# On Psychological Effects of Globalization: Development of a Scale of Global Identity

SALMAN TÜRKEN
University of Oslo

FLOYD W. RUDMIN
University of Tromsø

The present study reports the development of a brief scale of global identity. Based on literature review and on responses from 137 students from 24 countries answering open-ended questions, a pool of 113 Likert items was produced, which were then evaluated by 6 experts, resulting in a total trial item pool of 110 items. These items and a social desirability scale were administered to three samples of students: 684 Norwegians, 605 Turkish, and 406 Americans. Items were ranked based on equal weighting of 22 psychometric criteria: a) for each sample, few omissions, low correlation with social desirability, high response standard deviations, high item-total correlations, high correlations with indices of multicultural experience and cosmopolitan behaviour; b) for English and Turkish versions, few words and few characters. The best 24 items were subjected to item analysis, resulting in a 10-item Global Identity Scale (GIS-10) with high Cronbach alpha coefficients in all three samples. Factor analysis found a 2 factor orthogonal solution that replicated in each of the three samples: one factorial sub-scale representing cultural openness and the other representing non-nationalism.

*"The entire earth is my homeland and all its people my fellow citizens!"* (Gibran Khalil Gibran)

Internationalism, multiculturalism, and cosmopolitanism are steadily on the global agenda, and individual attachments and identities are in a process of change. Regardless of where we are in the world, we are exposed to global phenomena. Due to ideological shifts in international politics, to institutional changes, and to technological advancements, globalization has, in the last decades, opened physical as well as social borders. This leads to greater interconnectedness of people on our planet, and the psychological consequences of globalization are becoming increasingly evident. Two decades ago, Sampson (1989, p. 914) predicted that *"globalization will compel a change in psychology's current theory of the person."* Arnett (2002) argues that it is on personal identity that globalization has its primary psychological influence.

Historically, human beings have always had a relationship to the cultural *other,* and this relationship is psychologically central to the development and maintenance of identity (Larochelle, 1992; Tajfel, 1982; Volkan, 1994, 1998; Volkan & Itzkowitz, 1994). Identity development can be seen to be a continuous interaction between individuals and their sociocultural environment (Sevig, Higlen & Adams, 2000). Therefore, as this interaction changes, identity will also change. According to Social Identity Theory, people may develop

multiple identities or contextually dependent identities (Chryssochoou, 2000), especially if globalization creates new sociocultural environments (Arnett, 2002). Cosmopolitan identity is one option that globalization may engender. The idea of *kosmopolites*, the citizen of the cosmos, "*has existed for more than two thousand years, but it has never seemed so real and tangible to so many people as it does today*" (Skrbis, Kendall & Woodward, 2004, p. 117).

Psychological theories and research will have to encompass the consequences of globalization. As Beck (2002, p. 17) wrote, "*at the beginning of the 21st century the conditio humana cannot be understood nationally or locally but only globally.*" One aspect of this will be how humans self-identify themselves; hence, there is a need for a contemporary measure for global identity. The purpose of the present study is to develop an efficient, reliable measurement of global identity that might have cross-cultural application in contemporary contexts.

*Semantic Considerations*: First, the term "global" is directly associated with globalization, and it has been increasingly used in reference to new forms of attachments and identity formations (Arnett, 2002; Mlinar, 1992, Norris, 2000). "Global" means *"relating to the globe, especially as an entirety*" (*Webster's*, 1961, p. 352) and is synonymous with "universal," "worldwide," and "cosmopolitan" (*Merriam-Webster's online thesaurus*, 2005). "Global identity" is thus conceived here to be an aspect of "cosmopolitanism" which is an older term in the literature (e.g., Frumkin, 1962; Harris, 1927; Lammers, 1974; Lentz, 1950; Singer, 1965). It should be noted that "global identity" can also refer to a person's over-all identity, or sum-total personality profile, but that is not intended here. Second, in addition to the concepts of globalism and cosmopolitanism, there are many related terms such as multiculturalism, internationalism, transnationalism, worldism, worldmindedness, and glocalization in the literature. These concepts have overlapping meanings (Roudometof, 2005). Third, the focus of the present study is on making a measure of global *identity;* yet, this will not be sharply differentiated from a general orientation or *attitude* towards global identity. The term *identity* is preferred here. Attitudes serve to foster identification with important reference groups (Kelman, 1958), to express one's central values, and establish one's identity (Katz, 1960). Identity is determined by what matters to a person, what the person finds valuable and by the person's commitments (Brinkmann, 2008), all of which are reflected by the attitude items developed in this study. Thus, attitude items in the present study can function as operationalizations of global identity. Fourth, the term *culture* needs consideration since the project is the development of a scale that is cross-*culturally* applicable. Although difficult to define, *culture* can be conceived as "*a package of traditions that defines individuals and groups of individuals and an agent that shapes them in certain and predictable ways*" (Markowitz, 2004, p. 330). When *culture* refers to national culture, then the focus is on "*key issues…on which nations differ in empirically verifiable ways"* (Hofstede, 1984, p. 22). Consider the key issues of power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, and masculinity, respectively, for three cultures sampled in the present study: the cultural profile of Norway is low, low, high, very low; that of Turkey is high, high, low, low; and that of the USA is low, low, very high, high (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005).

## GLOBALIZATION AND GLOBAL IDENTITY

Globalization is not a new phenomenon (Broad & Heckscher, 2003), but the expression "globalization" is now in fashion and frequently used. For example, in PsycINFO, a search of the expression (globalization OR globalisation) shows that it appeared in English language titles and abstracts for the first time in 1947; next 2 times in the 1970s; then 3 times in the 1980s; 199 times in the 1990s; and 4602 times in the first ten years of the 2000s.

However, what one means by globalization is somewhat diffuse. Some see globalization as a mere economic process involving the opening and crossing of borders as an aspect of economic integration (Castles & Davidson in Chryssochoou, 2005). For others, globalization is a more comprehensive process affecting not only economics but also social spheres of life through increase in cross-border social, cultural and technological exchanges (*Globalisation Guide*, 2005). For instance, Scholte (1997, p. 6) describes globalization as *"the rise of supraterritoriality*", a process that makes the globe become "*a single 'place' in its own right*". In other words, *"globalization is understood as a process that erodes national boundaries, integrating national economies, cultures, technologies, and governance, producing complex relations of mutual interdependence*" (Norris, 2000, p. 2). Under conditions of globalization, "*social relations become less tied to territorial frameworks*" (Scholte, 1997, p.6). Changes in the territorial basis of identity due to globalization are also discussed by Mlinar (1992), Larochelle (1992), Poche (1992), and others. Transcendence of borders (not only territorial borders but also ones relating to economy, identity, community and so on) is a unique feature of globalization. Under conditions of globalization, people around the world simultaneously access, experience and share 'global phenomena' that extend across widely dispersed locations (Giddens in *Globalisation Guide*, 2005; Scholte, 1997). Time and distance are not the limiting conditions they once were, and people worldwide are capable of continuous and nearly instantaneous contact with the *other* (Cuccioletta, 2002).

Under these conditions, it seems likely to find wide spread awareness of globalization and identification with a larger world culture. Arnett (2002, p. 774) claims that globalization influences people worldwide such that they develop "*a bicultural identity that links their local identity with an identity linked to the global culture*". This idea is compatible with 19th century theorists such as August Comte, John Stuart Mill, Karl Marx and Anthony Giddens who have expressed optimism that humanity will eventually transcend national boundaries by moving towards a global culture and society (Norris, 2000). For instance, Jensen (2003) argues that teenagers today are acculturating to the global culture through more indirect interactions occurring in virtual reality.

Others, however, argue that globalization and increased interconnectedness mediated by television, travel, internet, etc. have created counter-forces that lead to distancing of cultures and strengthening of the concept of national identity (Held, 2006). In one of the first quantitative cross-national attitudes studies, launched by UNESCO after the World War II, it was reported that national identities prevailed over any other alternative form of loyalty (Buchanan & Cantril, 1953). In a recent study, almost 50 years later, Norris (2000) found similar results based on the data from the World Values Survey done in periods of

1990-91 and 1995-97: only 2% of respondents could be classified as cosmopolitans, choosing attachment to the world as a whole rather than other forms of attachment.

