce and diplomacy through its own trade and investment initiatives, potentially creating regional rules and norms less beneficial for U.S. interests” (p.3). When asked about the Trump Administration’s characterization of itself as a “strong-power administration” with a “hard-power” focus, Nye suggested that it “shows a profound misunderstanding of smart-power strategy. […] Nobody has expressed this in simpler, more effective terms than Secretary of Defense [Jim] Mattis. He said [in 2013 Senate testimony], ‘If you don’t fund the State Department fully, then I need to buy more ammunition ultimately’” (Laub, 2017).

While there are many facets to the shape soft power takes, cultural products are some of the easiest elements to identify. Traditions, religious practices, art, fashion, language, and food are all examples of cultural products often exchanged. A large subset of cultural products is also popular culture, arguably the most visible version of it as well.
Entertainment media like films, music, television programs and books can play a role in international opinion through soft power influence.

While popular culture is a large resource for some countries, others have less available for export. The three predominant East Asian countries (China, Japan, and South Korea) took an interest in soft power influence as their hard power influence grew (Nye, 2004, p. 18). There has been a sort of arms race between the three countries in an attempt to claim soft power influence within the ASEAN region, creating a flurry of attempts to further pop culture exports (p. 79). While there have been specific policy goals tied to popular culture soft power influences in the past (pp. 50-51), the general favor curried and positive attitudes implied in the exchange are enough to motivate many countries into active campaigns to increase their soft power resources. This represents an impressively large amount of money, energy, and resources, and demands a way to analyze these attempts at global cultural seduction. With these and other applications in mind, these studies attempt to provide a conceptualization and pathway for exploration.
Chapter 2 – Developing Cosmopolitan Measures (Study 1)

Measuring Cosmopolitanism

With a history of essentially no quantitative analysis on an individual level, developing metrics for identifying the cosmopolitan outlook was critical. When examining the dimensions I identified within an intercultural communication interaction, I found that while none had a “gold standard” scale for use, identifying or adapting developed scales was the best option. The value of this reconceptualization of the cosmopolitan outlook is not in developing an entirely novel phenomenon—it is in the new consolidation of existing values, identities, and concepts taken together. For this reason, using established scales was appropriate and beneficial for validity, reliability, and efficiency. The intended concept for measurement from these adapted scales was of extreme importance. Each of the four key dimensions was assessed, with any relevant existing scales sought for adaptation. Measurements for the moderating concept of mindfulness during intercultural interactions were also adapted and tested.

Superordinate identification.

Initial searches for measuring superordinate identification led to typical measures, like Luhtanen and Crocker’s (1990) collective self-esteem scale. However, this scale focuses on either the salience or strength of identity elements, as do most others involving national or ethnic identity. With the conceptualization of cosmopolitanism and superordinate identification, the importance of the measure should not be on strength or
salience, but rather on the ability and desire of a cosmopolitan person to place their identity within a larger and smaller context. Many of the scholars who wrote of cosmopolitanism warned of conflating it with nationalism, national identity, ethnocentrism, and identity salience (see Beck, 2006, Appiah, 2006, Szerszynski and Urry, 2002). In particular, Szerszynski and Urry found in their exploration of the cosmopolitan identity that a “citizen of the world” item by itself was inadequate, and instead, they found that also checking for knowledge or awareness of nested identities and interconnectedness provided the best markers (p. 472).

Due to there being little to no availability of these types of measures, I have developed a series of four questions hoping to assess superordinate identification. (See Table 1 for the means and standard deviations for each item.) In order to assess superordinate identification, this series of questions asks if the participant identifies at a higher level than national identity, and whether they acknowledge an interconnectedness that places their identity on a global scale. This set of measured items is on a scale of 1(strongly disagree) to 7(strongly agree).

In a pilot test of these questions, they were placed alongside concepts of national identity, including ethnocentrism, American exceptionalism, and national chauvinism. To set this concept of superordinate identification apart from these other concepts, establishing divergent validity was necessary to verify significant difference. Using the maximum likelihood option in EFA, the four items of interest were analyzed against the four to six items from the other three concepts. The analysis showed that the questions developed for the cosmopolitan outlook loaded onto a single factor, and this factor was
different than the factors underlying the other items. I also tested internal consistency with Cronbach’s alpha (α = .79, N = 311).

**Intercultural empathy.**

Several self-report questionnaires have been developed to measure dispositional facets of empathy. Although earlier scales assessed either only the cognitive component of empathy, such as the Hogan Empathy Scale (Hogan, 1969), or only the emotional component of empathy, such as the Emotional Empathic Tendency Scale (EETS; Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972), more recent scales tap into both affective and cognitive aspects of empathy. The Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI; Davis, 1980) was designed to assess four 7-item subscales reflecting both affective and cognitive components of empathy: empathic concern (EC) and personal distress (PD) represent affective aspects of empathy, whereas fantasy (FS) and perspective taking (PT) represent cognitive aspects. By investigating associations of the IRI subscales with other measures of empathy, as well as associations with empathy-related constructs such as interpersonal functioning, self-esteem, and sensitivity to others, Davis (1983) found empirical support for the four-factor structure of the IRI. To examine the reliability of the four subscales, the Cronbach’s alpha coefficients as well as test–retest reliabilities for the four subscales were evaluated. Scale score reliabilities varied from .72 to .78 (Davis, 1980).

In the case of cosmopolitanism, two main concepts of the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI) are mentioned in conceptual literature, specifically the empathic concern and perspective taking subscales. These seven item set of questions are on a 1(strongly disagree) to 7(strongly agree) scale. These subscale concepts align with the intercultural empathy and perspective taking discussed in the conceptualization of the cosmopolitan outlook by Hannerz (1990) and Beck and Cronin (2006). The empathic concern scale measures respondents’ tendency to experience
Table 1

*Items Used in Developing the Cosmopolitan Outlook Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Identification (SID) (α = .79)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SID1: No matter where you are from, we are all part of a global society.</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SID2: I believe there is a greater human identity that ties everyone together.</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SID3: My personal identity has many levels, and the broadest one is as a member of the human race.</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SID4: I would identify myself at least somewhat as a member of the human race or a citizen of the world.</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intercultural Empathy (Empathic concern – EC, α = .83; perspective taking – PT, α = .81)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC1: I often have tender, concerned feelings for people of other cultures who are less fortunate than me.</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC2: Sometimes I don’t feel very sorry for people from other cultures when they are having problems. (-)</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC3: When I see other cultures being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective towards them.</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC4: Other culture’s or country’s misfortunes do not usually disturb me a great deal. (-)</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC5: When I see other cultures being treated unfairly, I sometimes don’t feel very much pity for them. (-)</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC6: I am often quite touched by things that I see happening in other countries.</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT1: I sometimes find it difficult to see things from the “other guy’s” point of view with other cultures.</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT2: With people or issues involving other cultures, I try to look at everybody’s side of a disagreement before I make a decision.</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>1.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT3: I sometimes try to understand other cultures better by imagining how things look from their perspective.</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT4: I believe that there are two sides to every question and try to look at them both, especially if there are cultural differences.</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>1.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT5: When I’m upset about problems with other cultures, I usually try to “put myself in their shoes” for a while.</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>1.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT6: Before criticizing somebody from another culture, I try to imagine how I would feel if I were in their place.</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>1.062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Competency (CC) (α = .87)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC1: I can differentiate between people from similar cultures (Ex: Chinese, Korean, Japanese, etc.)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC2: I feel that people from other cultures have many valuable things to teach me.</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC3: I am comfortable with people from other cultures as much as I am with people from my culture.</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC4: I have friends from different cultures than my own.</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC5: I often notice similarities in personality between people who belong to completely different cultures.</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC6: I view travel primarily as an opportunity to learn about different cultures.</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC7: Learning about other cultures is something I enjoy.</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC8: I am interested in getting closer to people outside of my own culture so I can relate to them better.</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC9: I usually look for opportunities to interact with people from other cultures.</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(continued)*
feelings of concern or compassion for others. The perspective taking scale measures participants’ abilities to take the point of view of another person. The scales were adapted to focus on intercultural interactions, and one item was removed from each scale to lower the overall cosmopolitanism battery. The adapted 6-item scales were found to be reliable with these data (empathic concern $\alpha = .83$, perspective taking $\alpha = .81$).
Cultural competency.

