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We review psychological research on global human identification and citizenship, Thomas Paine’s belief that “The world is my country, and all mankind are my brethren.” In turn, we review the theoretical foundations that guided our work, research with measures that preceded our own, and our own work with our correlated scales. We review its foundations, its effects upon attitudes and behaviors, and how it might be enlarged. Global human identification and citizenship is related negatively to ethnocentrism, authoritarianism, the social dominance orientation, and self-centeredness, but positively to dispositional empathy, openness to experience, and the values of universalism, care, and justice. It is expressed in attitudes and behaviors that support human rights and work to reduce global suffering and inequalities. It is associated with greater global knowledge and with efforts to acquire that knowledge. Childrearing that emphasizes cross-cultural exposure and awareness of others’ suffering may promote global human identification and citizenship, as does education that encourages global mindedness. Environments that support global human identification also induce it, as does envisioning it as a moral ideal.
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“The world is my country, and all mankind are my brethren.” (Thomas Paine, *Age of Reason*, 1796)

Socrates said, “I am not an Athenian or a Greek, but a citizen of the world,” but such proclamations in antiquity were rare. To Renaissance historian John Headley, it was the discovery of strange new peoples in the Americas, Africa, and Asia during European explorations that created the “incipient notion of the human race as a single collectivity” (Headley, 2008, p. 27). While early colonizers regarded these strange peoples as slaves to be used and brutalized, Bartolomé de Las Casas, who came to Cuba in 1509 as a Spanish chaplain, defended the natives against conquistador cruelties and proclaimed, “All the races of the world are men …. Thus, the entire human race is one” (cited in Carozza, 2003, p. 293).

As the centuries progressed, such declarations slowly became more common (McFarland, 2011). In the century following Thomas Paine, quoted above, Bahá’u’lláh, the founder of the Bahá’í faith, declared, “The earth is but one country and mankind its citizens.” In the twentieth century, Pablo Casals stated, “We ought to think that we are one of the leaves of the tree, and the tree is all humanity.” To Gandhi, “All humanity is one undivided and indivisible family.” In 1951, photographer Edward Steichen created his inspiring photo exhibition of *The Family of Man* to proclaim “the essential oneness of mankind” (Steichen, 1955, p. 4). In 2015, film director Yann Arthus-Bertrand echoed this message in his acclaimed documentary, *Human*, which recorded people from all over the world telling their personal stories.

In recent decades, calls for “global citizenship” appear to have surged. In 1991, entrepreneur William Melton and peace activist Patricia Smith created the Melton Foundation “as a network of fellows that promotes and enables global citizenship” (Melton Foundation, n.d.). In 1997, the international charity Oxfam released its “Curriculum for Global Citizenship” (Oxfam, n.d.). Hicks (2003) summarized key principles in teaching global education and citizenship. Global Citizen, founded in 2008, holds music festivals in major world cities to promote this ideal. By 2017, it had raised over 10 billion dollars for global projects such as gender equality in education, clean water, vaccinations, and environmental protection (Global Citizen, 2017). In 2015, UNESCO initiated its Global Citizenship Education program to teach “responsible global citizenship: creativity, innovation, and commitment to peace, human rights and sustainable development” (UNESCO, n.d.).

The ideals of global human identification and citizenship (hereafter abbreviated GHIC) and of *The Family of Man* appeal to some, but narrower ingroup loyalties such as patriotism are still more common. In this light, the authors of this article have each studied GHIC and the sense that all humanity constitutes a single “family.” Why do these ideals appeal to some but not to others? What concerns and behaviors result from GHIC? How does it arise, and how might it be enlarged? We have used different measures and theoretical foundations, and a few other measures preceded ours. Global human identification and global citizenship might be regarded as separate constructs. They share a common meaning, although the first focuses on identification with all human beings, the latter on belonging to the global collection of human beings. Our measures differ in whether they focus on the former or the latter aspect. However, as we note later, our measures are strongly related, and each measure has yielded results that are consistent with the other measures. Therefore, for purposes of this review, we regard “global human identification and citizenship” as a singular construct and refer to it in the singular.

The aim of this article is to review the studies as comprehensively as a single article permits. We first present the theoretical foundations that have guided our work. Second, we summarize work with measures related to GHIC that preceded our own. Third, we present general summaries of our own measures and the empirical results we have obtained. Fourth, we discuss what our research suggests for how GHIC might be enlarged. We end with a summary of general conclusions.
Theoretical Foundations of Global Human Identification and Citizenship

Our studies, summarized later, have been guided by one or more of three theoretical foundations. The first is based on theories of the highest levels of psychological development, the second on social-psychological models of social identification, and the third on modern extensions of the meaning of community.

Global Human Identification and Citizenship as the Highest Level of Psychological Development

Several classical social-personality psychologists in the twentieth century envisioned GHIC as a natural consequence of mature psychological development. Alfred Adler’s (1927/1954) concept of *gemeinschaftsgefühl* (social interest, or community feeling) proposed that humans possess an innate capacity to care for others’ well-being. However, the range of this care expands with development from concern for just one’s closest ingroups (e.g., family, community) to larger groups, and potentially to all mankind. One with fully mature *gemeinschaftsgefühl* acts “in the interest of mankind generally” and engages in activities that express “helpfulness to all mankind, present and future” (Adler, 1929/1964, p. 78).

Four decades later, Gordon Allport (1958) asked the question, “Can Humanity Constitute an Ingroup?” (pp. 41–45). Allport proposed a series of concentric circles of ingroups with family as the closest ingroup, one’s neighborhood usually the next closest, with farther out circles representing one’s nation and racial stock. However, the outmost circle represented all humanity (“mankind” in Allport’s terminology, p. 42). Psychologically, it is easier to regard members of the closer circles as constituting one’s ingroup. The outmost circle, representing all humanity, whose boundaries are most extensive and whose membership is diverse and often strange and unknown, is the most difficult to regard as an ingroup. But learning to do so is vital for humanity’s future: “The important question is, Can a loyalty to mankind be fashioned before interracial warfare breaks out” (pp. 42–43). Without humanity becoming a common ingroup, human conflict appeared to Allport to be inevitable and endless. Of course, “Concentric loyalties take time to develop, and often, of course, they fail to do so” (p. 43). Still, “Narrow circles can, without conflict, be supplemented by larger circles of loyalty. This happy condition is not often achieved, but it remains from the psychological point of view a hopeful possibility” (p. 45).

Erik Erikson (1968) alluded to this expansion in describing the process of life-long development. “At its best, it is a process of increasing differentiation, and it becomes ever more inclusive as the individual grows aware of a widening circle of others significant to him, from the maternal person to ‘mankind’” (p. 23).

It was Abraham Maslow, however, who most explicitly described the psychological development to GHIC. To Maslow, the most mature individuals, those who have transcended the lower psychological needs in his famous hierarchy of needs (Maslow, 1954) and have become “self-actualized” (exemplified by persons such as Albert Schweitzer and Eleanor Roosevelt), have developed “a deep feeling of identification, sympathy, and affection for human beings in general. They feel friendship and connection, as if all people were members of a single family.” (p. 138). Further, “self-actualizing people … are not so much merely Americans as they are world citizens, members of the human species first and foremost” (1971, p. 177).

Global Human Identification and Citizenship as Social Identity

A second line of theoretical reasoning following the social identity approach (Reicher, Spears, & Haslam, 2010; Tajfel & Turner, 1986, 1979) has also informed our research. According to this approach, GHIC reflects identification on the highest possible human level, recognized by Allport (1954) as a “hopeful possibility” (p. 45, see above) for human cooperation and peaceful cohabitation.
The social identity approach delineates the psychological processes that bring people to perceive themselves as group members (i.e., through self-categorization) and make them act on behalf of their group (i.e., through internalization of the group’s norms, beliefs, and values). At a very fundamental level, one could say that groups shape us—they shape ourselves, our identities. Individuals derive a substantial part of their identity from their attachment to social groups and can define their selves on various levels of social inclusiveness (Brewer, 1991). The lowest level of inclusiveness—a personal self-definition—represents the self as a unique person. Beyond that, a virtually unlimited number of self-definitions on higher levels of inclusion are possible (think of identification with your community, a sports team, your faculty, your university), up to the level of “all humans” (and potentially, all species; Amiot & Bastian, 2015). In the original formulations of self-categorization theory (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987), a specific self-categorization becomes likely when at least two social categories (ingroup and outgroup) can be situationally distinguished, although Turner et al. did conceive of all humanity as the highest level of possible self-categorization. More recent research, however, suggests that social identities also emerge inductively through intra-group interaction and discussion (Postmes, Haslam, & Swaab, 2005; Thomas, Mavor, & McGarty, 2011; Thomas, McGarty, & Mavor, 2016). In other words, a contrasting outgroup is not a prerequisite for social identities to form and become relevant (see also Gaertner, Iuzzini, Witt, & Oriña, 2006). Thus, ultimately, under certain circumstances, people may—and do—identify with the global human community (McFarland, Webb, & Brown, 2012; Reese, Proch, & Finn, 2015; Rosenmann, Reese, & Cameron, 2016).

As we know from social identity theory, once people identify with a group, behavior that advances the group becomes more likely. For the superordinate group of all humans, for those with strong GHIC, all members of their ingroup “humanity” become relevant and deserve equal treatment. Group behavior thus ascends from parochial interests (e.g., “America first”) to solidarity with and care for all humans.