Although the pervasive influence of local and national attachments seems apparent and the reactions of some groups to globalization may reinforce their national or religious sentiments, others adopt an open, encompassing attitude and chose to prioritize transnational networks over the national ones (Roudometof, 2005; Tønnesen, 2004). Globalization promotes *cosmopolitanization* (Beck, 2002), which may in turn promote a nationalistic reaction. Thus, it can be expected that some people, but not all, may develop a new global identity. The increasingly complex interplay between societal – social, historical, economic, ideological – changes and individual agency in terms of meaning making and adjustment to new realities will obviously lead to different outcomes for groups and individuals who have throughout their history developed different identities, social representations and ideologies. Thus, individual differences are expected, perhaps are certain, and an instrument to measure such differences would be useful.

## HISTORY OF COSMOPOLITAN IDENTITY CONCEPTS

The word "cosmopolitan" derives from the Greek word *kosmopolitès,* which means "citizen of the world" (Nussbaum, 1997; *Stanford encyclopaedia of philosophy*, 2005). An inscription from the 13th century BC indicates that the Egyptian pharaoh Akhnaton *"regarded himself as owing the same duties to all men, irrespective of race or nationality*" (Harris, 1927, p. 2). However, it was Homer who first heralded the ideal of widely travelled men who are free of patriotic prejudice, and this was amplified by the pre-Socratic humanists Anaxagoras, Heracleitus, and Empedocles who argued that science and reason were cosmopolitan and thus in conflict with local, parochial beliefs (Harris, 1927). Greek legend has it that Diogenes the Cynic asserted himself to be a citizen of the world," that he did not want to be defined by rank, status, gender, local origins, language or ethnicity, but rather by universal aspirations and humanity based on the worth of reason and moral purpose (Nussbaum, 1997).

Such a cosmopolitan view became characteristic of Greek and Roman Stoicism which focussed on acting in accordance with universal reason rather than pursuing parochial ends (Jeffres, Atkin, Bracken & Neuendorf, 2004). The Stoics sought to displace loyalty to a local city-state and its *polis* and bring focus on the *cosmos* and harmonic order for all humankind (Hortsman in Held, 2005). Stoics therefore were willing to move to other places, motivated by cosmopolitanism's identification with other human beings regardless of place on earth. Cosmopolitan ideas were revived and reinvented by Enlightenment philosophers such as Kant, Rousseau, Bentham and Mill. Especially influential have been Kant's ideas of a cosmopolitan moral order for all humanity and world government (*Stanford encyclopaedia of philosophy*, 2005).

## CONCEPT OF GLOBAL IDENTITY

Today, however, there is not a uniform conceptualization of global or cosmopolitan identity. Some see it as a "*consciousness of an international society or global community transcending*

*national boundaries, without necessarily negating the importance of state, nation or domestic society*" (Iriye in Shinohara, 2004, p 1). For others, it is "*a willingness to engage with the other*" (Hannerz, 1996, p. 106). For others again, it is the decentring of the values, attitudes and lifestyles associated with the nation-state (Beck, 2002). "Cosmopolitan identity" can refer the cultural milieus of cities, to religions, to philosophical or ideological or ethical perspectives, or to individual attitudes (Roudometof, 2005).

Identity (individual attitudes) and responsibility (ethical perspective) are viewed as the two main aspects of cosmopolitanism, captured by the idea of being "a citizen of the world" (Brock & Brighouse, 2005). The identity aspect indicates that a cosmopolitan is a person marked by diverse cultural influences, which in the past could result in praise but also in condemnation (Sypnowich, 2005). Thus, cosmopolitan people can be identified as well-travelled, respected, and sophisticated people with much knowledge of the world, contrasted with the provincial. Conversely, cosmopolitans can also be identified as strangers to society, rootless people with few attachments to any community. The negative view of the cosmopolitan is usually widespread in nationalist movements. For instance, cosmopolitans were the target of xenophobia, were seen as disloyal to the nation and were associated with Jews or Bolsheviks in Nazi Germany (Sypnowich, 2005). The responsibility aspect directs individual outwards from local obligations, and emphasises obligations to distant *others* (Brock & Brighouse, 2005).

When operationalized as an attitude, cosmopolitanism often has been conceptualized in terms of identification with a broad, global culture and with interest in aspects of life outside of one's own community (Jeffres *et al.*, 2004). Generally speaking, four interpretations of the concept have been developed in the social sciences. First, cosmopolitanism is seen as the extent to which one is oriented, not toward the local community, but toward a larger context, thus defining a dimension called rural-urban or local-nonlocal (e.g., Gans, 1962; Jennings, 1967). Second, cosmopolitans are described as citizens of the world, with strong attachment to global community, beyond one's nation or culture (e.g., Dye, 1963; Norris, 2000). A third view applies the concept as an appreciation and understanding of contexts and cultures beyond one's own. For instance, Merton (1957) described the cosmopolitan type as a person who has some local ties but is oriented significantly to the world outside the local community and sees him or herself as an integral part the wider world, an ecumenical person. The localite is a person strictly parochial, preoccupied with local problems and without any interest in the national and international scene (e.g., Earle & Cvetkovich, 1997). Fourth, cosmopolitanism has been viewed as an attitude of tolerance toward other people, their ideas and their cultures (e.g., Bracken, Jeffres, Neuendorf, Kopfman & Moulla, 2005; Jeffres *et al.*, 2004; Robinson & Zill, 1997).

## SOCIAL REPRESENTATIONS AND SOCIAL IDENTITY

Chryssochoou (2005, p. xix) argues that new sociohistorical conditions under globalization "*demand that people review the way they see the world and as a consequence the way they define themselves*". Such argument is consistent with Social Representations Theory, in that social representations are generated in social interactions, refer to social phenomena, and

serve social functions for the group that evolves and shares the representations (Orr, Mana & Mana, 2003). Social representations function as specific ways of understanding and communicating – as mode of reality and of common sense. Social representations are ideas, thoughts, images, beliefs and knowledge which are shared by a group: consensual universes of thought which are socially created and socially communicated to form part of a 'common consciousness' (Augoustinos, 1998). Thus, merely by sharing social representations, people come to feel a common identity since they have a common 'world-view' (Breakwell, 1993).

As globalization creates new sociohistorical conditions in which people across borders have more and more contact with each other, are exposed to the same global phenomena, and interactively and simultaneously share knowledge and culture around the world, then more and more people may come to share similar world-views. Globalization, thus, can be seen as a driving force of social representations, spreading them across borders, making people from different cultures become more similar in perceptions and cognitions, and the emotions they constellate. For instance, human rights are seen to arise from shared social representations that have spread over much of the world (Doise, 2002).

Social Identity Theory posits that we have a tendency to categorize ourselves by in-groups, even if based on arbitrary criteria (Brown, 2002; Tajfel, 1982). Social categorization leads to social comparison processes of comparing in-group with out-groups, which leads to motivations to achieve positive group distinctiveness, which in turn may lead to enhancing our in-group's image, prestige, or resources by derogating or discriminating against out-groups (Esses, Dovidio, Semenya & Jackson, 2005). In the contexts of globalization, Social Identity Theory introduces immense complexity of in-group and out-group options.

On one hand, as globalization makes people aware of existence of the psychologically different *other*, the *other* might make an out-group that provides distinctiveness for the corresponding in-group; hence globalization increases national attachment and ethnic pride. On the other hand, globalization opens a wide range of options for in-groups, even groups that are geographically dispersed, allowing almost infinite ways of identification with each other. Social Identity Theory argues that one has as many social identities as there are groups to which one feels attached (Hogg & Vaughan, 2005).

## NATIONAL VERSUS COSMOPOLITAN IDENTITY

Cosmopolitanism competes with and may challenge loyalty to the nation-state (Thorup, 2006; Wiley, 2004). In a study of attitudes toward immigrants, Esses *et al.* (2005) reported a weak negative relation between nationalism and internationalism ($r$ = -.18). In the same study, they cited other research showing national identification and pride to be predictive of derogation of foreigners living in one's country. The conflicting nature of the two concepts is apparent. The centrality of nation as an in-group identity is not much disputed in social sciences (Alter, 1994; Billig, 1995). The derogating nature of nation as in-group identity is observable in war: "*From the very beginning the principle of nationalism was almost indissolubly linked, both in theory and practice, with the idea of war*" (Howard 1994, p. 254). The relation between nationalism and war was confirmed to most people in the

20th century (Hutchinson & Smith, 1994), and nationalism became between the two World Wars synonymous with intolerance and violence (Alter, 1994). Thus, the history of cosmopolitanism demonstrates that cosmopolitans have been conceived as not endorsing localism or nationalism.

