CROSS-NATIONAL DIFFERENCES IN GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP: COMPARISON OF BULGARIA, INDIA, AND THE UNITED STATES

Iva Katzarska-Miller, Stephen Reysen, Shanmukh V. Kamble, and Nandini Vithoji

In the article we explore the meaning and associations of global citizenship in three countries (namely, the USA, Bulgaria, and India). Cross-national differences of the definition of global citizenship, global citizenship identification, and endorsement of pro-social values (e.g., social justice, intergroup helping, and concern for the environment) were observed. However, the association between global citizenship identification and pro-social values was similar regardless of nationality. Participants' normative environment (friends and family value global citizenship) mediated the relationship between country comparisons and global citizenship identification. Global citizenship identification mediated the relationship between country comparisons and endorsement of pro-social values. Overall, the results provide support for promoting global citizenship education.

Keywords: *global citizenship, social identity, social justice, empathy, helping, norms.*

While global citizenship, as a concept, has been around for over 50 years, the last decade has been particularly beneficial to the term, mainly in regard to education (Davies 2006; Grudzinski-Hall 2007; Hicks 2003). With the increased changes in all realms of life (*e.g.,* economic, political, cultural, *etc.*) as a result of globalization, the need to engender individuals that can navigate the globalizing world requires an understanding of the global citizenship concept. Higher education institutions have called for greater emphasis on global citizenship education (Grudzinski-Hall 2007), however empirical research regarding the identity is relatively absent from the literature. Different terms have been proposed to capture the notion of global citizenship, such as global identity (Weathersby 1992), cosmopolitanism (Appiah 2006), world citizenship (Gibson, Rimmington, and Landwehr-Brown 2008), and planetary citizenship (Haigh 2008). Despite the multitude of terms used, there are consistent overlapping themes apparent across terms and disciplines.

Global Citizenship Definition

When asked about the meaning of global citizenship notion, individuals' views vary. Myers (2010) asked 77 U.S. high school students to define global citizenship. Their responses reflected a definition of global citizenship as a moral and active commitment to improving the world. Horsley, Newell, and Stubbs (2005) analyzed responses from 204 Australian undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in teacher education programs about their views and understanding of global education. The students' responses

reflected themes of interconnectedness, social justice, human rights, environmental issues, empathy, and cultural understanding. In a similar study, McLean, Cook, and Crowe (2008) polled 120 pre-service teachers in Canada about global education. The participants responded with themes including tolerance, empathy, respecting diversity, global interdependence, social justice, human rights, equality, environmentalism, and responsibilities associated with being a global citizen. In each of the above studies the individual responses varied, however the themes that emerged from lay understandings of global citizenship and global education revolved around similar pro-social themes.

Within the academic literature the same themes emerge when elaborating on the meaning of global citizenship. Past theorizing has argued that global citizenship is a positive concept in that it is defined and related to various positive constructs such valuing other cultures (Haydon 2006), social justice orientation (Davies 2006; Gibson *et al*. 2008; Oxfam 1997), sustainability and environmentalism (Davies 2006; Gibson *et al*. 2008; Oxfam 1997; Tarrant 2010), national equality (Ibrahim 2005), empathy (Gibson *et al*. 2008; Hanvey 1976; Oxfam 1997), and feeling a responsibility to act (Andrzejewski and Alessio 1999; Davies 2006; Oxfam 1997). In an attempt to reconcile the multiple conceptions of apparently the same identity, Pierce, Reysen, and Katzarska-Miller (2010) offered a definition of global citizenship as awareness, caring, and embracing cultural diversity, while promoting social justice and sustainability, coupled with responsibility to act. Together, the literature possesses similar themes across terms and these themes are reflected in participants' self-generated responses.

Global Citizenship Identification

Social identity (Tajfel and Turner 1979) and self-categorization (Turner *et al.* 1987) theories are often combined to form a unified theory of intra- and intergroup processes (Abrams and Hogg 1990). Individuals can psychologically identify with a group and view the self as a representative of the shared social category. Shared interests, common fate, and a perception of interconnectedness are variables that can lead to the formation of a common ingroup identity (Turner 1999). Group members' intragroup interactions form the content (*e.g.,* norms, values) of the group; in turn those groups inform and shape one's self-concept (Postmes *et al.* 2006). This analysis of group formation and group influence reflects the mutual constitution theory of culture (see Adams and Markus 2004); individuals dynamically shape an ever-evolving culture and the culture influences those embedded in it. The salience of a social identity reduces individual self-interests and instead promotes a shared group interest, related to greater cooperation with ingroup members (Turner 1999).

Individuals belong to and identify with multiple social groups. Each social identity carries with it a set of attitudes, norms, and values that are compartmentalized and are acted upon when the identity is salient (Hogg and Smith 2007). One's degree of ingroup identification is positively related to one's endorsement of and behavioral subscription to the group's norms, values, and attitudes (Turner *et al*. 1987; Hogg and Smith 2007). In effect, the degree of ingroup identification is related to one's self-definition, perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors in line with the group's norms and values (Armenta *et al.* 2011; Jetten and Postmes 2006). The degree of identification with the group also re-

flects the degree that the group and the self are intertwined with respect to attitudes, even in an individual's cognitive schema (Coats *et al.* 2000). However, little research directly examines the content of groups or how group members define their social identities (Ashby, Haslam, and Webley 2009). Based on the social identity perspective, the content of a group's identity is group members' shared norms, values, and attitudes. Yet, no research has examined if group attitudes overlap with group members' lay definitions of the group.