Global Human Identity as Community

The expanding understanding of “community” has undergirded the research of Malsch (2005) and colleagues. Historically, “community” referred to a specific geographical location and interpersonal relationships with familiar others (Dunham, 1986). Feeling connected to a community promotes behaviors aimed at helping the community. Early work on the psychological sense of community found this connection to be important for a wide range of behaviors. As examples, communities with residents reporting greater psychological sense of community have more citizens active in community organizations and more registered voters (Brodsky, O’Campo, & Aronson, 1999), more citizens as members of community organizations (Perkins & Long, 2002; Wandersman & Giamartino, 1980), higher levels of general political participation (Davidson & Cotter, 1989; Speer, Jackson, & Peterson, 2001), and a greater sense of political efficacy (Speer et al., 2001). Identification with a community also motivates HIV/AIDS activism (Omoto & Snyder, 2002).

However, with modern social changes (e.g., speed of communication, urbanization, individualization, and transportation) the meaning of community has been enlarged from community as a close place to what Dunham (1986) has labeled community as a “process” (see also Glynn, 1986; Omoto & Snyder, 2002). In this enlarged sense, a community may include not only known others living in close proximity, but those living far away that an individual may not know personally. Given this modern shift, McMillan and Chavis (1986) identified four components that appear to comprise a psychological sense of community: membership, influence, integration and fulfillment of needs, and shared emotional connection. The conceptual extension provided through a psychological sense of global community involves a sense of connection with people far beyond one’s current geographical location.
Based on this theoretical framework, Malsch (2005) expanded the notion of community to the concept of global community, a sense of community that extends far beyond psychological connection to local communities and personal relationships. Malsch’s focus was on the psychological dimensions of community such as feelings of membership and belonging that do not necessarily rely on a geographical setting or frequent interaction. A global community is not based in a particular location but includes feelings of connection to humanity in general. Malsch posited the global community as a psychological process representing an overarching tendency to feel connection, unity, and integration with the whole of humanity.

A Review of Empirical Research on Global Human Identification and Citizenship

Early Related Measures

Each author of this article has studied GHIC with at least one of four measures. However, we begin by reviewing research with related measures that predated our own.

Internationalism (Likert, 1932)

When Rensis Likert (1932) first described his method for measuring attitudes, now used universally, his first illustrative scale was an Internationalism Scale. While not exactly assessing GHIC, it did assess individuals’ attitudes toward U.S. involvement in promoting global peace and prosperity (e.g., “The United States, whether a member or not, should cooperate fully in the humanitarian and economic programs of the League of Nations”). This scale correlated .63 with a measure of anti-imperialism (“We should cooperate as fully as possible with Latin-American countries, treat them as equals, and stop regarding ourselves as their leaders and protectors”). Likert’s Internationalism Scale was not used in later published studies that we located, and more than two decades appear to have passed before another scale related to GHIC was used.

Worldmindedness (Sampson & Smith, 1957)

Sampson and Smith’s (1957) measure of Worldmindedness appears to be the earliest to directly assess GHIC. Worldmindedness was defined as a value orientation which “favors a world-view of the problems of humanity, whose primary reference group is mankind, rather than American, English, Chinese, etc.” (p. 99). Their 32-item Worldmindedness Scale (WS) contained two positively and two negatively worded items for each of eight categories: Positive attitudes toward world government, world religions, immigration, race, universal education, and economic equality were combined with negatively scored attitudes toward patriotism and war. Specifically tapping global human citizenship, a negatively scored item for patriotism read, “It would be better to be a citizen of the world than of any particular country.” Several items in the WS, such the one above, directly contrast global and national citizenship in single items. Several other scales described in this section also did so. Our own measures, discussed later, do not. An oppositely worded item, “Patriotism should be a primary aim of education so our children will believe our country is the best in the world,” was scored negatively for worldmindedness. Two small-sample studies found test-retests correlations on the WS of .75 for six months and .69 across four years. Sampson and Smith (1957) also reported that worldmindedness correlated −.71 with Adorno et al.’s (1950) Ethnocentrism Scale.

The WS was used in several later studies. Smith and Rosen (1958) conducted structured interviews with 20 high-scoring and 20 low-scoring young adults. Their responses, coded by multiple coders, found that the high scorers were higher in self-expansiveness (i.e., openmindedness), love-orientation (“warmth of feeling for people”), equalitarianism, independence and individuality (“independence of thought”), and optimism. Further, the high-scoring participants were more likely to describe their parents as lenient, while low-scorers more often described theirs as strict. Garrison (1961) found that students’ WS scores correlated .37 with test grades in an educational psychology
course and that WS average scores were higher for students in each higher college class, offering “evidence that worldmindedness is positively related to mental alertness” (p. 152).

Prien (1966), dividing the WS into its proworldmindedness and antiworldmindedness items, found that students’ proworldmindedness correlated with measures of “sociability, original thinking, benevolence, and esthetic values” (p. 244), while antiworldmindedness was related to being “self-oriented, seeking tangible rewards, less-flexible or adaptive in dealing with other people, and considerably more conservative” (p. 247). On a pretest-posttest, participation in a 10-week study program in Europe did not significantly change either pro- or antiworldmindedness scores.

Der-Karabetian (1992) found that WS correlated in the .20s with several measures of concern about nuclear war in several countries (England, Australia, and United States) but not in others (Greece, Taiwan, and India). Der-Karabetian, Stephenson, and Poggi (1996) found that WS correlated with several measures of environmental concern, and with both self-reported environmental behaviors and commitments to future environmental behaviors (e.g., willing to use mass transit to lower pollution), with most correlations in the .20s and .30s. For students in China, Taiwan, and the United States, WS correlated in the .30s with engaging in environmentally sustainable behaviors (e.g., trying to save water and electricity; Der-Karabetian, Cao, & Alfaro, 2014). Sakuragi (2006) found that U.S. students’ scores on a shortened version of the WS scale correlated in the .20s with willingness to accept members of other ethnic groups (Arabic, Chinese, and Japanese) in closer social relations up to marriage and with the desire to learn foreign languages.

Internationalism (Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989)

Kosterman and Feshbach (1989), trying mainly to distinguish the patriotism (feelings of attachment to one’s country) from nationalism (the view that one’s country is superior and should be dominant), obtained a third 10-item factor of internationalism (“Children should be educated to be internationally minded—to support any movement which contributes to the welfare of the world as a whole, regardless of special national interests”). Internationalism correlated weakly negatively, less than −.25, with both patriotism and nationalism. It correlated .56 with support for a nuclear freeze and in the .20s with support for civil liberties and for the creation of a world government. Esses, Dovidio, Semenya, and Jackson (2005) found that this measure of internationalism predicted Canadians’ favorable attitudes toward immigrants and immigration, while nationalism negatively predicted these attitudes. No later studies using the Kosterman and Feshbach measure of internationalism were located.

Global-Human Identity Scale (Der-Karabetian & Balian, 1992)

Der-Karabetian and Balian (1992) developed a seven-item Global-Human Identity scale (“I’d rather be a citizen of the world than of any one country”). All items were worded positively, and an alpha coefficient of .80 was reported. For a sample of Turkish-Armenian adults, this scale correlated .56 with education level and −.53 with Armenian identity. Der-Karabetian and Ruiz (1997) found that, for second-generation Latino-Americans in the United States, a six-item version of the scale correlated .19 with educational aspirations. Using the scale in marketing research, Westjohn, Arnold, and Magnusson (2009) found correlations in the .20s and .30s in China and the United States with “an individual’s predisposition to use new technologies” (p. 253). Westjohn et al. (2012) found that the scale correlated .56 with positive evaluations of product advertisements that “associate the brand with … themes that reflect an emerging global culture” (p. 60). De Rivera and Carson (2015) found that Global-Human Identity Scale scores correlated .54 with the degree that six possible items (e.g., “Some way of making amends for injustice”) were desired for a hypothetical celebration of global identity. De Rivera and Mahoney (2018) found that the scale correlated .64 with the desire to celebrate global identity. Der-Karabetian et al. (2018) found that the Global-Human Identity Scale correlated .40 with self-reported sustainable behaviors (recycling, saving water, and electricity) and,
along with national identity and the perceived positive impact of globalization, predicted sustainable behaviors in a simultaneous regression.

**Global Identity Scale (Türken, 2006)**

For his Masters Dissertation at the University of Oslo, Türken (2006) developed a 10-item Global Identity Scale, with five pro-trait (“I consider myself more as a citizen of the world than a citizen of some nation”) and five con-trait items (“One should first care about his or her nation, then others”). Phelps, Eilertsen, Türken, and Ommundsen (2011) found for a large sample of Norwegian university students that the Global Identity Scale correlated with −.41 with right-wing authoritarianism (RWA; Altemeyer, 1996), −.42 with the social dominance orientation (SDO; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999), but .59 with the desire to welcome and integrate immigrants into Norwegian society. Türken and Rudmin (2013) reported that, for large samples of Norwegian, Turkish, and U.S. students, the Global Identity Scale correlated from .22 to .39 with the sum of six cosmopolitan behaviors (e.g., reading international news) and from .13 to .26 with the number of languages spoken. Again, no further studies using Türken’s scale were found.

**Human Identity Salience (Nickerson & Louis, 2008)**

Nickerson and Louis (2008) assessed Australian and human identity salience with six comparable items (“How important is being a human being [an Australian] in your everyday life?”; “Are the values that are important to you related to being a human [or, Australian]?”). In regression analyses, RWA, SDO, and identification with Australians predicted negative feelings and attitudes toward asylum seekers, along with a greater willingness to sign a letter supporting the government’s tough policies toward asylum seekers. In contrast, human identity salience, with correlations in the .30s, predicted positive attitudes and feelings toward asylum seekers and greater willingness to sign a letter opposing the government’s harsh policy against them.