Although the nation is still a powerful ingroup (Billig, 1995), and national attachments are preferred across many countries (Norris, 2000), globalization since the end of the World War II has changed the international scenery, promoting cosmopolitanism in several spheres of life, and consequently creating possibilities for new forms of attachments beyond the national ones. Roudometof (2005), for instance, argues that globalization reconfigures the institution of national society and gives way to cosmopolitanism. Globalization may induce duality in identity: in addition to a local identity, people may develop a global identity that provides them with a sense of belonging to a wider world culture and an awareness of various aspects of this global culture (Arnett, 2002; Shinohara, 2004). Global identity, as any other identity, would not be salient all the time; therefore it would be contextual and situated. However, in a forced choice context, cosmopolitans would be expected to choose loyalty to the wider world, transcending their local and national boundaries.

In sum, considering a) that globalization processes are accelerating phenomena and are increasingly of interest to social scientists, b) that globalization is likely to affect changes in individual and collective identities, and c) that individual differences are to be expected in global identity development, there is need for a contemporary measure of global identity that will have cross-cultural application. The goal of the present study is to develop such a measure, following standard scale development processes (DeVellis, 2003): 1) survey literature and interview a range of people to understand what the construct of global identity is and what it is not; 2) compile a large pool of potential psychometric items; 3) have large, diverse samples of respondents answer the items; 4) engage in item analysis to select a best set of items for a final scale, and 5) analyze the factor structure of the final scale.

## STUDY 1: REVIEW OF PRIOR MEASURES

The purposes of this study were to find earlier operationalizations of cosmopolitanism and related constructs, and to consider their appropriateness for measurement of contemporary global identity.

### Method

Search for relevant literature was performed in these databases: PsycInfo, JSTOR, ISI Web of Science, IBSS, GeoRef, Philosopher's Index, PAIS International, Ingenta, Google, BIBSYS, Digital Dissertations, Cross Cultural Database, International Political Science Abstracts, and Sociological Abstracts. The search key words were combinations of the truncations 'cosmopolit*', 'international*', 'multicultural*', 'universal*', 'national*' and 'global*' crossed in Boolean conjunction with 'identity', 'attitudes', 'orientation', 'self', 'values'.

**Table 1**. *Prior Scales of Cosmopolitanism and Related Constructs, with Example Items*

| |
|---|
| Likert's (1932) 24-item **Internationalism Scale***:* |
| **We should be willing to fight for our country whether t is in the right or wrong.* |
| Levinson's (1957) 12-item **Internationalism-Nationalism Scale**: |
| **The immigration of foreigners to this country should be kept down so that we can provide for Americans first.* |
| Sampson & Smith's (1957) 32-item **Worldmindedness Scale**: |
| *It would be better to be a citizen of the world than of any particular country.* |
| Merton's (1957) 10-item **Cosmopolitan-Local Dimension:** |
| *Do you worry much about the news* [about the World War II]*?* |
| Dye's (1963) 5-item **Local Cosmopolitan Scale:** |
| **I have greater respect for a man who is well established in his local community than a man who is widely known in his field but who has no local roots.* |
| Jennings' (1967) 3-item **Cosmopolitanism Scale:** |
| *Which one do you follow most closely – international affairs, national affairs, state affairs, local affairs?* |
| Wittkopf's (1987) 86-item **Cooperative and Militant Internationalism Scale:** |
| *I follow news about international affairs closely.* |
| Kosterman & Feshbach's (1989) 46-item **Patriotism-Nationalism Questionnaire**: |
| *The agricultural surpluses of all countries should be shared with the have-nots of the world.* |
| Phillips & Ziller's (1997) 20-item **Universal Orientation Scale**: |
| *At one level of thinking we are all of a kind.* |
| Robinson & Zill's (1997) 5-item **Cultural Cosmopolitanism Scale**: |
| *I would feel uncomfortable entertaining people I don't know in my home*. |
| Norris's (2000) 2-item **Cosmopolitan Orientation**: |
| *To which of these geographical groups would you say you belong first of all? – The locality or town where you live, …– The world as a whole.* |
| Sevig's *et al.* (2000) 71-item **Self-Identity Inventory**: |
| *Because I share my humanness with all people everywhere, whatever affects them affects me.* |
| Karasawa's (2002) 34-item **National Identity Scale**: |
| *Japan has many things to learn from other countries.* |
| Jeffres' *et al.* (2004) 42-item **Cosmopoliteness Scale**: |
| *I am more aware of what's going on around the world than most of my friends*. |

* reverse-keyed

## Results & Discussion

In total, 12 studies were found to be measuring topics of cosmopolitanism. These are chronologically ordered in Table 1. An example item is given for each scale. Levinson's (1957) Internationalism-Nationalism Scale, Sampson & Smith's (1957) Worldmindedness Scale, McFarland and Brown's (2008) Identification With All Humanity Scale, and Buchan, Brewer, Grimalda et al.'s (2012) were discovered too late for inclusion in the study. The other 12 studies differed in their conceptualizations of and ways of measuring a person's cosmopolitan attitude. Scales by Likert (1932), Kosterman and Feshbach (1989), and Wittkopf (1987) were all war-related. They had items measuring opinions about the US relations to other nations. Karasawa's (2002) scale was similar to these but it had a Japanese perspective, as exemplified by the item in Table 1. Cosmopolitanism measures by Merton (1957), Dye (1963), Jennings (1967), and Norris (2000) were similar in that they all attempted to differentiate cosmopolitans/internationalists from locals/nationals, and they all thus measured territorial attachments. Phillips and Ziller (1997), Robinson and Zill (1997), Sevig, Higlen and Adams (2000), and Jeffres *et al.* (2004) focused more on the multicultural aspect of cosmopolitanism, measuring respect for, acceptance of, tolerance of, and identification with, psychologically different *others*. Common to all the scales was willingness to engage with the cultural *other* in a positive way.

## STUDY 2: OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE

Roudometof (2005) argues that contemporary discourse on cosmopolitanism is influenced by stereotypes that are specific to specific cultures. Similarly, Pollock, Bhabha, Breckenridge and Chakrabarty (2002, p. 10) suggest that "*one simply look at the world across time and space and see how people have thought and acted beyond the local*". Hofstede (1984, p. 24) has similarly asserted that "*There is something basically wrong if studies meant to be cross-cultural originate from a single cultural base*". Thus, the purposes of this multi-cultural study were 1) to include opinions of lay people world-wide on the subject of the present study and 2) to see the degree to which "global identity" and "cosmopolitan identity" could be used interchangeably, as proposed in the introduction.

### Method

An online questionnaire, in English, with open-ended questions, was made and pilot-tested for wording. Using the *Yahoo Education Directory* (2005), university websites were located and then internal links were followed to student organizations. The questionnaire was sent to 250 student organizations with request that they circulate it to their members. However, because 49 email addresses were faulty, 201 organizations were in fact sampled, representing 33 countries. Depending on the number of universities in a country and the availability of e-mail addresses to student organizations, the number of organizations contacted varied from 1 in one country (Portugal) to 38 in another country (USA).

In one version of the questionnaire, students were asked to describe the characteristics of a public personality and of another friend who had strong global identities. They were also

asked to describe another public personality and a friend who had weak global identities. After describing these four persons, participants were also asked to write down what they think "global identity" is, and what it is not. In the other version, "global identity" was replaced with "cosmopolitan identity".

In total, 137 students from 24 different countries answered the questionnaire. Respondents ranged in age from 18 to 49 years, with a mean age of 25 (SD = 5). Of these, 76 % were female, and 24 % were male.

