

## **Inclusive Global Citizenship Education: Measuring Types of Global Citizens**

**Iva Katzarska-Miller**

*Associate Professor*  
*Transylvania University Kentucky*  
*United States*

**Stephen Reysen, Ph.D.**

*Associate Professor*  
*Texas A&M University-Commerce*  
*United States*

*Keywords: global citizen, measure, environment, culture, moral, spiritual*

**ABSTRACT:** In three studies, we constructed and provided initial evidence of validity for a measure of types of global citizenship. Oxley and Morris (2013) proposed eight different types of global citizens based on prior theory (e.g., moral, economic). In Study 1, we constructed and examined the factor structure of a measure of these different types. With the exception of a social dimension of global citizenship, all of the proposed types appeared to be distinct factors. In Study 2, we found the – same factor structure in a different sample of participants and examined associations between the dimensions and prosocial values related to global citizenship (e.g., social justice, intergroup helping). Lastly, in Study 3 we examined the associations between the seven different types of global citizenship, different types of intended activist behaviours, and various values (e.g., moral foundations, core political values). Together, the results suggest that the measure of global citizen types is a valid and reliable measure.

### **Measuring Types of Global Citizens**

---

The concept of global citizenship is widely discussed across academic disciplines, and has recently received some attention in psychology as well (Reysen & Katzarska-Miller, 2013a). Following different theoretical perspectives within discrete disciplinary frameworks, global citizenship has been conceptualized in various ways and forms, oftentimes conflicting and converging (Oxley & Morris, 2013). For example, Falk (1994) distinguishes between two conflicting approaches to global citizenship, which he calls globalization from above and globalization from below. The globalization from above is a

hegemonic, dominant form that is based on consumerist ideals and is identified with political elites and transnational businesses. The globalization from below is a reactionary activism to the former and “consists of an array of transnational social forces animated by environmental concerns, human rights, hostility to patriarchy, and a vision of human community based on the unity of diverse cultures seeking an end to poverty, oppression, humiliation, and collective violence” (p. 39). The former connotes a “negative,” and the latter a “positive” evaluation of global citizenship. Currently, the majority of definitions of global citizenship tend to have converging elements with Falk’s (1994) conceptualization of globalization from below. For example, Morais and Ogden (2011) conceptualize global citizenship as having three overlapping dimensions: social responsibility, global competence, and global civic engagement. Similarly, Reysen, Larey, and Katzarska-Miller (2012) define global citizenship as global awareness, caring, embracing cultural diversity, promoting social justice and sustainability, and a sense of responsibility to act. Regardless of the overlap between these definitions, one can argue that one’s perception of themselves as a global citizen may be more strongly aligned along one dimension of the definition (e.g., social justice, sustainability). Furthermore, global civic engagement can be a result of different ideological underpinnings (e.g., political, moral).

## Global Citizenship Types

---

Oxley and Morris (2013) reviewed the literature regarding global citizenship and proposed a typology identifying and distinguishing the diversity of conceptions prevalent in the literature. Positioned within two broad categories, cosmopolitan and advocacy types, Oxley and Morris propose eight different types of global citizenship. Under a cosmopolitan framework (a universalist form of global citizenship), they include political, moral, economic, and cultural types of global citizenship. Under an advocacy framework (anti-individualistic ideologies that are advocacy oriented), they include social, critical, environmental, and spiritual types of global citizenship. *Political global citizenship* is related to citizenship as political status and is manifested in a global governance system that promotes democracy and the utilization of international organizations in maintaining a well-organized world society. *Moral global citizenship* is based on shared understanding of a universal moral code, with particular emphasis on human rights. *Economic global citizenship* focuses on economic international development, and the effects of free markets and corporations. *Cultural global citizenship* encompasses exposure, awareness, and cultural competence in regard to diverse groups and values. *Social global citizenship* focuses on a global civil society and advocacy for one’s freedom of expression. *Critical global citizenship* is based on activism that challenges oppression and focuses on breaking down oppressive global structures. *Environmental global citizenship* advocates changes in the treatment and responsibility of humans to nature. *Spiritual global citizenship* focuses on the transcendent bond between individuals and society, encompassing caring, and spiritual connections between humans.

## Correlates of Global Citizenship Identification

---

Although Oxley and Morris (2013) did not conceptualize the eight types of global citizenship in terms of prosocial outcomes, the majority of current research on global citizenship identification supports an association between global citizen identification and prosocial values. For example, Reysen, Pierce, Spencer, and Katzarska-Miller (2013) examined the content of global citizenship by reviewing students' definitions of global citizenship, themes found in interviews with self-described global citizens, and global education literature theorists. Across the three types of investigation, the authors concluded that the main content of global citizenship is a concern for the environment, valuing of diversity, empathy for others beyond the local environment, and a sense of responsibility to act. Furthermore, global citizenship identification was positively associated with the above-mentioned prosocial values. Subsequent studies have further demonstrated the empirical association between global citizenship identification and prosocial values (e.g., Katzarska-Miller, Barnsley, & Reysen, 2014; Reysen & Hackett, 2017; Reysen & Katzarska-Miller, 2013b, 2013c, in press; Reysen, Katzarska-Miller, Gibson, & Hobson, 2013).