**Cosmopolitan Orientation Scale (Leung, Koh, & Tam, 2015)**

Leung, Koh, and Tam (2015), defining the cosmopolitan orientation as the “attitudinal and value orientations of individuals who immerse as part of the globalized world” (p. 79), conceptualized and measured the cosmopolitan orientation as consisting of the three factors of cultural openness (e.g., “I am open to living in a different culture.”), global prosociality (“I would serve the world community by helping human beings”), and respect for cultural diversity (“I respect cultural differences”). Each factor is assessed by five items. In the only published study to date, the authors found that across samples in three nations (Singapore, Australia, the United States) the overall Cosmopolitan Orientation Scale, and particularly the global prosociality subscale, is significantly related to the belief that humans are damaging the global environment, to proenvironmental beliefs, motivations, and behaviors (e.g., using energy-efficient devices), and to support for the environmental movement.

**Membership in the Global Human Community (Marcus, Deutsch, & Liu, 2017)**

Marcus, Deutsch, and Liu (2017) presented a message, “Imagine a Global Human Community” to a large sample of U.S. adults via Survey Monkey. The message described the values in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in Franklin Roosevelt’s Four Freedoms speech and suggested that being a member of the Global Human Community implies “a commitment to take action” (p. 90), which was not specified. Participants were then asked, “Are you willing to be a member of such a global human community?” Responding “yes,” as did 70%, was significantly related to being more educated, liberal, younger, and economically comfortable. When asked their reasons, those who responded “yes” most commonly mentioned their interests in society or the world and the rightness of doing so. The 30% who replied “no” or “maybe,” often cited a lack of time or a fatalistic belief that being a member of the global community would not lead to positive changes.
Measures and Studies by the Current Authors

The authors of the current review have developed and used four distinct measures of GHIC. These are titled Identification With All Humanity (McFarland, Webb, & Brown, 2012), Global Social Identification (Reese, Proch, & Cohrs, 2014), Psychological Sense of Global Community (Malsch, 2005), and Global Citizenship Identification (Reysen & Katzarska-Miller, 2013c). While these measures intercorrelate very strongly, usually about .70 or higher (McFarland & Hornsby, 2015), key findings for each measure will be presented in turn.

Identification With All Humanity Scale (IWAH; McFarland, Webb, & Brown, 2012)

The Identification with All Humanity scale (IWAH) was developed by McFarland and student-colleagues Matthew Webb and Derek Brown (McFarland & Brown, 2008; McFarland et al., 2012). After several iterations, the final IWAH consists of nine three-part items in the form of these two exemplars:

1) How close to you feel to each of the following groups?
   a. People in my community
   b. Americans
   c. All humans everywhere
2) How much do you want to be:
   a. a responsible citizen of my community.
   b. a responsible American citizen.
   c. a responsible citizen of the world.

A 5-point response scale from 1 (e.g., not at all) to 5 (e.g., very much) is typically used. The sum or mean of the “c.” items assesses “identification with all humanity” (or simply IWAH). The “a.” and “b.” items assess identification with one’s community and nation, respectively. Across many students and adult samples in several countries, Cronbach’s alphas for each of the three identifications have been consistently above .80. Scores on the three identifications are always correlated, usually modestly. Because the three identifications are presented together, a comparison is implicitly suggested but not explicitly requested. To understand the unique associations of IWAH with other variables of interest, McFarland and colleagues have usually reported correlations that control for the other identifications, as is done for this report.

When used in another country, that country’s name is substituted for “Americans” on the “b.” items (e.g., in Poland, Mexico, Chile, see Hamer & Gutowski, 2009; Hamer et al., 2018, April; Hamer, McFarland, Penczek, et al., in preparation). When used internationally, as on the yourmorals.org website, “people of my country” is used.

Early studies (McFarland et al., 2012; Studies 1 and 2) found that all “identification with all humanity” items (the c. items) loaded on a single factor. However, later studies in several countries found two-factor solutions (McFarland & Hornsby, 2015; Reese et al., 2015; Reysen & Hackett, 2016). Because the two factors were similar to Leach et al.’s (2008) two-dimensional model of ingroup identification (the first feeling a part of one’s group, the second being concerned for its well-being), Reese et al. labeled them as Global Self-Definition, reflecting a sense of membership in the global ingroup, and Global Self-Investment, reflecting a proactive concern for the global group and its members. The two items above illustrate these two factors, respectively. When two-factor solutions are found, four items load strongly on each factor, while one item (“How much do you identify with [that is, feel a part of, feel love toward, have concern for] each of the following?”) loads moderately on both, as this item reflects both global self-definition (“feel a part of”) and global self-investment (“have concern for”). When scores on the two factors are used, this item is dropped. However, as this item taps both factors, it consistently has the highest item-total correlation with the full scale.
With one exception (Reysen & Hackett, 2016, Study 1), the two factors with oblimin rotation have correlated .55 or higher, indicating a higher-order construct. Indeed, Penczek et al. (2018) and Hamer, Penczek, McFarland et al. (in review) found that a model of the two subfactors and one superordinate factor was invariant across student samples in four countries (Poland, Chile, Mexico, United States). However, McFarland recently found single-factor solutions for each of two huge yourmorals.org samples, one of more than 14,200 U.S. residents and a second of more than 4,300 non-U.S. residents. For reasons not yet clear, whether one- or two-factor solutions are obtained appears to depend upon characteristics of the selected sample.

Initial Convergent Validity of the IWAH. McFarland et al. (2012) proposed that IWAH obviously should correlate negatively with generalized prejudice (or ethnocentrism; Altemeyer, 1996) and its major roots, RWA and SDO (Altemeyer, 1998). They also proposed that it should correlate positively with two facets of dispositional empathy (Davis, 1983) and with principled moral reasoning on Kohlberg’s (1969) model.

Across many samples, correlations with ethnocentrism, RWA and SDO have usually ranged from −.30 to −.60, with the negative correlations with ethnocentrism and SDO typically larger than those for RWA (McFarland, 2017). In structural model tests on U.S. samples, RWA and SDO each predict ethnocentrism, which in turn predicts lower IWAH scores (McFarland, 2010). Cross-cultural research by Hamer and her colleagues in the United States, Poland, Chile, and Mexico has replicated these associations and the structural model (Hamer, McFarland, Penczek, et al., in preparation). Correlations with Davis’s (1983) measure of empathic concern (“I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me”) range into the .50s, while those with his perspective-taking measure (“I try to look at everybody’s side of a disagreement before I make a decision”) are usually in the .30s (McFarland, 2017). Correlations with Rest, Narvaez, Thoma, and Bebeau’s (1999) Defining Issue Test, a measure of principled moral reasoning, have been in the .20s. The correlations with ethnocentrism, RWA, SDO, and empathy have been replicated in samples in Poland and Chile, although the correlations tend to be somewhat smaller than for U.S. samples (Hamer, McFarland, Penczek, et al., in preparation).

IWAH Personality-Related Correlates. For the well-known Big Five personality factors (Goldberg, 1990), IWAH usually correlates from the high .20s to the high .30s with openness to experience and in the .20s with agreeableness (McFarland et al., 2012; yourmorals.org data), although both correlations have been found somewhat higher in Poland (e.g., for one sample in Poland the IWAH-openness correlation was .44; Hamer, in press). IWAH is not related to conscientiousness or neuroticism. While using the HEXACO measure (Ashton & Lee, 2009), IWAH correlates mainly with openness (.39 in the United States and .26 in Poland), and very low with agreeableness and honesty-humility (less than .2 in both samples), emotionality (only in U.S. sample), and extraversion (only in Polish sample; Hamer, McFarland, Penczek, et al., in preparation).

For the yourmorals.org samples, IWAH correlates in the .30s with Triandis and Gelfand’s (1998) measure of horizontal collectivism (i.e., enjoying cooperative relationships with others). It correlates weakly positively with Bartholomew and Horowitz’s (1991) measure of secure attachment style and negatively with the fearful attachment style (Hamer, 2017). It is also weakly positively related to Lynn and Harris’s (1997) measure of need for uniqueness (“Being distinctive is important to me”; McCutcheon et al., 2015), and weakly negatively with measures of materialism and need for social approval (McFarland, 2017), with all these absolute correlations .25 or less. For a sample of Polish adults, however, IWAH correlated −.34 with need for approval (McFarland & Hamer, 2006).

1Yourmorals.org is a website created by psychologists at the University of Virginia, the University of California (Irvine), and the University of Southern California. Any person may log on and complete any of a large array of psychological measures of personality, personal values, and social attitudes. The IWAH was placed on the website in 2009. The yourmorals.org IWAH results reported in this study have not been reported previously.
Several results indicate that IWAH is substantially negatively related to self-centeredness. Averaged across the two yourmorals.org samples, IWAH correlated −.46 with Levenson, Kiehl, and Fitzpatrick’s (1995) measure of primary psychopathy (“For me, what’s right is whatever I can get away with”) and −.33 with Triandis and Gelfand’s (1998) measure of vertical individualism (“Winning is everything”). For the Dirty Dozen scale (Jonason & Webster, 2010), IWAH correlated −.20 with Psychopathy and −.15 with Machiavellianism in the U.S. and Polish samples (Hamer, McFarland, Penczek, et al., in preparation).

