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FOREWORD

This book comes out of a seminar organized in Middelburg, the Netherlands, in May 2015. The participants included some of the most important academics working on education for global citizenship in higher education today. The purpose was, on the one hand, to discuss current insights on the conceptualization of education for global citizenship, its translation into university curricula, and the assessment of its impact. In addition, we were keen to get their thoughts on the outcome of the Going Glocal program. Going Glocal was put in place at our liberal arts and sciences college in 2012, with an objective to simultaneously strengthen global and local engagement, drawing on students as connectors between worlds close by and far away. Given the innovative character of the program, we focused on rigorous assessment of its impact from the very start, and we wanted to relate our findings to similar projects in other parts of the world. We are very grateful to all who contributed to the debates, and to this volume. Apart from presenting the state of the art where it concerns insights on education for global citizenship at universities, this book also marks the end of the first phase of Going Glocal. This foreword, then, provides a good opportunity to thank some of the organizations and people who played a crucial role in making the program a success. Without funding from SBOS, the program to strengthen citizenship and development cooperation of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Going Glocal never would have been possible. Our partners in Namibia (especially the Young Achievers Empowerment Project, the Ministry of Youth, and the Ministry of Education) and Mexico (in particular, the Universidad de la Tierra) played a crucial role in welcoming, caring for, and teaching our students. Rosalba Icaza Garza contributed enormously to the coordination and teaching of the Mexico element of the program, as did Fatima Mueller-Friedman with respect to the Namibia component. Anneke van Os, together with many teachers in Zeeland, made the local part of the program into a reality. Nel Verhoeven played an important role in the early stages of the program, as did many student assistants who helped with the data collection. Nathalie van der Zande was the most effective program manager imaginable, and Jaco van Vliet and Linda Termaten were essential in managing our finances. Lara Week provided key editorial support to this book. Both the organization of the seminar, and the publication of the book, would not have been possible without the effective assistance of Laelia Dard-Dascot.

We hope this volume provides inspiration for many more well-designed and thought-through programs that will equip students to cultivate and strengthen their position as glocal citizens. After all, such programs do not only strengthen our education, but also our world.

The editors
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INTRODUCTION: EDUCATION FOR GLOCAL CITIZENSHIP

Barbara Oomen

How can universities educate young people who are rooted in a given locality, have an eye for global challenges, and see the local opportunities to address them? This question lies at the heart of this book. There are many reasons why it is important to address the specific role that universities have to play in offering a type of education for global citizenship that emphasizes the connections between the local and the global. For one, there are the enormous challenges that humanity, as a whole, faces. From global warming to economic crises, from persistent poverty to protracted warfare – all these challenges cross national boundaries and their resolution lies in the combination of international cooperation and concerted citizen action. As our brightest minds, our students will – whether they want to or not – have to face these challenges in the future.

In formulating appropriate responses to such global issues, universities hold a unique position of responsibility, which is (still) not often fully recognized. Ancient Greek thinkers like Aristotle emphasized how education, ultimately, serves the purpose of cultivating liberally educated individuals who could use their reason and knowledge to make decisions for the benefit of society as a whole (Aristotle & Lord, 2013, p. 223). However, the institutionalization of higher education in the 19th century, most particularly in Europe, came with a firm focus on disciplinary education and specialist research for its own sake, leading to a characterization of universities as ‘ivory towers’ (Bok, 1982). Over the past decades, however, many a scholar and policy maker have called for a reconnection between universities and society at large (Collini, 2012; Kronman, 2007; Nussbaum, 1997). This call is only strengthened by students who, as an integral part of their studies, indicate that they would like to contribute to the world at large. The increasingly diverse student body of many universities does not only call for global engagement, but also offers opportunities to foster and practice global citizenship at an unprecedented scale.

As a result, universities worldwide have come to offer a colorful variety of international service learning programs and modules to strengthen global citizenship – ranging from semesters abroad working in NGOs, to classroom programs that explicitly seek to open the students’ worlds (Lewin, 2010). The program outcomes and learning objectives of universities increasingly include objectives such as ‘civic knowledge and engagement – local and global’ and ‘intercultural knowledge or competence’. An exercise in defining the most
important objectives of higher education by the Organization for Economic Organization and Development Cooperation (OECD) led to an emphasis on not only ‘critical thinking’ and ‘discipline knowledge’, but also ‘global outlook’ and ‘social responsibility’ (OECD, 2013, p. 55). Individual universities will go even further. The University of Michigan, to quote one example, expects its students to investigate global issues, develop critical and reflective practices on difference, acquire intercultural communication skills, build meaningful cross-cultural collaborations and develop social responsibility.²

Even if the need for universities to equip students to engage with global issues is clear to many policymakers, instructors and students alike, many questions remain on the theory of education for global citizenship at the local level. How do we conceptualize citizenship, and build in the connection between the local and the global in such a conceptualization? How can we translate this notion into learning objectives, and didactics and pedagogics that serve them? And, possibly the most challenging question of them all, how shall we assess whether these objectives have been obtained?

Theorizing Education for Glocal Citizenship

This volume is about education for glocal citizenship: in first instance at universities, even if the lessons learned could well be applied to other institutions of higher education. It is especially the European universities, which grew out of the 19th century ideal of emphasizing disciplinary learning and critical thinking, that still have a long way to go in this field – the American liberal arts colleges, in contrast, have always considered education for democratic citizenship to be part of their mission (Bok, 2006; Lang, 1999). European universities were slow in starting to consider themes related to citizenship education as part of their essential task, and many of them still hesitate to do so at all. It could well be argued that the first, and still often the only, engagement of traditional universities with education for global citizenship is in the form of internationalizing the student body, something that is often motivated by financial reasons rather than simply principles (Rhoads & Szelenyi, 2011). In this sense, primary and secondary education have a much longer and more in-depth record of strengthening education for global citizenship in Europe.

Those universities that do opt to explicitly include education for global citizenship in their learning objectives have a variety of theories, definitions

¹ The Essential Learning Outcomes as defined by the American Association of Colleges and Universities: www.aacu.org/leap/essential-learning-outcomes (last visited 14 June 2015).
² http://www.crlt.umich.edu/internationalization/learning-outcomes (last visited 14 June 2015)
and understandings of the field and its objectives. One of the most common understandings of global citizenship education, for instance, is that it aims to equip learners with values, knowledge and skills that instill respect for human rights, social justice, diversity, gender equality and environmental sustainability – and that empower learners to be responsible global citizens. As such, it gives learners the competencies and opportunity to realize their rights and obligations to promote a better world and future for all (Unesco, 2015a). This type of education is closely related to human rights education, peace education, sustainability education, education for democratic citizenship, service learning and civic education in general, even if each of these fields has its own central topics and didactical emphasis (Andreopoulos & Richard Pierre, 1997; Bajaj, 2011). At the same time, each field has critical debates over the exact moral content that lies at its heart (Andreotti, 2006; Davies, Evans, & Reid, 2005; Osler & Starkey, 2004; Peters, Britton, & Blee, 2008).

Within this already diffuse field, the present volume seeks to introduce another variation of the term: that of education for glocal citizenship. Whilst adopting the central concerns of global citizenship education – the need to equip students with the values, knowledge and skills related to global challenges – education for glocal citizenship draws attention to the need to couple these global concerns with local action. The notion of globalization has been introduced in many contexts, for instance to emphasize the need for the local marketing of global products, but also to call attention to the dialectic relationship between the global and the local. In the latter respect, we’ve seen how the strengthening of global interconnectedness also calls for and leads to a strengthening of local rootedness (Bauman, 1998; Robertson, 1995; Roudometof, 2005). In education, “glocalized learning and teaching refers to the curricular consideration and pedagogical framing of local and global community connectedness in relation to social responsibility, justice and sustainability” (Patel & Lynch, 2013, p. 223).

There are a number of reasons to add the notion of glocal citizenship to the already wide-ranging set of perspectives in this field. The first is the empirical finding that tackling global challenges, whatever they are, requires local action. Such local action is often easier to take: recycling your waste water is easier than directly addressing desertification in the Sahara; helping refugees feel at home in your city is more doable than stopping boats from sinking in the Mediterranean; working for the local foodbank is easier to achieve than combating famine in Africa. As such, this approach helps avert the feelings of powerlessness that truly engaging with global problems can engender. A key feature of education for global, and thus also glocal, citizenship is that it emphasizes action next to knowledge and beliefs, and such action can well be taken locally. A final reason to firmly couple global engagement to local action is to avoid the risk of voluntourism – the cosmopolitan,
superficial, consumerist visiting of other parts of the world, primarily for CV-building and entertainment (Jakubiak, 2012).

With the *glocal* defined, the notion of citizenship still needs further scrutiny. In a classic work, Marshall made the distinction between social, political and civil citizenship (Marshall, 1964). Recent authors have juxtaposed a cosmopolitan citizenship centered on universal human rights and respect for diversity with more communalist versions that emphasize common bonds over the right to differ (Benhabib, 2008; Isin & Turner, 2002; Van Gunsteren, 1998). In all cases, citizenship serves to denote, and often also offer judgment on, the relationship between individuals and the community. Whilst in education for global citizenship the community at hand is the world community, education for glocal citizenship bridges different understandings of citizenship by explicitly emphasizing the connection between the global and the local. In terms of its focus, education for global citizenship tends to emphasize political over social components, and thus rights and responsibilities towards the world community over mere altruism and ‘the family of mankind’. The *glocal* emphasis straddles this perspective with an eye for localized social action.