**Table 2.** *The 15 Characteristics of Global Identity and Cosmopolitan Identity and Their Prevalence in Percentages. Ordered by Frequency of Mention*

| Descriptions by Respondents | Total Mention (N=137) | Global Identity (N=105) | Cosmopolitan Identity (N=32) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Interest and will to learn from other cultures | 58 | 41 % | 47 % |
| 2. Respect and acceptance of cultural differences | 55 | 38 % | 47 % |
| 3. Travel around the world | 54 | 34 % | 56 % |
| 4. Not nationalist | 53 | 41 % | 31 % |
| 5. Open-mind | 50 | 38 % | 31 % |
| 6. Adapt and live in other cultures | 43 | 32 % | 28 % |
| 7. Non-racist thinking | 31 | 26 % | 12 % |
| 8. Speak several languages | 29 | 18 % | 31 % |
| 9. Global consciousness | 26 | 18 % | 22 % |
| 10. Care for culturally different | 23 | 14 % | 25 % |
| 11. Citizen of the world | 21 | 15 % | 16 % |
| 12. Not bounded by the local community | 20 | 16 % | 9 % |
| 13. Identification with a world community | 18 | 13 % | 13 % |
| 14. Not superiority of own culture | 18 | 12 % | 16 % |
| 15. Knowledge about different cultures | 17 | 10 % | 19 % |

**Results & Discussion**

Responses were 105 answers for the "global identity" version, and 32 for the "cosmopolitan identity" version. The binomial probability of 105 global identity responses by chance out of a total 137 responses is $p<.000001$, which is not very likely. This suggests that "global identity" was more familiar or recognizable than "cosmopolitan identity" to contemporary university students.

Table 2 shows the 15 descriptions most frequently mentioned by the respondents and presents percentages of respondents from each sample who described the global or

cosmopolitan person by those characteristics. When opposites characteristics were mentioned (e.g., not-nationalist for "global" and nationalist for not "global"), the frequencies of these characteristics were added together.

Correlation between the prevalence of characteristics mentioned by respondents of global identity and that of cosmopolitan identity was r = .74 (n = 137, p<.001). A t-test of prevalence of characteristics of global identity and cosmopolitan identity showed that there was no significant difference in frequency of mention between the characteristics of global identity and those of cosmopolitan identity ($t$ (14) = -.935, df = 14, p>.05), suggesting that these are synonymous constructs.

Most respondents reported the salient traits of global and cosmopolitan identities to be forms of cultural openness, i.e., orientations of respect of other cultures and readiness to learn from them. One respondent described a person with global identity as someone who "*has lost 'national markers which we generally make a part of our identity when we present ourselves, for example, as Norwegian*". Another one described cosmopolitan identity as "*the will to spread welfare across the whole planet, a sense of universal togetherness with all humans*". The most frequently mentioned public personality with a global identity was Kofi Anan (former UN secretary General), named by 14% of respondents. The most frequently mentioned public personality with a non-global identity was George Bush (former US President), named by 38% of respondents.

Based on the respondents' descriptions of global and cosmopolitan identities, 21 new items were created for the total trial item pool. Example items are *"Sharing a common world, we should cooperate to make it a better place to live for everyone", "I can easily adjust to practices of other cultures"*, *"One should be tolerant of cultural differences",* and *"The welfare of my nation comes before the welfare of others"* (reverse keyed).

## STUDY 3: TOTAL TRIAL ITEM POOL

Scale development invariably entails the identification of psychometrically superior items from a large pool of potential items. The purpose of Study 3 was to use the information from Studies 1 and 2 to compile a total trial item pool, and have this item pool reviewed by experts to ensure appropriateness of items to measure the construct of global identity.

### Method

Studies 1 and 2 were used as a guide for writing Likert-type items. Wherever possible, the words and phrases provided by the respondents answering the open-ended questions were used. While most of the items were written by the first author, in total, 25 items were borrowed from scales that the literature review had revealed. Four items were taken from the Likert's (1932) Internationalism Scale. One of those was *"We must strive for loyalty to our country before we can afford to consider world brotherhood".* Six were taken from the Kosterman & Feshbach (1989) Patriotism-Nationalism Questionnaire, including, for

instance *"I would not be willing to decrease our living standard to increase that of people in poorer countries in the world"*. Three items were added to the total trial item pool from Karasawa's (2002) National Identity Scale, for example *"It helps my country that we try to learn from foreign cultures"*. In addition, nine items were taken from the Self-Identity Inventory of Sevig, Higlen & Adams (2000). One of these was *"I see myself in all others because we are all part of the same collective spirit"*. A single item, *"I enjoy learning about different cultures"*, was borrowed from the Cosmopoliteness Scale of Jeffres *et al.* (2004).

The initial total trial item pool consisted of 113 items that included a wide variety of ways in which the concept of global identity might be expressed. Of these, 37 were negatively-keyed. A six-point Likert response range used: 1 = "strongly agree", 2 = "agree", 3 = "slightly agree", 4 = "slightly disagree", 5 = "disagree" and 6 = "strongly disagree". As suggested by DeVellis (2003), a neutral response option was not used in order to avoid the confound of a midpoint response being a report of neutral agreement and also a report of no response.

This tentative total trial item pool was then reviewed by a convenience sample of six experts, professors within different fields of social sciences from 3 different universities. Experts were asked to rate each item "low", "moderate" or "high" according to how they thought each item would perform in measuring "global identity" defined as follows: *"Global identity is the notion of belonging to the whole world rather than some narrow territorial part of it. It is the idea of identifying with all human kind. It can also be understood as consciousness of an international society or global community transcending national boundaries, without necessarily negating the importance of state, nation or domestic society*". The experts were also encouraged to suggest possible new items for inclusion in the total trial item pool.

**Results & Discussion**

Items that were deemed problematic by experts were either deleted from the list or modified. For instance, the item *"I consider myself a citizen of the world"* was changed to "*I consider myself more as a citizen of the world than a citizen of some nation"*, since that most people would probably agree to the initial version of the item while the modified version of the item was thought to better differentiate people. One example item suggested by experts was *"I fear that my country would lose essential independence if there were a world government"*. By these processes, the total trial item pool consisted of 110 items, of which 38 were negatively-keyed.

However, of 110 items in total trial item pool, 9 were behavioural items rather than identity or attitude items, for example, *"I follow international news"* and *"I speak several languages."* These 6 were aggregated to make a behavioural measure by which to evaluate the validity of the identity measures. Thus, though the total number of Likert items was 110, the effective total trial item pool for devising a global identity scale was only 101 items.

In addition, the 10-item Strahan-Gerbasi (1972) Social Desirability Scale (SDS) was included in the questionnaire as a validation method for assessing how strongly individual

items were influenced by social desirability. Considering that the respondents would be an international sample, most of whom were 2nd language users of English, the word *"irked"* in one item was changed to *"annoyed"* so that the item became "*I have never been annoyed when people expressed ideas very different from my own"*.

## STUDY 4: PSYCHOMETRIC SELECTION OF ITEMS

In order to compile psychometric data by which to select a coherent set of Likert items for a brief scale of global identity, the purpose of Study 4 was to obtain responses to the total trial item pool from samples of respondents from three distinct cultures: Norway, Turkey, and the USA.

### Method

The original English version of the questionnaire was translated into Turkish. Forward-and-back translation was performed by two independent teams of Turkish teachers of English language. The first-author, who is Turkish-English bilingual, decided on a best translation when there was disagreement between the two translation teams.

Three convenience samples of university students were recruited from Norway, Turkey and the USA by two different methods: 1) direct classroom recruitment, and 2) email recruitment via university organizations. The number of respondents recruited in lecture classes were 161 at the University of Oslo in Norway, 43 at Osmangazi University in Turkey, and 14 at Clark University in the USA. The Yahoo Education Directory was used to find university websites, and internal links were traced to student organizations. In addition, teaching staff at university psychology departments were also contacted by e-mail and requested to circulate the link to the questionnaire to their students.

Respondents had three tasks: 1) answer descriptive questions asking about age, gender, country of birth, country of residence, country of citizenship, first language, other languages spoken, and years of post-secondary education; 2) answer 110 Likert items about global identity and behaviour and answer 10 items about social desirability; and 3) identify the two items they thought to be "*most difficult to understand, most ambiguous, most confusing, or poorly expressed*." All items were randomly ordered.

### Results & Discussion

The questionnaire was answered by 684 Norwegian, 605 Turkish and 406 American undergraduate and graduate students. In the Norwegian sample, respondents ranged in age from 19 to 60 years with a mean age of 26 (SD = 6.3); 73% of respondents were female, 26% male. In the Turkish sample, respondents ranged in age from 17 to 50, with a mean age of 23 (SD = 3.7); 59% were female, 38% male. In the American sample, respondents ranged from 17 to 65 years, with a mean age of 24 (SD = 7.0); 57% were female, 42% male. The Turkish sample was different in that both English and Turkish version of the questionnaire were presented, with students studying disciplines taught in English answering the English

version (N=144) and others answering the Turkish version (N=461). Respondents not answering more than 30% of all items were excluded from the study, resulting in 27 deleted from the Norwegian sample, 49 from the Turkish sample and 22 from the American sample.