The limited data suggest that IWAH may also correlate modestly with cognitive abilities. Data from the McFarland et al. (2012, Studies 1 and 8), not previously reported, found that IWAH correlated .21, p < .01, with logical reasoning on Leyens et al.’s (2001) matching bias test, a modification of the Wason (1966) logic test, and .21, p = .06, with composite scores on the American College Test (ACT), a strong correlate with other measures of general intelligence (Koenig, Frey, & Detterman, 2008). For a Polish student sample, Hamer (2008) found a correlation of .21, p < .10, with Bieri’s (1955) test of cognitive complexity. However, in unpublished data, Hamer found no relationship between the IWAH and scores on the Raven’s Progressive Matrices, a widely used index of fluid intelligence (Raven, Raven, & Court, 1998).

IWAH and Moral Values. For the five dimensions of Graham et al.’s (2011) Moral Foundations Questionnaire, the IWAH correlates with the dimension of care in the .40s and with the justice dimension in the .30s. As the dimensions of loyalty, authority, and purity are closely related to RWA (Sinn & Hayes, 2017), IWAH correlates negatively with these dimensions, usually in the −.20s and −.30s in both U.S. and Polish samples (Hamer, McFarland, Penczek, et al., in preparation; McFarland, 2017). Correlations with universalism from Schwartz’s (1992) 10-value circumplex model of personal values range up to the .50s, those with benevolence in the .30s, and those with power about −.20; IWAH correlates little or not at all with the remaining seven personal values (McFarland et al., 2012; yourmorals.org data).

Structural models predicting IWAH were tested on Polish student samples in two studies (N = 334, N = 311). Both studies found that dispositional empathy (empathic concern + perspective taking), universalism, and openness to experience all positively predicted IWAH. Study 2 showed that SDO and RWA also did so negatively. Further, the effects of empathy and universalism upon IWAH were partially mediated through reduced SDO, while those of universalism and openness were partially mediated through reduced RWA. Study 2, adding ethnocentrism, found that ethnocentrism also directly predicted IWAH and that the effects of SDO and RWA were partly (for SDO) or fully (for RWA) mediated through ethnocentrism (Hamer, McFarland, & Penczek, 2019).

IWAH Prediction of Attitudes and Behaviors. What attitudes and behaviors does IWAH predict? As summarized below, IWAH is positively related to many prosocial international attitudes and behaviors and negatively to prejudice and blind loyalty to one’s nation.

Concern for human rights and humanitarian needs. Perhaps most centrally, IWAH predicts commitment to international human rights and concern for global humanitarian needs (world hunger, AIDS, etc.); importantly, it consistently does so beyond the power of its major correlates (e.g., ethnocentrism, RWA, SDO, empathy; McFarland, 2017). Correlations with commitment to human rights on McFarland and Mathews’ (2005) Human Rights Choice Questionnaire (HRCQ) are usually in the .40s and .50s (McFarland, 2010, 2015; McFarland & Hornsby, 2015), with similar correlations in Poland and Mexico (Hamer et al., 2018). When two-factor solutions were obtained for the IWAH, McFarland and Hornsby (2015) found that both factors contributed to predicting a factor of that included the HRCQ. In two structural model tests, while RWA and SDO increased ethnocentrism, which reduced IWAH, IWAH enhanced human rights commitment (McFarland, 2010).

McFarland and Hornsby (2015) found that IWAH correlated .58 with Concern for Global Poverty, a factor consisting of items from Reese and colleagues measures of Justice Beliefs About Global Inequality (“The increasing gap between poor and rich in the world worries me”; Reese et al.,
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2014) and Behavioral Intentions Toward Global Inequality (“I would adjust my standard of living substantially if I could thereby contribute to global justice”; Reese, Berthold, & Steffens, 2012) and from similar items by Reysen and Katzarska-Miller (2013a) and Malsch (2005). While both IWAH factors also correlated .46 or higher with this factor, only the global self-investment factor contributed to it in regression analyses. Reysen and Hackett (2016) found that prosocial concerns such as for international social justice, intergroup helping, and commitment to a sustainable environment were driven mainly by global self-investment.

Across six countries, Buchan et al.’s (2011) Global Social Identity scale, which is structurally identical to the IWAH (assessing identification with one’s local community, nation, and the world), correlated .25 with the sum of concerns for global issues (global warming, the spread of dangerous diseases, global gap between rich and poor, and the effectiveness of international courts). Hamer et al. (2018, April) added a fifth global concern (“The persistent refugee crisis around the world”) and found that for each of three countries (Poland, United States, and Chile), the IWAH correlated positively with all five concerns and predicted the sum of these concerns, with correlations ranging from .25 in Poland to .35 in Chile and .38 in the United States.

Support for international charities. IWAH also predicts giving to and volunteering for international charities. McFarland (2017) summarized how IWAH predicts giving to international charities on both self-report measures and behavioral tests. Further, IWAH strongly predicts channeling one’s giving toward alleviating global hunger and establishing justice for the poor, with these correlations in the .40s and .50s (McFarland et al., 2012, Study 10; yourmorals.org samples). In an experimental game, across six countries, Buchan et al.’s (2011) similar measure predicted contributing tokens with small monetary value to a “world” account rather than to a “personal” or “local” account. In recent data, IWAH correlated .26 with humanitarian internationalism in the United States (“Our country should give humanitarian aid like food and medicine to foreign countries in need”; Hamer, McFarland, Penczek, et al., in preparation).

Regarding volunteering, Faulkner (2018) found that IWAH strongly predicted hours volunteered to help an international agency campaign against child labor. Stürmer, Rohmann, and van der Noll (2016) reported that IWAH correlated .54 with willingness to volunteer to help in various ways in the fight against Ebola. Additionally, cross-cultural studies showed higher IWAH for those who sign petitions for human rights (U.S., Chilean, and Polish samples) and for those who participate in charities for causes connected to human rights (U.S. and Polish samples; Hamer et al., 2018, July). Hamer et al. (2018, April) asked participants from Poland, Chile, and the United States about their willingness to volunteer for three tasks: Collecting signatures petitioning cloth companies against their use of slave employees in developing countries, volunteering time to help at a refugee center, and organizing workshops for school pupils on tolerance towards persons from different cultures. Willingness to help in the three tasks correlated highly, and regression analyses for all three samples found that IWAH and empathy positively predicted willingness to help while ethnocentrism negatively predicted this willingness.

Studies in Poland found that blood donors have higher IWAH scores than do those who do not give blood and that volunteers for charities helping people have higher IWAH scores than volunteers for charities helping animals. Volunteers for an international cause averaged higher on the IWAH than volunteers for a national cause (Hamer, 2011, in preparation).

Human Equality, Prejudice, and Nationalism. Positively, IWAH predicts valuing the lives of all human beings equally. It correlated with Pratto and Glasford’s (2008) measure of the “ethnocentric valuation of human life,” valuing the lives of ingroup members over those of outgroup members, −.41 for a U.S. adult sample, −.35 for a U.S. student sample (McFarland et al., 2012, Study 7), and −.20 for Polish and Mexican samples (Hamer et al., 2018, July). In regression analyses on the U.S. samples that included SDO, identification with Americans and dispositional empathy, IWAH was the strongest predictor of valuing all lives equally for both samples.
In addition to its negative correlations with ethnocentrism, IWAH correlates negatively with many specific prejudices. For a U.S. student sample, it correlated in the −.40s with all three subscales of Ünal’s (2016) Islamophobia scale (Anti-Muslim conspiracy beliefs, Anti-Muslim prejudice, Anti-Muslim sentiment; Hamer, McFarland, & Drogosz, in preparation). Dunwoody and McFarland (2018) found that IWAH correlated −.50 with fear of Muslims and .50 with willingness to welcome Muslim refugees into the United States. In samples in Poland, Mexico, and the United States, when students were shown faces of college-aged persons from five ethnic groups (Asian, Black, Hindu, Latino, White), IWAH was associated with greater willingness to include those of different ethnicities as both friends (all three samples) and as part of their own nation (in Poland and Mexico). IWAH also predicted higher ratings of attractiveness of their faces (Hamer, Drogosz, McFarland, et al., 2017; Hamer, McFarland, & Drogosz, in preparation). Nai, Narayanan, Hernandez, and Savani (2018) recently found that IWAH was associated with living in more racially diverse communities, with greater helping of strangers, and that the effect of living in racially diverse communities upon helping was substantially mediated through IWAH.

In two recent studies, Hamer, McFarland, and Drogosz (in preparation) examined the relationship between IWAH and blatant dehumanization as measured by Kteily, Bruneau, Watzl, and Cotterill’s (2015) Ascent of Man scale. This measure shows a sequence of five images, progressing from a semi-erect simian to a fully erect human, and participants are asked to rate on a sliding 100-point scale where various ethnic and religious groups seem to fit. Following Kteily et al.’s scoring method (ingroup rating minus outgroup rating on the scale), for two samples, IWAH correlated a median of −.34 with blatant dehumanization for all ethnic (Hispanic, Asian, and Mexican) and religious (Hindu and Muslims) groups and with blatant dehumanization of refugees and homosexuals.

In an experiment showing an online news about a mugging, varying information about the type of mugging (hate crime vs. nonhate crime) and the victim (Muslim vs. non-Muslim), Hamer, Drogosz, and McFarland (2018) found that IWAH scores predicted greater sadness, anxiety, shame, and anger over the mugging, along with greater willingness to condemn the perpetrator and to participate in anticrime and victim support groups; all of these effects were regardless of the type of crime or victim.