The above studies show that global citizenship correlates with a cluster of prosocial values. In regard to types of global citizenship, one question is whether one's perception of themselves as a global citizen is aligned along a particular dimension or type. In other words, will a person who views themselves through the lens of one particular type of global citizenship only endorse prosocial values related to that type or will the person endorse all the other prosocial values typically found to be outcomes of global citizenship identification? For example, if one's global citizenship is the environmental type, is endorsement of environmental global citizenship correlated only with values associated with environmentalism (e.g., concern for the environment, responsibility to act), or with the whole cluster of prosocial values (e.g., intergroup empathy, valuing diversity, etc.)? The question posed here is comparable to the research on feminism showing that under the broad term of feminism there are different perspectives (e.g., conservative, liberal, radical, etc.) and one's identification with a particular perspective is correlated with a different set of attitudes (Henley, Spalding, & Kosta, 2000). The objective of the present research is to explore the measurement of different types of global citizens and examine the relationships with various prosocial values and intended behaviours.

## Overview of Present Studies

---

In three studies we set out to develop and empirically test a scale reflecting the eight global citizenship types proposed by Oxley and Morris (2013). In Study 1, we started with 80 items reflecting global citizenship types, and reduced these initial items through exploratory principle components analyses. The purpose of Study 2 was to conduct a factor analysis on the global citizen type scale, and examine initial convergent and divergent

validity. The purpose of Study 3 was to examine convergent, divergent, and predictive validity of the global citizen type scale.

## Study 1

---

The purpose of Study 1 is to reduce the initial pool of 80 items reflecting global citizen types through exploratory principle components analyses. Based on the dimensions proposed by Oxley and Morris (2013) we expect to find eight distinct factors.

### *Method*

#### **Participants and Procedure**

Participants ( $N = 957$ , 52% female;  $M_{age} = 36.43$ ,  $SD = 13.21$ ) included Americans recruited from Amazon's Mechanical Turk. Mechanical Turk is an online labour market where individuals can complete tasks for money. In recent years this website has been a popular tool for data collection (for more information see Paolacci & Chandler, 2014). Each participant indicated their ethnic/racial identity as White (75.9%), African American (9.2%), Asian/South Pacific Islander (6.3%), Hispanic (4.7%), multiracial (1.8%), Indigenous Peoples (1.4%), Arab/Middle Eastern (.3%), Central Asian/Indian/Pakistani (.3%), or other (.2%). Participants completed the initial set of items tapping components of global citizen types and reported demographic information.

#### **Materials**

We constructed 80 initial items to tap the types of global citizens as described by Oxley and Morris (2013). The initial measure contained 10 items per construct (i.e., environmental, political, economic, spiritual, cultural, critical, moral, and social). The measure used a 7-point Likert-type response scale, from 1 = *strongly agree* to 7 = *strongly disagree*.

#### **Results and Discussion**

To examine the factor structure of the global citizen types measure we conducted a series of principle components analyses (oblimin rotation) with the initial 80 items. After removing items that cross-loaded or showed low factor loadings ( $> |.50|$ ), seven factors remained. The items initially constructed to tap the "social" dimension of global citizenship did not emerge as a separate factor. Therefore, the social items were removed from the analyses. The remaining seven factors (28 items) comprised the final global citizen types scale (see Table 1 for items). As shown in Table 2, the items loaded on factors representing environmental, political, economic, spiritual, cultural, critical, and moral types of global citizenship. The factors tended to positively correlate with one another (see Table 3), with the exception of the economic subscale. The economic global

citizen type measure was negatively related to environmental, cultural, and critical types of global citizens.

Overall, seven of the eight proposed factors were observed. The items tapping the social dimension of global citizenship overlapped with cultural and moral dimensions of global citizenship. Although this result may be due to the items constructed to tap the social dimension, the result may also be due to the theoretical similarity of these dimensions as described by Oxley and Morris (2013). With a final set of items following the exploratory analyses, we constructed a second study with a different sample of participants to conduct a factor analysis.

## Study 2

---

The purpose of Study 2 is to conduct a factor analysis on the global citizen types scale, and examine initial convergent and divergent validity. Convergent validity will be shown via positive correlations between the global citizen type subscales and variables related (e.g., global citizenship identification) to global citizenship identified in prior research (Reysen & Katzarska-Miller, 2013b). Divergent validity will be shown via non-significant correlations between the types measures and a measure of social desirability. Furthermore, we examine the relationship between the subscales and characteristics of participants (e.g., political orientation, age).

### *Method*

#### **Participants and Procedure**

Participants ( $N = 555$ , 54.1% female;  $M_{\text{age}} = 37.02$ ,  $SD = 12.96$ ) included Americans recruited from Amazon's Mechanical Turk. Each participant indicated their ethnic/racial identity as White (76.2%), African American (8.3%), Hispanic (5.4%), Asian/South Pacific Islander (5.2%), multiracial (2.9%), Indigenous Peoples (.5%), Arab/Middle Eastern (.5%), Central Asian/Indian/Pakistani (.5%), or other (.4%). Participants completed the revised global citizen types measure from Study 1, global citizenship identification, outcomes of global citizenship identification, social desirability, and reported demographic information. Unless noted otherwise, all measures used a 7-point Likert-type response scale, from 1 = *strongly agree* to 7 = *strongly disagree*.

#### **Materials**

**Global citizen types scale.** The 28 items derived from the initial items administered in Study 1 were included in Study 2 to examine the factor structure (see Table 2 for subscale reliability).

**Global citizenship identification.** Two items (e.g., "I strongly identify with global citizens") were adapted from prior research (Reysen & Katzarska-Miller, 2013b; Reysen,

Katzarska-Miller, Nesbit, & Pierce, 2013) to assess identification with global citizens ( $\alpha = .95$ ).