**Table 3.** *Comparison of the Three Samples on Age, Number of Languages Spoken, Years of Higher Education, Social Desirability, Multicultural Index and Cosmopolitan Behaviour Index*

| | Norway N=657 | | Turkey N=556 | | U.S.A. N=384 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mn | SD | Mn | SD | Mn | SD |
| Age | 26 | 6.3 | 22 | 3.7 | 24 | 5.9 |
| Years of higher education | 4.1 | 2.5 | 3.3 | 2.5 | 4.3 | 3.0 |
| Number of languages spoken | 3.3 | 1.1 | 2.5 | 0.7 | 1.9 | 0.9 |
| Multicultural Index | 1.2 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 0.4 |
| Social Desirability | 3.5 | 0.6 | 3.9 | 0.5 | 3.6 | 0.7 |
| Cosmopolitan Behaviour Index | 4.6 | 0.7 | 4.1 | 0.9 | 4.0 | 1.0 |

The Cronbach alpha coefficient for the 10-item Social Desirable Scale (SDS) was $\alpha = .70$ for the Norwegian sample, $\alpha = .55$ for the Turkish sample $\alpha = .75$ for the American sample. Consistency was lower for the Turkish sample due a negative item-total correlation for one item ("*I never resent being asked to return a favour*"). Means and standard deviations are reported in Table 3.

Another validity measure, called the Multicultural Index (MI), was computed as the total number of cultures with which the respondent had had engagement based on answers to questions about country of birth, country of residence, country of citizenship and mother tongue. For example, a British citizen who was born to Chinese-speaking parents in America but who now studies in Norway, would have an index score of 4. An English-speaking American born in the USA to American parents and who now studies in the USA would have an index score of 1. All three samples were largely unicultural: MI scores of 1 were evident for 81% of the Norway sample, 92% of the Turkey sample, and 85% of the USA sample. Means and standard deviations are reported in Table 3.

A Cosmopolitan Behaviour Scale (CBS) was also computed as a validity measure. Of the 9 items describing cosmopolitan behaviours as distinct from identities or attitudes, 3 were about reading news and 2 were about website preferences. The Cosmopolitan Behaviour Scale was computed using the 6 non-redundant Likert items yielding the highest alpha

coefficient. These items asked about 1) reading international news, 2) reading foreign magazines, 3) speaking several languages, 4) having foreign friends, 5) travelling to foreign countries, and 6) preferring international websites. The Cronbach alpha for this scale was $\alpha = .65$ for the Norwegian sample, $\alpha = .73$ for the Turkish sample and $\alpha = .77$ for the American sample. Item-total correlations were all positive in all three samples. Means and standard deviations are reported in Table 3.

Any item identified by 5 or more respondents as difficult to understand, ambiguous, confusing, or poorly expressed was excluded from further analysis and consideration. For example, the item, *"Only international communities can find solutions to address problems with cross-border implications"* was identified as problematic by 20 respondents. The respondents' reports of problematic items led to elimination of 19 items. Thus, 82 of the initial 101 attitude items remained for potential inclusion in a Global Identity Scale.

These 82 items were evaluated on the basis of how they performed on 22 criteria. Preferred items were deemed to have: 1-3) low frequency of omission in each sample, 4-6) low correlations with social desirability in each sample, 7-9) high standard deviations in each sample, 10-12) high item-total correlations in each sample, 13-15) high correlations with the Multicultural Index in each sample, 16-18) high correlations with the Cosmopolitan Behaviour Scale in each sample, 19-20) few characters in the English and Turkish versions, and 21-22) few words in both versions. Items were ranked, with equal weight given to all criteria.

A mean of all 22 ranks was computed for each item, and based on these rankings the "best" 12 positively-keyed items and the "best" 12 negatively-keyed items were selected for further item analysis. See Table 4 for examples of the rankings of the two "best" and the two "worst" items. From these 24 items, three tentative scales of 8, 10 and 12 items were created based on their mean item-total correlations across samples as well as on avoiding repetitive items. All three tentative scales consisted of half positively-keyed and half negatively-keyed items.

**Table 4.** *Rank Values on the 22 Selection Criteria Illustrated with the 2 Items with the Highest Mean Rank and the 2 Items with the Lowest Mean Rank. SDS = Social Desirability Scale; MI = Multicultural Index; CBS = Cosmopolitan Behavior Scale*

| Rank criteria | My country is one of the best in the world. | I could live in other cultures than my own. | Everyone, irrespective of who they are, is entitled to an adequate standard of living. | Sharing a common world, we should cooperate to make it a better place to live for everyone. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| MEAN RANK FOR 22 CRITERIA | 62 | 60 | 28 | 28 |
| Norway: Few omissions | 27 | 53 | 8 | 53 |
| Turkey: Few omissions | 51 | 82 | 24 | 24 |
| USA: Few omissions | 23 | 83 | 12 | 23 |
| Norway: Low SDS correlation | 56 | 79 | 52 | 52 |
| Turkey: Low SDS correlation | 80 | 72 | 22 | 63 |
| USA: Low SDS correlation | 68 | 46 | 19 | 54 |
| Norway: High standard deviation | 87 | 32 | 12 | 17 |
| Turkey: High standard deviation | 86 | 43 | 8 | 26 |
| USA: High standard deviation | 87 | 28 | 16 | 35 |
| Nor.: High item-total correlation | 67 | 14 | 53 | 65 |
| Turkey: High item-total correlatio | 69 | 40 | 65 | 13 |
| USA: High item-total correlation | 81 | 19 | 69 | 33 |
| Norway: High MI correlation | 79 | 55 | 45 | 9 |
| Turkey: High MI correlation | 55 | 82 | 20 | 8 |
| USA: High MI correlation | 29 | 48 | 20 | 33 |
| Norway: High CBS correlation | 48 | 78 | 25 | 3 |
| Turkey: High CBS correlation | 29 | 79 | 48 | 11 |
| USA: High CBS correlation | 31 | 71 | 46 | 3 |
| Turkish: Few characters | 83 | 57 | 2 | 28 |
| English: Few characters | 81 | 79 | 11 | 12 |
| Turkish: Few words | 72 | 54 | 1 | 39 |
| English: Few words | 50 | 61 | 7 | 18 |

**Table 5.** *Reliability, Validity Performance of 8-item, 10-item, and 12-item Scales of Global Identity for Samples from Norway, Turkey and the USA. SDS = Social Desirability Scale; MI = Multiculturalism Index; CBS = Cosmopolitan Behavior Scale; LS = number of languages spoken*

| | Norway N = 657 | | | Turkey N = 556 | | | U.S.A. N = 384 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 8-item | 10-item | 12-item | 8-item | 10-item | 12-item | 8-item | 10-item | 12-item |
| | - - - High, positive coefficients are preferred.- - - | | | | | | | | |
| Alpha | .75 | .79 | .83 | .78 | .81 | .84 | .81 | .85 | .87 |
| CBS | .26* | .27* | .25* | .22* | .22* | .22* | .39* | .39* | .39* |
| LS | .13* | .13* | .11* | .13* | .15* | .16* | .25* | .26* | .26* |
| MI | .07 | .10* | .09* | .03 | .04 | .03 | .04 | .05 | .04 |
| | - - - Near-zero, non-significant coefficients are preferred. - - - | | | | | | | | |
| SDS | .03 | .04 | .04 | .10* | .09* | .09* | .15* | .15* | .14* |
| Female | .05 | .09* | .08 | .11* | .11* | .09* | .13* | .16* | .17* |
| Age | .15* | .16* | .15* | .04 | .03 | .04 | .02 | .01 | .00 |
| Educ. | .15* | .17* | .17* | -.06 | -.06 | -.05 | -.02 | .00 | .00 |

* $p < .05$

As shown in Table 5, the Cronbach alpha coefficients for each scale, for each sample, were adequately high. All three scales showed significant, positive correlations with the validity measure of the Cosmopolitan Behaviour Scale (CBS), though these correlations were stronger for the USA sample. The other two validity measures of the number of languages spoken (LS) and the Multicultural Index (MI) were positively correlated with all three scales in all samples, but the MI correlations were weak and generally not statistically significant. Thus, this study did not replicate Robinson and Zill (1997) who had reported higher cosmopolitan scores for people with greater exposure to a variety of cultures.