For patriotism, McFarland et al. (2012) found that IWAH correlated −.41 with Schatz, Staub, and Lavine’s (1999) measure of blind patriotism (“unquestioning positive evaluation, staunch allegiance, and intolerance of criticism,” p. 151), but was unrelated to constructive patriotism, wanting to make one’s country better. However, for a Polish national sample, IWAH correlated .2 with constructive patriotism, but no correlation was found for blind patriotism (Hamer, Penczek, & Bilewicz, 2018). Similarly, in recent U.S. data, the IWAH correlated −.41 and −.51 for two samples with Golec de Zavala, Cichocka, Eidelson, and Jayawickreme’s (2009) measure of collective narcissism (an unrealistic belief in one’s nation’s greatness, moral superiority, and undeservedness of special treatment in the international order; Hamer, McFarland, & Penczek, in preparation). The IWAH also correlated −.37 with isolationism (“Our country would be better off if we did not concern ourselves with problems in other parts of the world”; Hamer, McFarland, Penczek, et al., in preparation). Of immediate import in the U.S. context, IWAH correlated −.36 with support for building a wall on the American-Mexican border and .36 with support for granting citizenship to the “Dreamers,” undocumented immigrants brought into the United States as children (Hamer, McFarland, Penczek, et al., in preparation).

Other IWAH relationships. IWAH is related to greater global knowledge, particularly on issues of humanitarian concern and a greater desire to know about global concerns, and it predicts choosing to read journal articles on humanitarian concerns (e.g., “Can We End Genocide?”) over other articles (McFarland, 2017). Research in Chile, Mexico, and Poland has confirmed these connections (Hamer et al., 2018, July).

IWAH predicts forgiveness of former national enemies. Two studies in Poland (Hamer, Penczek, & Bilewicz, 2017, 2018), with the latter on a large national sample, found that IWAH predicted
forgiving Germans and Russians for their World War II atrocities in Poland (e.g., “I have forgiven Germans for their atrocities in World War II”). In a U.S. replication, it predicted forgiving Germans and Japanese for their wartime hostilities against the United States. Collective narcissism predicted less willingness to forgive in both countries (Hamer, McFarland, Penczek, et al., in preparation).

Other attitudinal correlates are also relevant. Lee, Ashton, Choi, and Zachariassen (2015) found a correlation of .44 between IWAH and a measure of connectedness with nature (“I often feel a sense of oneness with the natural world around me”). Kahane et al. (2018) found that that IWAH correlated .33 with the Impartial Benevolence factor (“It is just as wrong to fail to help someone as it is to actively harm them yourself”) of their new Oxford Utilitarianism Scale.

Finally, in studies to date, IWAH is either slightly negatively related or unrelated to measures of religious faith. For a large U.S. adult sample, IWAH correlated slightly negatively with self-reported religiousness, Christian orthodoxy, and Christian fundamentalism, with all correlations less than −.25 (McFarland, 2017). McCutcheon et al. (2015) found that identification with one’s community and with America correlated positively with belief in God, but IWAH and belief in God were not correlated.

Intuiting IWAH and Moral Maturity. As noted in the theoretical background, Allport, Adler, Erikson, and Maslow all believed that as individuals fully mature psychologically, they adopt GHIC. But can college students envision that relationship? McFarland and Brown (2008) had 360 students complete the IWAH and then a second time “as you believe the most moral and most mature person you could imagine (bolded on the questionnaire) would answer.” For 86% of the participants, IWAH scores for the most moral and mature person were higher than their own scores. Just 13% rated that they personally “very much” (5 on the response scale) “feel a part of, feel love toward, have concern for all humans everywhere,” but 47% intuited that a very mature and moral person would “very much” do so (McFarland, Brown, & Webb, 2013). These students were not moral philosophers, but somehow most could sense that a fully mature individual with the highest morality would identify much more with all humanity than they did themselves.

Global Social Identification Scale (GSI; Reese, Proch, & Cohrs, 2014)

Reese and colleagues developed the Global Social Identification Scale (GSI) based upon the social identity approach and on earlier social identification scales based on the cognitive, affective, and conative aspects of social identity (e.g., Buchan et al., 2011; Castano, Yzerbyt, & Bourguignon, & Seron, 2002; Reysen & Katzarska-Miller, 2013a). Rather than the comprehensive IWAH scale that also allows one to control for effects of lower level identities, the five-item GSI (“Being part of the world community is an important part of my identity”) was designed to be global identification specific while at the same time being economic in its use. As described below, the GSI proved to be both reliable and valid. All studies by Reese and his colleagues have used German student samples.

In a first study establishing this measure, GSI was used as a predictor of actions to reduce global inequality (Reese et al., 2014). The scale was internally consistent, $\alpha = .88$. Consistent with IWAH studies, GSI correlated −.24 with RWA and −.32 with SDO, as well as .29 with openness and .25

$^2$Similar to the relationships between IWAH and forgiveness, several studies using the Common Ingroup Identity Model (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000) have found that experimentally inducing human category as common ingroup including victims and perpetrators enhances forgiveness toward them. As examples, Wohl and Branscombe (2005) found that inducing Native Canadian Indians and Jewish North Americans to think of Canadian and German cruelties against them as cases in which “humans behaved aggressively toward other humans” (p. 293) rather than as the specific cruelty against their own group led to greater forgiveness of Canadians and Germans for their ancestors’ cruelties. Greenway, Quinn, and Lewis (2011) found that asking Indigenous Australians to reflect on the Stolen Generations, in which Indigenous children were taken by force from their families, as an example of “humans behaving heartlessly and ignorantly towards other humans” rather than as “White Australians behaving heartlessly and ignorantly towards Indigenous Australians” led to greater forgiveness of contemporary Australians for their ancestor’s cruelties. However, in each of these studies, while feelings of similarity with the perpetrator group were higher in the “human” condition, feelings of common identification with the perpetrator group was not measured.
with agreeableness on a German version of John, Donahue, and Kentle’s (1991) Big Five personality inventory. In this study and in a subsequent study (Reese & Kohlmann, 2015), GSI correlated .43 and .45 with other-related justice sensitivity, (“I am upset when someone is treated worse than others”; Schmitt, Baumert, Gollwitzer, & Maes, 2010).

Both studies revealed important attitudinal and behavioral correlates of global identification. In the first study (Reese et al., 2014), GSI correlated .41 with a six-item measure that Global Inequality is Unjust (“Global inequality between people from developed and developing countries is unjust”), and .48 with a seven-item measure of Behavioral Intentions to Act Against Global Inequality (“I would reduce my standard of living if I could thereby contribute to decreasing global inequality”). These associations were confirmed in a path model showing that beyond the Big Five personality factors and RWA and SDO, GSI substantially predicted these intentions.

In a second study (Reese & Kohlmann, 2015), GSI predicted a significant ethical choice behavior. First, participants completed several questionnaires, including the GSI and the other measures cited above. After (the ostensible) completion of the study, participants were allowed to choose either a 45 gram Fairtrade chocolate bar or a conventional 100 gram chocolate bar (flavors were matched) as payment for their participation. As expected, GSI predicted choosing the Fairtrade chocolate bar, mediated by the belief that global inequality is unjust. This finding indicates that global identification can lead to behaviors that go beyond self-interest (i.e., choosing a bar that is less than half the size of the conventional option). Similarly, global identity predicted stronger behavioral intentions to act against global inequality, also mediated via injustice beliefs.

Renger and Reese (2017) used an altered four-item version of the GSI, including two items representing identification with “earth” (“I feel connected with the whole earth”) rather than “humans” (α = .84), to predict regularly donating money to proenvironmental organizations. The modified GSI correlated .35 with proenvironmental attitudes and past environmental behaviors and .25 with reported donations to an environmental organization. Importantly, in a path model controlling for effects of other strong predictors of proenvironmental action (i.e., attitudes, norms, perceived behavioral control; Ajzen, 1991), global identity still significantly predicted pro-environmental intentions, which in turn predicted donating to environmental organizations.

**Psychological Sense of Global Community (PSGC; Malsch, 2005)**

Based on the modern extensions of the meaning of community discussed earlier, Malsch (2005) developed the Psychological Sense of Global Community scale (PSGC). The first version, tested with older adults living in U.S. retirement communities (mean age = 80.5), consisted of six items based on Chavis, Hogge, McMillan, and Wandersman’s (1986) Sense of Community Index, with items modified to reflect a broader sense of community, including all humanity and the global community as the referents. Participants were instructed, “When answering these questions, think about all people in the world, in all different countries and cultures. For example, think about all of humanity or the world or global community.”

The items were designed to reflect McMillan and Chavis’s (1986) four dimensions of sense of community: membership (“I feel a sense of belonging to a human or world community, one that extends beyond where I live and includes more than just people I know”), influence (“People’s actions can affect others in the world, whether directly or indirectly”), integration and needs fulfillment (“At the end of the day, all people living in the world want the same things”), and shared emotional connection (“I feel a sense of connection to people all over the world, even if I don’t know them personally”). Participants responded using a 5-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The items for the four conceptual dimensions were highly related, rs>.38, and an initial factor analysis yielded only one factor, accounting for 62% of the variance. Therefore, the measure was subsequently treated as a unidimensional construct (α = .84).
When tested among younger adults (mean age = 21.3), eight additional items were added to further assess the four PSGC dimensions, creating a final 14-item scale. Although four factors were extracted, the first accounted for almost three times the amount of variance as the second factor (30% and 11%, respectively). Therefore, all items were averaged to form a unidimensional a PSGC composite score \( (a = .78). \)

**Predicting PSGC.** Malsch (2005) found three predictors of PSGC: Phillips and Ziller’s (1997) measure of Universal Orientation (“I can understand almost anyone because I’m a little like everyone”), Davis’s (1994) measure of empathic concern, and her own six-item measure of humanitarian values (“Acting generously; sharing what you have with others”), with six correlations across two studies ranging from .33 to .61. Universal orientation reflects a nonprejudiced “tolerant personality,” derived from a tendency to focus on the similarities between people rather than differences. Previous approaches, particularly those emphasizing a social cognitive perspective, have focused on how people categorize social information and exaggerate the differences between various categories (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). The PSGC, similar to the universal orientation, reflects a tendency to perceive commonalities with other people.