Following a social identity perspective, the degree of identification with a global citizen identity should relate to the degree of endorsement of the pro-social values posited in the literature (*e.g.,* social justice, environmentalism). In other words, the more an individual defines the self as a global citizen should predict greater endorsement of social justice, national equality, intergroup empathy and helping, and concern for the environment (*i.e.* the content of that identity), although their definition of global citizenship might differ. Furthermore, an individual's normative environment (perception that friends and family value being a global citizen) should predict their degree of global citizenship identification. A social identity perspective of global citizenship also suggests that interactions between small grass-root movements have a strong influence on the content and norms of the identity, and that identifying the self as a global citizen (an inclusive social identity) should relate to cooperation and intragroup helping.

Global Citizenship across Various Cultural Spaces

As mentioned earlier, although global citizenship as an educational outcome has received attention in the literature, little is empirically known about global citizen identification. Across studies from various disciplines, empirical results suggest that definitions of global citizenship can be impacted by the cultural space that one inhabits. As discussed previously, U.S. high students (Myers 2010), Australian college students (Horsley, Newell, and Stubbs 2005), and Canadian pre-service teachers (McLean, Cook, and Crowe 2008), used different definitions of global citizenship, ranging from commitment to improving the world, interconnectedness, social justice, human rights, environmental issues, empathy, and cultural understanding.

Despite the differences in the definition of global citizenship, people representative of different world populations indicate that they experience themselves in terms of global or world citizen. For example, according to the World Values Survey 2005–2008 wave, 77.9 per cent of respondents from 54 countries answered that they agree and strongly agree with the statement 'I see myself as a world citizen' (World Values Survey 2008). Furthermore, research has shown that there are cross-cultural similarities as well as differences in the pro-social themes associated with the content of global citizenship. Although studies have not conceptualized and measured these pro-social values within the concept of global citizenship, they suggest that there are cross-cultural similarities and differences in regard to endorsement of global awareness (*e.g.,* Cogan, Torney-Purta, and Anderson 1988; Torney-Purta 2002), social justice (*e.g.,* Torney-Purta, Wilkenfeld, and Barber 2008), environmentalism (*e.g.,* Hunter, Hatch, and Johnson 2004), and civic involvement (*e.g.,* Howard and Gilbert 2008).

Present Study

The purposes of the present study are to examine (1) participants' definition of global citizenship, (2) values posited to represent the content of global citizenship identity, and (3) cross-national differences among the assessed variables. Participants in three countries (USA, Bulgaria, India) completed a survey regarding their definition of global citizenship, national and global citizen identification, exposure to global information, pro-social values (*e.g.*, helping, empathy), and factual knowledge of the world. These three countries were chosen for the present study because they differ in terms of population size and economic standing in the world. While this study is exploratory in nature, we have some general hypotheses. First, similar to past research regarding participants' self-generated definitions of global citizenship and global education (Horsley *et al*. 2005; McLean *et al*. 2008; Myers 2010), we expect definitions to differ between participants' country of residence. Second, we predict that participants' degree of global citizenship identification will be associated with the pro-social values representing the content of global citizenship regardless of country. Third, we expect one's normative environment to predict the degree of global citizenship identification. Overall, we expect that while definitions between individuals embedded in different cultural contexts may differ, global citizenship is a unique identity represented by similar pro-social values across cultural contexts.

Method

Participants
American participants were recruited from psychology classes at Texas A&M University-Commerce, Bulgarian participants were recruited from local residents in western Bulgaria,[1] and Indian participants were recruited in graduate courses at Karnatak University (see Table 1 for sample characteristics). The American participants completed the survey on a computer, while the Bulgarian and Indian participants completed a paper-and-pencil version of the survey. Unless noted otherwise, all items were rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale, from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*.

Materials

Global citizenship definition. Participants were asked to generate free responses to the question 'What does it mean to you to be a global citizen (what is a global citizen)?' A native Bulgarian speaker (residing in the United States) translated the Bulgarian data for the coding procedure. The first step of the coding process, based on an adaptation of the grounded theory method (Glaser and Strauss 1967), was to look for common themes in the data (*e.g.,* travel, connection with the world); the second step was to code whether each theme was present in individual responses. Two independent raters blind to the origin of the samples coded the responses from the three samples. Each theme was coded '0' if it was absent in the response and '1' if it was present.

Eight themes emerged as part of the first step: *tolerance* (acceptance towards other cultures and people, $\kappa = .70$), *connection* (experiencing the self as connected to the world, $\kappa = .44$), *knowledge* (general knowledge of other places, cultures, people, $\kappa = .59$), *action* (engaging in action for the betterment of the world, $\kappa = .63$), *travel* (past or ability to travel the world, $\kappa = .64$), *concern* (caring about other cultures, peo-

ple, and the world, κ = .54), *rejection* (rejection of the nation state, κ = .49), and *freedom* (ability to be free in traveling, living or working all over the world, κ = .43). A third independent rater reconciled any differences between the first two raters.

Global citizen identification. Six items (*e.g.,* 'To be a global citizen is important to me') were adapted from past research (Doosje, Ellemers, and Spears 1995; Luhtanen and Crocker 1992) and combined to measure participants' degree of identification with a global citizen identity (α = .96).

National identification. Four items (*e.g.,* 'I am glad to be an American') were adapted from Doosje, Ellemers, and Spears (1995) to form a national identification index (α = .86).

Normative environment. Four items (*e.g.,* 'Most people who are important to me think that being a global citizen is desirable') were adapted from (Smith *et al.* 2008). One item ('What percentage of the people who are important to you would describe themselves as global citizens?') utilized a 10-point scale, from 0 per cent to 100 per cent. The items were standardized and combined to assess the perceived normative environment of support for being a global citizen (α = .81).

Exposure to global information. Five items (*e.g.,* 'How often do you discuss international events with you family?') were adapted from Alden, Steenkamp, and Batra (2006) to assess exposure to global information (α = .86).

Social justice. Three items (*e.g.,* 'Everyone has the right to an adequate standard of living') were selected from research by Diaz-Veizades, Widaman, Little, and Gibbs (1995) and combined to form a social justice scale (α = .79).