Table 5 also shows relationships of the scales with other measures where near zero or non-significant correlations would be preferable. All three scales were, unfortunately, positively correlated with the measure of social desirability, despite items being selected in part based on low correlation with this bias. This indicates that Global Identity is a positive norm among university students in all three cultures sampled for this study, but the correlations were weak and not statistically significant in the Norwegian sample. Table 5 suggests that the effects of social desirability are somewhat variable across cultures, which has also been reported by Thompson and Phua (2005) and by Rudmin (1999).

In all three samples, all three scales also showed weak, positive correlations with femaleness. In contrast, Norris (2000) had found women to be marginally more localized than men. Age was positively correlated to Global Identity in all three samples but the correlations were statistically significant only in the Norwegian sample, and near-zero in the US sample. The effects of education on Global Identity was different across cultures, with the Norwegians showing positive correlations, the Turks showing negative correlations and the Americans near-zero correlations.

Table 5 shows that there are no dramatic psychometric differences by which to prefer one version of the Global Identity Scale over the other two. The decision was made to adopt the 10-item version because it had higher alpha coefficients across samples than the 8-item scale and because it had fewer items than the 12-item scale, on the resumption that briefer scales have greater utility than longer scales. Table 5 also shows that this scale should be used in conjunction with measures of social desirability, age, gender, and education so that the effects of these might be controlled by covariance methods. The present study shows that cultural variation is to be expected in these effects.

**Table 6.** *Global Identity Scale Means, Standard Deviations (SD) and Item-total Correlations (ITC) for the Three Samples*

| Positively- & negatively-keyed | Norway N=657 | | | Turkey N=556 | | | U.S.A. N=384 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| items for the GIS - 10 | Mn | SD | ITC | Mn | SD | ITC | Mn | SD | ITC |
| **Positively - Keyed Items** | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. I consider myself more as a citizen of the world than a citizen of some nation. | 3.5 | 1.3 | .50 | 3.7 | 1.5 | .53 | 4.0 | 1.5 | .60 |
| 2. I could live in other cultures than my own. | 5.0 | 0.9 | .38 | 4.3 | 1.2 | .37 | 5.1 | 1.0 | .39 |
| 3. I identify with a world community. | 4.3 | 1.0 | .41 | 4.5 | 1.2 | .34 | 4.7 | 1.1 | .51 |
| 4. I enjoy learning about different cultures. | 5.4 | 0.7 | .34 | 5.5 | 0.7 | .26 | 5.4 | 0.7 | .49 |
| 5. I like listening to music from different cultures. | 4.8 | 1.0 | .37 | 5.4 | 0.8 | .25 | 4.8 | 1.3 | .41 |
| **Negatively - Keyed Items** | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. My own culture is the best in the whole world. | 4.3 | 1.2 | .50 | 3.4 | 1.4 | .64 | 4.3 | 1.4 | .61 |
| 7. One should first care for his or her nation, then others. | 4.2 | 1.2 | .42 | 3.2 | 1.5 | .55 | 3.6 | 1.4 | .54 |
| 8. I feel intense pride when I think about my country. | 3.9 | 1.3 | .54 | 2.9 | 1.3 | .61 | 3.6 | 1.6 | .66 |
| 9. I feel most connected to members of my own country. | 3.3 | 1.2 | .56 | 2.8 | 1.3 | .68 | 3.2 | 1.4 | .62 |
| 10. My country is one of the best in the world. | 4.0 | 1.4 | .61 | 3.3 | 1.6 | .59 | 4.1 | 1.5 | .70 |

The descriptive characteristics of the items in the 10-item Global Identity Scale (acronymed GIS-10) are presented in Table 6. Of particular note are the high item-total correlations, ranging from a low of r = .25 to a high of r = .70. Five of the items are positively-keyed and five negatively-keyed.

**Table 7.** *Item Loadings on Principle Components Factors in Each Sample**

| Positively- keyed & negatively-keyed items for the GIS - 10 | Varimax Rotated Factor Loadings | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Norway | | Turkey | | U.S.A. | |
| | Factor 1 | Factor 2 | Factor 1 | Factor 2 | Factor 1 | Factor 2 |
| **Positively - Keyed Items** | | | | | | |
| 1. I consider myself more as a citizen of the world than a citizen of some nation. | .33 | .58 | .35 | .64 | .46 | .56 |
| 2. I could live in other cultures than my own. | .14 | .61 | .28 | .49 | .08 | .71 |
| 3. I identify with a world community. | .20 | .60 | .05 | .77 | .23 | .71 |
| 4.[J] I enjoy learning about different cultures. | .01 | .70 | .00 | .67 | .14 | .77 |
| 5. I like listening to music from different cultures. | .05 | .71 | .00 | .64 | .11 | .72 |
| **Negatively - Keyed Items** | | | | | | |
| 6. My own culture is the best in the whole world. | .74 | .01 | .82 | .11 | .81 | .09 |
| 7. One should first care for his/her nation, then others. | .67 | .06 | .69 | .16 | .65 | .21 |
| 8.[SHA] I feel intense pride when I think about my country. | .77 | .11 | .83 | .04 | .85 | .12 |
| 9.[SHA] I feel most connected to members of my own country. | .57 | .40 | .79 | .22 | .67 | .30 |
| 10. My country is one of the best in the world. | .76 | .22 | .83 | .03 | .87 | .14 |

[J] Item from Jeffress *et al.* (2004).
[SHA] Items modified from Sevig, Higlen & Adams (2000).
* Retraction by Maximum Likelihood method yielded very similar loadings for all items in the three samples except for item 8 in the Norwegian sample which loaded equally on both factors.

As shown in Table 7, the GIS-10 was factor analyzed in each sample, using the default Principal Components method in SPSS and Varimax rotation of the two-factor solution. Some scholars, however, recommend Maximum Likelihood extraction for psychometric analysis (e.g., Costello & Osborne, 2005). In the present study, use of Maximum Likelihood extraction resulted in minor changes in factor loadings, the largest being for the item "I feel most connected to members of my country", loading .57 and .40 respectively in the two factors using Principle Components extraction in the Norwegian sample, changing to .43 and .46 respectively using Maximum Likelihood extraction. Cross-cultural metric equivalence can be evaluated by the degree to which the factor loadings of the items are similar in the three samples. High positive correlations were found for the loadings of Norway and Turkey samples ($r$ = .94, $n$ = 20, $p$ < .01), for the Norway and USA samples ($r$ = .97, $n$ = 20, $p$ < .01), and for the Turkey and USA samples ($r$ = .95, $n$ = 20, $p$ < .01). Thus the factor structure of the GIS-10 is stable across cultures, at least for the three cultures examined thus far.

As shown in Table 7, the two factor rotated solution differentiated in each sample the positively-keyed items about cultural curiosity and respect, from the negatively-keyed items about nationalism. It was a serendipitous result of the selection machinations that the two factorial sub-scales of the 10-item scale unambiguously differentiated the positively-keyed and negatively-keyed items. It was not planned or anticipated. These two orthogonal sub-scales of the GIS-10 were named *Cultural Openness*, factor 2, and *Non-Nationalism*, factor 1. They thus represent the classical approach-avoidance dynamic common in much psychological theorizing. For the Norway, Turkey and USA samples, respectively, the alpha coefficients for 5-item Cultural Openness sub-scale were α = .67, α = .66, and α = .76. For the Non-Nationalism sub-scale, the respective alpha coefficients were α = .78, α = .86, and α = .85. In comparison, these two 5-item scales have better alpha coefficients than the five 5-item scales reported by Vedder & van de Vijver (2006) for a study with 55 samples (N =7,342) in 13 nations: mean alpha coefficients were .48, .55, .58, .64, and .77.

*Validation of GIS:* Once a scale is developed and its reliability is established, the further step would be to demonstrate its criterion or predictive validity. In a different study (Phelps, Eilertsen, Türken & Ommundsen, 2011), GIS was administered to a sample of 486 Norwegian university students together with established psychological measures such as right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation and also a new scale of majority integration efforts which taps majority members' openness to diversity and their attitudes toward their own proactive contribution to integration of immigrants. GIS was found to be significantly correlated, in expected ways, negatively to measures of right-wing authoritarianism (-0.41) and social dominance orientation (-0.42) and positively to majority integration efforts (.59). Thus, it is demonstrated that GIS has criterion validity.