**Attitudes and Behaviors Related to PSGC.** PSGC predicts attitudes that reflect favorable responses toward all people. Across Malsch’s (2005) first two studies, the PSGC correlated .71 and .45 with a four-item measure of global social responsibility (“I feel a responsibility to contribute to improving the welfare of all people in need”) and in the .30s and .40s with various measures of global activism (involvement in social causes such as peace, human rights, environmentalism). In a path model, the PSGC mediated the relationship between the three predictors of PSGC cited above and global activism. In short, feeling part of a global community is related to attitudes and behaviors that represent a deep concern for all people.

Hackett, Omoto, and Mathews (2015) found that the PSGC predicted concern for human rights on a three-item measure (“I feel informed about human rights issues”) and greater involvement in human rights activities on a seven-item measure (“Have you ever donated money to a human rights organization?”), with correlations generally in the .20s and .30s.

McFarland and Hornsby (2015) found that the PSGC correlated above .70 with the IWAH. Similarly in strength to the IWAH, PSGC correlated positively with the HRCQ, the desire for global knowledge, choosing to read humanitarian articles over other articles, and pledging portions of drawing prizes to an humanitarian organization (Doctors without Borders), and negatively with the ethnocentric valuation of human life. However, the IWAH and PSGC are not fully identical, as in regression models both the IWAH and PSGC contributed unique variance in predicting global humanitarian concerns (the factor score of the measures listed above) and concern for global poverty, whereas identification with Americans predicted less global humanitarian concern and less concern for global poverty (McFarland and Hornsby, Studies 1 and 2).

**Global Citizenship Identification (GCI; Reysen & Katzarska-Miller, 2013)**

Reysen, Katzarska-Miller, and their colleagues (e.g., Reysen & Katzarska-Miller, 2013a) have reported a series of studies with the majority using a two-item measure of Global Citizenship Identification (GCI; “I would describe myself as a global citizen”). However, the researchers have also adopted other ingroup identification measures to assess GCI, such as a five-item (Reysen & Katzarska-Miller, 2017b) and a single-item (Reysen, Katzarska-Miller, Nesbit, & Pierce, 2013) measure of ingroup identification (for a discussion of measurement of global citizenship, see Reysen & Katzarska-Miller, 2018).

In a first study, Katzarska-Miller, Reysen, Kamble, and Vithoji (2012), surveying participants in the United States, Bulgaria, and India, GCI correlated positively with several prosocial values (e.g., social justice, intergroup empathy, intergroup helping) in each country. Further, participants in Bulgaria and India were higher on both the GCI and on several global concerns (e.g., concern for
global warming, national equality) than were U.S. participants. Katzarska-Miller et al. reasoned that this difference was due to a higher norm for GHIC in Bulgaria and India than in the United States, as the participants’ perceptions of friend and family norms for GHIC were higher than for U.S. participants. Meditational analyses between countries were consistent with this reasoning.

**A Model of Antecedents and Outcomes of Global Citizenship Identification.** Based on this research, Reysen and Katzarska-Miller (2013a) proposed two proximal antecedents of global citizenship identification—normative environment and global awareness. Normative environment represents the perception that valued others (fellow citizens, friends, and family) support a global citizen identity. In addition to grounding their work in the social identity perspective (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner et al., 1987), they drew upon Shweder’s (1990) notion of intentional worlds, which posits that individuals live in cultures filled with meaningful patterns constructed by prior generations. Applied to GHIC, to the extent that one’s world (e.g., the media, valued other people) promotes viewing oneself as a member of the global human community, one is more likely to adopt that identity. In their studies, normative environment has typically been assessed by a four-item scale (“Most people who are important to me think that being a global citizen is desirable”).

Global awareness consists of one’s perceived knowledge of the world and felt interconnectedness with others in the world, again, usually assessed by a four-item scale (“I try to stay informed of current issues that impact international relations”). Notably, global awareness is perceived knowledge and interconnectedness rather than factual knowledge. Normative environment and global awareness are consistently positively correlated and likely influence one another.

Reysen and Katzarska-Miller (2013a) proposed that global citizenship identification, as assessed by their GCI, should predict six clusters of prosocial values. These prosocial values include intergroup empathy (“I am able to empathize with people from other countries”), valuing diversity (“I am interested in learning about the many cultures that have existed in this world”), social justice (“Those countries that are well off should help people in countries who are less fortunate”), intergroup helping (“If I had the opportunity, I would help others who are in need regardless of their nationality”), environmental sustainability (“People have a responsibility to conserve natural resources to foster a sustainable environment”), and responsibility to act (“Being actively involved in global issues is my responsibility”). This model, the foundation of many of their studies, is presented in Figure 1. Across a number of structural model tests, both in the United States and in the Philippines, the data fit this model well, as normative environment and global awareness both predict GCI, which in turn predicts all six prosocial values (Reysen & Katzarska-Miller, 2013a).

**Enhancing Global Awareness and Normative Environment.** Early research sought to test the influence of the antecedents (global awareness and normative environment) as predictors of GCI. To explore this issue, Reysen, Larey, and Katzarska-Miller (2012) administered their model at the beginning and end of a semester to students in 30 college classes in different disciplines. Students in classes whose syllabi contained more global words (e.g., justice, cultural, environment) gained greater global awareness across the semester, which in turn predicted higher GCI, and led indirectly in model tests to higher scores on all six prosocial values. Blake, Pierce, Gibson, Reysen, and Katzarska-Miller (2015) replicated this effect using student ratings of the extent that the class covered global topics rather than the number of global terms in the syllabi.

But were the students higher on GCI because they now had greater global knowledge or because they had greater global awareness (again, not a measure of factual knowledge)? To address this issue, Reysen, Katzarska-Miller, Gibson, and Hobson (2013) had students complete a test of world knowledge (e.g., “Where is Argentina located?”) along with the measures in the model. In regression tests, world knowledge did not directly predict GCI but did predict global awareness: While the perception of knowledge appears more important in directly predicting GCI, actual knowledge enhances seeing oneself as knowledgeable. To test this further, students in a second study were randomly told that they had scored well or poorly, or not told their scores, on a global knowledge test and then
completed the model. Interestingly, those simply told that they had greater global knowledge had higher global awareness and GCI scores.

What aspects of one’s normative environment influence global citizenship identification? Building upon the finding that Bulgarians viewed their normative environment as more proglobal and were higher on GCI than U.S. participants, Reysen and Katzarska-Miller (2017a) examined media as one potential aspect of the normative environment. Consistent with this national difference, they found that Bulgarian newspapers and magazines contain more global stories than did comparable U.S. media. Further, when the story was about a foreign event, Bulgarian media were less likely to interpret the event in relation to one’s nation than were U.S. media. Bulgarians, compared to U.S. citizens, simply live in an environment where the media cover more international news. The researchers next surveyed individuals in Bulgaria regarding their amount of news consumption, normative environment, and GCI. News consumption predicted perceiving the normative environment as proglobal, which in turn predicted higher GCI scores. In effect, the news media influenced the participants’ perception that one’s society thinks that being a global citizen is important; this perception, in turn, strengthened one’s own sense of being as a global citizen.

Reysen and Katzarska-Miller (2017a) had students write about their friends and family exemplifying global citizens, not exemplifying global citizens, or not write about others prior to completing measures of the model. A path model showed that highlighting friends and family as global citizens (vs. not) resulted in higher normative environment and GCI scores. The results experimentally
showed a causal relationship of seeing one’s valued others as global citizens upon one’s normative environment and GCI.

Beyond the media, more proximate normative influences have been found to affect GCI and its related prosocial values, including the perception that one’s university encourages global citizenship identification (Blake et al., 2015), exposure to a professor who favorably (vs. negatively) discusses GHIC (Gibson & Reysen, 2013), and perceiving that other fans of a fan interest group value it (Plante, Roberts, Reysen, & Gerbasi, 2014). In short, the extent that one’s institutions, authority figures (e.g., professors), and others with similar interests in one’s normative environment value GHIC predicts one seeing oneself as a global citizen.

Reysen, Katzarska-Miller, and their colleagues have found several additional factors that positively predict GCI through one or both of the antecedents. These include the perception that culture is dynamic and fluid (Reysen & Katzarska-Miller, 2013b), thinking about a hoped-for future possible self (Blake & Reysen, 2014), liberal political orientation, quest religious motivation (Katzarska-Miller, Barnsley, & Reysen, 2014), higher grade-point average, positive attitudes toward technology, participation in more social networks (Lee, Baring, Maria, & Reysen, 2017), and prior activism (Reysen & Hackett, 2017). While many prior variables may influence it, the model itself has been consistently replicated.