National equality. Two items, 'Every country in the world should have equal say in world events', and 'Every country has a legitimate point of view', were combined to form a national equality index (α = .75).

Intergroup empathy. One item, 'When I hear about natural disasters in other countries I feel sad', assessed intergroup empathy.

Intergroup helping. Two items, 'If I had the means, I would help others who are in need regardless of their nationality', and 'If I could, I would dedicate my life to helping others no matter what country they are from', were combined to assess intergroup helping (α = .74).

Global warming. Two items, 'Everyone should do what they can to reduce global warming', and 'Global warming is a serious issue', were combined to form a concern for global warming scale (α = .91).

World knowledge. Nine items were standardized and combined to form a world knowledge scale (α = .70). The first eight items asked participants to write the capitals and continents for China, USA, India, and Bulgaria. The last item asked participants to rank, from most to least, the countries by population.

Demographics. Political orientation was rated on a 7-point Likert type scale, from 1 = *very conservative* to 7 = *very liberal*. Participant also listed their religion (if one), and rated their religiosity on a 7-point scale, from 1 = *not religious* to 7 = *very religious*. Three items asked for participants' age, gender, and ethnicity. Participants then answered questions regarding their yearly income, highest level of education, and parents' level of education. Yearly income (after conversion to US dollars for the Bulgar-

ian and Indian samples) was divided by the country's purchasing power parity (PPP) from the World Bank's International Comparison Program (2005).

Results

Global Citizenship Definitions

Since the nature of the coding (presence and absence of the eight themes) produced categorical data, we used chi-square analyses. The observed and expected values for each country, as well as the chi-square statistics are presented in Table 2. Overall, the data revealed that there were differences in the definitions of global citizenship between respondents sampled in the three countries. A higher proportion of American participants, in comparison with Bulgarian and Indian participants, defined global citizenship in terms of knowledge. In comparison with the other two nations, a higher proportion of Bulgarian participants defined global citizenship in terms of travel and freedom, while a higher proportion of Indian participants defined it in terms of connection and action. Concern for others was marginally significant with a lower proportion of Bulgarian participants using concern in comparison with Indian and American participants. There was no difference in the proportion of participants in the three samples using tolerance as a defining characteristic of global citizenship.[2]

Mean Comparisons

To examine mean differences on identification, global attitudes, and knowledge, we conducted a series of one-way (US *vs.* Bulgaria *vs.* India) between-subjects ANOVAs. All analyses were conducted controlling for participants' political orientation, religiosity, gender, age, income, education (self and parents), and number of kids. See Table 3 for means, standard deviations, main effects, and post hoc comparisons (using a Sidak correction to control for multiple comparisons). Participants in the U.S. sample rated their degree of global citizenship identification, normative environment, exposure to information about other countries, belief in national equality, concern for global warming, and knowledge of the world to a lesser extent than participants in the Bulgarian and Indian samples. Participants in the Bulgarian sample rated their degree of national identification lower and belief in social justice higher than participants in the U.S. and Indian samples. Bulgarian participants rated their degree of intergroup empathy higher than U.S. participants. Participants in the Indian sample rated their degree of intergroup helping higher than U.S. participants.

Correlations

To examine the relationship between global citizenship identification and related pro-social values (*e.g.,* social justice) we conducted a series of correlations collapsed across condition and separate for each country. Overall, correlations collapsed across country (*i.e.* while controlling for country) showed that global citizenship identification is positively related to national identification, normative environment, exposure to global information, social justice, national equality, intergroup empathy, intergroup helping, and concern for the environment (see Table 4).

Small differences were found when examining the relationships between the variables within each country. For example, in the U.S. sample global citizenship identifi-

cation was not significantly related to intergroup empathy (see Table 4), while in the Bulgarian and Indian samples global citizenship identification is positively correlated (see Table 5). The U.S. sample showed a negative correlation between global citizenship and national identification, while in the Bulgarian and Indian samples they are positively correlated.

Mediation Analyses

Normative environment. To examine whether the normative environment accounts for identification with a global citizen identity two mediation analyses were conducted. Using the SPSS macro provided by Preacher and Hayes (2008) for testing mediation with bootstrapping (5,000 iterations), we entered the country (USA *vs.* Bulgaria) as the independent variable, normative environment as the mediator, global citizenship identification as the dependent variable, and demographics and socio-economic status (*e.g.,* gender, age, income) as covariates. Country predicted participants' degree of global citizenship identification (β = .26, *p* = .002) and the normative environment (β = .40, *p* < .001). The normative environment predicted global citizenship identification (β = .75, *p* < .001). The relationship between country and global citizenship identification was significantly lower when the ratings of the normative environment was included in the model (β = –.05, *p* = .44). The effect of normative environment was significantly different from zero at *p* < .05 (two tailed); zero was not within the 95 per cent confidence interval (CI = .680 to 1.67). A similar pattern was found between the USA and India.[3]

Global citizenship identification. To examine the influence of global citizenship identification as a mediator between country and dependent variables, we conducted a series of meditation analyses. The country (USA *vs.* Bulgaria, USA *vs.* India) was included as the independent variable, global citizenship identification as the mediator, and pro-social values (*e.g.,* social justice, national equality) as dependent variables, and demographics and socio-economic status (*e.g.,* gender, age, income) as covariates. As shown in Table 6, the relationships between country and dependent measures were mediated by global citizenship identification as indicated by the absence of zero within the 95 per cent confidence interval.[4]

Discussion

The purposes of the present study were to examine (1) participants' definition of global citizenship, (2) values posited to represent the content of global citizen identity, and (3) cross-national differences among the assessed variables. We predicted that participants' definitions of global citizenship would vary by country of residence, global citizenship identification would be related to pro-social values (*e.g.,* social justice, concern for the environment), and that participants' normative environment would influence participants' degree of global citizenship identification. The results show that participants' definitions varied depending on their country of residence. Global citizenship identification correlated with pro-social values, and relatively similar patterns of correlations emerged regardless of participants' country of residence. The normative environment (friends and family value a global identity) was found to mediate the relationship between country comparison (USA *vs.* Bulgaria, USA *vs.* India) and identification with

a global citizen identity. Furthermore, global citizenship identification mediated the relationship between country comparison and endorsement of pro-social values.