One of the most useful instruments in this climate of globalization and performance evaluations based on intercultural competency is an instrument which not only evaluates one's intercultural communication competence but also performs well amongst participants from multiple cultural backgrounds. Arasaratnam, Banerjee, and Dembek’s (2010) intercultural communication competence (ICC) scale was created to attempt to fulfill this goal. It consists of ten items on a 1(strongly disagree) to 5(strongly agree) scale. Other related variables were included in the study in order to test the validity of the new measure. These variables were selected based on Arasaratnam's (2006) model of ICC, which shows positive relationships between ICC and variables such as motivation to interact with people from other cultures, positive attitudes toward people from other cultures, and interaction involvement. The items in the ICC were subjected to factor analysis with Varimax rotation. Using selection criteria of primary loading of .50 or higher and no secondary loading higher than .30, 9 items were selected from the four components which emerged (α = .77). For use in measuring the cosmopolitan outlook, I removed reversed coding to make factor loading more reliable and to eliminate any methodological artifacts caused by reverse coding (see Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994). Testing reliability with the research data, the 9-item scale was found to be very reliable (α = .87).

In order to best differentiate between respondents who might succumb to socially desirable rather than factual answers, I also used a series of questions to act as a test of cultural competency. These include identifying foreign text, nationalities, monuments, and people. The respondent is given four choices, one which is correct and one which is
culturally close. This allows for a more nuanced measurement to compare against the impact of social desirability in answers to the first scale.

**Pluralism.**

To measure pluralism and acceptance of otherness, items were taken from the Intercultural Tolerance Scale (Mendleson, Bures, Champion, & Lott, 1997). The scale was developed to create more concrete examples from the elements found in Sampson and Smith’s (1957) world-mindedness scale. The scale was tested across multiple samples and tested for reliability ($\alpha = .81$). The items were also checked using a factor analysis with a Varimix rotation loading on two factors, deemed to be the positive and negative items. Originally a 32-item scale, eight items were chosen to reduce the overall number of measures for the cosmopolitan outlook. The items were chosen from the positive scale to limit design artifacts in the factor analysis. Some wording was adapted. The scale was found to be reliable with this study’s sample ($\alpha = .83$).

**Motivation.**

Motivation requires an important view into the self-efficacy and underlying desire to engage in intercultural interactions. Brumbaugh and Grier’s (2013) diversity seeking scale was intended to measure agents of intercultural change. Their scale had both living and learning items which related to the reasons behind engagement in intercultural interactions. The final seven-item scale was tested across multiple samples and demonstrated a good model fit ($GFI = .96$, $CFI = .93$) as well as good reliability ($\alpha = .90$). Reliability within this study’s sample was also found ($\alpha = .86$).

**Mindful engagement.**
Mindfulness must be measured in two ways to assess both trait and state attributes. First, in order to assess general mindfulness during intercultural interactions, a self-report measure of an adapted version of the cultural intelligence scale (CIS) will be used. The scale, recently redeveloped to assess intercultural interactions and competency, is used by the United States military, diplomatic and intelligence services, and consists of twenty items across four factors on a 1(strongly disagree) to 5(strongly agree) scale (Van Dyne, Ang, Ng, Rockstuhl, Tan, Koh, 2012). Van Dyne et al (2012) focused on four dimensions of intercultural interactions, including metacognitive, cognitive, motivational, and behavioral. This four factor model was found to be a good fit ($RMSEA = 0.08$; $NNFI = 0.91$), and a better fit than a one-factor or bi-factor option. The metacognitive subset was specifically designed to identify awareness, planning, regulating, and monitoring processes of thinking and learning while engaging in intercultural interactions. The metacognitive test demonstrated a reasonable reliability across several tests, including across several cultures ($α > 0.71$). In these data analyses, the reliability was also found to be reasonable ($α = .77$).

In research where state mindfulness is required, a second measure of mindfulness is necessary. In particular, the cultural tolerance scale as developed by Gasser and Tan (1999) provides an excellent check on the attention of intercultural differences via a series of scenarios. These scenarios involve intercultural interactions, assessments of attitudes, and questions of behavior in response to cultural differences. Each cultural scale was tested and validated across three samples, and each has an alpha of .82 or above, with a total scale alpha of .95. These scenarios have subscales for attitude components of
attitude, belief, and intention. In the single sample used with this analysis, the scale reliability was found to be good ($\alpha = .86, N = 238$).

**Assessing Cosmopolitanism**

**Summary of methods and analyses.**

The development of the cosmopolitan outlook scale utilized three data sets from three groups of participants. The process started with exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with the first data set ($N = 311$) using the statistical package Comprehensive Exploratory Factor Analysis (CEFA; Browne, Cudeck, Tateneni, & Mels, 1998). Using a second data set ($N = 145$), confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed, and finally, a third data set ($N = 238$) was examined for both CFA and second-order factor analysis using the statistical program LISREL (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2012).

**Participants and procedure.**

The EFA on the combined scale items and subsequent CFA tests were done with three data sets from students at a large Midwestern university. In the first two data sets, for extra credit in a course, undergraduate students from communication courses participated in two consequent versions of the survey in two separate semesters. Students signed up for and filled out online surveys via the Qualtrics service. These two versions of the survey were the basis for the EFA ($N = 311$) and initial CFA ($N = 145$) data. The final CFA and second-order analysis was tested with a separate data set, where participants in a quasi-experimental examination of the cosmopolitan outlook and foreign media selection filled out the first part of the research, including the final 19-item scale, via the online Qualtrics service ($N = 238$). Like the previous respondents, they were granted extra credit in communication courses for their participation. Participants who
left more than five values blank or finished the survey in less than one standard deviation from the mean time were removed from analysis. Remaining missing data were replaced with sample means (Little & Rubin, 2002, p.59).