**Personality Correlates of Global Citizen Identification.** Personality correlates of GCI have not been studied extensively, but Jenkins, Reysen, and Katzarska-Miller (2012) found for a large student sample that GCI correlated .20, $p < .01$, with the Big Five openness to experience, whereas identification with subgroup identities (as an American, Texan, student) were not related to openness to experience. GCI also correlated significantly, but less than .20, with agreeableness, emotional stability, and conscientiousness, but these correlations were also found for the other subgroup identities.

**Global Citizen Identification Relationships with Attitude and Behaviors.** Reysen, Pierce, et al. (2013) found that GCI correlated .61 with the desire to learn about other cultures and .57 with desire to attend diversity events. In regression analyses, it significantly predicted acceptance of diverse others, willingness to give to charity and sponsor a child (from another country, or through a child sponsorship organization), intention to protest unethical corporations, intentions to act in an environmentally friendly manner, and intention to do community service.

For an adult online sample, GCI correlated .44 with a measure of concern for human rights, .39 with support for international welfare, .36 with support for international diplomacy to address terrorism and other global problems, .35 with promoting peace, and .25 with forgiveness of those who have attacked America. GCI correlated negatively, $- .14$, with support for the war on terror (Reysen & Katzarska-Miller, 2017b). Katzarska-Miller et al. (2014) found that GCI correlated .23 with a measure of desire for world peace. It also correlated .20 with attachment to one's nation, but not to national glorification, $r = .10$, $p > .05$. Using a single item assessing global citizenship identification virtually identical with GCI items, Ariely (2017) found that it correlated negatively with xenophobic attitudes toward immigrants and that the correlation was more strongly negative in countries with greater globalization (greater cultural integration, international contact, and trade). Ariely found similar results in two other studies using similar measures of GHIC.

Snider, Reysen, and Katzarska-Miller (2013) found that GCI correlated .56 with students’ self-reported academic motivation. Katzarska-Miller et al. (2012) found that GCI correlated .23 with to belief in national equality and .28 with concern for global warming.

McFarland and Hornsby (2015) found that the items from Reese and colleagues’ (2014) GSI and Reysen and Katzarska-Miller’s (2013c) GCI loaded on a single strong factor, indicating that these two measures are closely related. This is understandable, given that both measures use items that are based on a social identity perspective (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner et al., 1986). Used as a single measure, this combined measure correlated .45 with the desire for global knowledge, .35 with
selecting to read humanitarian articles over other articles, and .35 with the HRCQ. These correlations were comparable to those for the IWAH and PSGC.

Koc and Vignoles (2018) found that, among Turkish gay men, global identification, assessed by six items drawn from the GSI, GCI, and similar items, positively predicted gay-male identity integration ("I feel gay and male at the same time"), and in turn, higher subjective well-being. A separate measure of global identification ("How often do you think of yourself as global?") predicted having access to supportive social environments ("I have social environments that accept me as a gay man"), which in turn also increased subjective well-being. Self-identification as Muslim ("How often do you think of yourself as Muslim?") reduced both Turkish gay men’s global identification and feelings of access to supportive social environments.

**Influences that lower global citizenship identification.** What influences might lower global citizenship identification? Studies with the GCI suggest that fear of future global competition, perceived economic threats from an outgroup, and threat to one’s sense of global knowledge can all do so. Snider et al. (2013) presented students with a message that the international job market was becoming more competitive and found that GCI scores were lower compared to when told that the job market was becoming more culturally diverse. When told in two studies that America was economically threatened by China, students’ GSI scores were lower than when no threat was presented (Reysen, Katzarska-Miller, Salter, & Hirko, 2014). When students were repeatedly presented with difficult global knowledge questions ("Which [of four choices] is the most environmentally polluted country?") that indicated a lack of knowledge, GCI scores fell across tests (Parkerson & Reysen, 2015).

**How Can Global Human Identification and Citizenship Be Increased?**

First, a pessimistic note: At least three important GHIC correlates have significant genetic underpinnings: authoritarianism (Lewis & Bates, 2014), empathic concern (Davis, Luce, & Krauss, 1994), and openness to experience (Jang, Livesley, & Vernon, 1996). GHIC consistently relates negatively to the first, positively to the latter two. To the degree that one is born prone to the fear of outgroups and moral rigidity of authoritarianism, one may be less likely to acquire a sense of GHIC. However, if one is born prone to empathic concern and open-minded curiosity, GHIC may develop more easily. We note, however, that there is no evidence to date that the shared variance between these constructs and GHIC is attributable to genes.

Does childrearing matter? Early evidence suggested that it might not. McFarland et al. (2013) had adults complete a 52-item questionnaire about their memories of their parents’ behaviors. Each item began, “When I was a child, my parents …” with positively and negatively worded items for many behaviors (“were caring for others” vs. “were self-centered”). These items constituted seven factors, including affection and support (“were very affectionate”), moral and caring (“had concern for suffering people”), intellectual and global (“encouraged me to be intellectually inquisitive”), punitive (“used physical punishment quite a bit”), religious (“wanted me to be devoutly religious”), patriotic (“were very patriotic”), and spoiling (“were very lenient”). Surprisingly, none of the seven dimensions correlated significantly with IWAH in that study. Similarly, Hamer and McFarland (2018, June) found Duckitt’s (2001) measures of harsh and strict socialization (“I would describe my upbringing as very strict”) and of unaffectionate socialization (“I did not receive love or affection from my father while I was growing up”) unrelated to IWAH scores.

However, Reysen and Katzarska-Miller’s model that normative environments leads to greater global citizenship suggests that childhood normative environments for GHIC should promote it. Consistent with this formulation, Hamer (2017) found for a U.S. student sample that IWAH correlated .29 with her nine-item measure of “opening up experiences” during childhood and adolescence (OUE Scale). This measure, based in part on childhood memories of people saving others during World War II, consists of parents teaching empathy and openness toward all (“My parents/
caregivers taught me to be empathetic toward all people") and having experiences that led to emotional and cognitive connection with other groups ("I deeply experienced suffering of someone from a different cultural or/and ethnic background during my childhood or adolescence"; "During my childhood or adolescence a person from a different cultural or ethnic background helped me when I needed support"). In regression analyses, this early "opening up experiences" measure still predicted positive IWAH scores after openness, dispositional empathy, universalism, authoritarianism, social dominance, and ethnocentrism were all entered. In short, it appears that experiencing significant and specific contact with those of other cultures, along with awareness of the suffering of others, may be important childhood precursors of GHIC, whether that contact and awareness are provided by parents or by others.

Hamer (2017) also found for both a small student sample and nationwide adult sample in Poland that IWAH correlated significantly but weakly (correlations ranged from .08 and .21) with two subscales of Plopa's (2008) Questionnaire of Retrospective Assessment of Parental Attitudes (English translation of title). Specifically, IWAH correlated with both the father and mother giving autonomy and acceptance to a child for one or both samples.

Can GHIC be taught to college students? A study of World Values Survey data across 46 countries found that education level was the strongest of several predictors of agreeing with the statement, "I see myself as a world citizen," (Smith et al., 2017), a statement that correlates strongly with all our GHIC measures (McFarland & Hornsby, 2015). Across the globe, more educated people are more likely to be global citizens. But what factors within education can particularly enhance GHIC?

Reysen and Katzarska-Miller (2013c), following their model, have recommended a number of ways that educational institutions might enhance both the normative environment for global awareness to promote GHIC. The normative environment could be enhanced by adding global citizenship terminology to school mission and vision statements, encouraging faculty to include global components in classes, increasing service learning and study abroad opportunities, promoting interactions between domestic and international students, and more generally, infusing GHIC messages throughout a campus. Educational institutions can also increase students’ global awareness through highlighting classes that contain global components, inviting speakers to highlight the connection between local and global, encouraging the study of foreign languages, holding extracurricular activities that promote global learning, and generally highlighting connections between the school and the world. Theoretically, a whole school approach could include all of the above. Consistent with this proposal, Morrison, Pedram, Whittaker, and Shores (2017), using precourse and postcourse measures, found that completing one of the University of New England’s required social/global awareness courses significantly increased students’ global awareness and GCI scores. Further, expanding the normative environment to include family members and the local community seems ideal, although more difficult to achieve. In such an environment, even when students are off campus they are still embedded in an environment that encourages a GHIC.

Relying on the finding cited earlier that most students can intuit that a mature and moral person would identify strongly with all humanity (McFarland & Brown, 2008), Dewall and Myers (2013) created a classroom exercise: Students first complete the IWAH as themselves, then as an ideal romantic partner, and finally as the “most mature and moral person you could imagine.” The students compare their three scores and reflect on the differences, often in small groups. Because students can now grasp identifying with all humanity as an ethical ideal, they next brainstorm about how identification with all humanity can be expanded and present their ideas to the class. A week or two later, students complete the IWAH again and reflect upon changes in their scores. One faculty member who used this exercise wrote that “completing the scale based on how the most mature and moral person would respond was an ‘aha moment’ for many students. This assignment really helped them grasp the point of identifying with all humanity and why it matters” (email to McFarland). However,
the effectiveness of this exercise has not yet been experimentally tested with pretest-posttest or control group designs.

Teaching empathy and compassion to adults may also enlarge GHIC. Brito-Pons, Campos, and Cebella (2018) found that adults’ participation in a nine-week Compassion Cultivation Training program, which emphasized empathetic listening and compassion toward others, significantly increased perspective taking, empathic concern, and IWAH on both an immediate posttest and a two-month follow-up. The scores for individuals on waiting lists for the course did not increase on either the IWAH or the empathy measures.