This does not mean that the rights-based approach to civic education becomes less important. Such an approach, after all, is increasingly the formal basis for education for global citizenship, also at universities. Since the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, the indivisible, inalienable and universal human rights of all human beings have increasingly been set out in binding documents, like the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (Ishay, 2004; Steiner & Alston, 2000). The provisions on human rights education in these documents formed the basis for the World Program for Human Rights Education, of which the second phase focused on higher education (United Nations, Unesco, & Ohchr, 2006). According to the Plan of Action related to the World Program, “higher education institutions, through their core functions (research, teaching and service to the community), not only have the social responsibility to educate ethical citizens committed to the construction of peace, the defense of human rights and the values of democracy, but also to generate global knowledge to meet current human rights challenges, such as eradication of poverty and discrimination, post-conflict rebuilding, sustainable development and multicultural understanding” (p. 19). Education here is not only about the contents of the curriculum, but also about the educational processes, the pedagogics, and the environment in which the education takes place. A fundamental feature of education for global citizenship at university is its critical perspective. The UNESCO overview of topics and learning objectives in global citizenship education at the university level, for instance, emphasizes objectives ranging from critically analyzing global governance systems, structures and processes and assessing implications for global citizenship to critically assessing connectedness between different groups,
communities and countries and developing and applying skills for effective civic engagement (Unesco, 2015b, p. 30).

**Putting Theory into Practice and its Evaluation**

If the objective is to equip students with the values, knowledge and skills related to addressing global challenges through local action, how do we translate this into more specific learning objectives, and specific practices inside and outside of the classroom? This volume emerges out of one example of such an attempt, the *Going Glocal* program at University College Roosevelt (UCR). The program took place at one of the relatively new liberal arts and sciences colleges in the Netherlands: selective, small-scale international colleges related to research universities that offer a broad bachelor program and put an emphasis on excellent teaching and bildung (Tak & Oomen, 2012; Wende, 2011). The *Going Glocal* program started with students receiving an intensive course on either modernity and change in Namibia, or social movements in Mexico. Then, over the summer, students worked on projects in these countries, in close contact with the local population. Throughout the project, they also taught on issues of global citizenship, partially based on their own experiences, at primary and high schools in the local region of Zeeland. Students thus became ‘world connectors’, linking individuals and concerns in Namibia and Mexico with their local life-world.

This is, of course, but one example of an attempt to stimulate engagement with global issues, partially through local action, and this volume contains others. The contributions herein all draw attention to one of the biggest challenges in this type of education: assessing the extent to which such a program can, and does, truly stimulate students to think harder, care more and do more in relation to the world’s problems. Even if a short-term impact can be noted, how about long-term effects? Will students who participated in these types of programs turn out to be more responsible glocal citizens in the long run? Such questions require a clear conceptualization of glocal citizenship and its translation into specific objectives and indicators suited to assessment. There are a variety of measurement instruments available, each with their own advantages, and some of them will be discussed in this volume.

At the same time, it is worth repeating the quote attributed to Einstein: “Not everything that counts can be counted, and not everything that can be counted counts”. Global citizenship programs are typically about experiential learning, and individualized, human experiences and encounters that are difficult to capture in numbers alone. Here, the mere activity of stimulating students to explicitly reflect on their experiences and what they meant to them, and the narratives that this generates, might be as valuable as more quantitative forms of assessment.
Outline of the Volume

This brings us to the setup of this book, a volume that seeks to discuss the theory, practice and measurement of education for global citizenship for policymakers, teachers, students and scholars of higher education.

Mannion starts us off with an overview of what a glocal orientation in pedagogy could comprise, and might offer. Going Glocal, he argues, could form a way of producing new knowledge and practices, and overcoming some of the risks associated with education for global citizenship. These risks include a lack of political and ecological analysis, ethnocentrism, a transmissive approach, and individualizing competencies. Mannion argues that addressing global concerns through the local, as is the case in education for glocal citizenship, recognizes how the expressions and practices of ‘the global’ within local culture give meaning to extra-local and transnational influences.

The three subsequent theoretical chapters each highlight general theories of education for global citizenship from different disciplinary perspectives. First, Beasley-Murray takes a historical and humanities approach to the development of discussions on education for global citizenship. Quoting Diogenes – “I am a citizen of the whole world” – he argues that we owe the notion of global citizenship to the Greeks. Beasley-Murray also shows how some of the challenges related to education for global citizenship – like anti-cosmopolitan skepticism and the question of how to generate ‘global fellow feeling’ – have deep historical roots, and he discusses what this means for current practice.

From the perspective of pedagogics, Osler considers the efforts to strengthen glocal citizenship amongst students as a form of education for cosmopolitan citizenship, and focuses on this type of education in more general terms. Education for cosmopolitan citizenship aims to support learners’ citizenship engagement at different scales, including the local, the national and the international, and to understand the interconnections between these different scales. Such education, she argues, must necessarily equip learners not merely with knowledge and skills, but also with a disposition to take action to promote greater social justice, acknowledging not only our common humanity and global interconnectedness, but also learners’ diverse affinities and identities. In this manner, citizenship is not only a status and a feeling, but also a practice that requires fostering.

From the perspective of social psychology, Sklad and Park then consider how this could be done. They review existing global citizenship education paradigms in order to develop a comprehensive framework concerning the aims, effects, and focus of global citizenship programs. They define such a program as one that aims to prepare students to actively face the challenges of a global society in a way that benefits global society, and that promotes at least one competence needed to address at least one global challenge. On the basis of this, they develop a framework that involves five stages: global
awareness; recognition of the need for action; accepting responsibility; achieving global civic self-efficacy; and evaluating costs. Subsequently, they discuss how to address each of these stages in educational practice.

The next part of the book is concerned with the practice of a specific program, one designed to stimulate education for glocal citizenship. Friedman thus describes the Going Glocal program offered by University College Roosevelt, an international undergraduate honors college in the Netherlands. The four-year pilot program sought to contribute to a rebalancing of the internationalization process by favoring the social, cultural and pedagogic priorities of an ‘internationalization at home’ approach, rather than the political and economic interests that flow from the more dominant emphasis on ‘internationalization abroad’. In describing the first round of the program, one that focused on engaging with both people and organizations in Namibia, and pupils in schools in the local province of Zeeland, Friedman details the ways students acquired the skills, attitudes and capacities to engage constructively, ethically and reflexively in an interconnected and globalized world.

In the subsequent chapter on the program, Vázquez focuses on the pedagogical philosophy that underpinned the program element that concentrated on Mexico. How do we move truly beyond academic tourism, and enable intercultural dialogue in the context of such a program, thus un-build the assumed privileges of the West? He describes the literature that students who joined in Going Glocal Mexico read, and the decolonial perspectives behind it. Vázquez also explains how its main objective was – from a pedagogics of positionality – to make students aware of their place in the colonial divide. In the subsequent encounters in Mexico, social movements in Oaxaca and Chiapas were not objects of study, but communities of learning instead – a humbling and empowering experience all at once.

A crucial component of the Going Glocal program was that students shared their insights on global citizenship with learners in primary and secondary schools in the province of Zeeland. In the third specific contribution on Going Glocal, Haverkate thus focuses on the pedagogical vision behind this aspect, and its impact. She argues how the outreach element added to the program as a whole, by strengthening students’ ability to act ‘glocally’, but also via deepening their understanding of the issues at stake through ‘teaching as learning’. Here, there are also lessons to be learned for global citizenship education in general.

Returning to more general discussion on education for both global and glocal citizenship, the third section of this volume focuses specifically on the measurement of the outcomes of such programs. McGuire-Snieckus provides an exploration of the multifaceted concept of global citizenship. She provides a critical reflection on the very different ways in which global citizenship has been assessed within institutions of higher learning, and makes a call to action for a comprehensive tool that encompasses all relevant global citizen concepts.
The following chapters provide examples of what such comprehensive tools could look like. Hartman, Lough, Toms, and Reynolds provide an overview of a number of existing efforts to assess global citizenship, and their theoretical underpinnings. Building upon these attempts they put forward an alternative instrument, the Global Engagement Survey, in which they integrate the strengths in existing scales around an understanding of global learning that is predicated upon the outcome area of intercultural competence, global citizenship, and critical thinking. They provide examples of the type of open-ended questions asked within this survey and show the advantages of such comprehensive and longitudinal research.

In turn, Carabain and Hogeling detail how the concept of education for global citizenship has been made operational and measured in the Netherlands. They define the global dimension of citizenship as manifest in behavior that does justice to the principles of mutual dependency in the world, the equality of human beings, and the shared responsibility for solving global issues. In doing so, they focus on behavior. This definition was used in a longitudinal study amongst Dutch adolescents, offering the possibility to reflect upon the explanatory value of this particular approach. On the basis of their experiences, Carabain and Hogeling argue for a contextualized understanding of global citizenship, one that takes cultural context into account.

Two final chapters return to the assessment of the effects of the Going Glocal program, focusing first on a quantitative, and then on a qualitative, evaluation. The quantitative evaluation, offered by Sklad, sets out the similarities and differences in approaches between the Namibian and Mexican editions of Going Glocal. Even if both programs shared the same structure, they differed in terms of the choice for the ‘structural other’, the way of engagement, and the theoretical and disciplinary approaches underlying them. Sklad also sets out the Global Perspective Scale, developed for the assessment of the effects of the program, and its results, demonstrating that the program met several of the stated outcomes. The fact that self-reported cultural competencies decreased, he argues, can also be considered in line with program objectives. In addition, a comparison between the two program elements, i.e. Namibia and Mexico, gives rise to additional insights on the differing goals that can be associated with education for glocal citizenship.