**Global citizenship outcomes.** To assess outcomes of global citizenship identification we adopted six 2-item measures from Reysen and Katzarska-Miller (2013b). The outcomes include intergroup empathy (e.g., “I am able to empathize with people from other countries,”  $\alpha = .83$ ), valuing diversity (e.g., “I would like to join groups that emphasize getting to know people from different countries,”  $\alpha = .80$ ), social justice (e.g., “Countries that are well off should help people in countries who are less fortunate,”  $\alpha = .72$ ), environmental sustainability (e.g., “People have a responsibility to conserve natural resources to foster a sustainable environment,”  $\alpha = .83$ ), intergroup helping (e.g., “If I could, I would dedicate my life to helping others no matter what country they are from,”  $\alpha = .81$ ), and feeling responsibility to act (e.g., “Being actively involved in global issues is my responsibility,”  $\alpha = .85$ ).

**Social desirability.** To assess socially desirable responding we adopted Crowne and Marlowe’s (1960, 1964) social desirability scale. The measure contains 33 true/false items ( $\alpha = .85$ ).

## Results and Discussion

We first conducted a factor analysis of the 28-item global citizen types measure. As expected, the items loaded well on the same seven factors as Study 1 (see Table 2 for factor loadings and eigenvalues). Next, we examined the correlations between the subscales of the types of global citizens. Similar to Study 1, the economic scale varied from the general trend of positive correlations among the types of global citizens. Examination of the correlations between the types subscales and variables related to global citizenship showed a similar pattern. With the exception of the economic subscale, all of the global citizen types showed positive correlations with global citizenship identification and global citizen outcomes (see Table 4). Additionally, although significant, the political dimension showed weak correlations with the global citizen outcomes. The results provide initial convergent validity (with the exception of the small correlations with the economic subscale). The environmental, economic, spiritual, and cultural subscales showed small, but significant correlations with the measure of social desirability. However, non-significant correlations, providing divergent validity, were found for political, critical, and moral subscales.

Examination of the relationships between the types and participant characteristics showed age positively related to environmental, and negatively related to political and cultural. Religiosity was positively related to economic and spiritual, and negatively related to the critical type scale. Prior research (Katzarska-Miller et al., 2014) showed global citizen related variables are associated with a liberal political orientation. With the exception of a negative correlation (i.e., conservative political orientation) with economic

and a non-significant correlation with spiritual type, the dimensions showed a positive association with liberal political orientation.

The lack of associations between economic type and global citizenship related values, the positive relationship with conservatism and religiosity suggests a pattern that is different than the other global citizenship types. One explanation is that economic global citizenship is associated with Falk's (1994) globalization from above framework, where the economic sphere is being connected conceptually with neoliberalism and capitalism, rather than with the prosocial outcomes associated with the globalization from below. Neoliberalism has been consistently criticized for its neglect of moral global principles, with its focus on consumption and economic growth (e.g., Falk, 1994). Thus, the economic type might be associated with values that are perceived as contrary to the prosocial variables measured.

Political global citizen type showed a correlation pattern with prosocial outcomes, which although in the same direction as the other types, is much smaller. One explanation for this pattern may be the meaning of one-world state/government that participants had in mind. As Oxley and Morris (2013) point out, there are different ways in which political global citizenship is conceptualized, and the meaning of one-world state can vary from cosmopolitan democracy, to a sovereign world state. Depending on how one conceptualizes the one-world state, the degree to which their definition is associated with certain values can lead to a more 'diluted' pattern of results. Despite this, the different associations between the type dimensions and other variables assessed suggest that the dimensions do differ. To examine further associations we constructed a third study.

### Study 3

---

The purpose of Study 3 is to examine convergent, divergent, and predictive validity of the global citizen type scale. Convergent validity will be shown with positive correlations with global citizenship identification, and variables related to prosocial values. Divergent validity will be shown via non-significant associations with measures of social desirability. Predictive validity will be shown with positive association between the types and intention to participate in activist causes related to those dimensions.

#### *Method*

#### **Participants and Procedure**

Participants ( $N = 343$ , 7.6% female;  $M_{\text{age}} = 21.70$ ,  $SD = 6.34$ ) included undergraduate students from A&M-Commerce ( $n = 271$ ) and Transylvania University ( $n = 72$ ) participating for partial or extra credit toward a psychology course. Participants indicated their ethnic/racial identity as White (54.2%), African American (25.7%), Hispanic (11.1%), Asian/South Pacific Islander (4.7%), multiracial (2.3%), or other (2%). Participants completed measures regarding global citizen types, global citizenship

identification, intention to participate in activist issues, ethnocentrism, authoritarianism, moral foundations, core political attitudes, Schwartz's universal values, social desirability, and reported demographic information. Unless noted otherwise, all measures used a 7-point Likert-type response scale, from 1 = *strongly agree* to 7 = *strongly disagree*.

## Materials

**Global citizen types scale.** The final 28-item global citizen types scale was identical to Study 2. The subscales showed adequate reliability: environmental ( $\alpha = .94$ ), political ( $\alpha = .92$ ), economic ( $\alpha = .70$ ), spiritual ( $\alpha = .85$ ), cultural ( $\alpha = .84$ ), critical ( $\alpha = .90$ ), and moral ( $\alpha = .85$ ).

**Global citizenship identification.** The global citizenship identification measure was identical to Study 2 ( $\alpha = .94$ ).

**Intention to participate in activist issues.** To assess intention to participate in activist causes participants were asked to rate the extent that they planned to be involved in various causes in the future (if they were not already active in the causes). The causes were chosen to reflect issues related to environmental ("Animal Rights," "Environmental Issues,"  $\alpha = .80$ ), political ("Political Issues," "Congressional Lobbying Issues,"  $\alpha = .88$ ), economic ("Business Support and Expansion," "Financial Issues,"  $\alpha = .85$ ), spiritual ("Religious Issues," "Peace Issues,"  $\alpha = .71$ ), cultural ("Global Education Issues," "Diversity Issues,"  $\alpha = .85$ ), critical ("Struggle Against Oppression," "Civil Rights Issues,"  $\alpha = .83$ ), and moral ("Human Rights Issues," "Racial Equality Issues,"  $\alpha = .89$ ) activist issues. Responses were made on a 7-point Likert-type scale, from 1 = *not active* to 7 = *very active*.