GHIC may also be situationally activated, but it is not yet known whether such effects are lasting. A few studies have found that experimental exposures enhance IWAH scores, at least temporarily. Reese et al. (2015, Study 3), had participants ostensibly take part in a study on self-perception. Seated facing a mirror, participants saw either a poster depicting globality (i.e., many hands holding a globe) or internationality (i.e., depiction of 24 different flags) on the rear wall, or no poster. While seated, they completed a questionnaire that included the IWAH. At the end of the study, participants were given the opportunity to donate from their payment (4 euros) to a local or a global cause. Participants in the two poster conditions reported higher IWAH scores on the self-investment factor, which in turn led to higher donations to the global (but not a local) charity. Stürmer et al. (2016) found that viewing a music video by Band Aid 30, a charity pop group, featuring pictures of suffering Ebola victims, led to higher IWAH scores in comparison to control groups. De Rivera and Carson (2015) found that students in a study who visited suggested websites that featured either video interviews of people from different cultural backgrounds (www.global-identity.org) or stories of people “working to create a more peaceful and just world” (p. 316; www.pwpp.org) increased significantly in their global identity as assessed by the Der-Karabetian and Ruiz (1997) Global-Human Identity Scale. In another study, De Rivera and Carson used a “call and response ceremony” in which a visitor to college classes sequentially called out eight facts that could be celebrated by all peoples (such as that ancestors developed medicines used today), and the class responded after each fact, “We are one people.” Following this ceremony, average scores on the Global-Human Identity Scale increased significantly from a pretest given before the ceremony. De Rivera and Mahoney (2018) found that students instructed to visit a “solutions-oriented” news website (the People's World Peace Project website; www.pwpp.org), as compared to either a traditional news website (www.newsweek.com) or a control website on fashion, reported greater feelings of hope and admiration, lower feelings of fear, and that greater admiration and lower fear led to enhanced Global-Human Identity Scale scores.

Studies following Common Ingroup Identity Model approach (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000) showed that experimental activation of human identification results in positive effects for intergroup relations, for example, greater intergroup forgiveness of victims toward perpetrators (see more in Greenaway et al., 2011; Hamer et al., 2017, 2018; Wohl & Branscombe, 2005). Again, it is not yet known the degree to which these experimental enhancements of GHIC endure.

Intercultural contact, particularly if positive, appears to foster GHIC. For both U.S. students and adults, Sparkman and Eidelman (2018) found in path models that two factors of multicultural contact, experience with cultural elements (“I watch movies and film from different cultures”) and contact with cultural members (“How many times have you traveled outside the United States?”) enhanced identification with all humanity and reduced ethnic prejudice (Study 1) and prejudice against immigrants (Studies 2 and 3). Across the studies, the effects of the two factors of multicultural contact upon prejudice were either partially or fully mediated through increased identification with all humanity. Study 3 also found that the self-rated positive quality of one’s intercultural contacts contributed to greater identification with all humanity, reduced prejudice, and to greater concern for human rights. The authors note, however, that these effects may be bidirectional: While multicultural contact appears to increase IWAH and reduce prejudice, it is also likely that those with higher IWAH and less prejudice are more prone to seek multicultural contacts. Similarly, Grimalda,
Buchan, and Brewer (2018) recently found that a 30-item Individual Globalization Index, a measure of “individual access to globalization” (p. 25; e.g., “How often do you watch/listen to an international news source”) predicted GHIC in a structural model, which in turn predicted contributing tokens with monetary value to a global account. In a new set of experimental studies, Römpke, Fritsche, and Reese (2018) also argued that international contact increases GHIC. Römpke et al. developed a simulated Internet chat program that appeared to provide contact with an individual from another continent (e.g., Paraguayan for German participants). Following a simulated chat, during which the participants jointly worked on a puzzle task, the participants completed the IWAH and several measures of global responsible behaviors (e.g., proenvironmental intentions). Across two studies, international contact resulted in stronger global identification, which in turn led to stronger proenvironmental intentions.

In another set of studies on the motivational basis of global identification, Reese and Barth (in preparation, Study 1) confronted participants with negative information about the human ingroup by asking participants to first complete an 11-item “human devaluation” scale that included items such as “In their core, all humans are evil,” and “The atrocities humans are capable of are part of human nature.” Compared to a control group that did not complete this scale, global human identity on the IWAH increased, presumably due to ingroup protection strategies in the face of negative ingroup information (see also Leach et al., 2010). In a second study, Reese and Barth gave participants either the human devaluation or a human positivity scale (“Love and trust are innate parts of human nature”). Compared to a control group, both manipulations increased IWAH scores, presumably through different emotional responses.

Renger and Reese’s (2017) have presented evidence that being treated with equality-based respect (“Other people always treat me as a human being of equal worth”) may also increase GHIC (see Simon, 2007 and Simon, Mommert, & Renger, 2015 for elaboration of the group dynamics of equality-based respect). Feelings of equality-based respect led in a path model to higher GSI scores, which in turn predicted the proenvironmental intentions and actions cited earlier. Neither need-based care (“Other persons always satisfy my emotional needs”) nor achievement-based esteem (“I consistently receive positive feedback for what I’m doing”) predicted GSI scores. However, the equality-based respect effect, while found significant in a structural model test, has not yet been tested experimentally.

General Discussion

We have presented an up-to-date summary of the psychological study of global human identification and citizenship, including the work of others that preceded our own. We have drawn on different theoretical foundations for GHIC and have explored it with different measures in many countries and cultures. However, we view our work as complementary rather than contradictory, as we have all aimed at understanding the foundations of GHIC and its influences upon attitudes and behaviors. Because all of us value it as a moral ideal, we have also been concerned with how it might be enlarged.

What, together, have we learned? First, we have certainly learned that a sense of GHIC is founded in individual differences, childhood and adolescent experiences, education, and one’s normative environment—all of the above. Limited evidence from both the IWAH and WS suggests that GHIC is modestly related to some indices of intelligence. Educational attainment, itself influenced by intelligence (Deary, Strand, Smith, & Fernandes, 2007), also strongly predicts GHIC. Dispositional empathy and openness to experience both predict GHIC on more than one measure and in several countries. Oppositely, authoritarianism and the social dominance orientation negatively predict GHIC on several of its measures. GHIC is positively related to self-transcendent values such as universalism (Schwartz, 1992), care and justice on the Moral Foundation Questionnaire.
Global Human Identification and Citizenship (Graham et al., 2011), but negatively to several indices of self-centeredness, including psychopathy, Machiavellianism, vertical individualism, and materialism. At least in some cultures, the need for social approval appears antithetical to GHIC, whereas a desire for individual distinctiveness is positively associated with it. However, in places where the normative environment encourages GHIC, these relationships may not hold.

What attitudes and behaviors are associated with GHIC? Consistently, GHIC is related to lower ethnocentrism, lower prejudice, and lower dehumanization toward many groups, and a greater willingness to accept members of outgroups as immigrants, fellow citizens, friends, and into even closer relationships. It strongly predicts greater concerns for human rights, global injustices and poverty, and for the global environment. It is related to lower blind patriotism and less collective narcissism, less support for isolationism or to seal one’s nation from outsiders, greater forgiveness of former national enemies, and a greater desire for one’s nation to address global concerns. It predicts greater global knowledge, greater desire for global knowledge, and greater attention to global concerns. It predicts greater giving to international charities, more volunteerism for international causes, and greater willingness to protest global injustices, whether committed by one’s government or by international businesses.

If GHIC is, as we believe, important and desirable, how can it be increased? While individual differences in empathy, openness, and authoritarianism might influence whether one is more or less receptive to GHIC, our research indicates that GHIC might be increased by several childrearing, educational, and environmental factors. Childhood and adolescent experiences that encourage empathy for the suffering of others and significant intercultural experience provides a normative environment for GHIC and encourages the growing child to adopt GHIC. Childrearing that is strict may inhibit it, although the evidence is inconsistent. Childrearing that encourages autonomy may increase it. National, educational, friendship groups, and other environments that emphasize GHIC encourage its adoption. Similarly, environments that enhance global knowledge and promote global awareness also encourage the adoption of GHIC. In educational settings, normative environments for GHIC appear to enhance it, as does the promotion of intercultural contact, real or simulated. Presenting students with images of GHIC also, at least temporarily, encourage GHIC and globally responsible behaviors. Simply asking students to consider how a fully moral and mature person might respond to a GHIC measure (such as the IWAH) may also enable them to recognize the moral value of adopting GHIC for themselves. Finally, as economic threat and feeling ignorant appear to lower global social identification, to the degree that we, as a society, can ensure economic security and good education for all, more will be psychologically ready to adopt GHIC.

As for our studies, we find no substantive inconsistencies in our findings, and we do not argue for the superiority of one measure of GHIC over others. For researchers with adequate project space, the IWAH scale offers the most detailed measure and allows for controlling for correlated identifications with one’s community and nation. To the degree that feeling a part of all humanity and caring for all humanity are distinguishable, as the two-factor IWAH solutions often suggest, the IWAH also offers greater precision. However, other authors may find the GSI, PSGC, or GCI very suitable for their projects, particularly if economy of measurement is essential. If an extremely economical measure must be used, we would encourage authors to consider the World Value Survey single item, “I see myself as a global citizen,” which was also used by Rosenmann et al. (2016).

Collectively, in an era of rising global problems that only all humanity can solve, while simultaneously facing narrow nationalism increasing in many places, we view global human identification and citizenship as an important offsetting ideal. We believe that we have contributed to understanding its foundations and effects, and we hope that others will join us in both studying and promoting this identification. Certainly, far more of our fellow citizens are able to develop global human identification and citizenship than possess it now.
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