Finally, Park, Sklad and Tsirogianni focus on the Namibia 2014 round of Going Glocal to add a qualitative evaluation to the results of the analysis. The program was essentially about strengthening intercultural communication skills, recognizing one’s own cultural values and appreciating those of others, as well as recognizing one’s position in a global setting. On the basis of student interviews, the authors discuss how participating students, as part of a dominant group, related to the Namibian students and how they categorized and recategorized themselves to resolve emotional states triggered by exposure to potentially different worldviews. Subsequent analysis focuses on the consequences of these identity construction processes in terms of ‘closing down’
or opening up dialogue about issues that acknowledge the reality of unequal relations and social injustice. Here, ambivalent states and emotional tensions might not only occur, but are also encouraged as a logical part of the process of strengthening glocal citizenship.

In all, this volume does more than just demonstrate the importance of critical engagement with global interrelatedness by university students and their teachers. It also sets out the many ways in which education for global citizenship can be conceptualized and made operational, and it provides a wealth of examples on how to assess whether the lofty objectives have indeed been attained. As such, it will undoubtedly strengthen the design of future university programs in this field, and help support students, worldwide, to truly consider and cultivate their positions as citizens of the world.
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Greg Mannion

Whilst there is growing interest in applying the theory of glocalization in education, there is still a need to outline what glocal pedagogies comprise. In this chapter, I outline what a pedagogical orientation to the ‘glocal’ might comprise and afford. I argue that ‘going glocal’ in our pedagogies will mean never losing touch with the local when responding to transnational forces; going glocal means taking local settings, concerns and practices as connected to extra-local ones. Going glocal helps us comprehend and respond to the lived realities of transnational forces. This can help with ameliorating and potentially overcoming some of the risks and critiques associated with weaker formulations of ‘education for global citizenship’. Glocal pedagogies can enable us to address ecological and social justice, and produce viable knowledge and practices within a reframed education for global citizenship.

The chapter takes the following form. First, I provide some background and an introduction to the glocal argument. Then, I describe the lineage of education for global citizenship before outlining some critiques and risks associated with its contemporary expression. Next, I set out some of the main ingredients in glocal pedagogies: a concern with transnational and global issues through and within local experience; a realization that it is through being situated in local places that we encounter differences; the idea that we are all local and cosmopolitan to some degree on a cosmopolitan-local continuum; and the need for challenging educational encounters that change ourselves and our relations. Lastly, I summarize the main arguments and describe some directions for glocal pedagogies.

The Glocal Argument

Since the arrival of education for global citizenship (and its related formulations) in formal schooling and higher education, there has been burgeoning interest in the way global concerns impact upon education and are responded to through educational policy (Rizvi & Lingard, 2009): both in theory (Andreotti, 2006) and through programming (for an example in higher education see Scott, 2015). Less commonly do researchers look
empirically at the experience of curricula from the point of view of learners, or address how local concerns interlink with extra-local ones.¹ There are also now some strong critiques of the extant notions of education for global citizenship (Davies, Evans & Reid 2005; Mannion, Biesta, Priestley & Ross, 2011; Andreotti, 2015). There is also emerging interest in the application of glocalization theory in research about, for example, teaching and learning in higher education in general (Patel & Lynch, 2013), in online learning (Swanson, 2011), language teaching (Joseph & Ramani, 2012), in educational theory (Daykin, 2014), and science teaching (Tippins, Rudolph & Dubois, 2014). In the area of environmental and sustainability education, there are applicable ideas emerging too within studies of place-based and ‘place-responsive’ pedagogies (Mannion & Gilbert, 2015; Mannion, Fenwick & Lynch, 2013). Looking across these literatures, we can see a need to more coherently and explicitly apply glocalization theory to educational endeavors, and to delineate what glocal pedagogies might comprise.

As I will show, the term ‘glocal’ is a useful idea because it provides an inbuilt critique of some contemporary notions of globalization that lurk behind many so-called global curriculum initiatives. Currently, there is a view that much of our educational offerings are ‘too local’ and need to change in order to respond adequately to an impending global milieu. But with theories of glocalization, the processes of homogenization and heterogenization are seen to have coexisted for some time. Crucially, it is only with practices arising within local culture that meaning is ever given to extra-local and transnational influences. Within a glocalization framing, the local and extra-local are interdependent in educational processes in particular ways (Robertson, 1995). I seek to tease these out below. I also show how a glocalization framing helps ameliorate some of the risks associated with contemporary notions of education for global citizenship.

As contemporarily framed, especially in organizational and national policy, education for global citizenship is often offered as a component or interdisciplinary curricular theme that sees globalization as an exponentially increasing process that is literally ‘global’: globalization, as some would have it, is everywhere, and irrevocable. The lack of a situated, historical and critical perspective especially in western formulations is itself problematic here (see Mannion et al., 2011). Even more problematic is the view that globalization is an abstract driving force that we all need to embrace or attend to in some way. ‘Infusing global content’ is seen as a way of reorienting education systems that are seen to be too locally focused and parochial and not meeting the needs of a society or an economy (see Mannion et al., 2011). Duhn’s (2012) study suggests globalization is too abstract an idea that misses the important role of the local and lived experience in places. Pedagogically, there is a lot at stake here. What if education can only address so-called global concerns through the local – contextualized in some ‘place’?

¹ There are some useful exceptions: for example, Duhn, 2012.
In response, I argue that the idea of glocalization can play a useful role in re-theorizing education for global citizenship. The sociologist Roland Robertson (1994) coined the term glocalization in the 1990s. His study looked at how Japanese businesses were modifying their practices to comply with local markets and showed how global processes and local agencies were mutually constitutive. Glocalization as a term helps us capture the idea that the local is always with, through, and in the global. Put another way, the global always has a local context for its operationalization. By this understanding, globalization is not an abstract driving force or even an inexorable pre-given. Neither are we necessarily looking at a decrease in diversity in the world through some form of ‘McDonaldization’ (Ritzer, 2000). Instead, it actually appears that local practice and national cultures are quite resilient in the face of global forces. In any event, it is a moot point to note that some local people some ‘where’ are always implicated in operationalizing projects that may have transnational elements, but even these are transnational only through being locally effective in multiple places over time.

**Origins of Education for Global Citizenship**

Our early awareness of the educational concern for the Earth as a planet came to the fore around 40 years ago with the publication of a photograph (originally taken in 1968) that came to be known as ‘Earthrise’.

---

**Image 1.** NASA 1969 (Creative Commons)
‘Earthrise’ became an iconic rallying image of the environmental movement as it depicted our very blue home planet rising above the horizon of a quite desolate Moon. Subsequently, many efforts largely from outside educational policy sought to engender a more global orientation to formal education. These efforts were driven by concerns for the fragility of life on Earth and our need to share this one planetary home. Discrete so-called ‘adjectival educations’ such as peace education, environmental education, futures education and human rights education were all spawned after this time and each drew upon this rhetoric.

At around the same time in the 1960s, we had the genesis of the term ‘global’ within education. The use of the term ‘global’ has always been connected to the issues of the day in educational policy. Early terms such as ‘world studies’ were later replaced by ‘global education’ around the 1980s (see Standish, 2012). Later, mainstream educational policy took more of an interest in what had earlier been a concern of NGOs.

An example from 2001 in Scotland in the UK will suffice here to capture a mood of the turn of the millennium. The then Scotland Minister for Education, Europe and External Affairs emphasized the need for information but also perhaps for education that addresses cultural inclusion and religious difference:

[ Learners need to be] well informed about issues relating, for example, to the environment, civil rights, genetic technology, information and communication developments, and world supplies of food, water and energy, to name but a few. In all of this they will also have to be well aware of the cultural and religious dimensions of the pace of world change. (McConnell, 2001, preface).

Naturally perhaps, contemporary times have led to further re-shaping of educational concerns away from environmental activism and towards responding to what are seen as pressing issues related to processes of globalization. In 2011, in Scotland, the policy document ‘Developing Global Citizens within Curriculum For Excellence’ (Scottish Government, 2011), repositions ‘global citizenship education’ as an umbrella term bringing together citizenship education, international education and sustainable development education (in a similar manner identified in Figure 1). In that document, the arrival of new concern with climate change might be said to supplant earlier concerns with, for example, genetic technology. Noticeably, education for global citizenship is always a situated and changing project. The ‘global’ is always a perspective from some ‘where’ and ‘time’.

In this same document, we can consider the relative emphasis on local and global concerns. In the 2011 guidelines, the main emphasis is on the ‘global’ rather than the ‘local’. The global is foregrounded with the idea that the curriculum should be dedicated to learning certain content, purposes and settings: “learning about a globalized world”, “learning for life, and work in a global society” and “learning through global contexts”.
It is useful here to note, however, that in the text, the word ‘local’ appears over 30 times in the 32 pages. This includes claims that global citizenship education is about “the ways in which local and global issues are connected and relevant to the lives of children and young people” and there is a call for “a deep commitment to social justice both locally and globally” (p. 20). However, the term ‘global’ or (globalization and related) appears over 150 times.

The current problem I argue, especially in policies of education for global citizenship, is that we risk overemphasizing the global at the expense of the local, which is clearly a necessary ingredient. This mismatch between advice, terminology (normally involving some use of global), and practice examples (which invariably contain local elements) can lead to confusion, especially for the novice or uninitiated. On the surface, the rhetoric is all about the ‘global’. But digging deeper, the local is clearly relevant. In fact, as I will argue, the local is a necessary component. But without an understanding of how local and global concerns are connected, many diverse kinds of teaching might be superficially branded as ‘global citizenship education’ and fall prey to all kinds of risks. Teaching about globalization in the abstract might lead to a similar disconnection. Within discourses on global education or education for global citizenship, the emphasis on the global and the lack of theoretical grounding can mean we risk beginning with inaccurate premises, setting out to meet the wrong targets, and failing to make links across local and extra-local domains.