**Results of analyses.**

Beginning with exploratory factor analysis in the CEFA program, the amalgamated items were tested to check for clear dimension definition and to reduce the set of items for further testing. Considering the theorized relationship between the items and an underlying cosmopolitan outlook, allowing the factors to correlate via an oblique solution was deemed the best option. Using maximum likelihood analysis and a geomin rotation, an initial EFA was performed with factors varying from one to ten. While most items loaded significantly on a single factor, the best fit was the five factor model (RMSEA = .05). This reflected the dual factors implicated by the IRI subscales, where empathic concern and perspective taking load on their own factors. Using a target matrix adjustment to align these two subscales on one factor returned a well-fitting four factor model (RMSEA = .06, \( p = .014 \); \( \chi^2 = 684.27 \); df = 347). Factor loadings in the pattern matrix were examined to meet the loading significance of at least .35 as recommend by Hair et al (1998). At this point, any items with large secondary loadings were also removed to eliminate problematic items (Viswanathan, 2005, p.185). Of the 43 original items, 19 produced appropriate loading significance without double loading. This 19-item scale was run again and demonstrated robustness across multiple rotation methods (see Table 2 for factor loadings, communalities, percentage of variance and other relevant statistics).
Table 2
Factor Loadings, Communalities ($h^2$), Rotation Sum of Squared Loadings, Percentage of Variance, and Factor Correlations for Exploratory Factor Analysis With Geomin Rotation of Cosmopolitan Subscales (Only Stable Items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original theoretical construct item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>$h^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC2: I feel that people from other cultures have many valuable things to teach me.</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC3: I am comfortable with people from other cultures as much as I am with people from my culture.</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC4: I have friends from different cultures than my own.</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC5: I often notice similarities in personality between people who belong to completely different cultures.</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC6: I view travel primarily as an opportunity to learn about different cultures.</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC9: I usually look for opportunities to interact with people from other cultures.</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC1: I often have tender, concerned feelings for people of other cultures who less fortunate than me.</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC3: When I see other cultures being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective towards them.</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC6: I am often quite touched by things that I see happening in other countries.</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT2: With people or issues involving other cultures, I try to look at everybody’s side of a disagreement before I make a decision.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT3: I sometimes try to understand other cultures better by imagining how things look from their perspective.</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT6: Before criticizing somebody from another culture, I try to imagine how I would feel if I were in their place.</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL2: Different traditions and cultures make the world more interesting.</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL3: I would prefer to see all languages of the world continue to be used.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL5: I would enjoy working with coworkers who are from other countries.</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL6: I think the world is more interesting with a variety of different religions and beliefs.</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SID1: No matter where you are from, we are all part of a global society.</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SID2: I believe there is a greater human identity that ties everyone together.</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SID3: My personal identity has many levels, and the broadest one is as a member of the human race.</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rotation sum of squared loadings: 5.60 4.49 4.57 4.13
Percentage of variance (before extraction): 39.48 7.50 7.17 6.49
Correlation with Factor 1: 1.00
Correlation with Factor 2: .57 1.00
Correlation with Factor 3: .44 .54 1.00
Correlation with Factor 4: .44 .35 .23 1.00

Note. Loadings below .20 not printed. *Key to items’ original theoretical constructs: SID = superordinate identification; EC = empathic concern; PT = perspective taking; CC = cultural competency; PL = pluralism.
Next, a confirmatory factor analysis was run on the second data set \((N = 145)\) using the LISREL statistical program. The factors were allowed to correlate in order to analyze the model discovered through EFA. Evaluation of the model was based on overall goodness of fit using root mean squared estimate of association (RMSEA), chi-square, comparative fit index (CFI), standardized root mean square residual (SRMR), modification indices, and overall theoretical implications for the constructs. The four factor model across 19-items demonstrated an overall acceptable goodness of fit (RMSEA = .0672 [range = .0518 to .0820]; \(\chi^2 = 241.57, df = 146; CFI = .969; SRMR = .0618\)).

Finally, a second confirmatory factor analysis and second-order latent factor structure was examined with a third data set \((N = 238)\). Theoretically, the items are meant to measure the four dimensions of the cosmopolitan outlook, so the correlations between factors were removed and the higher-order variable was added (see Figure 3). With this configuration, the model fit was predictably slightly lower, but still in the acceptable range of goodness of fit (RMSEA = .0809 [range = .0697 to .0922]; \(\chi^2 = 341.89, df = 148; CFI = .955; SRMR = .0635\)).

**Discussion.**

This series of analyses was undertaken in order to provide a clearer conceptualization for the cosmopolitan outlook, define dimensions of cosmopolitanism, and develop ways to measure those dimensions. I will outline the implications and relations to further research, and address the strengths and limitations of the scale and my studies to explore its structure.
Figure 3. Second-order confirmatory factor analysis for the cosmopolitan outlook, including all dimensions and latent variable. All parameter estimates are standardized and significant, at p < .000.
As a combination of identities, values, and behavior, the proposed scale for the cosmopolitan outlook as explored here offers a variety of benefits to further media, political communication, intercultural communication, and education research. The four dimensions of cosmopolitanism—cultural competency, intercultural empathy, pluralism, and superordinate identification—demonstrate exactly why so much of the previous research done in search of identities and motivations for foreign media consumption ended rather unfruitfully. By identifying and combining these key traits, cosmopolitanism now has a much more solid capability to provide insight.

The relationship between superordinate identity and the cosmopolitan outlook in particular is notable. Much of the previous research relied on identity measures, and focused on strength of that identity as the main way of classifying someone as “cosmopolitan”, “globally-minded”, or other concepts. However, it is clear that superordinate identification is actually the weakest dimension of the cosmopolitan outlook. While it remains an important aspect of the higher-order concept, this comparative relationship with the other dimensions demonstrates why previous research often returned disappointing or weak results (e.g. DeFleur & DeFleur, 2003; Fullerton et al, 2007; Ishii, 2012; Knobloch-Westerwick & Hastall, 2010; Trepte and Kramer, 2008).

For convergent validity, drawing the items of the scale from other scales and subscales provides a strong reinforcement for the attitudes, behaviors, and identities that were theoretically tied to the cosmopolitan outlook. That these established and validated measures could be employed, and some with long histories of use, meant that the scale development process was both more effective and more expedient. Regarding divergent validity, the incorporation in the exploratory analysis of measures like ethnocentrism,
American exceptionalism, and national chauvinism provided demonstrable proof that the cosmopolitan outlook, while certainly negatively correlating with these concepts, embodied a more complicated makeup than simply being the opposite of these traits.

The nature of the interrelatedness of the four dimensions also led to some limitations of this scale development. The subscales demonstrated a high level of correlation, and particularly between cultural competence and pluralism. This suggests that the focus on intended construct measurement when adapting the items from existing instruments was well-warranted. However, as the inter-factor correlations are not uniform, this also suggests that the four dimensions of the cosmopolitan outlook and their subscales are not redundant, but have many related characteristics and influences. Similarly, many items showed a proclivity for cross-loading, predominantly on the pluralism factor. Unrotated orthogonal factor exploration was particularly ineffective in identifying underlying factors, and had a tendency to prefer a single factor model, even though it provided a lower goodness of fit. While I see this as a good indicator of the underlying cosmopolitan outlook, a bi-factor model may be another answer. Any future use of the scale would be well-served by analyzing a bi-factor solution in comparison to the second-order model.

The population sample and sample size of these analyses also limit the full confidence of the scale. Principally, the age, diversity, socio-economic status, and experiences of college students could certainly present a sampling bias. In order to address these issues, replication with a more diverse population should be beneficial in providing evidence of the scale’s ability to assess the cosmopolitan outlook in the more general population.
Overall, the scale and subscales developed here have already provided some insight into the failings of previous research, and could provide a representation of the more complex nature of the fully-conceptualized cosmopolitan outlook. This scale will hopefully contribute to the understanding both of the concept itself, as well as its impact on intercultural communication behavior via the mechanisms implicated in my theoretical design.
Chapter 3 – Intercultural Experiences and Cosmopolitanism (Study 2)

Theoretical Implications

This study provides an opportunity to explore the communication experiences that can influence the creation and reinforcement of the cosmopolitan outlook. The focus of this study is to provide divergent validity via measures like national chauvinism as well as predictive (criterion) validity through willingness to engage in intercultural interactions. The more diverse sample also provides ecological validity to the previously developed scale for the cosmopolitan outlook.

Introduction

The appeal of creating global citizens.

Governments, companies, and societies in a global world have begun to acknowledge the value of a globally-minded citizenry and workers. This has translated into a shift into creating and rewarding training toward global skills. Conversations about the usefulness of professional skills for a global economy are commonplace in business and trade magazines like Forbes (Symonds, May 16, 2017) and Bloomberg News (Frier, February 16, 2017), but Facebook Chief Executive Officer Mark Zuckerberg also asserted that those skills have become an important part of simply existing and communicating within a global community: “Our greatest opportunities are now global [and] …our greatest challenges also need global responses” (Zuckerberg, February 16, 2017). These skills often include cultural competency (Arasaratnam, Banerjee, and
Dembek, 2010), foreign languages (Lo and Kim, 2012), intercultural tolerance (Gudykunst and Kim, 1992) and more.