Global Citizenship Definitions

American participants tended to define global citizenship in terms of knowledge of other cultures. Thus, for the U.S. participants a global citizen is a person who has knowledge of many countries and cultures. Additionally, American participants were more likely to mention a rejection of the nation as a part of being a global citizen. Together, the results paint an image of a world traveler who considers other nations to the same extent as their own. This image may be connected to Americans' perception of mobility and individualism. American participants often hold an individualistic ethos where moving is easily accomplished (Oishi, Ishii, and Lun 2009). The U.S. participants may view travel as relatively easy, and one who travels greatly as less concerned or identified with one's nation of birth. Additionally, a traveler would have experiences with other nations and cultures and thus have extensive knowledge of these countries. The U.S. response is greatly contrasted to Bulgarian participants who historically have not had an opportunity to travel.

Our sample in Bulgaria consisted of, on average, older adults who lived in Bulgaria during communism. Under communist rule (1944–1989), Bulgaria was characterized by neighboring countries as an isolated nation (Benovska-Săbkova 2002). During this time travel for personal (as compared to nationalistic) reasons was nearly impossible (Kostova 2009). After the fall of communism, travel was still restricted due to citizens' economic predicament (Benovska-Săbkova 2002). A study on potential migrants from Bulgaria (Rangelova and Vladimirova 2003) indicates that the third most cited reason for leaving Bulgaria (after economic reasons and disappointment with Bulgaria) is adventure or change in the environment, as a result of the freedom to travel, in contrast with the past when it was strongly restricted. Bulgaria entered the European Union in January, 2007, and has much lower travel freedom than countries joining in 2004 (Eurasian Development Bank 2009). Overall, travel freedom in Europe is high, due to the EU, which allows visa-free travel among its states' citizens, however economic restrictions remain for many Bulgarians. Based on the cultural and political history of this nation it is understandable that Bulgarian participants were more likely than USA or Indian participants to state that a global citizen is a person who has the freedom and ability to travel since participants were most likely unable to travel.

Indian participants were more likely than the USA or Bulgarian participants to mention connection to others and acting toward the global good in their responses. We suggest that the responses reflect an image of a global citizen as connecting with others and working to correct global problems through technologies such as the Internet. Karnataka, where participants were sampled, is India's communication and information technology center (Madon and Sahay 2001). The information technology sector of India has expanded by 50 per cent each year since 1991 (Naidu 2003). The state of Karnataka is the center of the explosion of technology companies settling in the region (van Dijk 2003). We suggest that participants are defining global citizens as individuals who can use this new and valued technology industry for the betterment of everyone in the world.

Taken together, the definitional responses observed in the current study reflect historical and current cultural contexts in which the participants are embedded (Adams and Markus 2004). The U.S. participants are accustomed to an individualized environment and view a global citizen as an individual who travels the world. Bulgarian participants are denied travel (historically through politics and currently through economic deficiencies) and view freedom to travel as reflecting global citizens. Indian participants are embedded in a local setting that is experiencing information technology growth and view global citizens as being connected to others. The cultural grounding of participants' experiences may influence their worldview that is then reflected when asked to intuit the mind of a global citizen (Epley 2008).

Respecting (Davies 2006; Oxfam 1997) or accepting (Kirkwood 2001) other cultures is a consistent theme in past theorizing concerning global citizenship. Across each of the countries sampled in the present study there were consistent numbers of participants who indicated that tolerance for people from other countries is a component of their definition of a global citizen. The present result also supports past research examining open-ended responses regarding the definition of global education as supporting tolerance of others (Horsley *et al.* 2005; McLean *et al.* 2008). In general, the key similarity across the three nations sampled is that global citizens respect others regardless of their national origin.

Global Citizenship Identification

Analysis of the mean differences shows that the U.S. participants reported less global citizenship identification, normative environment, exposure to global information (*e.g.,* news), belief in national equality, concern for the environment, and world knowledge than Bulgarian and Indian participants. The U.S. participants also reported less belief in social justice and intergroup empathy than Bulgarian participants, and less endorsement of intergroup helping than Indian participants. Together the results suggest that U.S. participants knew less and cared less about the world than Bulgarian and Indian participants. This highlights the difference between participant definition and content of global citizen identity. Although the U.S. participants partially defined global citizenship as knowledge about the world, on average they were less knowledgeable than Bulgarian and Indian participants. However, similar to participants in Bulgaria and India, the U.S. participants who were highly identified with global citizens endorsed greater pro-social values.

A possible explanation for these results may be that the norms of the group in Bulgaria and India support viewing the self as a global citizen. In effect, the more one identifies with the group the stronger they follow and endorse the group norms (Armenta *et al.* 2011; Jetten and Postmes 2006). If a norm in Bulgaria and India is to view the self as a global citizen then the obtained results should be expected. Indeed, in these countries the results showed positive correlations between national identification and the perception that valued others encouraged identifying as a global citizen. Further evidence supporting this notion is the mediations conducted comparing the USA and Bulgaria, and the USA and India to predict participants' degree of global citizenship identification. The perceived normative environment mediated the relationship between country comparison and degree of global citizenship identification. In other words,

Bulgarian and Indian participants were more likely to view themselves as global citizens due to their perception that valued others supported viewing the self as a global citizen.