In an earlier article with colleagues (Mannion et al., 2011), I outlined how the more contemporary global turn in curriculum policy is now a nodal point in the discourse in at least three main subfields: citizenship education (connected in the past to civic studies), environmental education (with earlier formulations in ‘nature education’ and conservation education), and development education (which has emerged from formulations such as ‘third world education’, ‘world studies’, and more lately transmuted to some degree into, ‘education for sustainable development’). Each has a lineage that means some camps within each subfield potentially converge policy under a new umbrella term: education for global citizenship. Whilst each lineage is not a linear sequence of transformations, we can depict some of the trajectories of these fields in the following way.
Figure 1 shows how the term ‘education for global citizenship’ and related terms, such as ‘education for global mindedness’, have a relatively recent birth date. Mannion et al. (2011) have shown how education for global citizenship has gained currency in many countries in formal curriculum policy as a way of addressing, in a linked way, the earlier concerns of the three lineages (above) that are increasingly seen as connected. However, there are newer concerns in the mix, such as: the attributes of globally minded graduates; entrepreneurial education; marketization; and internationalization – particularly in higher education. Mannion et al. (2011) note that education for global citizenship is partly on the rise because of the effects and pressures of attempting to thrive (or as one policy maker put it, to ‘earn a living’) in an increasingly ‘globalized’ world. And so the rhetoric goes, in the current globalized world, ‘can any country afford not to infuse global content into their curriculum?’ as I heard one proponent express it. Jorgenson and Shultz (2012) found that global citizenship education may claim to be working for justice and inclusion but in fact be advancing internationalization and marketization more foundationally (Jorgenson & Shultz, 2012).
Contemporary Education for Global Citizenship: Critiques and Risks

We have seen how policies advancing a response to globalization often miss a local standpoint, and how the perspective of ‘the global’ must always be understood to be coming from some position. Contemporary global citizenship discourses are more usefully seen as being ‘of our time and place’. Andreotti posits that contemporary education policy risks taking too ‘soft’ an approach and belies a western dominance standpoint. Instead, for her, a ‘critical’ global citizenship education would address head on the ongoing epistemic violence of imperialism of the so-called ‘First World’ over the ‘Third World’, which is encouraged through development discourse. The ‘less developed’ world may not want or need to ‘catch up’ and become more ‘civilized’ where this term also means ‘globalized’ (Andreotti, 2006; 2007). Steger (2005) shows that since the fall of Soviet-supported communism, we have had (at least until the recent banking crisis of 2007) a shared belief system in many countries based on a narrative that (inter alia) positions globalization as a force that (a) cultivates consumerism within liberalized markets, (b) is inevitable and irreversible, (c) has no obvious leaders, (d) will benefit everyone in the long run, (e) is supportive of democracy, and (f) requires some form of work on counterterrorism. All of these positions are debatable and many are now well critiqued by Steger and others (though space here does not permit much exploration). Ideas such as these can be seen to influence educational policy too.

Education systems in developed countries, expectedly perhaps, mostly seek to respond to a particularly western version of a globalization narrative that is inherently unstable. This may mean, in part, helping learners deal with and compete in an increasingly neoliberal market-driven economy – ironically a potential feature of the global forces that may make our lives less sustainable and unjustly interdependent. In education for global citizenship, a noted concern with competition in market economies on the one hand sits uneasily alongside a drive for interdependence, social justice, and sustainable lifestyles on the other. This leaves the global turn in curriculum policy fraught with difficulties. For some, contemporary notions of education for global citizenship are welcome because they finally lead governments to take what were once peripheral concerns of activist NGOs into the heart of curricula: human rights, peace, justice, and environmental degradation are now firmly on the agenda.

Next, I summarize the main risks of taking and sustaining this contemporary approach based on some of the sources provided above. I outline what I see are six key risks. These include: the failure to adequately name, notice, and critique what counts as globalization; the conflation of the global with cultural and economic concerns; and the individualization and depoliticization of processes and outcomes.
Some Risks Associated with Education for Global Citizenship

Given the analysis and critiques above, the risks with contemporary discourses of education for global citizenship are identifiable. Space here does not permit an exploration of all of these (but see also Andreotti, 2015):

1. **Failure to understand how local and global domains are connected.** The risk here, especially in the policy rhetoric, is that focusing on the global and globalization leads to ignoring the local, seeing global issues in the abstract or ‘at a distance’ (for example, ‘global poverty’ or ‘climate change’), and a failure to adequately connect local and extra-local domains.

2. **The lack of political analysis and response.** The risk that we fail to recognize the importance of political aspects when curriculum policy is founded on an analysis of globalization as merely social, cultural and economic, or where the political is seen as acting as a good responsible citizen in pre-given ways.

3. **The lack of ecological analysis and response.** The risk that we fail to address the material and ecological aspect of the way the Earth is changing through focusing on globalization as a social process.

4. **Ethnocentrism and neocolonialism.** The risk that that we in the ‘West’ position ourselves as the ones who can see things globally – global mindedness may be a new form of colonial perspective taking.

5. **A transmissive approach.** The risk that we take the view that education is about encouraging learners to learn ‘about’ the global processes of change rather than collaborating with others to invent new responses and practices within processes that have both local and extra-local elements.

6. **The individualization of competencies.** Within a skills based and competencies oriented curriculum, we run the risk of seeing learning as an individual process, neglectful of the situated and collective contexts for creative response making to shared challenges.

In the next section, I wish to show how we might address some of these risks by taking a glocal approach. I will sketch out some aspects of glocal pedagogy drawing on the work of theorists of space, place and globalization: in particular Robertson (1995), Massey (1995), Roudometof (2005), and Bauman (2013). Here I seek to flesh out one way of addressing some the critiques of education for global citizenship, through signposting a more general direction for glocal pedagogies.
Towards Glocal Pedagogies

Glocal pedagogies respond to contemporary ecological and social issues in ways that take account of the integrated nature of local and global processes. They acknowledge that these processes are social, cultural, economic, political, and environmental/material.

**Global concerns are important but so are local ones.** One response to the critiques and risks (outlined above), is to ‘go glocal’ in educational approaches. I suggest we might take education for *glocal* citizenship as a term that more adequately describes the nature of the problem, the starting point for response making, and the kinds of effects desired. I wish to argue that education for glocal citizenship opens up different kinds of educational opportunities and ameliorates some of the risks. In glocally-oriented pedagogies, education takes as a starting point the ecological, political, social and cultural dimensions of *real places* as a nexus of global and local flows and concerns. The importance of place comes from the view that a given locale is always connected to many other places beyond the immediate experienced context.

Theory can help us here. As Massey usefully explains, local places intersect with many extra-local places: “their ‘local uniqueness’ is always already a product of wider contacts; the local is always already a product in part of ‘global’ forces, where global in this context refers not necessarily to the planetary scale, but to the geographical beyond, the world beyond the place itself” (Massey, 1995, p. 183). Hence, the local is always the key milieu within which the extra-local becomes meaningfully relevant and pedagogically important. Studies of outdoor, environmental and experiential education have attended to the role of place in learning about social and ecological justice (for example, Gruenewald, 2003; Stewart, 2004; Gruenewald & Smith, 2008). Mannion and Gilbert (2015) show that people and places are reciprocally enmeshed and co-emergent, and that people learn through making embodied responses to experienced differences. Some of these differences will be of other places and times (but even these will be ‘local’ in their own terms). What if, to invert the Scottish advice, ‘learning through the local’ is the only viable way to get to experience, and to understand and respond to the global?

**We are all cosmopolitan-locals.** Another problem with education for global citizenship is the way it employs a binary between local and global, localized and globalized. As we have seen within the policy example, this binary infuses much of the rhetoric around education for global citizenship (whilst in practice examples, the realization that the local is necessary is also clear). Glocal pedagogy as I envision it replaces this unhelpful binary with a continuum of relations between the local and the extra-local. Roudometof (2005) usefully avoids loose talk of abstracted globalization (as one side of a binary) through the use of alternative terms such as transnational (to describe the flow of people and ideas across territories). Cosmopolitanism is a second useful term (after Roudometof) which we can harness into the frame too, but only if we see it also as one end of a continuum with the local. Roudometof (2005) argues that
we should do away with the binary distinction between global and local: ‘cosmopolitans’ on the one hand and ‘locals’ on the other. He argues we should utilize a cosmopolitan-local continuum to understand that we all have degrees of attachment to various cultures, locales and regions.

Robertson’s (1995) theory of glocalization provides the rationale for the understanding of the cosmopolitan-local continuum. Glocalization captures the ongoing mixing and blending between local and extra-local that creates opportunities for a response from citizens. Importantly, it is glocalization (not globalization) that is responsible for the transformation of people’s everyday lives. We recall that global processes and local agencies are mutually constitutive. This effect is apparent whether people experience the world as a transnational worker or as a locally based farmer. Glocalization, he suggests, leads to two hypothetically different and idealized versions of the cosmopolitan which are never present in reality: first, someone who stays completely rooted to the local and, the second, someone who always transcends the boundaries of their own culture or locale. In fact, a local farmer and a migrant worker each will experience glocalization albeit in different ways. For Roudometof, glocalization is the process that allows us to notice what is happening along a cosmopolitan-local continuum in terms of our different degrees of attachment to cultures, locales and regions. In practice, no one is a true cosmopolitan and no one is a full blown local unaffected by extra-local forces.