**Ethnocentrism.** Eight items (e.g., "Life in the U.S. is much better than most other places") were adopted from Neuliep and McCroskey (1997) to assess ethnocentrism ( $\alpha = .93$ ).

**Authoritarianism.** A 10-item (e.g., "Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn,"  $\alpha = .85$ ) measure of right-wing authoritarianism was adopted from McFarland (2010).

**Moral foundations.** A 20-item measure of moral values was adopted from Graham et al. (2011). The measure taps moral domains related to harm/care (e.g., "Compassion for those who are suffering is the most crucial virtue,"  $\alpha = .70$ ), fairness/reciprocity (e.g., "When the government makes laws, the number one principle should be ensuring that everyone is treated fairly,"  $\alpha = .77$ ), ingroup/loyalty (e.g., "I am proud of my country's history,"  $\alpha = .60$ ), authority/respect ("Respect for authority is something all children need to learn,"  $\alpha = .61$ ), and purity/sanctity (e.g., "People should not do things that are disgusting, even if no one is harmed,"  $\alpha = .63$ ).

**Core political attitudes.** We adopted a 34-item measure of core political values from Schwartz, Caprara, and Vecchione (2010). The measure contains subscales tapping beliefs



related to law and order (e.g., “The most important thing for our country is to maintain law and order,”  $\alpha = .89$ ), traditional morality (e.g., “Newer lifestyles are contributing to the breakdown of our society,”  $\alpha = .80$ ), equality (e.g., “The government should take responsibility to provide free health care to all citizens,”  $\alpha = .80$ ), foreign military intervention (e.g., “Any act is justified to fight terrorism,”  $\alpha = .49$ ), free enterprise (e.g., “It would be a good idea to privatize all of the public enterprises,”  $\alpha = .75$ ), civil liberties (e.g., “The most important thing for our country is to defend civil liberties,”  $\alpha = .81$ ), blind patriotism (e.g., “It is unpatriotic to criticize this country,”  $\alpha = .79$ ), and accepting immigrants (e.g., “People who come to live here from other countries make America’s cultural life richer,”  $\alpha = .54$ ).

**Schwartz’s universal values.** We adapted a short 21-item measure (Knoppen & Saris, 2009) of Schwartz’s (1992) 10 universal values. The subscales tap benevolence (e.g., “I want to devote myself to other people,”  $\alpha = .82$ ), universalism (e.g., “I think it is important that every person in the world be treated equally,”  $\alpha = .86$ ), self-direction (e.g., “I like to do things in my own original way,”  $\alpha = .80$ ), stimulation (e.g., “I want to have an exciting life,”  $\alpha = .72$ ), hedonism (e.g., “I seek every chance I can to have fun,”  $\alpha = .81$ ), achievement (e.g., “Being very successful is important to me,”  $\alpha = .83$ ), power (e.g., “I want people to do what I say,”  $\alpha = .76$ ), security (e.g., “I avoid anything that might endanger my safety,”  $\alpha = .76$ ), conformity (e.g., “I believe that people should do what they’re told,”  $\alpha = .84$ ), and tradition (e.g., “I believe that people should be satisfied with what they have,”  $\alpha = .45$ ).

**Social desirability.** We adopted a 40-item measure (Paulhus, 1984) of social desirability. The measure taps dimensions related to self-deceptive enhancement (e.g., “I never regret my decisions,”  $\alpha = .54$ ) and impression management (e.g., “I never swear,”  $\alpha = .70$ ).

## Results and Discussion

As a preliminary examination, we conducted correlations among the types subscales. As shown in Table 5, the subscales were moderately correlated with one another. Similar to Studies 1 and 2, the economic type showed a different trend with non-significant or small associations with the other dimensions. Next, we examined the correlations between the types subscales and the other assessed variables. Showing convergent validity, all of the subscales were correlated with global citizenship identification. Providing predictive validity, each subscale was positively associated with intention to participate in activist causes related to that dimension (see Table 6).

Political and economic subscales showed positive relationships with ethnocentrism (see Table 7). Economic subscales also showed a positive relationship with right-wing authoritarianism, while environment, cultural, critical, and moral subscales showed negative relationships. With the exception of political and economic, the subscales were positively related to concerns about harm/care as a moral foundation. With the exception of

political, all the subscales were also related to fairness/reciprocity moral foundation. Furthermore, the economic subscale showed positive relationships with ingroup/loyalty and authority/respect.

The relationships with core political values subscales showed that environmental global citizenship was most strongly related to equality and civil liberties. The political global citizen measure was most strongly related to law and order and free enterprise. The economic subscale was most strongly related to blind patriotism, and law and order. The spiritual subscale was most strongly related to civil liberties and equality. The cultural, critical, and moral global citizen type scales were most strongly related to civil liberties, acceptance of immigrants, and equality. Furthermore, critical was negatively associated with law and order and traditional morality.

Prior research utilizing Schwartz's (1992) universal values suggested that values related to stimulation, universalism, and self-direction when combined are predictors of a prosocial orientation to help others (Salgado & Oceja, 2011). With the exceptions of political and economic, all of the subscales showed strong positive associations with these constructs, as well as benevolence (see Table 8). On the other hand, political was related to power, hedonism, and achievement values, and economic was related to tradition, power, security, and conformity. Lastly, providing divergent validity, with the exception of economic showing a small positive correlation with impression management, none of the subscales showed significant relationships with the two dimensions of social desirability.