Following a social identity perspective, we suggested and found that global citizenship identification was positively correlated with pro-social values in each of the countries sampled (with the exception that the U.S. participants' degree of global citizenship identification was not significantly related to intergroup empathy). Although participants may have defined global citizenship differently, their degree of identification with the identity was related to similar pro-social values. The present results provide empirical evidence to support global citizenship theorists who suggest that viewing the self as a global citizen is related to belief in social justice (Davies 2006; Gibson, Rimmington, and Landwehr-Brown 2008; Oxfam 1997), national equality (Ibrahim 2005), intergroup empathy (Gibson, Rimmington, and Landwehr-Brown 2008; Hanvey 1976; Oxfam 1997), felt responsibility to help (Andrzejewski and Alessio 1999; Davies 2006; Oxfam 1997), and concern for the environment (Davies 2006; Gibson *et al.* 2008; Oxfam 1997; Tarrant 2010). Furthermore, global citizenship identification mediated the relationship between country comparison and endorsement of these pro-social values.

Overall, we suggest that the pro-social values related to global citizenship identification make up the 'content' of the global citizen identity. The social identity perspective suggests that social identities are related to sets of attitudes, norms, and values (Hogg and Smith 2007). Ingroup identification is positively related to greater endorsement and behavioral subscription to these norms and values (Jetten and Postmes 2006). Although definitions of global citizenship differed between respondents depending on countries of residence, the content of global citizen identity was similar across nations. In general, the results of the present study show that regardless of country of residence, global citizenship identification predicted greater endorsement of pro-social values. Greater examination is needed of the distinction between participants' definition of identities and the content of those identities.

Limitations

The present study was limited in the type of participants sampled. University students were sampled in the USA and India, and older adults in Bulgaria. Demographic and socio-economic differences may have contributed to the observed cross-national differences as a consequence of the type of participants sampled in each country. However, we attempted to address this issue by considering the larger cultural and contextual environment in which participants were embedded, and controlled for socio-economic status and demographics at every opportunity. The second limitation was the language differences between the samples. Bulgarian participants were asked and responded to the survey in their native language, and Indian participants were asked and responded in their non-native language. Thus, language issues may have affected the results of the study. Furthermore, because a native Bulgarian speaker translated the Bulgarian data, the translator's culture may have impacted the translation of the Bulgarian responses. The nationalities of the independent raters for the open-ended definitions of global citizenship were not representative of the three cultural spaces examined in the study. Al-

though these issues are not uncommon in cross-cultural research, it is a useful reminder to consider them when interpreting the present results.

Conclusion

The growing influence of globalization and global interconnectedness has encouraged scholars, universities, and business to promote a global citizen identity. In the present study the meaning and pro-social associations related to viewing the self as a global citizen have been examined in three countries. While the definitions of global citizenship have been found to differ, the association between degree of global citizenship identification and social justice, national equality, intergroup helping, and concern for the environment were similar regardless of country of residence. The perceived normative environment (*i.e.* friends and family supporting a global citizenship identity) predicted the degree of global citizenship identification. Furthermore, global citizenship identification predicted endorsement of pro-social values. The results provide empirical support for teachers who wish to internationalize their curriculum or promote greater global citizenship education at their academic institutions. Further research is needed to explore the antecedents and outcomes of this understudied and unique identity, and more generally, the difference between participant definition and content of social identities. The present study offers support for the pro-social benefits when one takes a global perspective.

NOTES

[1] We thank Maya Katsarska-Lyubenova and Rosen Lyubenov for conducting the data collection in Bulgaria.

[2] Due to some small cell sizes in the chi-square analyses, we also conducted Fisher's exact tests. The results were nearly identical except for action ($p = .047$) and concern ($p = .046$).

[3] Country (USA = 0, India = 1) predicted global citizenship identification ($\beta = .45$, $p < .001$) and normative environment ($\beta = .35$, $p = .008$). Normative environment predicted global citizenship identification ($\beta = .69$, $p < .001$). The relationship between country and global citizenship identification ($\beta = .20$, $p = .014$) was significantly lower when normative environment was included in the model (95 % CI: .184 to 1.54). We also conducted similar analyses between USA and Bulgaria, and USA and India including exposure to global information, world knowledge, and normative environment as mediators. In both analyses the perceived normative environment was the only significant mediator between country and global citizenship identification.

[4] We also conducted mediations between USA and Bulgaria, and USA and India including the pro-social values as mediators and global citizenship identification as a dependent variable (including demographics and socio-economic status as covariates). The relationship between country comparison (USA *vs.* Bulgaria) and global citizenship identification showed significant mediation (.017 to .860), however the mediators were not significant: social justice (–.019 to .492), national equality (–.305 to .430), intergroup empathy (–.175 to .130), intergroup helping (–.069 to .261), global warming (–.036 to .328). The relationship between country comparison (USA *vs.* India) and global citizenship identification showed significant mediation (.060 to .998), however the mediators were not significant: social justice (–.018 to .369), national equality (–.139 to .502), intergroup empathy (–.096 to .075), intergroup helping (–.009 to .457), global warming (–.080 to .543).

REFERENCES

Abrams, D., and Hogg, M. A.

1990. An Introduction to the Social Identity Approach. In Abrams, D., and Hogg, M. A. (eds.), *Social Identity Theory: Constructive and Critical Advances* (pp. 1–9). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Adams, G., and Markus, H. R.

2004. Toward a Conception of Culture Suitable for a Social Psychology of Culture. In Schaller, M. and Crandall, C. S. (eds.), *The Psychological Foundations of Culture* (pp. 335–360). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Alden, D. L., Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M., and Batra, R.

2006. Consumer Attitudes toward Marketplace Globalization: Structure, Antecedents and Consequences. *International Journal of Research in Marketing* 23: 227–239.