Taking on board the arguments above, the result if applied to educational experience is that an educational encounter will need to accept that among any group of learners there will be diverse starting points along the cosmopolitan-local continuum. By this view, within a glocal educational ontology, the learner’s encounter might best be described as an open-ended invitation to respond to difference and consider the productive potential of whatever mix of local and extra-local is relevant. The processes and outcomes are complex and never easy to work out and the results are likely to involve areas of greyness. A benefit of this approach is to accept that we may not need to try to produce ‘global citizens’ to the exclusion of a local, regional or national identity. Within a glocal pedagogy, there is no requirement to reject one’s own culture at the expense of the call to abstract global mindedness or the practice of the purified cosmopolitan. No such outright rejection is possible or necessary. Indeed, it is the mix of local and extra-local elements that are material conditions needed for the educational response to be possible. Put another way, it is only out of the local situated context that any new community, new practice and new recognitions of the value of the extra-local is possible.

**We need places of educational encounter, dialogue, exchange and action.** Based on theories of place and glocalization, I have argued that educational experiences can only ever unfold within events in a local place. This assertion is cognizant of the fact that local places are always inevitably connected to all kinds of other places (Massey, 1995). But what makes these place-based events educational?
Various authors have argued that it is in the encounters between people of diverse backgrounds and between the socio-material and discursive elements found there (Nespor, 2008; Mannion & Adey, 2011; Duhn, 2012) that makes such encounter educational. In eventful, place-based, globally connected forms of education, local places are the necessary situated places that afford response making (Somerville, 2010). Mannion, Fenwick and Lynch (2013) show that place-responsive pedagogy “involves explicitly teaching by-means-of-an-environment with the aim of understanding and improving human-environment relations.” This involves educators’ and learners’ experiences and dispositions to place as well as the ongoing contingent events in the place itself. Since glocal pedagogies are both situated and seek to address ecological and social justice, they share a strong family resemblance with place-responsive pedagogies.

Yet, in much of the literature and policy on contemporary expressions of education for global citizenship, local places have been backgrounded. This is perhaps because of a worry of a return to solely local specificity, overly fervent nationalism, or parochial narrow mindedness. These worries fall away, however, when pedagogical strategies and curriculum makers notice how and why they are never merely local and how and why the extra-local is deeply connected to any given place and practice. By this view, the ‘global’ is never an abstract, obscure, or distant idea but an infused part of the everyday whether the learner is mobile, at home, abroad, on an exchange visit or, indeed, labeled as an ‘unwelcome vagabond’ or ‘inward migrant’. Bauman’s (2013) helpful contribution is that we move from a ‘space of flows’ to a ‘space of places’ (Bauman, 2013, p. 3). In a ‘space of flows’, humans must confront each other in imaginary ways (as ‘nation-states’, large church groupings or international companies). In contrast, within a ‘space of places’ we find interpersonal engagement within eco-social, political and cultural places:

... humans have the opportunity of confronting each other as persons – neighbours, workmates or schoolmates, bus drivers, postmen, shopkeepers, craftsmen, waiters, doctors, dentists, nurses, receptionists, teachers, policemen, municipal officers, security guards and so on and on: some of them are confronted as friends, some others as enemies, but personal friends or enemies rather than anonymous and interchangeable, stereotyped specimens of an abstract category. (Bauman, 2013, p. 3)

Patel and Lynch (2013) provide some further signposts for how the application of glocalization to education can work. For them, the concept of glocalization helps us connect the global and local together but does not blend the two in a way that eradicates differences, or the requirement to address these differences for educational ends. Inserting the idea of the glocal within pedagogy challenges learners to respectfully engage with and through the culture of another. The ‘glocal’ educational event will necessarily involve an encounter with difference. It starts with acknowledging the
culturally located position of all parties involved but does not presume any one of these is hierarchically superior. Patel and Lynch (2013) draw upon Welikala’s notion of the ‘multi-perspective curriculum’ based on a pedagogy of encounter. Within a glocalized curriculum, new ‘third’ cultures are built up through respectful exchange among multiple perspectives found in each of the two (or more) encountering local cultures. The result, one hopes, is not the subjugation of one over the other:

Learning is effective when contextualized within the local context because that context frames the learner’s experience and lived reality. The focus in glocalized teaching and learning is a critical reflection and understanding of important and relevant connections between the local and global perspectives of learners. Learners bring to the third culture space their diverse cultural worldviews but it is through the respectful exchange of their cultural wealth that they will map their shared futures. Important to this perspective is the supposition that the two communities “may be defined by their histories but that they are bound by their destinies”.
(Patel, Sooknanan, Rampersad, & Mundkur, 2012, p. 23)

Glocalization recognizes the need to continue to identify and expand the building blocks of a glocal community network. This network embraces global community building within a third culture development model. Third culture building does not reduce and subjugate one culture or make it “dominant over another”.
(Patel & Lynch, 2013, p. 225)

For Patel and Lynch (2013), a glocal curriculum is not at all the same as the process of educational internationalization. In their view, glocalization is “empowering, inspiring, and socially responsible” and leads to “action for change” through critical review and dialogue.

Summary

Local uniqueness, personal attachment to culture, places, and regions, and place-based interpersonal contacts have, inter alia, all been shown to be critically relevant to understanding, experiencing and responding to extra-local or ‘global’ forces. Glocalization (Robertson, 1995), the idea of a cosmopolitan-local continuum (Roudometof, 2005), the ‘space of places’ (Bauman, 2013), and the creation of glocal curricula for ‘third cultures’ (Patel & Lynch, 2013) are ideas that help us reframe education for global citizenship as a glocal enterprise. Glocal pedagogies are suggestive of new place responsive and experiential ways in which education can help learners viably understand and respond to transnational issues and address the otherwise abstract notion of globalization.
In any program of education for global citizenship, we should attend to the local places that are cut through with global forces to afford learners the opportunity to engage in critical dialogue and actions for change. For learners, it will be the emergence of some form of response to differences found in places that makes an event educational. Since people and places are reciprocally enmeshed and co-emergent, and people learn through making embodied responses to experienced differences (Mannion & Gilbert, 2015), it is clear we need to reorient so called ‘global’ pedagogies towards relational place-based encounters. Any glocal pedagogy will need to address both local and extra-local issues found in culture, politics, social institutions and ecological interactions (see Steger, 2005), but these educational experiences will also be opportunity for embodied responses to differences via the practices developed in some local place.

A purely ‘global response’ or a purely ‘global educational experience’ are impossible abstractions (but these kinds of phrases litter our policy documents and some of the academic writing too). Rather, the necessary response to the global predicament, is always a glocal one: a practice-based enactment that involves a form of encounter between people (who by default come from more than one local place) that is mindful of how the local practices are connected to extra-local flows. Through the concept of the glocal, the binary between local and global is challenged and overcome and pedagogies that can viably address the global are made possible.

Setting out to educate for global citizenship to the exclusion of local concerns is, within this framing, a misguided affair. This is because we have ignored our shared glocal ontology where the local and global are co-specified; whether we are near or far from ‘home’, extra-local and local elements and practices are always co-infused. This means the glocal curriculum making can just as easily start on our doorstep as with an international exchange. In our ubiquitous everyday glocal milieus, individual, shared, embodied, affective, socio-material, cultural and political actions are possible and are part of any glocal curricula. We are all cosmopolitan-locals.

I have sought to explain and apply the glocal argument to education for global citizenship through inviting us to remember the ecological dimension of the Earth itself: perhaps seeing the Earth as also a larger ‘local’ place will help us connect to this concern. Robertson uses the glocal as an ontological frame to invite us to think again about way we now live on the Earth. In effect, glocal pedagogies ask us to look again at Earthrise but with new ‘glocal’ eyes. Glocal pedagogies are a call to enact and embody Robertson’s glocal imaginary. Through glocal pedagogy we are called to situate ourselves locally in real places via new forms of place making or ways of being on planet Earth. Glocal citizenship is now more important than ever: we live in a time when climate change and other environmental place-based issues are pressing (such as biodiversity, threats to pollinating insects, water supplies, food chains etc.) and non-state actors, transnational NGOs, corporations, and many nation states are becoming increasingly more assertive across borders. Glocal education is needed to develop critical readings of the concepts
we need and use to understand problems, to frame the invitations to respond, and to devise solutions. Glocal educational programs are needed that can help learners address the local and transnational nature of the social, political, cultural, and ecological dimensions of our lives.

Glocal pedagogies as I envision them can ameliorate if not do away with some of the risks outlined above for education for global citizenship, which has been shown to be fraught with difficulties and misunderstandings. Glocal pedagogies invite us to make embodied and place-based responses to differences found among people connected with diverse local and extra-local cultures. This is achievable through observing how all of our local places are cut through with flows of materials, forces, people, ideas and practices from other local places within nation states, wider regions, and the Earth. This approach can assist us in addressing social and ecological injustices by moving beyond ethnocentric, transmissive and individualistic approaches. Within the everyday emplaced world of teaching and learning, glocal pedagogies provide a way of framing the task educators face: to devise new place and culturally sensitive forms of education that address how the local and extra-local interact and are responded to, so that we can advance more ecologically sound and socially just societies. In glocal pedagogies, active response making to differences between people that improve ecological and social justice is a goal. Worthwhile responses are never assured but always possible through meaning making and action.
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THE CHALLENGES OF GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP AND OF FELLOW FEELING, FROM THE POLIS TO EDUCATION TODAY

Tim Beasley-Murray

This chapter sets modern ideas of citizenship and of global citizenship (GC) into a tradition that reaches back to Ancient Greece. It is in the light of this tradition that the radical nature of these ideas can be better appreciated and their conceptual complexities better grasped. The chapter concludes by investigating the problematic concept of ‘global fellow feeling’, something that, I argue, is central to sustaining global citizenship, as both idea and as reality, and is no less of a challenge in today’s globalized society than it was in the past.