## **General Discussion**

---

The purpose of the current research was to develop and empirically test a scale reflecting the eight global citizenship types as discussed by Oxley and Morris (2013). Through exploratory principle components analyses (Study 1), a factor analysis (Study 2), convergent, divergent (Study 2 and 3), and predictive validity (Study 3), we created and provided initial validation for a global citizen type scale incorporating seven of the eight types. Support for the factor structure was evidenced in Studies 1 and 2. Convergent validity was shown via significant correlations with similar constructs (e.g., global citizenship identification, prosocial values) in Studies 2 and 3. Divergent validity was shown via small or non-significant correlations with social desirability measures in Studies 2 and 3. Lastly, predictive validity was shown via positive correlations with intention to engage in activist activities in Study 3. Together, the results across the three studies provide initial support for a reliable and valid measure of seven different types of global citizenship.

Global citizenship as a concept has received widespread attention across various disciplines including psychology (Reysen & Katzarska-Miller, 2013a). The vast amount of theorizing and discussion about what global citizenship means and what it comprises has led to a multitude of opinions, definitions, and conceptualizations. Oxley and Morris (2013) provided another interpretation of the concept by suggesting there are eight

different types of global citizens. In line with the objective of the present research, we built upon their eight types of global citizens and constructed and provided initial validation of measures of the types, with the exception of social global citizenship. This latter type of global citizenship showed a great deal of overlap with the cultural and moral dimensions. Presumably this is due to the notion of awareness of interconnections with others that is a component of all three of these dimensions. Because the social dimension was not distinguishable from these other dimensions it was removed from the measure. Despite not finding a distinguishable social global citizen type, the remaining seven dimensions did show to be distinct factors. The results largely support Oxley and Morris' (2013) conceptualization of different types of global citizens.

A primary objective of the present research was to examine if different types of global citizens were empirically distinguishable. As noted above, the results indeed suggest that there are dimensions and that they are distinct. A second objective was to examine whether these different types of global citizenship would be associated similarly with related constructs or if they would show different associations. This question was based on prior research showing that identification with a particular perspective of feminism is related to sets of attitudes that differ depending on the perspective taken (Henley et al., 2000). First, we expected, and found, that all of the dimensions would be related to global citizenship identification, with the exception of a non-significant correlation between economic global citizenship and identification in Study 2. This result suggests that regardless of the type of global citizenship endorsed, greater endorsement of a type is related to feeling a psychological connection to the larger category label of global citizenship in general. Second, although overlap emerged between the types and a variety of values and attitudes, there were differences in the associations. For example, in Study 2, with the exception of economic global citizenship, all of the dimensions showed positive correlations with prosocial values. The dimension of economic global citizenship showed the largest difference from the other types of global citizenship in Study 3 with positive associations between the dimension and variables such as ethnocentrism, traditional morality, authoritarianism, and conformity. We suspect that economic global citizenship is similar to Falk's (1994) globalization from above framework and connected conceptually with neoliberalism and capitalism rather than prosocial values that reflect a globalization from below notion. Across the studies, and in line with the objective of the present research, the results showed that there are distinct global citizenship types and those types did indeed show relationships with prosocial values and intended behaviours relevant to the corresponding type.

The present research, although novel in empirically showing Oxley and Morris' (2013) different types of global citizens, is not without limitations. First, this research is correlational and therefore does not provide any causal explanations regarding the associations between the types of global citizens and endorsed values and intended behaviours. Second, although we assessed intended activist actions in Study 3, we did not measure actual behaviour. Future research may assess different activist behaviours to

address this limitation. Third, all of the participants were from the United States. Participants in other cultural spaces may respond differently to the measures.

## **Conclusion**

---

To conclude, in the present research we constructed and provided initial validation of a measure of Oxley and Morris' (2013) types of global citizens. The measure showed a consistent factor structure across two samples and all of the dimensions showed adequate reliability. Convergent validity was shown with associations with related variables, divergent validity was shown with small or non-significant associations with two different measures of social desirability, and predictive validity was shown with associations with intended activist behaviours. Across the studies there emerged overlap between the dimensions and prosocial values. Yet, differences, particularly the economic global citizen dimension, emerged in the patterns of associations with other values and beliefs. Together, the results support the notion of a typology of global citizenship. Further research is needed to provide a fuller understanding of how endorsement of different types predicts different behaviours related to global citizenship.

## References

---

- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24*, 349-354.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1964). *The approval motive*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Falk, R. (1994). The making of global citizen. In B. Van Steernbergen (Ed.), *The condition of citizenship* (pp. 39-50). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Koleva, S., & Ditto, P. H. (2011). Mapping the moral domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*, 366-385.
- Henley, N. M., Spalsing, L. R., & Kosta, A. (2000). Development of the short form of the feminist perspectives scale. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 24*, 254-256.
- Katzarska-Miller, I., Barnsley, C. A., & Reysen, S. (2014). Global citizenship identification and religiosity. *Archive for the Psychology of Religion, 36*, 344-367.
- Knoppen, D., & Saris, W. (2009). Do we have to combine values in the Schwartz' human values scale? A comment on the Davidov studies. *Survey Research Methods, 3*, 91-103.
- McFarland, S. G. (2010). Authoritarianism, social dominance, and other roots of generalized prejudice. *Political Psychology, 31*, 453-477.
- Morais, D. B., & Ogden, A. C. (2011). Development and validation of the global citizenship scale. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 15*, 445-466.
- Neuliep, J. W., & McCroskey, J. C. (1997). The development of a U.S. and generalized ethnocentrism scale. *Communication Research Reports, 14*, 385-398.
- Oxley, L., & Morris, P. (2013). Global citizenship: A typology for distinguishing its multiple conceptions. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 61*, 301-325.
- Paolacci, G., & Chandler, J. (2014). Inside the Turk: Understanding Mechanical Turk as a participant pool. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 23*, 184-188.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1984). Two-component models of socially desirable responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*, 598-609.
- Reysen, S., & Hackett, J. (2017). Activism as a pathway to global citizenship. *The Social Science Journal, 54*, 132-138.