Andrzejewski, J., and Alessio, J.

1999. *Education for Global Citizenship and Social Responsibility.* Burlington, VT: John Dewey Project on Progressive Education.

Appiah, K. A.

2006. *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers.* New York: W. W. Norton.

Armenta, B. E., Knight, G. P., Carlo, G., and Jacobson, R. P.

2011. The Relation between Ethnic Group Attachment and Pro-social Tendencies: The Mediating Role of Cultural Values. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 41: 107–115.

Ashby, J. S., Haslam, S. A., and Webley, P.

2009. The Distinct Role of Group-Central and Group-Peripheral Norms in Taxpaying Behaviour. *Journal of Socio-Economics* 38: 230–237.

Benovska-Săbkova, M.

2002. Constituting the Image of Europe in the Post-Socialist Period in Bulgaria. *Ethnologia Europaea* 32: 49–56.

Coats, S., Smith, E. R., Claypool, H. M., and Banner, M. J.

2000. Overlapping Mental Representations of Self and In-Group: Reaction Time Evidence and Its Relationship with Explicit Measures of Group Identification. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 36: 304–315.

Cogan, J., Torney-Purta, J., and Anderson, D.

1988. Knowledge and Attitudes toward Global Issues. *Comparative Education Review* 32: 282–297.

Davies, L.

2006. Global Citizenship: Abstraction or Framework for Action? *Educational Review* 58: 5–25.

Diaz-Veizades, J., Widaman, K. F., Little, T. D., and Gibbs, K. W.

1995. The Measurement and Structure of Human Rights Attitudes. *Journal of Social Psychology* 135: 313–328.

van Dijk, M. P.

2003. Government Policies With Respect to an Information Technology Cluster in Bangalore, India. *European Journal of Development Research* 15: 89–104.

Doosje, B., Ellemers, N., and Spears, R.

1995. Perceived Intragroup Variability as a Function of Group Status and Identification. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 31: 410–436.

Epley, N.

2008. Solving the (Real) Other Minds Problem. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 2: 1455–1474.

Eurasian Development Bank

2009. *Eurasian Integration Yearbook.* Retrieved from http://www.eabr.org/eng/publications/IntegrationYearbook/index.wbp?articleid=591B688-BF0D-45FC-9EFD-B31E0E1E4DD7

Gibson, K. L., Rimmington, G. M., and Landwehr-Brown, M.

2008. Developing Global Awareness and Responsible World Citizenship with Global Learning. *Roeper Review* 30: 11–23.

Glaser, B., and Strauss, A.

1967. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research.* Chicago: Aldine.

Grudzinski-Hall, M. N.

2007. *How do College and University Undergraduate Level Global Citizenship Programs Advance the Development and Experiences of Global Competencies?* A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Drexel University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Leadership Development and Learning Technologies. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/1860/1769.

Haigh, M.

2008. Internationalization, Planetary Citizenship and Higher Education Inc. *Compare* 38: 427–440.

Hanvey, R. G.

1976. *An Attainable Global Perspective.* New York: Global Perspectives in Education.

Haydon, G.

2006. Respect for Persons and for Cultures as a Basis for National and Global Citizenship. *Journal of Moral Education* 35: 457–471.

Hicks, D.

2003. Thirty Years of Global Education: A Reminder of Key Principles and Precedents. *Educational Review* 55: 265–275.

Hogg, M. A., and Smith, J. R.

2007. Attitudes in Social Context: A Social Identity Perspective. *European Review of Social Psychology* 18: 89–131.

Horsley, M., Newell, S., and Stubbs, B.

2005. The Prior Knowledge of Global Education of Pre-Service Teacher Education Students. *Citizenship, Social and Economics Education* 6: 137–155.

Howard, M. M., and Gilbert, L.

2008. A Cross-National Comparison of the Internal Effects of Participation in Voluntary Organizations. *Political Studies* 56: 12–32.

Hunter, L., Hatch, A., and Johnson, A.

2004. Cross-National Gender Variation in Environmental Behaviors. *Social Science Quarterly* 85: 677–694.

Ibrahim, T.

2005. Global Citizenship Education: Mainstreaming the Curriculum? *Cambridge Journal of Education* 35: 177–194.

International Comparison Program

2005. *Global Purchasing Power Parities and Real Expenditures*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Jetten, J., and Postmes, T.

2006. 'I did it My Way': Collective Expressions of Individualism. In Postmes, T., and Jetten, J. (eds.), *Individuality and the Group: Advances in Social Identity* (pp. 116–136). London: Sage.

Kirkwood, T. F.

2001. Our Global Age Requires Global Education: Clarifying Definitional Ambiguities. *Social Studies* 92: 10–15.

Kostova, L.

2009. Defining the Literary Parameters of Englishness in Bulgarian Academic Culture: The Case of Marco Mincoff's History of English Literature. In Gupta, S., and Katsarska, M. (eds.), *English Studies on This Side: Post-2007 Reckonings* (pp. 75–95). Plovdiv: Plovdiv University Press.

Luhtanen, R., and Crocker, J.

1992. A Collective Self-Esteem Scale: Self-Evaluation of One's Social Identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 18: 302–318.

Madon, S., and Sahay, S.

2001. Cities in the Developing World: Linking Global and Local Networks. *Information Technology & People* 14: 273–286.

McLean, L. R., Cook, S. A., and Crowe, T.

2008. Imagining Global Citizens: Teaching Peace and Global Education in a Teacher-Education Programme. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning* 4: 50–64.

Myers, J. P.

2010. 'To Benefit the World by Whatever Means Possible': Adolescents' Constructed Meaning for Global Citizenship. *British Education Research Journal* 36: 483–502.

Naidu, B. V.