The Global: Rastignac and the Mandarin

Let us start with a story. This is the story of two students – not in London or Middelburg, and not in 2015 – but rather of two students in Paris sometime in the 1830s. This is a story told in Le Père Goriot, the novel by Balzac. Two students have come to Paris to make their fortune: one is a would-be poet and the hero of the novel, Rastignac, and the other his friend Bianchon, a student of medicine. The friends have not seen each other for while when they bump into each other at the entrance to the Jardin du Luxembourg. Rastignac reminds his friend of a passage, apparently in a book by the philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau:

“Do you recall the passage where [Rousseau] asks the reader what he’d do if he could make himself rich by killing an old mandarin in China merely by willing it, without budging from Paris?” “Yes.” “Well?” “Bah! I’m on my thirty-third mandarin.” “Don’t make a joke of it. Really, if it were proved to you that the thing were possible and that a nod of your head would be enough, would you do it?” (Balzac, 2014)

The question that Rastignac put here is an important and difficult one that, in turn, contains a series of further questions: what are we willing to do to guarantee our own success? Whom are we willing to step on or to allow to suffer for our own gain? To whom do we have moral obligations and responsibilities? Are these responsibilities

1 In fact, Rousseau’s writings contain no such passage.
any less if the people whom our actions affect are not the people near us, members of our immediate community, but rather are people we have never met, living very different sorts of lives on the other side of the globe? These questions of our ethical responsibilities (and the way that these responsibilities are mediated by proximity and distance) are no less relevant and no less difficult to answer today.²

There is, of course, a big difference between the way that Rastignac and his fictional friend faced these questions in 1830s Paris and the way that we face these questions in Western Europe today. In the 1830s, Paris and China were, in practical terms, very far apart. It would have taken months of arduous travel by land or of a long and dangerous sea voyage round Africa and India to get from France to the Far East. What little a Parisian knew of China would have been gleaned from the fanciful accounts of travellers, or news that travelled so slowly that it was no longer news when it arrived.

So much has changed in the less than 200 years that separates us from Balzac. If we want to find out about China, all we have to do is switch on the television, pick up a newspaper or, most obviously, look online. More simply, we might just turn and talk to one of the hundreds of thousands of Europeans who are of Chinese origin – the passenger next to us on the bus, or the student next to us in the lecture hall. Or we could glance at the labels of the clothes that we are wearing, or the Made in China stamp on pretty well any consumer good that we use.

Today, then, Rastignac’s question has a very different resonance. The extraordinary processes of globalization of the past 200 years have shaped the world we live in whether we like it or not. What this means is that human beings, right across the globe, are connected in real and dense ways. It follows that the ‘old mandarin’ of Rastignac’s question is not some unimaginable figure, distant from us and to whom we have no connection. And it follows that we can’t simply wish him dead and enjoy the riches that would result, blissfully ignorant.

Globalization means that we live in a world where our choices and our actions are both affected by, and have an impact on, the billions of other human beings with whom we share this planet. From this web of interconnections arises a – perhaps opaque and difficult to define – web of responsibilities. As the editors of a recent volume on cosmopolitanism put it in an evocative turn of phrase, we live “in a global age, in an age of overlapping communities of fate, where the fate and fortunes of countries are increasingly entwined with one another” (Brown & Held, 2010, p.13). In the light of our belonging to shared ‘communities of fate’, I argue that it is imperative, indeed unavoidable, that we start to develop a sense of ourselves as global citizens. What does this mean? To understand this, we need first to ask ourselves what it means to be a citizen.

² Appiah (2007, pp. 155-57) puts the story of Rousseau’s mandarin to good use in his discussion of ‘moral cosmopolitanism’.
Citizenship

In thinking about citizenship let us turn not to Paris of the 1830s, but to Ancient Greece. The aim here is to (re)discover the origins of our contemporary conception of citizenship. Despite the temporal distance that separates us from the Ancient Greeks, and despite the ways in which their concept of citizenship developed and became modified in Roman and in modern historical and political experience, our traditional and contemporary conception of citizenship continues to be structured by Greek ideas and by Greek political experience. Hence, while the image that I give you here of Greece – filtered not insignificantly through the thinking of Hannah Arendt – might be something of an idealized one, it is an image whose power legitimately lays claim to our imagination.

In Greece in the period between the 8th and 5th centuries BCE, a gradual process occurs in which communities reject previous forms of social organization, such as pre-political forms of primitive kingship, and come together in cities, thereby creating the polis. In the realm of ideas, the key feature of the polis is the notion that, within its walls, speech replaces violence, and that one does things through persuasion and through the power of words. As Arendt puts it:

To be political, to live in a polis, meant that everything was decided through words and persuasion and not through force and violence. In Greek self-understanding, to force people by violence, to command rather than persuade, were pre-political ways to deal with people characteristic of life outside the polis, of home and family life, where the household head ruled with uncontested despotic powers, or of life in the barbarian empires of Asia, whose despotism was frequently linked to the organization of the household. (1998, pp. 26-27)

Speech, according to this Greek and Arendtian understanding of things, is the fundamental bedrock of citizenship. It is, then, the right to freedom of speech – that is not met by violence – that is not simply one of many rights, but the fundamental and foundational right of citizenship.

This Ancient Greek transition – from pre-political existence to the polis, and from mute violence to speech – was accompanied by a whole set of further shifts on a conceptual level and in conceptual vocabulary. In terms of Greek conceptual self-understanding: in moving to the polis and in throwing up walls around the city, human beings left the natural world and entered the artificial world of civilization. They thus left the sphere of natural necessity and set foot, for the first time, into a world of human freedom: bonds of kinship, which human beings cannot choose and were subjected to, were replaced by social bonds that human beings had chosen for themselves and in which they participated. The charisma of tyranny – and the hierarchy that tyranny institutes – gave way to legitimate authority and equality before the law (isonomia),
where lawfulness replaced the arbitrariness of personal rule. This conception of isonomia, an equality of rights and of responsibilities, was the bedrock of the Greek idea of citizenship, characterized by Aristotle, for example, as “constitutional rule” and “government of freemen and equals” (1996, p. 19).

In sum, the Greeks have bequeathed to us a concept of citizenship that may be defined as follows: coming together freely, as equals, to work for the common good, within a framework of law that we have made and chosen to submit to, where all share the benefits and burdens of common existence. And it is against the background of this working definition of citizenship that we shall be able to better understand the concept of global citizenship and what it might mean.

Global Citizenship

The notion of global citizenship also traces its origins to Ancient Greece. The first self-proclaimed global citizen was the philosopher and cynic Diogenes of Sinope, a colorful figure famed, among other things, for his public masturbation and for living in a barrel. This was a thinker who deliberately and provocatively went against the conventions of his time (Hicks, 1972). On one occasion, when asked where he came from, Diogenes replied: “I am a citizen of the whole world”. What Diogenes was saying was little less shocking than his public masturbation: he was saying that he did not identify with his particular city but rather with humanity as a whole, the latter a concept that scarcely existed at the time. Further, he was suggesting that we ought to treat members of the whole of humanity with the same responsibility and respect for rights that we treat members of our immediate political community. In taking the idea of citizenship beyond the bounds of the city, cosmopolitanism was a radical and, even, paradoxical concept. Diogenes’ listeners would have thought he was out of his mind.

Once again then, the basic structure of notion of global citizenship is something that we owe to the Greeks. This idea, as cosmopolitanism, which found its first explicit statement in Diogenes’ provocative words, was developed in the teachings of the Stoics and passed through the hands of thinkers like Erasmus, Kant, and others, until it became the buzzword that is today global citizenship. In this process of intellectual-

---

3 The Greek word that Diogenes used for “citizen of the whole world” was kosmopolitês, and it is from this that we get the word ‘cosmopolitan’.

4 ‘Global citizenship’ and ‘cosmopolitanism’ are simply different names for the same idea. The recent terminological shift from the latter to the former has come about simply because of the negative associations that.
historical transition, the idea of global citizenship has lost nothing of its radical and challenging nature. Here is one contemporary writer on the difficulties inherent in taking bounded notions of citizenship and stretching them onto a global scale:

The idea of citizenship gets its moral force from the experience of people living together in cities, people who identify with one another, face common enemies, and so forth. The idea of global citizenship takes that idea and stretches it so as to embrace the whole of humanity, regardless of what relationships may exist between people across the globe. It assumes that the moral force of citizenship can survive stretching. But this, to say the least, is something that needs to be argued for. (Miller, 2010, p. 378)

In today's situation where, as I have argued, globalization and the creation of global webs of enmeshment mean that we cannot avoid thinking in terms of global citizenship, we are compelled to face up to what happens to the concept and practice of citizenship as it undergoes this global stretching. And we are no less compelled to face up to the range of paradoxes and conceptual challenges that emerge in the process.

The Challenges of Global Citizenship

From city state to world state? The Greek notion of citizenship was a matter of the Greek polis, and the traditional notions of citizenship that draw on Greek ideas are likewise a matter of the state, the modern equivalent of the polis. Global citizenship rejects the boundedness that is inherent to the state (in this sense ‘global citizenship’ – certainly in the way that Diogenes used the term – is a weak oxymoron.) Global citizenship is, after all, a concept of citizenship without any state that it corresponds to.