- Reysen, S., & Katzarska-Miller, I. (2013a). Student pathways to global citizenship. In C. Boyle (Ed.), *Student learning: Improving practice* (pp. 121-137). Hauppauge, NY: Nova.
- Reysen, S., & Katzarska-Miller, I. (2013b). A model of global citizenship: Antecedents and outcomes. *International Journal of Psychology, 48*, 858-87.
- Reysen, S., & Katzarska-Miller, I. (2013c). Intentional worlds and global citizenship. *Journal of Global Citizenship and Equity Education, 3*, 34-52.
- Reysen, S., & Katzarska-Miller, I. (in press). Superordinate and subgroup identities as predictors of peace and conflict: The unique content of global citizenship identity. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*.
- Reysen, S., Katzarska-Miller, I., Gibson, S. A., & Hobson, B. (2013). World knowledge and global citizenship: Factual and perceived world knowledge as predictors of global citizenship identification. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning, 5*, 49-68.
- Reysen, S., Katzarska-Miller, I., Nesbit, S. M., & Pierce, L. (2013). Further validation of a single-item measure of social identification. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 43*, 463-47.
- Reysen, S., Larey, L. W., & Katzarska-Miller, I. (2012). College course curriculum and global citizenship. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning, 4*, 27-39.
- Reysen, S., Pierce, L., Spencer, C., & Katzarska-Miller, I. (2013). Exploring the content of global citizenship identity. *The Journal of Multiculturalism in Education, 9*, 1-31.
- Salgado, S., & Ocejja, L. (2011). Towards a characterization of a motive whose ultimate goal is to increase the welfare of the world: Quixoteism. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology, 14*, 145-155.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theory and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1-25). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Schwartz, S. H., Caprara, G. V., & Vecchione, M. (2010). Basic personal values, core political values, and voting: A longitudinal analysis. *Political Psychology, 31*, 421-452.

## APPENDIX

---

**Table 1 Global Citizen Types Scale Final Measure Items**

---

**Items**

---

- Item 1: Future generations have the right to enjoy clean air, fresh water, and uncontaminated food.
- Item 2: Human beings have the right to enjoy clean air, fresh water, and uncontaminated food.
- Item 3: Humans have a responsibility towards nature.
- Item 4: Everyone needs to do their part to care for the natural environment.
- Item 5: We need a one-world government.
- Item 6: There should be a one-world state.
- Item 7: A one-world government will lead to social justice for everyone.
- Item 8: Cooperation between nations can be achieved only by a one-world government.
- Item 9: Economic international development is good for everyone in the world.
- Item 10: Free markets are good for everyone in the world.
- Item 11: Corporations benefit everyone in the world.
- Item 12: Corporations are good for the planet.
- Item 13: All people are spiritually connected.
- Item 14: Spiritual and emotional connections among people are the basis of humanity.
- Item 15: The core function of spirituality is to promote caring for other humans.
- Item 16: Individuals and society have a transcendent bond.
- Item 17: Schools should require knowledge of many different cultures as a graduation requirement.
- Item 18: People should incorporate diverse cultural values into their own.
- Item 19: It is everyone's responsibility to be knowledgeable about the diverse cultures in the world.
- Item 20: People benefit from interacting with individuals from diverse cultural backgrounds.
- Item 21: Everyone should question the status quo.
- Item 22: People should be involved in the organized struggle for their liberation.
- Item 23: People should support the breaking down of oppressive global structures.
- Item 24: Everyone should challenge oppression in the world.
- Item 25: There are universal moral values that everyone should follow.
- Item 26: Everyone in the world needs to be held to the same moral code.
- Item 27: Human rights should embody a universal global ethic.
- Item 28: One of the laws that every nation should have is a human rights law.
- 

Note. Subscales include: environmental (items 1-4), political (items 5-8), economic (items 9-12), spiritual (items 13-16), cultural (items 17-20), critical (items 21-24), and moral (items 25-28)