Educational authorities are also calling for creating more interculturally competent students (Brustien, 2007; Deardorff, 2006; Jones & Killick, 2013; Lee, Poch, Shaw, & Williams, 2012; Seifert, Goodman, King & Baxter Magolda, 2010). To meet this demand, many schools and universities are now focusing on both the employability of students as well as the pro-social effect on societies by creating programs to influence globally-minded students. For example, Stanford has an entirely separate Global Executive MBA program, as well as a Global Supply Chain Management master’s degree (Tilsner, February 18, 2015). Arizona State University has an entire platform dedicated to enhancing opportunities for both international and local students to learn global professional skills for “students, educators, and other professionals to thrive in the global marketplace” (ASU, n.d.). Meanwhile, Stanford University has been offering faculty grants for “globally minded research” since 2013 (Shiau, July 19, 2016).

But the correct way to create and measure the effectiveness of these programs is still under debate (see Garcia-Perez & Rojas-Primus, 2017, Leavitt & Wisdom, 2017, and Reynolds et al, 2015). Programs vary in their inclusion of experiences to create the desired global-mindedness—some employ curriculum, some promote intercultural exchanges and interactions, some use international travel and work. The design of these programs largely revolves around following industry standards and offerings rather than any studied results. And while many thoughts about best practices and curriculum pedagogy have been proffered, the typical standard of measurement in the education field has been the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) (Hammer, 1999, 2011), which
has been met with some serious issues in application. Garson (2017) found that the IDI significantly overestimated intercultural competence, a finding Taylor (2015) also found, as well as a concerning finding regarding teachers and their reported level of intercultural sensitivity (p. 19). He discussed at length the development, testing, re-testing, and multiple versions of the IDI, which now stands at version three, with 50 self-reporting items on a seven factor model (pp. 17-19), and concluded that the error may exist because “the IDI does not measure what it purports to measure” (p.19). Clearly, the need is there for both the development and the measurement of globally minded students and programs.

**Exposure to other cultures and effects on opinions.**

Many of the approaches to increasing intercultural sensitivity among students are aimed from the angle of increasing campus diversity and thereby hopefully increasing intercultural interpersonal interactions. But being in the presence of cultural differences doesn’t guarantee increased cultural understanding. In fact, there is a substantial amount of research that demonstrates that intergroup contact that does not meet an “ideal” condition of guided interaction can often create a deeper retreat into stereotyping and divisiveness (Allport, 1954; Crichton & Scarino, 2007; Sidanius, Levin, van Larr, & Sears, 2008). The contact theory has had a long history of research and problems that grew out of it (see Dixon, Durrheim, and Tredoux, 2005). While often the temptation is to say that prejudice exists because of a lack of contact, the presence of contact may also cause that prejudice. Using the optimal contact strategy is one way to improve intergroup attitudes and relations markedly (p. 699). Research has also demonstrated that intercultural relationships, international experiences, and foreign entertainment media
consumption have been shown to foster openness toward other cultures as well as a
decrease in stereotyping (Delwiche, 2004; Zhu and Christie, 2015).

Entertainment media like films, music, television programs and books can play a role in international opinion through influence of soft power. While this format provides a cheap and easy way to introduce other cultures to students, programs like studies abroad, international students, international clubs and organizations, and globally-focused classes and subjects are how most universities are attempting to integrate interpersonal intercultural interactions into the campus experience. However, when looking at mediated intercultural exposure, selective exposure suggests that attitudes influence decisions toward information exposure via the media, and specifically that people will prefer ideas that align with their choices and attitudes over those that do not (Klapper, 1960). Much political research examines the role this selection can play in changing ideas, (Chaffee, Saphir, Graf, Sandvig, and Hahn, 2001; Garrett, 2009; Valentino, Banks, Hutchings, and Davis, 2009. Exposure to alternative opinions can foster political tolerance (Mutz, 2002; Price, Capella, & Nir, 2002) as well as stimulate more in-depth information seeking and critical examination of opposing viewpoints (Mendelberg, 2002, Nemeth, 1986).

**Reinforcing the cosmopolitan outlook.**

The reinforcing spirals model (Slater 2007, 2015) at its roots is based in attitude accessibility and its effects on identity creation and maintenance (Slater, 2015, p. 377). The active, on-going selection of attitude and identity consistent content creates and reinforces the accessibility of the attitudes and identities that prompted selective choice. The cosmopolitan outlook as an identity is one which supports open, tolerant attitudes
toward other cultures and ideas. This means that media selection should be to reinforce the attitude of openness, and pluralistic tolerance. However, just as the contact theory creates opportunity for reinforcement of negative attitudes, so does the RSM. While certainly a positive outcome of foreign media exposure would be the reinforcing of information seeking behavior and further exposure (upward spiral), the opposite may also happen. If someone is exposed to foreign media and reacts negatively, this should decrease their seeking behavior and decrease their engagement with the media, further emboldening their negative mindset. In this way, both the mediated and interpersonal theories suggest that there are “ideal” ways to interact with foreign culture, and there are possible downsides to unmoderated exposure.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

If schools, governments, and other entities are hoping to create a globally-focused population who share the cosmopolitan outlook, there are some interesting questions that arise when considering how to measure the success and effect of programs to instill these attitudes. What experiences can create or reinforce the cosmopolitan outlook? Are some experiences or interactions more impactful? Do some of the experiences affect some people more than others? The proposed model of cosmopolitanism from the first study suggests attitude change and reinforcement over time, so the first step in examining this process is establishing what experiences and interactions provide a predictive association.

*H1*. Intercultural experiences promote the cosmopolitan outlook.

*H1a*. Foreign media consumption promotes the cosmopolitan outlook.

*H1b*. Intercultural interpersonal experiences promote the cosmopolitan outlook.
$H1c$. Intercultural events and travel experiences promote the cosmopolitan outlook.

$H1d$. Intercultural academic experiences promote the cosmopolitan outlook.

$H2$. Less intimate interpersonal interactions or those lacking the formal structure for cultural exchange, like those found in daily academic situations, will have the least impact on cosmopolitanism.

$H3$. Intercultural experiences will have a smaller influence on cosmopolitanism among students with study abroad experience than among those without it.

RQ1. How do intercultural experiences influence the sub-dimensions of cosmopolitanism?

RQ2: How does social structure influence cosmopolitanism?

*Figure 4*. Theoretical model of relationships between the cosmopolitan outlook, intercultural experiences, and international study experience as proposed in the third hypothesis.
Method

Participants.

In order to assess the global competencies of the student body population, participants were gathered from the Ohio State University student body population in the spring semester of 2016 via an e-mail solicitation to participate in the survey. The sampling of Ohio State undergraduates was split into three strata: a) international students, b) U.S. undergraduates who have completed an education abroad, and c) U.S. undergraduates who have not studied abroad. A participation incentive was available to students (all survey participants were eligible to be entered into a drawing for the opportunity to win a $50 gift card). Responses where the participant took less time than one standard deviation from the mean or failed to correctly mark attention check questions were removed from the sample.

Sampling strategy.

With an estimated population size, required sample size was estimated and contacted based on a 15% rate of return. 3338 valid surveys were completed from the first wave (after a response rate of 21.3%). The survey was administered online using the survey software package Qualtrics. Institutional data of email addresses and first names was also used to send personalized email invites to sampled students over the duration of two weeks, with non-responding students receiving reminders every 48-72 hours. The final demographic makeup was 39% male and 60% female. 78% of the respondents were white, with 4% of both black and Hispanic respondents, 7% Asian, and 7% of other or mixed racial background.
Measures.