2003. Tracing the History of Information Technology in India. In Jussawalla, M., and Taylor, R. D. (eds.), *Information Technology Parks of the Asia Pacific* (pp. 119–150). Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Oishi, S., Ishii, K., and Lun, J.

2009. Residential Mobility and Conditionality of Group Identification. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 45: 913–919.

Oxfam

1997. *A Curriculum for Global Citizenship.* Oxford: Oxfam.

Pierce, L., Reysen, S., and Katzarska-Miller, I.

2010. The Search for a Definition of Global Citizenship. In Reysen, S. (Chair), *Global Citizenship: Americans within the World*. Symposium conducted at the 54th annual meeting of the American Studies Association of Texas, Commerce, TX.

Postmes, T., Baray, G., Haslam, S. A., Morton, T. A., and Swaab, R. I.

2006. The Dynamics of Personal and Social Identity Formation. In Postmes, T., and Jetten, J. (eds.), *Individuality and the Group: Advances in Social Identity* (pp. 215–236). London: Sage.

Preacher, K. J., and Hayes, A. F.

2008. Asymptotic and Re-sampling Strategies for Assessing and Comparing Indirect Effects in Multiple Mediator Models. *Behavior Research Methods* 40: 879–891.

Rangelova, R., and Vladimirova, K.

2003. Migration from Central and Eastern Europe: The Case of Bulgaria. *South-East Europe Review for Labor and Social Affairs* 3: 7–30.

Smith, J. R., Terry, D. J., Manstead, A. S. R., Louis, W. R., Kotterman, D., and Wolfs, J.

2008. The Attitude-Behavior Relationship in Consumer Conduct: The Role of Norms, Past Behavior, and Self-Identity. *Journal of Social Psychology* 148: 311–333.

Tajfel, H., and Turner, J. C.

1979. An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict. In Austin, W., and Worchel, S. (eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Tarrant, M. A.

2010. A Conceptual Framework for Exploring the Role of Studies Abroad in Nurturing Global Citizenship. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 14: 433–451.

Torney-Purta, J.

2002. Patterns in the Civic Knowledge, Engagement, and Attitudes of European Adolescents: The IEA Civic Education Study. *European Journal of Education* 37: 129–141.

Torney-Purta, J., Wilkenfeld, B., and Barber, C.

2008. How Adolescents in 27 Countries Understand, Support, and Practice Human Rights. *Journal of Social Issues* 64: 857–880.

Turner, J. C.

1999. Some Current Issues in Research on Social Identity and Self-Categorization Theories. In Ellemers, N., Spears, R., and Doosje, B. (eds.), *Social Identity, Context, Commitment, Content* (pp. 6–34). Oxford: Blackwell.

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., and Wetherell, M.

1987. *Rediscovering the Social Group: A Self-Categorization Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Weathersby, R.

1992. Developing a Global Perspective: A Crucial 'Changing of our Minds'. *Journal of Management Education* 16: 10–27.

World Values Survey

2008. *Online Data Analysis*. URL: http://www.wvsevsdb.com/wvs/WVSAnalizeStudy.jsp.

Table 1

Sample Characteristics Frequencies and Means

Variable	America Sampl	Bulgaria Sample	India Sample
N	157	100	100
Gender	75.2 % Female	69 % Female	50 % Female
Ethnicity	75.2 % White	90 % White	92 % Indian
Age	25.77 (8.97)	42.86 (14.76)	23.41 (2.63)
Education	Some College	Some College	Grad. School
Mother Education	Some College	High School	Some College
Father Education	Some College	High School	High School
Yearly Income (/PPP)	0.88 (0.63)	0.60 (0.35)	0.44 (0.26)
Political Orientation[a]	3.67 (1.52)	3.88 (1.82)	5.27 (1.39)
Religion	78.7 % Christian	69 % Christian	66 % Hindu
Religiosity[b]	4.78 (1.71)	3.94 (1.62)	5.11 (1.55)
Number of Kids	0.64 (1.11)	1.49 (0.76)	0.10 (0.41)

Note: [a] higher scores indicate favoring liberal attitudes, [b] higher scores indicate greater religiosity.

Table 2

Chi-Square Analysis of Themes in Meaning of Global Citizen by Country

Variable	US	BG	IN	χ^2	*p*-value	Φ
Tolerance	34 (34.0)	23 (21.6)	20 (21.4)	0.23	.89	.03
Connection	20 (30.0)	6 (19.1)	42 (18.9)	50.07	.00	.38
Knowledge	31 (22.5)	10 (14.3)	10 (14.2)	6.72	.04	.14
Action	18 (21.6)	10 (13.8)	21 (13.6)	6.53	.04	.14
Travel	12 (15.9)	22 (10.1)	2 (10.0)	23.73	.00	.26
Concern	20 (15.4)	4 (9.8)	11 (9.7)	5.52	.06	.12
Rejection	26 (15.0)	2 (9.6)	6 (9.5)	16.93	.00	.22
Freedom	2 (14.2)	29 (8.9)	1 (8.9)	68.08	.00	.44

Note: Observed (expected) frequency of mention (2, *N* = 357).