**Table 2 Global Citizen Types Scale Factor Loadings for Principle Components (Study 1) and Factor Analysis (Study 2)**

Item	Environment		Political		Economic		Spiritual		Cultural		Critical		Moral	
	S1	S2	S1	S2	S1	S2	S1	S2	S1	S2	S1	S2	S1	S2
Item 1	.911	.884	.016	.005	-.021	-.005	.024	-.017	.003	.039	.070	-.021	-.075	.048
Item 2	.899	.887	.041	.066	-.036	-.008	-.010	-.024	-.024	.086	.051	-.013	-.075	.036
Item 3	.754	.684	-.006	-.027	.030	-.025	-.108	-.059	.035	-.130	-.131	.012	.054	-.002
Item 4	.704	.585	-.001	-.022	.041	.035	-.096	-.009	.092	-.140	-.140	.065	.033	.008
Item 5	.029	.042	.951	.938	-.034	-.049	.005	.006	-.013	-.016	-.027	-.002	-.008	.019
Item 6	-.004	-.023	.936	.923	-.032	-.008	-.001	-.030	-.020	-.016	-.018	.021	-.020	-.008
Item 7	.08	.045	.934	.903	.001	-.021	.014	-.017	.014	-.021	-.015	-.001	.015	.013
Item 8	-.025	-.013	.901	.890	.053	.054	-.033	.029	.031	.008	.015	.007	.009	-.005
Item 9	.181	.118	-.008	.024	.817	.709	.082	.048	.004	-.009	-.150	.162	-.048	.000
Item 10	.003	.050	-.090	-.070	.813	.715	-.052	-.038	-.029	-.024	-.020	.044	-.048	-.067
Item 11	-.126	-.080	.105	.032	.721	.757	-.034	-.018	.044	-.007	.143	-.118	.016	.048
Item 12	-.118	-.116	.031	.017	.646	.641	-.053	-.040	-.035	.023	.182	-.111	.027	.036
Item 13	-.053	-.059	-.013	-.010	-.012	-.069	-.835	-.891	-.005	-.019	-.029	-.011	.059	.039
Item 14	.080	.058	-.022	-.032	-.034	-.022	-.812	-.900	-.008	.015	.026	-.017	-.086	.026
Item 15	.075	.066	.023	.035	.013	.057	-.804	-.760	.002	.020	.062	.015	-.033	-.068
Item 16	-.029	-.008	.032	.019	.047	.064	-.709	-.686	.060	-.059	-.091	.108	.018	.027
Item 17	-.074	.027	.044	.030	-.084	-.080	-.039	-.007	.833	-.804	.049	-.044	-.024	.000
Item 18	-.103	-.100	.068	.053	.021	.028	-.032	-.043	.833	-.813	-.027	.004	.023	.003
Item 19	.051	.015	-.036	.024	.035	.058	-.049	-.035	.782	-.768	-.045	.008	-.022	-.002
Item 20	.281	.170	-.076	-.102	.048	.027	.055	.051	.635	-.564	-.055	.103	.014	.061
Item 21	.050	-.021	-.009	-.008	-.063	-.133	-.001	-.026	-.083	-.046	-.831	.707	.075	-.051
Item 22	-.087	-.058	.041	.025	.066	.086	-.051	-.062	.028	.008	-.817	.790	-.027	-.007
Item 23	-.033	.042	.048	-.004	-.066	.033	.017	.019	.079	-.010	-.073	.662	-.108	.114
Item 24	.097	.154	-.025	.017	.008	.012	-.023	-.086	.086	-.041	-.689	.595	-.044	.052
Item 25	.007	.028	-.052	-.095	.023	.042	-.106	-.063	-.079	.027	-.005	-.081	-.832	.868
Item 26	-.130	-.034	.089	.191	.159	.091	.048	-.020	-.037	-.013	.004	-.041	-.0762	0.656
Item 27	.103	-.029	-.004	.043	-.127	-.082	-.001	.036	.177	-.055	-.108	.118	-.636	.790
Item 28	.295	.136	.001	-.053	-.096	-.062	-.001	.016	.101	-.026	-.026	.103	-.616	.649
Eigenvalue	7.09	7.3	3.82	3.83	2.7	2.88	2.16	1.73	1.42	1.36	1.22	1.27	1.16	2.21
Variance	25.32	26.06	13.63	13.67	9.64	10.27	7.72	6.17	5.07	4.87	4.34	4.52	4.13	7.89
Alpha	0.89	0.87	0.95	0.95	0.77	0.8	0.82	0.9	0.82	0.85	0.81	0.82	0.75	0.84
Mean	6.07	6.06	2.49	2.34	3.85	4	4.43	4.49	4.92	4.97	5.17	5.2	5.33	5.03
SD	1.07	1.05	1.61	1.6	1.27	1.32	1.36	1.62	1.26	1.33	1.13	1.15	1.17	1.5

Note. S1 = Study 1, S2 = Study 2. Oblimin rotation used in both studies.



**Table 3 Correlations between Subscales of Global Citizen Types Scale, Studies 1 & 2**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Environ.</b>	<b>Political</b>	<b>Economic</b>	<b>Spiritual</b>	<b>Cultural</b>	<b>Critical</b>	<b>Moral</b>
Environmental	1.0	-.03	-.17**	.28**	.43**	.50**	.45**
Political	-.01	1.0	.08*	.13**	.20**	.12**	.17**
Economic	-.03	.07	1.0	.10**	-.14**	-.23**	.10**
Spiritual	.32**	.16**	.21**	1.0	.38**	.24**	.22**
Cultural	.42**	.19**	.04	.35**	1.0	.50**	.30**
Critical	.51**	.06	-.02	.38**	.46**	1.0	.36**
Moral	.40**	.29**	.07	.20**	.29**	.30**	1.0

Note. \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ . Top half of diagonal is Study 1, bottom half of diagonal is Study 2.

**Table 4 Correlations between Global Citizen Type Scale Subscales and Relevant Variables, Study 2**

Variable	Environ.	Political	Economic	Spiritual	Cultural	Critical	Moral
GCID	.26**	.31**	.01	.35**	.48**	.35**	.24**
Empathy	.42**	.12**	.02	.37**	.50**	.48**	.27**
Diversity	.42**	.12**	.02	.41**	.62**	.46**	.23**
Social Justice	.39**	.13**	-.08*	.36**	.49**	.54**	.43**
Environ. Sustain.	.66**	.09*	-.10*	.34**	.48**	.52**	.38**
Helping	.73**	.09*	.03	.42**	.47**	.47**	.29**
Responsibility	.47**	.15**	.07	.43**	.64**	.50**	.29**
Social Desirability	.11**	.00	.20**	.19**	.13**	.02	.02
Age	.13**	-.17**	.08	-.00	-.10*	-.01	-.03
Religiosity	.04	-.08	.21**	.31**	-.07	-.12**	-.01
Political Orient.	.19**	.13**	-.33**	.04	.32**	.30**	.15**
Sex	.24**	.02	-.02	.24**	.11*	.03	.15**

Note. \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ . GCID = global citizenship identification, biological sex (1 = male, 2 = female), political orientation (1 = very conservative, 7 = very liberal).