## GENERAL DISCUSSION

The present study details the stepwise development of a scale of global identity, GIS. Earlier similar constructs found in literature review (Study 1), analysis of lay peoples' description of global identity (Study 2), scholarly evaluations of scale items (Study 3) have led to an

item pool that was administered in three different cultures (Study 4). Our analysis resulted in development of a cross-culturally stable 10-item Global Identity Scale with two components.

One limitation this study, as any other study of development of an identity scale, faces is the difficulty with operationalization of concept of identity. Identity in humanities and social sciences today is seen more and more as a social construction rather than a fixed entity (Hermans & Dimaggio, 2007; Jack & Lorbiecki, 2007). This implies that identity is more than a purely individual, psychological phenomenon and is contingent upon wider societal discourses. Therefore, measuring identity is a risky business. The notion of a stable and enduring identity that can be measured with fixed scale items is challenged by the social constructionist and discursive perspectives that emphasize *situated* (conditional on specific physical and social contexts) and *occasioned* (as a response to specific social requirement) accounts of self and identity (Augoustinos, Walker & Donaghue, 2006). In addition, that the GIS comprises a mixture of attitude and identification items might be a weakness from a theoretical point of view, collapsing two theoretically different constructs. However, the bottom-up approach chosen in this study justifies the mixture of items in the final GIS. Furthermore, the concepts of cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitan identity in the scholarly literature are not precise either. Results found here should therefore be interpreted in terms of the theoretical framework of the present study. The intertwining of scholarly views, expert opinion, and lay opinion to develop an understanding of global identity is however assumed to provide the present study with a basis of confidence and robustness. The procedure chosen here for selection of items for the GIS is only one of many ways to develop a scale. Depending on the method and criteria chosen for item selection, another composition of items might emerge as the final scale. However, item development based on both a theory driven, top-down approach and an empirically driven, bottom-up approach indicates valid choice of items.

Although the study shows cross-cultural stability for the GIS, the study is exploratory in nature and therefore needs to be replicated in other contexts and under different circumstances so that the validity of results can be established further. Thus, future studies should focus on validation, within other cultural contexts and with populations other than university students, and also in combination with similar recent measures such as IWAHS (McFarland & Brown, 2008) to establish discriminant validity. Gender and education effects need further study as well as explanation. However, the fact that GIS was found to be related, in expected ways, positively to majority integration efforts, and negatively to right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation in a recent study (Phelps et al., 2011) strengthens the validity of the scale.

The worth of a psychometric scale eventually is based on its utility. Thus, future research might focus on the utility of the GIS, for example, in personnel selection and/or training in transnational companies or global governance institutions. The GIS might also be useful in contexts of conflict resolution, for example, in selecting mediators or peace-builders (Kelman, 1998). Assuming that cosmopolitan people are more neutral than nationalists, it is expected that they would more often make use of diplomacy rather than military

confrontation. In accord with Social Identity Theory, cosmopolitans would be expected to have fewer stereotypes of the cultural *other*, and would be disinclined to derogate the cultural *other.*

In conclusion, the early measurement scales of topics of cosmopolitanism came mostly from studies conducted in developed nations, and were often articulated in reference to particular nations (e.g., USA, Japan, etc.) and particular historical contexts (e.g., WWII, Cold War, etc.). Roudometof (2005, p. 115) wrote that "*contemporary discourse on . . . cosmopolitanism suffers from . . . spatially and culturally specific stereotypes that colour our imagination and limit our grasp . . .*" The present study, therefore, was based on data gathered from geographically distant as well as culturally different samples (Study 2 and Study 4). The result is a brief Global Identity Scale that is cross-culturally stable, and that has two clear components. Such a scale should be of benefit to those interested in development of new attachments as a result of globalization.

The conclusion of this study concurs with that of Buchan, Brewer, Grimalda et al. (2012, p. 825): *"an inclusive social identification with the world community is a meaningful psychological construct and . . . plays a role in motivating cooperation that transcends parochial interests."*

## References


Arnett, J. J. (2002). The psychology of globalization. *American Psychologist, 57*, 774-783.

Augoustinos, M. (1998). Social representations and ideology: Towards the study of ideological representations. In U. Flick (Ed.). *The psychology of the social* (pp. 156-169). UK: Cambridge University Press.

Augoustinos, M., Walker, I., & Donaghue, N. (2006). *Social cognition. An integrated introduction.* Oxford: Sage.

Beck, U. (2002). The cosmopolitan society and its enemies. *Theory, Culture & Society, 19,* 17-44.

Bracken, C. C., Jeffres, L. W., Neuendorf, K. A., Kopfman, J., & Moulla, F. (2005). How cosmopolites react to messages: America under attack. *Communication Research Reports, 22,* 47-58.

Breakwell, G. M. (1993). Integrating paradigms, methodological implications. In G. M. Breakwell & D. V. Canter (Eds.), *Empirical approaches to social representations* (pp. 180-201). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Brinkmann, S. (2008). Identity as self-interpretation. *Theory and Psychology, 18,* 404-422.

Broad, R., & Heckscher, Z. (2003). Before Seattle: The historical roots of the current movement against corporate-led globalisation. *Third World Quarterly, 24,* 713-728.

Brock, G., & Brighouse, H. (2005). Introduction. In G. Brock and H. Brighouse (Eds.), *The political philosophy of cosmopolitanism* (pp. 1-9). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, R. (2002). Intergroup relations. In M. Hewstone & W. Stroebe (Eds.), *Introduction to social psychology* (pp. 479-515). Oxford: Blackwell.

Buchan, N. R., Brewer, M. B., Grimalda, G., Wilson, R. K., Fatas, E., & Foddy, M. (2012). Global

social identity and global cooperation. *Psychological Science, 22*, 821-828.
Buchanan, W., & Cantril, H. (1953). *How nations see each other.* Urbana, Il: University of Illinois Press.
Chryssochoou, X. (2005). *Cultural diversity: Its social psychology.* Oxford: Blackwell.
Costello, A. B. & Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 10.* Available online: http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=10&n=7
Cuccioletta, D. (2002). Multiculturalism or transculturalism: Towards a cosmopolitan citizenship. *London Journal of Canadian Studies, 17,* 1-11.
DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development. Theory and applications.* Applied Social Research Methods Series, (Vol. 26). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Doise, W. (2002). *Human rights as social representations.* London: Routledge.
Dye, T. R. (1963). The local-cosmopolitan dimension and the study of urban politics. *Social Forces, 41,* 239-246.
Earle, T. C., & Cvetkovich, G. (1997). Culture, cosmopolitanism and risk management. *Risk Analysis, 17,* 55-65.
Esses, V. M., Dovidio, J. F., Semenya, A. H., & Jackson, L. M. (2005). Attitudes toward immigrants and immigration: The role of national and international identity. In J. M. Marques, D. Abrams & M. A. Hogg (Eds.), *The social psychology of inclusion and exclusion.* New York: Psychology Press.
Frumkin, R. M. (1962). Scientific millennialism as the coming world ideology. *Journal of Human Relations, 10*, 145-162.
Gans, H. J. (1962). *The urban villagers.* New York: Free Press.
*Globalisation Guide* (2002). *What is globalisation?* Retrieved October 25, 2005, from http://www.globalisationguide.org/01.html
Hannerz, U. (1996). *Transnational connections: Culture, people, places.* London: Routledge.
Harris, H. (1927). The Greek origins of the idea of cosmopolitanism. *International Journal of Ethics, 38*, 1-10.
Held, D. (2005). Principles of cosmopolitan order. In G. Brock & H. Brighouse (Eds.), *The political philosophy of cosmopolitanism* (pp. 10-27). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Held, D. (2006, April). Kosmopolitisme som vor tids politiske filosofi? [Cosmopolitanism as our time's political philosophy?]. Interview by Thorup, M. *Le Monde Diplomatique*, *4,* p. 10.
Hermans, H. J. M. & Dimaggio, G. (2007). Self, identity, and globalization in times of uncertainty: A dialogical analysis. *Review of General Psychology, 11,* 31-61.
Hofstede, G. (1984). National cultures revisited. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 2,* 22-28.
Hofstede, G., & Hofstede, G. J. (2005). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw Hill.
Jack, G. & Lorbiecki, A. (2007). National identity, globalization and the discursive construction of organizational identity. *British Journal of Management, 18,* 79-94.