There are theories of global citizenship that posit the desirability of a world state and seek the expansion and strengthening of mechanisms (such as those that exist already in the form of the UN Declaration of Human Rights and the International Criminal Court) that aim to impose universally binding obligations and duties on all the world’s inhabitants as world citizens. These are the sorts of principles that underpin strong theories of Global Governance. Nevertheless, I would argue that to think along these lines and to say that the aim of global citizenship ought to be the creation of a global state is to miss the thrust of global citizenship as a critical position.

From a critical perspective, the idea of global citizenship is a post-statist position. It is a position that is skeptical of the whole notion of boundedness and boundaries by which traditional notions of the state are characterized. And after all, in an era of mass

5 For an overview of these theories, see Hewson & Sinclair (1999).
surveillance and the ever-increasing power of states to control their citizens, we might legitimately ask whether a global state really would be such a desirable thing.

**From exclusion to inclusion.** Ancient Greek conceptions of citizenship – and the traditional conceptions of citizenship that develop from them – exclude. This exclusion works in two directions: externally and internally. Insofar as you were a citizen of, say, Athens, you were defined by not being a citizen of Sparta, and you owed to a citizen of Sparta none of the duties that you owed to one of your own. This notion of citizenship not only excluded members of other political communities, but also excluded ‘barbarians’ who, according to the ‘civilized’ Greek, were not political beings at all. In both cases of external exclusion, those who lay outside the bounds of your own political community were not only those to whom you did not extend the benefits of citizenship, they were also those against whom you could be expected to fight, dying for your city if necessary.

This external process of exclusion in the concept of Greek citizenship was mirrored by an internal process of exclusion. For all the glory of Athens, for example, and the civic freedom that its citizens enjoyed, this was a city that conferred the benefits of citizenship only on a privileged few: namely adult males from citizen families. Varying over time, the number of citizens never amounted to more than 50,000 or so of a total population of approximately 300,000 inhabitants of the city. The rest of the population, excluded from citizenship, was made up of women, slaves and metics (resident foreigners) (Thorley, 2004, pp. 75-78). In both directions, then, Greek and traditional ideas of citizenship gain their vital force through mechanisms of exclusion.

Global citizenship, by contrast, is an inclusive concept. Global citizenship likewise includes in two directions. First, externally, or perhaps better, horizontally: it extends the conception of citizenship across national and state boundaries. In this way, global citizenship is truly ‘global’ in an international and transnational sense. Second, global citizenship includes internally, or perhaps better, vertically. Here we see a different and often overlooked way in which global citizenship is ‘global’: it is predicated on the rights of all, as human rights, to the benefits of citizenship, regardless of factors like gender, race and ethnicity, sexuality, or socioeconomic status. Here, no less than on the international and transnational plane, global Citizenship is about overcoming the barriers of exclusion.

**From homogeneity to heterogeneity.** Traditional notions of citizenship are predicated upon homogeneity, and construct communities defined by their homogeneity. According to this model, the community is a group of people that agrees on things and that is not characterized by difference, whether of religion, of values, or of identity. Here, in the homogeneity of traditional citizenship, one can have a statement like that of Pericles’ funeral oration that says: this is who we are and these are the values of our city to which we adhere. Global citizenship, by contrast, deals with a notion of community that is characterized not by sameness but by difference: by all the differences in values,
culture, and identities that cut across the vast and complex world that we inhabit. What this means is that, for the community of global citizens, there is no equivalent to Pericles’ funeral oration. What we share in common cannot be fixed once and for all, but is permanently fragile and permanently in need of renegotiation. It follows from this that the demand that global citizenship makes of us is more complicated and more onerous than the demand that traditional notions make of its citizens: it demands not that we agree, but rather that we learn to disagree and nevertheless find common ground across difference.

Reality or utopia? The final challenge – or weak paradox – inherent in the concept of global citizenship is one that I have alluded to above. On the one hand, processes of globalization and our ever denser enmeshment with others in other parts of the globe mean that we are already global citizens, whether we like it or not. From this perspective, global citizenship is no abstract goal but rather an inescapable reality. In this case, the question is not whether we wish to become global citizens, but rather whether we ought to seek to be more conscious, more responsible, and better citizens of the world that we share. On the other hand, precisely because of the difficult and paradoxical nature of global citizenship as a concept, as I have described it above, global citizenship retains an unreal quality. It might be described as a challenge, an ambition, a metaphor, an attitude, a mode of engaging, a way of thinking, a demand that is yet to be fulfilled – a promise. Seen in the light of this unreal, utopian nonexistence, global citizenship as an idea can nonetheless have an effect on the way we think and the way we act. But if this is to be the case, I argue, the idea of global citizenship needs to engage us, not only as rational, but also as affective beings. And here we come to the problem of global citizenship as a problem of global fellow feeling.

The Problem of Global Fellow Feeling

Anti-cosmopolitan skepticism. Ever since the rude reception that greeted Diogenes’ original proclamation of his belonging to the world, global citizenship has been an idea that many thinkers and writers have been skeptical of and have frequently dismissed. The reasons for this stem from global citizenship’s rejection of homogeneity and exclusion: this means it may appear to be rootless, abstract, and generalized. Here is Rousseau on the matter:

The essential thing is to be good to the people with whom one lives. Distrust those cosmopolitans who go to great lengths to discover duties they do not deign to fulfill to those around them. A philosopher loves the Tartars so as to be spared loving his neighbor. (1979, p. 39)
Behind Rousseau’s effective anti-cosmopolitan rhetoric lies the idea that it is only with others like oneself that one can identify and share a sense of common feeling that leads to actions for the good. In this strand of thought, there is a skepticism towards the idea that global citizenship can have the motive force to bring people to feel, and hence act on, their responsibilities. As a contemporary writer puts it:

Cosmopolitanism as an ethical commitment strains to extend our concrete realities to include some distant and generalized ‘others’ who, we are told, are our global neighbors. The idea might give you the warm and fuzzies, but it’s nothing for which you’d be willing to go to war. (Sibley, quoted in Appiah, 2007, p. 157)

The suggestion here is that cosmopolitanism is capable of producing no more than a lukewarm feeling of solidarity with the others, whether it be Rastignac’s mandarin, Rousseau’s Tartar, or the millions who suffer in other parts of the world today; it is insufficient to fire a driving passion and commitment to act, least of all in extreme cases.

**How to generate global fellow feeling.** The tradition of political thought has often distrusted the role of the passions in politics, seeing in the passions the source of irrational outbursts and violence that need to be kept in check by clear-sighted reason. A more nuanced view, however, would point to the indispensability of the passions in political experience. For the passions are those things that make people act, as Hobbes (1991), for example, demonstrates so clearly in the opening chapters of *Leviathan.* More specifically, fellow feeling, as a particular form of passion, is indispensable in the creation and sustenance of political communities. Thus, Rousseau, in *The Social Contract,* talks about the “sentiments of sociability, without which it is impossible to be a good citizen” (1997, p. 150). If this is the case, and if sentiments of sociability (what I am glossing as ‘fellow feeling’) are indeed the prerequisite for good citizenship, then the questions that follow for global citizenship are serious ones indeed. Is it possible to generate effective and cohesive fellow feeling that transcends the vast global diversity of culture and values? Can we commit ourselves affectively to a global community of difference, in such a way that we transcend our local identifications with those who are similar to us? If such a form of global fellow feeling were possible, how would it be possible to propagate or foster it in a global community as a whole?

To answer this last question, let us look at the ways that thinkers have posited that fellow feeling might be encouraged. Rousseau (1997) discusses the idea of civil religion. By this, what he means is a set of socially instituted rituals and ceremonial practices. Through civil religion, he suggests, in an evocative phrase, citizens may be taught how to “love their duties” (p. 150). Might there be a civil religion that could be instituted globally in the service of global citizenship?

Another way of promoting fellow feeling might be through art, as Nussbaum (2013) suggests. Nussbaum’s idea is that in art human beings can come together around a
common set of symbols and a common set of aesthetic experiences. Could one similarly imagine a global aesthetic and a global art that might be harnessed to promote the sort of fellow feeling necessary for global citizenship? In the cases of both globally cohesive civil religion and globally cohesive art, the task is a difficult one. One the one hand, there is the danger that a global civil religion or art would be too specific. Such a thing would apparently be global but in fact it would reflect local tastes and practices; apparently global, but – as the history of world cultural hegemony teaches us – most likely European in inspiration. As a result, it would fail to account for the cultural variety of the world. Or, on the other hand, a civil religion or art designed to promote global citizenship would be too general, too vague, too banal, if not downright kitsch. As a result, it would lack that emotional sway that civil religion or a unifying art are meant to have.

**Education for global citizenship.** If the paths of civil religion and art are unlikely to lead us very far in the right direction, then a more effective route – and one that Rousseau and others have also thought about in relation to fellow feeling – will be that of education. Education has that advantage that it can incorporate difference and promote the modes of critical reflection that will be needed to do justice to the complexities of global citizenship. Education for global citizenship, as education for global fellow feeling, will be indispensable in an age where global citizenship has become unavoidable.