The survey questionnaire followed Claude Bennett's (1975) focus on outcome/impact of program evaluation with survey constructs/items corresponding to each of knowledge, attitudes, skills, and aspirations (KASA) of undergraduate experience outcomes. In particular, the focus was on five competencies of awareness of and adaptability to diverse cultures, perception and approaches; capability for effective communication across cultural and linguistic boundaries; familiarity with the major currents of global change and the issues they raise; ability to comprehend the international dimension of one’s field of study; and ability to work effectively in international settings. The 19-item scale of the cosmopolitan outlook was shortened to keep the overall survey length down, resulting in shortened versions of intercultural empathy (the items from perspective taking were not included), pluralism (two items were removed), and cultural competency (two items were removed).

The questionnaire consisted of approximately 100 close-ended items and a few open-ended items, with a target of no more than 20-22 minutes in average length. A common core set of questions was combined with specific questions customized to each stratum. In addition, this survey employed institutional data on survey respondents as well as other survey variables to identify how these competencies vary by student demographics, coursework, personal experience, social networks, co-curricular activities, colleges, and distinctions such as the Global Option.

Procedure.

After opting in to the survey via the e-mailed link, participants completed the 100-item survey online. Data were evaluated using the statistical package SPSS (IBM Corp.,
2016), using multiple regression analyses and Hayes (2013) PROCESS statistical macro for SPSS.

Results and Findings

Across survey respondents, demographic controls were tested and found significant in predicting cosmopolitanism ($R^2 = .180, F(5, 3338) = 140.80, p < .001$) and showed that women were found to typically be more cosmopolitan ($\beta = .092, r^2 = .007, p < .001$) as were respondents with more liberal social political ideology ($\beta = .241, r^2 = .058, p < .001$). Academic standing did correlate slightly with higher cosmopolitanism ($\beta = .086, r^2 = .003, p < .001$) as did race/ethnicity ($\beta = .054, r^2 = .002, p < .001$) which was dummy coded for white/Caucasians versus other ethnicities. All regression analyses were performed controlling for these demographics.

In order to assess what experiences influenced the development of the cosmopolitan outlook, a series of analyses were performed. Primary explorations examined various communication interactions with intercultural people or content, as designated within the survey. These were separated into interpersonal ($\alpha = .70, 4$ items), media ($\alpha = .75, 5$ items), events and travel ($\alpha = .69, 5$ items), and academic experiences ($\alpha = .72, 11$ items). Using hierarchical regression, these experiences were tested for their predictive value on the cosmopolitan outlook, as shown in Table 3. The cumulative effect of the four types of experiences on cosmopolitanism explained over 38% of the variance in cosmopolitanism among students ($R^2 = .380, F(4, 3338) = 64.695, p < .001$). As hypothesized, all four types of experiences did have an effect, and overall, the more intercultural interactions of any kind a student had, the higher their cosmopolitanism.
Table 3
Regression Analysis of Various Intercultural Experiences and Their Impact on the Cosmopolitan Outlook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.065 **</td>
<td>-.089 ***</td>
<td>-.066 ***</td>
<td>-.092 ***</td>
<td>-.074 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Year</td>
<td>.127 ***</td>
<td>.137 ***</td>
<td>.104 ***</td>
<td>.109 ***</td>
<td>.086 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Social Politics</td>
<td>.331 ***</td>
<td>.282 ***</td>
<td>.315 ***</td>
<td>.332 ***</td>
<td>.241 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.088 ***</td>
<td>.120 ***</td>
<td>.075 ***</td>
<td>.063 ***</td>
<td>.092 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity – White/Caucasian</td>
<td>.065 ***</td>
<td>.040 *</td>
<td>.061 ***</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.054 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Incremental Variance Explained</td>
<td>.180 ***</td>
<td>.180 ***</td>
<td>.180 ***</td>
<td>.180 ***</td>
<td>.180 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a lengthy conversation in a foreign language</td>
<td>.068 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a lengthy conversation with someone from another country</td>
<td>.153 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.082 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a lengthy conversation with a non-native English speaker</td>
<td>.096 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.051 *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of close friends who are from a different country or culture</td>
<td>.067 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.051 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Incremental Variance Explained</td>
<td>.077 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.014 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Media Consumption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watched foreign movies, TV programs, or shows without subtitles</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-.049 *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid attention to news about international issues and happenings</td>
<td>.159 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.121 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listened to music from other countries or regions</td>
<td>.156 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.086 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watched foreign movies, TV programs, or shows with subtitles</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid attention to news about issues and happenings in other countries</td>
<td>.178 ***</td>
<td>.160 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Incremental Variance Explained</td>
<td>.140 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.061 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Events and Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in events or activities sponsored by groups from a different national heritage or culture</td>
<td>.130 ***</td>
<td>.069 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended a lecture/workshop/campus discussion on international/global issues</td>
<td>.101 ***</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ate new international cuisine for the first time</td>
<td>.134 ***</td>
<td>.062 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of international travel (not including trips to Canada)</td>
<td>.070 ***</td>
<td>.042 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personally made international travel arrangements</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Incremental Variance Explained</td>
<td>.082 ***</td>
<td>.009 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Academic Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had classmates from other countries</td>
<td>-.110 ***</td>
<td>-.094 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with international classmates on group projects</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.034 *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had international examples presented in class</td>
<td>.062 ***</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had faculty from other countries as an instructor(s)</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had class TA(s) from other countries</td>
<td>-.094 ***</td>
<td>-.073 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took classes with a substantial amount of international content</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 3338, *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p ≤ .001.
In order to assess whether academic intercultural experiences would be the weakest predictor of cosmopolitanism, the standardized beta coefficient of each type of experience was tested for statistically significant difference from the others. Their respective 95% confidence intervals were estimated via bias corrected bootstrapping with 1000 resamples and they were checked for any occurrence of overlapping above 50%, which would prove them not significantly different ($p > .05$; Cumming, 2009). The only overlapping of coefficients was between interpersonal interactions ($\beta = .117$, 95 % CI [.160, .107], $R^2\Delta = .014$, $F\Delta = 17.36$, $p < .001$) and intercultural events and travel ($\beta = .146$, 95 % CI [.107, .189], $R^2\Delta = .014$, $F\Delta = 17.36$, $p < .001$). This overlapping was above 50% (.160 > .126; $p > .05$), suggesting the two types share much of the same variance and are not statistically different from each other. However, they did exhibit significant difference from the other two types of experiences. Interactions produced the weakest positive effects, and in some cases actually had negative effects, like the “non-ideal” daily interpersonal interactions more common in academic settings ($\beta = -.093$, 95 % CI [-.127, -.058], $R^2\Delta = .025$, $F\Delta = 11.80$, $p < .001$). The strongest predictor for
the cosmopolitan outlook was foreign media consumption ($\beta = .232$, 95% CI [.193, .269], $R^2\Delta = .061$, $F\Delta = 62.83$, $p < .001$). These findings support the second hypothesis in this study.

The trends for influence of the different types of intercultural experiences on the cosmopolitan outlook were examined in a series of regression and moderation analyses according to students’ international status and study abroad experience. Students were compared using Hayes’ (2013) PROCESS procedure in SPSS. There was a dampening effect found for students with study abroad experience versus typical domestic students without study abroad experience for three of the four types of intercultural experiences. The negative effect of academic experiences on cosmopolitanism had a larger impact on typical American students than those with international study experience, $R^2\Delta = .002$, $F\Delta(11,3338) = 7.852$, $p = .005$, $\beta = -.224$, $t(3338) = -2.802$, $p < .001$, see Figure 5. But interestingly this is because students without study abroad experience have a higher baseline cosmopolitanism. Next, the interaction between interpersonal interactions and the cosmopolitan outlook was examined and also accounted for a proportion of the variance between these groups, $R^2\Delta = .005$, $F\Delta(11,3338) = 6.246$, $p = .013$, $\beta = .274$, $t(3338) = 4.868$, $p < .001$, see Figure 6.