Jeffres, L. W., Atkin, D. J., Bracken, C. C., & Neuendorf, K. A. (2004). Cosmopoliteness in the internet age. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 10* (1), Article 2. Retrieved on 30.09.2005 from http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol10/issue1/jeffres.html

Jennings, M. K. (1967). Pre-adult orientation to multiple systems of government. *Midwest Journal of Political Science, 11,* 291-317.

Jensen, L. (2003). Coming of age in a multicultural world: Globalization and adolescent cultural identity formation. *Applied Developmental Science, 7,* 189-196.

Karasawa, M. (2002). Patriotism nationalism, and internationalism among Japanese citizens: An etic-emic approach. *Political Psychology, 23,* 645-666.

Katz, D. (1960). The functional approach to the study of attitudes. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 24,* 163-204.

Kelman, H. C. (1958). Compliance, identification, and internationalization: Three processes of attitude change. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 2,* 51-60.

Kelman, H. C. (1998). Interactive problem solving: An active approach to conflict resolution and its application in the Middle East. *Political Science and Politics, 31,* 190-198.

Kosterman, R., & Feshbach, S. (1989). Toward a measure of patriotic and nationalistic attitudes. *Political Psychology, 10,* 257-274.

Lammers, C. J. (1974). Localism, cosmopolitanism, and faculty response. *Sociology of Education, 47*, 129-158.

Larochelle, G. (1992). Interdependence, globalization and fragmentation. In Mlinar, Z. (Ed.), *Globalization and territorial identities* (pp. 150-164). Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Lentz, T.-F. (1950). The attitudes of world citizenship. *Journal of Social Psychology, 32*, 207-214.

Levinson, D. J. (1957). Authoritarian personality and foreign policy. *Conflict Resolution, 1*, 37-47.

Likert, R. (1932). *A technique for the measurement of attitudes*. Columbia University doctoral dissertation published in *Archives of Psychology*, *22* (140), 1-55.

McFarland, S. & Brown, D. (2008). Who believes that identification with all humanity is ethical? *Psicologìa Polìtica, 36*, 37-49.

*Merriam-Webster's online thesaurus* (2005). *Global*. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from http://www.britannica.com/thesaurus?hdwd=global&book=Collegiate&swap=Thesaurus

Merton, R. (1957). *Social theory and social structure*, (2nd ed.). Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Mlinar, Z. (1992). Individuation and globalization: The transformation of territorial social organization. In Mlinar, Z. (Ed), *Globalization and territorial identities* (pp. 15-34). Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Norris, P. (2001). Global governance & cosmopolitan citizens. In J. S Nye & J. Donahue (Eds.), *Governance in a globalizing world* (pp. 155-177). Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Nussbaum, M. C (1997). Kant and cosmopolitanism. In J. Bohman & M. Lutz-Bachann (Eds.), *Perpetual peace. Essays on Kant's cosmopolitan ideal* (pp. 25.57). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Orr, E., Mana A., & Mana, Y. (2003). Immigrant identity of Israeli adolescents from Ethiopia and the former USSR: Culture-specific principles of organization. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 33,* 71-92.

Pedhazur, E. J., & Schmelkin, L. P. (1991). *Measurement, design and analysis. An integrated approach.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Phelps, J. M., Eilertsen, D. E., Türken, S., & Ommundsen, R. (2011). Integrating immigrant minorities. Developing a scale to measure majority members' attitudes toward their own proactive efforts. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 52,* 404-410.

Phillips, S. T., & Ziller, R. C. (1997). Toward a theory and measure of the nature of non-prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*, 420-434.

Poche, B. (1992). Identification as a process: Territorial as an organizational or a symbolic area. In Mlinar, Z. (Ed.), *Globalization and territorial identities* (pp. 129-149). Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Pollock, S., Bhabha, H. K, Breckenridge, C. A, & Chakrabarty, D. (2002). Cosmopolitanisms. In C. A. Breckenridge, S. Pollock, H. K. Bhabha & D. Chakrabarty (Eds.), *Cosmopolitanism* (pp. 1-14). Durham: Duke University Press.

Robinson, J. P., & Zill, N. (1997). Matters of culture. *American Demographics, 19,* 48-52.

Roudometof, V. (2005). Transnationalism, cosmopolitanism and globalization. *Current Sociology, 53,* 113-135.

Rudmin, F. W. (1999). Norwegian short-form of the Marlowe-Crowne social desirability scale. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 40,* 229-233.

Sampson, D. L., & Smith, H. P. (1957). A scale to measure world minded attitudes. *Journal of Social Psychology, 45*, 99-106.

Sampson, E. D. (1989). The challenge of social change for psychology. Globalization and psychology's theory of the person. *American Psychologist, 44,* 914-921.

Scholte, J. A. (1997). Global capitalism and the state. *International Affairs, 73,* 427-452.

Sevig, T. D., Higlen, P. S., & Adams, E. M. (2000). Development and validation of the Self-Identity Inventory (SII): A multicultural identity development instrument. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 6,* 168-182.

Shinohara, H. (2004). *Evolution in global identity: The League of Nations and the United Nations.* Paper presented at the UNU Global Seminar, September 7. Retrieved November 30, 2005, from http://www.google.com/search?client=opera&rls=nb&q=shinohara,+hatsue&sourceid=opera&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8

Singer, J. D. (1965). Cosmopolitan attitudes and international relations courses: Some tentative correlations. *Journal of Politics, 27*, 318-338

Skrbis, Z., Kendall, G., & Woodward, I. (204). Locating cosmopolitanism. Between humanist ideal and grounded social theory. *Theory, Culture & Society, 21,* 115-136.

*Stanford encyclopaedia of philosophy* (2005). *Cosmopolitanism.* Retrieved October 25, 2005, from http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/cosmopolitanism/

Sypnowich, C. (2005). Cosmopolitans, cosmopolitanism, and human flourishing. In G. Brock & H. Brighouse (Eds.), *The political philosophy of cosmopolitanism* (pp. 55-74). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Reviews of Psychology, 33*, 1-39.

Thomson, E. R., & Phua, F. T. T. (2005). Reliability among senior managers of the Marlowe-Crowne short form social desirability scale. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 19,* 541-554.

Thorup, M. (2006, April). Kosmopolitikk [Cosmopolitics]. *Le Monde Diplomatique*, 4, p. 10.
Thurstone, L. L. (1928). Attitudes can be measured. *American Journal of Sociology, 33*, 529-554.
Tønnesson, S. (2004). Globalizing national states. In M. Guibernau & J. Hutchinson (Eds.), *History and national destiny: Ethnosymbolism and its critics* (pp. 179-194). Oxford: Blackwell.
Vedder, P., & van de Vijver, F. (2006). Methodological aspects: Studying adolescents in 13 countries. In J. W. Berry, J. S. Phinney, D. L. Sam, & P. Vedder. (Eds.), Immigrant youth in cultural transition: Acculturation, identity and adaptation across national contexts ( pp. 47-69). London: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Volkan, V. D. (1998). *Bloodlines: From ethnic pride to ethnic terrorism.* Boulder, Colorado: Westviev Press.
Volkan, V. D. (1994). *The need to have enemies and allies: From clinical practice to international relationships.* Northvale, N.J.: Jason Aronson.
Volkan, V. D., & Itzkovitz, N. (1994). *Turks & Greeks: Neigbours in conflict.* Cambridgeshire, UK: The Eothen Press.
*Webster's new collegiate dictionary* (1961). Global. Cambridge, MA: Houghton.
Wiley, S. B. C. (2004). Rethinking nationality in the context of globalization. *Communication Theory, 14,* 78-96.
Wittkopf, E. R. (1987). Elites and masses. Another look at attitudes toward America's world role. *International Studies Quarterly, 31,* 131-159.
*Yahoo education directory*, (2005). *Colleges and universities.* Retrieved December 10, 2005, from http://dir.yahoo.com/Education/Higher_Education/Colleges_and_Universities/By_Region/Countries/

## AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY

Salman Türken is currently a PhD-research fellow at the Department of Psychology, University of Oslo. His current interests include theoretical as well as empirical investigations of the link between ideology and identity. Email: salman.turken@psykologi.uio.no

Floyd W. Rudmin is a professor of psychology at the University of Tromsø. His reaserch interests include, among others, acculturation, peace and war, and social responsibility. Email: floyd.rudmi@uit.no