Table 3

Main Effect of Country on Dependent Variable Means (Standard Deviations)

Variable	America Sample	Bulgaria Sample	India Sample	$F(2, 345)$	p-value	η_p^2
Global Citizen Identification	3.58 (1.71)$_a$	4.68 (1.92)$_b$	5.59 (1.01)$_b$	15.80	.00	.09
National Identification	6.14 (0.96)$_a$	5.51 (1.63)$_b$	6.45 (0.56)$_a$	15.48	.00	.08
Normative Environment	−0.42 (0.73)$_a$	0.30 (0.81)$_b$	0.36 (0.58)$_b$	21.75	.00	.11
Global Exposure	3.50 (1.42)$_a$	4.94 (1.46)$_b$	4.83 (1.13)$_b$	20.20	.00	.11
Social Justice	4.71 (1.44)$_a$	6.03 (1.39)$_b$	5.71 (0.97)$_a$	20.88	.00	.11
National Equality	4.21 (1.45)$_a$	6.05 (1.46)$_b$	5.82 (1.14)$_b$	47.35	.00	.22
Intergroup Empathy	5.82 (1.48)$_a$	6.30 (1.36)$_b$	5.76 (1.45)$_{ab}$	3.34	.04	.02
Intergroup Helping	5.62 (1.34)$_a$	5.87 (1.48)$_{ab}$	6.14 (0.85)$_b$	3.32	.04	.02
Global Warming	5.35 (1.62)$_a$	6.31 (1.47)$_b$	6.45 (0.87)$_b$	13.27	.00	.07
World Knowledge	0.76 (0.30)$_a$	1.29 (0.09)$_b$	1.16 (0.17)$_b$	115.50	.00	.40

Note: Means with differing subscripts differ significantly ($p < .05$). Controlling for political orientation, religiosity, gender, age, income, education (self and parents), and number of kids. Post hoc comparisons were conducted with a Sidak correction.

Table 4

Correlations, Overall Controlling for Country (Top Half of Diagonal), and U.S. (Bottom Half of Diagonal)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Global Citizenship	1.0	.14*	.71**	.18**	.27**	.23**	.17**	.30**	.28**	.03
2. National Identification	−.20*	1.0	.14*	−.12*	.05	.00	.12*	.23**	.12*	−.17**
3. Normative Environment	.79**	−.13	1.0	.29**	.33**	.30**	.18**	.31**	.24**	.17**
4. Global Exposure	.34**	−.18*	.35**	1.0	.11*	.08	.04	.10+	.03	.23**
5. Social Justice	.23**	−.20*	.16*	.02	1.0	.58**	.24**	.26**	.47**	.10+
6. National Equality	.20**	−.20*	.14+	−.01	.42**	1.0	.25**	.32**	.43**	.16**
7. Intergroup Empathy	−.01	.12	−.04	.12	.06	.01	1.0	.47**	.39**	.16**
8. Intergroup Helping	.16*	.10	.23**	.19**	.09	.16*	.43**	1.0	.46**	.10+
9. Global Warming	.20*	.01	.04	.08	.40**	.34**	.25**	.33**	1.0	.10+
10. World Knowledge	−.00	−.03	.04	.18*	−.12	−.12	.09	.08	−.01	1.0

Note: Correlations collapsed across country while controlling for country are presented in the top half of the diagonal. Correlations for U.S. participants are presented in the bottom half of the diagonal. + $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 5

**Correlations, India (Top Half of Diagonal), and Bulgaria
(Bottom Half of Diagonal)**

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Global Citizenship	1.0	.23*	.67**	-.00	.30**	.22*	.39**	.32**	.36**	.02
2. National Identification	.45**	1.0	.35**	.11	.22*	.22*	.15	.14	.23*	−.01
3. Normative Environment	.67**	.50**	1.0	.02	.33**	.20*	.28**	.24**	.32**	.15
4. Global Exposure	.05	.03	.26**	1.0	.34**	.10	−.05	.06	−.06	.15
5. Social Justice	.32**	.46**	.46**	−.07	1.0	.61**	.19+	.28**	.33**	−.02
6. National Equality	.27**	.37**	.42**	−.04	.69**	1.0	.27**	.41**	.35**	.12
7. Intergroup Empathy	.31**	.29**	.36**	−.12	.46**	.42**	1.0	.38**	.42**	.07
8. Intergroup Helping	.42**	.39**	.43**	−.01	.48**	.52**	.65**	1.0	.45**	.15
9. Global Warming	.40**	.35**	.45**	−.11	.60**	.60**	.56**	.61**	1.0	.11
10. World Knowledge	.21**	.11	.24*	−.07	.20*	.23*	.22*	.22*	.30**	1.0

Note: Correlations for Indian participants are presented in the top half of the diagonal. Correlations for Bulgarian participants are presented in the bottom half of the diagonal. $+ p < .10$, $* p < .05$, $** p < .01$.

Table 6

**Relationship between Country Comparison and Dependent Variables Mediated
by Global Citizenship Identification**

	Standardized Beta (*p*-value)				Confidence Interval (95 %)	
	I.V. on D.V.	I.V. on Med.	Med. on D.V.	I.V. on D.V.'	Lower	Upper
U.S. (= 0) vs. Bulgaria (= 1)						
Social Justice	.42 (.00)	.26 (.00)	.23 (.00)	.36 (.00)	.056	.415
National Equality	.58 (.00)	.26 (.00)	.20 (.00)	.48 (.00)	.041	.375
Intergroup Empathy	.22 (.01)	.26 (.00)	.16 (.02)	.18 (.04)	.036	.324
Intergroup Helping	.07 (.41)	.26 (.00)	.34 (.00)	−.01 (.91)	.081	.482
Global Warming	.30 (.00)	.26 (.00)	.27 (.00)	.23 (.01)	.075	.478
U.S. (= 0) vs. India (= 1)						
Social Justice	.22 (.12)	.45 (.00)	.22 (.00)	.12 (.40)	.085	.613
National Equality	.52 (.00)	.45 (.00)	.18 (.01)	.44 (.00)	.067	.590
Intergroup Empathy	−.13 (.38)	.45 (.00)	.16 (.05)	−.20 (.20)	.064	.555
Intergroup Helping	.24 (.09)	.45 (.00)	.29 (.00)	.12 (.43)	.112	.670
Global Warming	.50 (.00)	.45 (.00)	.24 (.00)	.40 (.01)	.093	.701

Note: Controlling for gender, age, self-education, mother education, father education, self-income, political orientation, religiosity, number of kids.