This same reducing effect for students with international study experience was also found within the relationship between interpersonal interactions and cosmopolitanism, $R^2\Delta = .001$, $F\Delta(11,3338) = 6.761$, $p = .009$, $\beta = .120$, $t(3338) = 4.868$, $p < .001$, see Figure 7. Students with study abroad experience showed a muting effect from intercultural experiences on their overall cosmopolitanism while domestic students
showed greater variance in their overall cosmopolitanism due to intercultural experiences. These findings support the third hypotheses of this study.

Figure 5. Moderating effect for study abroad experience on the relationship between academic intercultural experiences and cosmopolitanism.

Figure 6. Moderating effect for study abroad experience on the relationship between interpersonal experiences and cosmopolitanism.
Finally, I explored research questions posed in this project. First, I looked at the impact of these intercultural experiences on the dimensions of cosmopolitanism. Hierarchical regressions with all the intercultural experiences were run on each sub-dimension. While there is not a large amount of variation among the different measures across sub-dimensions, the results do point to the interrelatedness of the concepts. The places where the effects are notably different highlights the important differences in what it takes to cultivate the complete cosmopolitan outlook, as shown in Table 4.

The inclusion of these four sub-dimensions was to gain a better, comprehensive view of a global mindset, so the places of significant variance would certainly seem to imply that this measure allows for discrete distinction that other scales have not been able to provide. For example, the demographic controls are generally the same across dimensions, except for on pluralism, where it explains far more of the variance, $R^2\Delta = .137$, $F(5,3338) = 101.50, p < .001$. Specifically, social political leanings provide
Table 4
Regression Analysis of Various Intercultural Experiences and Their Impact on the Four Dimensions of the Cosmopolitan Outlook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Superordinate Identification</th>
<th>Cultural Competency</th>
<th>Intercultural Empathy</th>
<th>Pluralism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.054 *</td>
<td>-.021 *</td>
<td>-.049 *</td>
<td>-.070 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Year</td>
<td>.055 *</td>
<td>.085 ***</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.094 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Social Politics</td>
<td>.184 ***</td>
<td>.084 ***</td>
<td>.130 ***</td>
<td>.247 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.078 ***</td>
<td>-.132 ***</td>
<td>.095 ***</td>
<td>.134 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity – White/Caucasian</td>
<td>.037 *</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.071 ***</td>
<td>.038 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Incremental Variance Explained</td>
<td>.094 ***</td>
<td>.093 ***</td>
<td>.093 ***</td>
<td>.137 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a lengthy conversation in a foreign language</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a lengthy conversation with someone from another country</td>
<td>.056 *</td>
<td>.044 *</td>
<td>.070 ***</td>
<td>.061 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a lengthy conversation with a non-native English speaker</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.049 *</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of close friends who are from a different country or culture</td>
<td>.038 *</td>
<td>.038 *</td>
<td>.036 *</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Incremental Variance Explained</td>
<td>.038 ***</td>
<td>.063 ***</td>
<td>.074 ***</td>
<td>.016 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Media Consumption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watched foreign movies, TV programs, or shows without subtitles</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.085 ***</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.060 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid attention to news about international issues and happenings</td>
<td>.064 *</td>
<td>.102 ***</td>
<td>.131 ***</td>
<td>.067 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listened to music from other countries or regions</td>
<td>.076 ***</td>
<td>.046 *</td>
<td>.047 *</td>
<td>.068 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watched foreign movies, TV programs, or shows with subtitles</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid attention to news about issues and happenings in other countries</td>
<td>.076 **</td>
<td>.179 ***</td>
<td>.261 ***</td>
<td>-.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Incremental Variance Explained</td>
<td>.031 ***</td>
<td>.085 ***</td>
<td>.146 ***</td>
<td>.009 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Events and Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in events or activities sponsored by groups from a different national heritage or culture</td>
<td>.074 ***</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.044 *</td>
<td>.048 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended a lecture/workshop/campus discussion on international/global issues</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-.038 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ate new international cuisine or dishes for the first time</td>
<td>.058 **</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.045 **</td>
<td>.060 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of international travel (not including trips to Canada)</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.073 ***</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personally made international travel arrangements</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.035 *</td>
<td>-.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Incremental Variance Explained</td>
<td>.009 ***</td>
<td>.008 ***</td>
<td>.008 ***</td>
<td>.005 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 3338, *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p ≤ .001.
(continued)
Table 4 (continued)
Regression Analysis of Various Intercultural Experiences and Their Impact on the Four Dimensions of the Cosmopolitan Outlook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Superordinate Identification</th>
<th>Cultural Competency</th>
<th>Intercultural Empathy</th>
<th>Pluralism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Had classmates from other countries</td>
<td>-0.072 ***</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>-0.072 ***</td>
<td>-0.082 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with international classmates on group projects</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>-0.067 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had international examples presented in class</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.033 *</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had faculty from other countries as an instructor(s)</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-0.045 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had class TA(s) from other countries</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>-0.051 **</td>
<td>-0.099 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took classes with a substantial amount of international content</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took a foreign language course</td>
<td>0.044 *</td>
<td>0.045 *</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took a course focused on a particular country or region of the world other than a language course</td>
<td>-0.041 *</td>
<td>0.049 **</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took a course focused on significant global/international issues and problems</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.083 ***</td>
<td>0.068 ***</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took a course taught by a professor from another country</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took a course with one or more TAs from another country</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage Incremental Variance Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Incremental Variance Explained</th>
<th>.010 ***</th>
<th>.017 ***</th>
<th>.017 ***</th>
<th>.033 ***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Total Variance Explained</td>
<td>.182 ***</td>
<td>.260 ***</td>
<td>.338 ***</td>
<td>.200 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 3338, *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p ≤ .001.

almost half of that, with 5.4% of unique variance attributed to it, p < .001. Similarly, while foreign media consumption certainly provides variance on three of the sub-dimensions, it explains almost twice as much variance on intercultural empathy than the next closest dimension, $R^2Δ = .146$, $F(14,3338) = 103.89$, $p < .001$. Consuming international and foreign news stories was especially interesting across the sub-dimensions, explaining anywhere between no significant amount to 3.1% of unique variance, $p < .001$.

Academic experiences seem to have the most consistent negative impact. The greatest explanatory proportion for these classroom and course-based interactions is on
pluralism, where it provides 3.3% of unique variance, $p < .001$. In particular, more interaction with international classmates and teaching assistants together provide a third of that variance, with 1.1% explained by these interactions, $p < .001$. While the previously explored beta coefficients implied that academic experiences have the smallest impact overall on cosmopolitanism, it was intercultural events and travel that explained the smallest variance on each sub-dimension, consistently explaining just under one percent for each. This makes the assertion of the second hypothesis more intriguing and certainly more complicated.