**Table 5 Correlations between Global Citizen Type Scale Subscales, Study 3**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Environ.</b>	<b>Political</b>	<b>Economic</b>	<b>Spiritual</b>	<b>Cultural</b>	<b>Critical</b>	<b>Moral</b>
Environmental	1.0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Political	-.10	1.0	--	--			--
Economic	.18**	.35**	1.0		--	--	--
Spiritual	.30**	.25**	.39**	1.0	--	--	--
Cultural	.47**	.15**	.33**	.56**	1.0	--	--
Critical	.38**	.18**	.26**	.49**	.63**	1.0	--
Moral	.52**	.09	.31**	.51**	.62**	.67**	1.0
Mean	6.19	3.06	4.11	4.45	4.93	4.83	5.23
<i>SD</i>	1.24	1.56	1.13	1.35	1.30	1.35	1.34

Note. \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ . 7-point scale from, 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree.

**Table 6 Correlations between Global Citizen Types, Global Citizenship Identification, and Intended Activism, Study 3**

Variable	Environ.	Political	Economic	Spiritual	Cultural	Critical	Moral
GCID	.28**	.16**	.19**	.31**	.34**	.25**	.32**
<i>Intended Activism</i>							
Environment	.27**	.21**	.17**	.25**	.33**	.34**	.35**
Political	-.00	.20**	.23**	.12*	.19**	.13*	.09
Economic	.06	.15**	.28**	.06	.07	-.02	.06
Spiritual	.17**	.13*	.26**	.24**	.22**	.20**	.24**
Cultural	.25**	.17**	.28**	.29**	.47**	.41**	.37**
Critical	.27**	.12*	.23**	.28**	.38**	.43**	.38**
Moral	.37**	.08	.24**	.26**	.41**	.39**	.39**

Note. \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$

**Table 7 Correlations between Global Citizen Types, Ethnocentrism, Authoritarianism, Moral Foundations, and Core Political Values, Study 3**

Variable	Environ.	Political	Economic	Spiritual	Cultural	Critical	Moral
Ethnocentrism	-.07	.15**	.23**	-.01	-.11*	-.06	-.03
Authoritarianism	-.18**	.07	.13*	-.06	-.31**	-.34**	-.18**
<i>Moral Foundations</i>							
Harm	.46**	.02	.10	.31**	.35**	.32**	.41**
Fairness	.48**	-.04	.20**	.27**	.32**	.35**	.42**
Ingroup	.12*	.14**	.30**	.11*	.00	-.09	.02
Authority	.20**	.11*	.30**	.13*	.03	-.05	.14*
Purity	.15**	.10	.17**	.15**	.12*	.09	.21**
<i>Core Political Values</i>							
Law and Order	-.13*	.28**	.28**	.02	-.10	-.22**	-.08
Traditional Morality	-.06	.07	.23**	.03	-.18**	-.29**	-.08
Equality	.33**	.22**	.25**	.31**	.40**	.41**	.32**
Military Intervention	.03	.03	.13*	.12*	.01	.02	.11
Free Enterprise	-.18**	.27**	.22**	.16**	-.06	.01	-.02
Civil Liberties	.37**	-.06	.17**	.34**	.43**	.48**	.48**
Blind Patriotism	-.08	.22**	.33**	.04	-.07	-.15**	-.07
Pro-Immigrants	.19**	-.05	.04	.17**	.36**	.38**	.25**

Note. \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ .

**Table 8 Correlations between Global Citizen, Universal Human Values, and Social Desirability, Study 3**

Variable	Environ.	Political	Economic	Spiritual	Cultural	Critical	Moral
<i>Schwartz's Values</i>							
Benevolence	.43**	-.10	.10	.23**	.31**	.30**	.37**
Universalism	.47**	-.04	.11	.29**	.44**	.41**	.44**
Self-Direction	.42**	-.04	.08	.21**	.33**	.34**	.34**
Stimulation	.36**	.01	.11*	.17**	.33**	.29**	.25**
Hedonism	.17**	.16**	.17**	.12*	.14**	.15**	.14*
Achievement	.15**	.14**	.09	.13*	.14*	.12*	.14*
Power	-.09	.29**	.20**	.14*	-.01	.01	.01
Security	.20**	-.01	.19**	.11*	.11*	.01	.16**
Conformity	.03	.11*	.19**	.02	-.09	-.12*	.05
Tradition	.04	.06	.22**	.10	-.03	-.08	-.00
<i>Social Desirability</i>							
Self-Deceptive	.07	-.04	.11	-.03	-.00	-.10	.03
Impression Manage.	.02	-.07	.13*	.07	-.01	-.01	.05

Note. \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$

## Author Biographies

---

**Iva Katzarska-Miller** is an Associate Professor of Psychology at Transylvania University in Lexington, Kentucky. She teaches classes related to cultural psychology, social justice, and diversity. Her research interests focus on self-stereotyping, interpersonal relationships, and global citizenship. **Contact:** [ikatzarskamiller@transy.edu](mailto:ikatzarskamiller@transy.edu)

**Stephen Reysen** is an Associate Professor of Psychology at Texas A&M University-Commerce. He teaches classes related to social psychology, intergroup relations, and multicultural diversity. His research interests include topics related to personal (e.g., threats to interpersonal public identity) and social identity (e.g., global citizenship). **Contact:** [stephen.reysen@tamuc.edu](mailto:stephen.reysen@tamuc.edu)