To explore the second research question, the origin countries of international students surveyed were grouped according to Fearon’s (2003) ethnic and cultural diversity listing and Alesina et al’s (2003) ethnic fractionalization list to compare levels of national social openness on cosmopolitanism. Placement on both lists was averaged and placed into categories of degree for this exploratory analysis due to lower sample sizes by nationality. The lower overall mean score of the cosmopolitan outlook for international students was perplexing until these results highlighted that indeed societies with more ethnically diverse populations had higher levels of cosmopolitanism, as seen in Table 5, and that the largest-by-far national sample was drawn from China ($N = 217$), a low diversity country. This may also account for the lower overall cosmopolitanism in the interactions and the positive correlation between white/Caucasian race and cosmopolitanism. When these students were removed from the sample, this relationship was found to disappear.
Table 5

Mean Values of Cosmopolitanism Across Study Abroad Experience and National Diversity Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>3338</td>
<td>3.89(.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Students without Study Abroad</td>
<td>2032</td>
<td>3.84(.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Students with Study Abroad</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>4.05(.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Students</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>3.71(.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High National Cultural and Ethnic Diversity †</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.89(.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium National Cultural and Ethnic Diversity †</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.81(.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low National Cultural and Ethnic Diversity †</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>3.69(.38)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Cosmopolitanism was standardized in this comparison. †According to Fearon (2003) and Alesina et al (2003).

Discussion

The two aims of this study were to validate the conceptualization and measurements presented in the first study and to further conceptualize the influencing factors and experiences that create and reinforce the cosmopolitan outlook. Below, I describe the relationships identified in this study and their impact on the overall concept of cosmopolitanism as well as its four sub-dimensions. I then discuss the implications of these relationships and the strengths and limitations of the study.

The concept of cosmopolitanism can be interpreted as representing a unique set of attitudes and behaviors along the four identified sub-dimensions in the first study. This is further supported by the demonstration in this study of its relation and divergence from similar concepts, like national identity, national chauvinism, and cultural knowledge. Cosmopolitanism followed the same trends with the other concepts, illustrating its divergent and convergent validity. The four sub-dimensions of cosmopolitanism allow for a more nuanced and robust representation of the highly prized “global mindset” from
these other concepts. From this study, the findings reveal particularly interesting relationships with the development and reinforcement of the cosmopolitan outlook.

As expected, cosmopolitanism is affected by intercultural experiences of many kinds, and those experiences can be impacted by individual experiential differences as well. In this study sample, the goals of the university’s programming were to increase global-mindedness by providing both structured and organic opportunities for students to engage with various intercultural experiences over the course of their career. Though these encounters are intended to be a positive influence, some of them have demonstrated a negative relationship with overall cosmopolitanism and the individual dimensions of it. Many of the academic experiences and their negative impact on the cosmopolitan outlook should be particularly worrying for administrators. While the contact theory stressed the need for the best possible settings for interactions, these results certainly indicate that experiences can reinforce both positively and negatively and that these everyday, non-ideal interactions add up. As Dixon, Durrheim, and Tredoux (2005) noted, “in the absence of detailed information about these kinds of banal contacts, social psychologists cannot begin to understand wider implications […] or formulate realistic programs of social intervention” (p. 704).

Interpersonal interactions were found to be significant for each group, but the variation in their impact both for each possible kind and across sub-dimensions would seem to point to another of the “failings” of contact theory Dixon et al. warned about. They found that many of the ways in which “quality” interactions are measured are inadequate, and the most common and egregious error is disregarding the participant’s own sense-making of their encounters with others (p. 701). This is evident where daily
interactions with international classmates, groupmate, or teaching assistants can create an overall lower cosmopolitan outlook and significantly negatively impact intercultural pluralism, empathy, and identity. However, these banal encounters can serve for the good, as shown with the impact of media consumption. The most unique positive impact came from foreign media, and in particular listening to foreign music and watching international news coverage.

The impact of everyday experiences also comes into play with the impact of societal and personal cultural openness and its impact on cosmopolitanism. As noted in the RSM, a system which is open to external factors, or a social or personal culture where exposure to other cultures is allowed or encouraged, is more likely to result in positive spirals (Slater, 2007, pp. 288-290). While international students had a lower overall level of cosmopolitanism, exploratory analyses demonstrated that at a national level, international students coming from a more culturally diverse society predicted higher levels of cosmopolitanism. At a personal level, more frequent viewing of international news, more friends of other cultures, and more international travel also predicted higher levels of cosmopolitanism. The surrounding system and culture can impact the choice of engaging with cultural others and their products like media and events, the outcome of which can act as a dampener or a boost for attitude maintenance or exploration.

A place particularly ripe for future study is looking into the factors underlying these specific individual and social influences. For example, the impact of demographics on pluralism could represent the strong influence of social political leanings on pluralistic and interculturally tolerant attitudes. Conversely, the influence of foreign media consumption on intercultural empathy could be interpreted as the influence of narrative
on creating perspective-taking and empathy that can bridge cultural divides. These differing impacts on overall cosmopolitanism display how experiences might be able to be used to develop cross-cultural attitudes and how the cosmopolitan scale should provide a better measurement tool for scholars and program administrators alike in determining how those attitudes are formed and impacted.

This study provided a good validation for the scale developed for the cosmopolitan outlook. However, there were some limitations. While the population was more diverse than in the factor analysis and scale development study, it still represented a student population. Also, an important part of the model of cosmopolitanism is a reinforcing effect over time. While establishing the influence of these experiences and their predictive association with cosmopolitism, to demonstrate a true reinforcing or developing relationship, the robust and necessary depth of longitudinal, multi-wave data would be required to truly examine the iterative process (Slater, 2015, p.385). While longitudinal data would be the richest and most relevant to an analysis of the full reinforcing relationship as theorized, the logistical and expense considerations make that endeavor one best suited for future research.
Chapter 4 – Conclusion and Discussion

Conclusions

The goal in undertaking this research was to explore key questions that had been largely left unanswered or unexplored. With the reconceptualization and new operationalization of the cosmopolitan outlook as discussed here, researchers have better footing to start finding answers. In this discussion, I will address the findings from the studies conducted in this pursuit, as well as the implications, limitations, and future research possibilities offered from these inquiries.

The initial questions that drove me to these analyses were centered on understanding the process of cultural consumption and interaction. With the world engaging in ever more apparent cultural power struggles, the importance of recognizing what factors matter and how they create or affect changing attitudes and behaviors is only growing. At this moment in history, understanding that process is becoming vital. The first step to address this lack of understanding was in identifying the weaknesses of the current body of research and providing a new approach to better explain both the concepts and their impact. Testing the new conceptual grounding in the first study and factor analysis demonstrated that previous attempts to correctly identify the full facets of a global mindset were not adequate. The further conceptual relationships demonstrated in the second study establish the benefit this scale and concept can provide, with a more nuanced and robust measure of intercultural knowledge and ability.
Following this reconceptualization, identifying and testing new theoretical relationships means that the cosmopolitan outlook can not only be a better measure than previous research was able to use, but now it can also explain and predict the paths people with intercultural exposures or experiences can take. The connections between intercultural experiences and the cosmopolitan outlook have been demonstrated. When considering if the consumption of intercultural products changes attitudes or opinions of other cultures over time, further studies should seek to provide evidence that this iterative process is present and works as theorized.

With this reconceptualization of the cosmopolitan outlook and the theorized model of relationships with communication behavior, there were seven propositions offered. The first proposition states that cosmopolitanism should be a cross-culturally valid measure. While these studies were not directly testing this proposition, the measure’s variance in Study 2 within an international student population correlates with this premise. The scale was consistent in assessing cosmopolitan levels, though there was a relationship with nationality. This largely served as a measure of the level of ethnic openness of the society to which the participant belonged and was demonstrated with a correlation of overall cosmopolitanism levels across countries of similar levels of ethnic diversity and cultural tolerance. For example, mean scores of cosmopolitanism were similar for respondents from Canada ($M = 3.77; SD = .462$) and Malaysia ($M = 3.80; SD = .330$). This is a good indicator of cross-cultural accuracy, as they are ranked 59th and 60th (respectively) in Fearon’s(2003) ethnic and cultural diversity listing, with similar rankings on Alesina et al’s (2003) ethnic fractionalization list. However, there are some cross-cultural issues that need to be assessed with scales that are sensitive to social
desirability influences. For example, while the socially desirable answer to many
tolerance items may be to err more generously in the United States, places like Saudi
Arabia, where the Wahhabi government has a vested interest in derogating other
ethnicities and cultures, would show a socially desirable shift to less tolerant statements.
Still, this proposition needs further exploration in order to establish robustness.

The second proposition stated that there are three forms of cosmopolitanism—
motivated, banal, and counter-cosmopolitanism—related to motivation and strength of
identification on each of the four measures. The conceptualization and measurement
validation in Study 1 was designed to account for motivation through mindfulness and
interest in intercultural experiences. The second study did not have motivation or
mindfulness measures, which made it impossible to establish these relationships.
However, further studies can explore these moderators by employing the proposed scales,
which were tested for reliability in several small samples in the first study. Similarly,
demonstrating a relationship with motivation and mindfulness would require a large
sample and a sophisticated design to truly capture both the proposed types of
cosmopolitanism as well as exploring and establishing the mechanisms within the
proposed model.

Implications

With this body of work indicating cosmopolitanism can influence both
interpersonal and mediated behavior as well as reinforcement of identity-consistent
attitudes, there are a variety of further implications. This conceptualization provides an
explanation for how communication behavior can impact attitudes about other cultures.
Devine (1989) has shown that desire for control of prejudice creates lower stereotype
activation. Moskowitz did several studies to show that having egalitarian goals creates preconscious control of stereotype activation (Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000; Moskowitz, 2010; Moskowitz et al, 1999; Moskowitz et al, 2011). It follows then that cosmopolitans who engage in mindful intercultural interactions and hold the traits of being cosmopolitan could actively push back against stereotyping, further deepening the possible cognitive, behavioral, and attitudinal interactions.

Another important implication from these studies is in the results from the second study on experiences and cosmopolitanism, where mediated communication behavior showed a stronger impact than interpersonal interactions—a finding certainly worth further exploration. The same data also showed that the quality of the interpersonal contact was far more important than the quantity, again demonstrating the accuracy of the contact theory, but also its limitations (Dixon, Durrheim, & Tredoux, 2005). Chronic interpersonal interactions with another culture which are not in the “idealised” format of contact theory may represent an avenue for a downward spiral of negative reinforcement. Conversely, if intercultural media has the ability to create a stronger influence on reinforcing the cosmopolitan outlook, an upwards spiral may be related to the more unobtrusive nature of ubiquitous foreign entertainment and informational media.

**Limitations and Future Research**

Considering the newness of both the conceptual and theoretical offerings, it might be best to think of these studies as pilot tests, providing initial and provisional results. In order to more robustly examine both concepts and theoretical models, dynamic and thorough longitudinal studies with replications are needed. Well-designed multi-wave data with time points, cosmopolitanism, and media exposures documented would provide
a resilient within-subjects design. Time points would need to be targeted differently depending on the conceptualization as a downward (exposure creating attitude change) or upward (attitude creating exposure change) spiral (Slater, 2015, p. 391). This should provide a true demonstration of the effect of the cosmopolitan outlook on selective exposure, as well as the reinforcement of exposure on cosmopolitan values over time.

Relatedly, while surveys tend to be the fallback for social scientists, there is evidence to suggest that there are better ways to examine selective exposure effects (see Clay, Barber, and Shook, 2013; Garrett, 2013; Feldman, Stroud, Bimber, Wojcieszak, 2013). Self-report measures often confound selective exposure with selective recall or attention (Clay et al, 2013, p. 153). This demonstrates why a research paradigm measuring selective exposure through observed behavior can be more accurate than one relying on self-reporting in surveys. Still, there are issues that come from observed behavior modeling, the least of which is the concern over privacy and monitoring. Though technology has provided advances in observing behavior, there are still limitations on the mock-up versus real-world options (see Clay et al, 2013 for their discussion, pp. 157-159). Of particular note for the entertainment media aspect of this problem is the role of multitasking and distraction present in real-world media use, so further studies could use multitasking elements or larger selection variation to increase ecological validity.

Finally, a cross-cultural examination of the concept and the proposed model of selection and reinforcement should be applied to fully validate them. The conceptualization of cosmopolitanism should not change with each cultural application. It is, as theorized, a transnational set of values. There is nothing inherently “Western”
about cosmopolitanism, though an argument for development or modernization could be made (Appiah, 2006, p. 172). However, understanding the context in which populations are operating, both culturally and for media, is important in being able to place the occurrence of the orientation and the effects on media and attitudes on a larger, generalizable scale. There has already been an acknowledgement of the complexities of cross-national comparative research in this modern age of globalization (Georgiou, 2012, p. 365). As discussed here, understanding the contextual nature of outside influences, like media and social systems, represents controls from local, national, and transnational levels (p. 366). Particularly when examining the effects of globalization, it is important to address the problems Ulrich Beck identified as “methodological nationalism,” whereby the cross-national data is not only organized by but often defaulted to national identities, national values, and nation-based concepts (Beck, 2006, p. 75). Georgiou (2012) offers the elements of conducting cross-national research with the cosmopolitan outlook in mind through three ideas: considering transnational connections, acknowledging juxtapositions of inherent differences in a globalized society, and reflecting on methods to accurately measure flexible and fluid identities and belonging (pp. 371-372).

Meanwhile, Teer-Tomaselli and Dyll-Myklebust (2012) support the importance of time, contextual space, and influences in understanding the changes essential to globalization and the cosmopolitan outlook. They specifically identify the mediagraphy, or ethnographic study of media use, to fully identify complex systems of values, media use, and reinforcement that occur for cosmopolitan, cross-national studies (p. 468).

Cosmopolitanism has been a concept largely held in the Western-centric halls of academia. Showing that the concept can hold up across cultures is important both for its
conceptualization as a reaction to globalization and for its role of it in the selection of foreign entertainment media. The studies here were conducted with samples that followed the unfortunate WEIRD skew: Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic (Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010). This is also what probably largely confounded the proposed third stratification of the cosmopolitan outlook. As the participants involved in these studies were largely young college students, the number of truly counter-cosmopolitans would be small, as counter-cosmopolitanism represents a fairly strong rejection of cultural tolerance and interest in others. These are difficult mindsets to have at a large public university in a large, Midwestern city. Cross-cultural validation of the concept and process would be an important step in understanding the true nature of cosmopolitanism, and how it effects media consumption and intercultural attitudes and values on a global scale.

The cosmopolitan outlook is a reaction to the pressures of globalization. As the world is compressed through ever-growing interdependent pressures, one answer is to embrace cultural pluralism, with openness to other ways-of-life, an interest in gaining cultural competency, showing empathy with foreign cultures, and being able to identify within and above local, national, and personal identities. My conceptualization provides several significant solutions that allow cosmopolitanism to become the identifiable and predictive trait it should be. Future research should take advantage of the relationships both theorized and demonstrated here and further develop the opportunities to address the complex and still somewhat obfuscated nature of interpersonal and mediated communication experiences and intercultural attitudes.
The theoretical relationships between intercultural motivations, cosmopolitanism, foreign media consumption, and attitudes toward foreign cultures proposed here will provide new avenues of measurement and assessment of both intentional and unintentional exposure to foreign media and cultural products. This new framework provides insight into foreign media consumption and selection and their effects, as well as opening up a new way to view intercultural experiences and their effects. There are numerous applications possible, from educational aims and international diplomacy to international marketing endeavors. Through all of these possible areas of application lies the importance of cultivating openness and understanding of difference. As always, there is opportunity for understanding if we mindfully seek the answers: “Understanding is essential in hearing well-spoken words; concentration, essential for learning and understanding” (Kimsila Sutta: Right Conduct, Sn 2.9).
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