What ought such an education to look like? Education for global citizenship cannot, by definition, be prescriptive or aggressively normative. It must, however, create a space for critical reflection where students become aware of the complexities and challenges of GC and prepare to act on the consequences. Drawing on some of the thoughts on the nature of global citizenship outlined above, education for global citizenship will encourage students to think in terms of what they share in common and to think critically about how they are already implicated in the global. It will encourage students to think in terms of the differences in culture, values, power, and perspective that cut across our common world, and learn how to negotiate them with respect but not with indifference. And finally, it will encourage the sort of participation that emerges from reflection and help students to define a sense of rights and responsibilities on which such participation will be based. In so doing, education for global citizenship will necessarily aim to foster that fragile and difficult thing, so necessary for global solidarity and globally directed action: global fellow feeling. The aim of an education of this sort is to produce – and I quote here from the aims of the Global Citizenship program at my own university – students who:

look beyond their individual and local interests; who see the complexity of an interconnected world, in all its diversity and inequality; who understand the nature of the challenges that face that world; are aware of their social, ethical and political
responsibilities towards that world; and who are ready to work together to change it for the better. (UCL Global Citizenship)

But what of the students with whose story I started this paper? After anguished deliberation, Bianchon answers Rastignac’s questions as follows: “Damn it, I’ve come to the conclusion that the Chinaman must live” (Balzac, 2014). Leaving behind the high minded ideals of universities’ manifestos for global citizenship, a more modest aim of education for global citizenship might be this: to educate students who – whether with Bianchon’s reluctance or not – come to the same conclusion and let the mandarin live; students who are willing to take at least a first step towards becoming responsible global citizens.
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GLOBAL PEDAGOGY IN PRACTICE: CITIZENSHIP, RIGHTS AND STUDENT IDENTITIES

Audrey Osler

In many regions of the world, university and college students are encouraged, and even expected, to engage in civic learning. At the same time, there has been a renewal of interest at national and international levels in education for democratic citizenship that targets children and young people in elementary and high schools across the globe (European Commission, 1997; Osler & Starkey, 1999; Torney Purta et al., 1999, 2001; Cogan & Derricott, 2000; Parker, 2003; Banks, 2004; Council of Europe, 2002, 2011). Opportunities for civic learning at schools and universities are complementary: both can contribute to the strengthening of democracy and to the enhancement of democratic practices and processes in communities. This educational goal remains critical, as Osler and Starkey have noted:

In both established democracies and newly established democratic states, such as those of Eastern and Central Europe and Latin America, there is a recognition that democracy is essentially fragile and that it depends on the active engagement of citizens, not just in voting, but in developing and participating in sustainable and cohesive communities. (2006: 433)

Increasingly, programs are moving from a framework in which civic learning is designed for the national sphere (to which learners are assumed to have a natural affinity) to one that encompasses local, global, and other scales of belonging. This chapter presents a framework for civic learning that might be applied at various levels of education to support what has been termed ‘education for cosmopolitan citizenship’ (Osler & Starkey, 2003, 2005; Osler, 2011b).

Education for cosmopolitan citizenship aims to support learners’ citizenship engagement at different scales, including the local, the national and the international, and to understand the inter-connections between these different scales. Such education must necessarily equip learners with knowledge and skills, but also with a disposition to take action to promote greater social justice, acknowledging not only our common humanity and global interconnectedness, but also learners’ diverse affinities and identities. Civic educational programs which focus exclusively on the national level are no longer appropriate, since as Castles has observed, the “principle of each individual being a citizen of just one nation-state no longer corresponds with reality for millions of people who move across borders and who belong in various ways in multiple places” (2004: 18).
Furthermore, educational programs that ignore a social justice dimension are not neutral, but are likely to compound existing disadvantages. In a deeply unequal world, and in divided and deeply stratified societies “each of us does have a choice about whether we are going to work to interrupt these systems or support their existence by ignoring them. There is no neutral ground; to choose not to act against injustice is to choose to allow it” (Sensoy & Di Angelo, 2012: xxii). Therefore, teachers cannot be neutral in engaging in civic education.

In a number of respects, the education for cosmopolitan citizenship framework proposed here matches the thinking behind the Going Glocal project presented in this book, since the Going Glocal team members grappled with the challenge of supporting young people who are “rooted in a given locality” to develop a sense of social responsibility and an awareness of global inequities while providing them with “local opportunities to address them” (Oomen, Introduction). The various initiatives promoted within the Going Glocal project sought to promote both local and international dimensions of learning for citizenship, developing an understanding of citizenship which is located in a particular community, yet which also recognizes global interconnectedness and our common humanity. To this extent, ‘glocal citizenship’ can be equated with education for cosmopolitan citizenship.

Education for cosmopolitan citizenship is necessarily about enabling social justice. Yet, as researchers have argued (Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2010; Sleeter, 2005, 2015), inadequate theorizing can undermine teachers’ efforts to promote social justice outcomes, with unintended consequences. This chapter will therefore explore possible theoretical frameworks to support projects designed to promote active citizenship learning for social justice at various scales. Before turning to theory, however, it is important to consider what universities currently aspire to realize within civic learning programs and to consider how these relate to changing conceptions of citizenship and changing concepts of citizen rights.

**Education, Changing Citizenship and Human Rights**

The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) commissioned a National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (CLDE) to review the components of effective civic education. The task force concluded that education for action was of key importance, and that the components of such learning should include, among other goals:

- Knowledge of the political systems that frame constitutional democracies and of political levers for affecting change;
- Knowledge of diverse cultures and religions, in the US and around the world;
• Critical inquiry and reasoning capacities;
• Deliberation and bridge building across differences;
• Open mindedness and capacity to engage different points of view and cultures;
• Civic problem solving skills and experience; and
• Civility, ethical integrity, and mutual respect (CLDE, 2012: 4).

The task force found that 70 per cent of U.S. college students report participating in some form of volunteering, community service or service learning, and around one half reports participation in credit-bearing service learning activities (CLDE, 2012). While the task force noted that research indicates that service learning is positively associated with a variety of civic learning outcomes, it also found that over time students’ civic learning is neither robust nor persuasive.

A framework is needed whereby service learning extends beyond activities which encourage charity or goodwill to the less fortunate, to one in which students are encouraged to show solidarity to their fellow humankind. A human rights framework, it is argued here, would support such a development and offer a strong, robust and unifying foundation for such learning. Ideally, students should be able to make links between local struggles for justice and global efforts to promote human rights. A human rights framework offers greater coherence to diverse civic learning initiatives and enables higher education institutions to support students in enhancing and strengthening democracy (Osler, 2016).

European nations (all 47 member states of the Council of Europe, 28 of which are also members of the European Union) have made both a rhetorical and a legally binding commitment to human rights. The Council of Europe exists to promote and protect human rights, and all member states have ratified the 1950 European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), a treaty designed to protect human rights, democracy and the rule of law, which covers all living under the jurisdiction of these states, regardless of their citizenship status. Nevertheless, it would appear that within Europe, concrete national commitments to support education for democratic citizenship (EDC) and human rights education (HRE) vary somewhat.1

The Council of Ministers of the member states of the Council of Europe adopted the Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education in 2010. The preamble of Recommendation CM/Rec (2010)7 notes that the Committee of Ministers is: “Firmly convinced that education and training play a central role in furthering this mission” of the Council of Europe “to promote human rights, democracy and the rule of law” (Council of Europe, 2010). Here, the Committee of Ministers is acknowledging the fundamental role of education, and by extension the role of teachers, in establishing a culture of human rights.

At the same time, in this second decade of the twenty-first century, Europe faces considerable challenges in enabling a human rights culture through education. One
challenge relates to the danger of far-right activists who have expressed racist and Islamophobic views, incompatible with democratic principles; these dangers have been exacerbated by senior political leaders who have engaged in populist rhetoric (Council of Europe’s Group of Eminent Persons, 2011; Osler, 2015). A report commissioned by the Council of Europe recognized a number of inequities in contemporary Europe in relation to race, ethnicity and migration, arguing that European societies need to embrace diversity and accept that one can be a “hyphenated European” (Council of Europe’s Group of Eminent Persons, 2011: 34): a Congolese-German, a North African-Frenchwoman or a Kurdish-Norwegian. It goes on to state that this can work only if all long term residents are accepted as citizens, and if all – despite faith, culture, or ethnicity – are treated equally by the law and their fellow citizens, and have a say in making the law.

The second challenge facing educators, and indeed all those engaged in broader social policymaking, relates to the nature of recent migration in Europe. Our age has been characterized as one of ‘super-diversity’ (Vertovec, 2007), a term coined to acknowledge that national communities are today increasingly diverse, and that newcomers are no longer necessarily linked to places with which states have long standing colonial or other historical links. While since 2004 and the expansion of the EU, countries in western Europe have seen significant migration from east to the west, and the continent now faces the issue of large numbers of undocumented migrants and asylum seekers arriving across the Mediterranean, as well as overland from Syria and north Africa. For the year 2014, the International Organization for Migration’s (IOM) Missing Migrants Project (2015) reported that 3,279 migrants died trying to reach Europe by sea. The statistics for 2015 are expected to far exceed that number. The tardy response by western European governments to put in place adequate measures to rescue such migrants, and secondly, to address their needs once they arrive, has called Europe’s human rights standards into question.

This situation places a particular responsibility on teachers of citizenship and human rights in enabling learners, first, to understand and engage with international (EU) and national policy responses to migration and changing demographics. Secondly, teachers need to support students in understanding the interconnectedness of Europe with the places from which these migrants come. Students need opportunities to examine the stratified and often unequal relationships between European nations and the places migrants and refugees are fleeing, relationships that are mediated through colonial history and recent conflicts, and through policies developed in response to resources and trading opportunities.

Across Europe, a third and significant challenge facing educators in schools and universities relates to government initiatives against radicalization. Educators are expected to address the perceived risks of radicalization and, sometimes, inform the authorities about persons at risk. In particular, schoolteachers are being asked to
safeguard children from these risks (Coppock, 2014). In Norway, for example, the Oslo municipality has engaged in a project to counter radicalization through social studies classes in the capital, with schools collaborating with the police, in an education initiative which forms part of a broader government strategy against extremism. The apparent purpose of the initiative is not simply to counter radicalization but “to allow the teacher to capture evidence of harmful radicalization” (Slettholm, 2015, my italics and translation). It is not clear what is supposed to happen if such ‘evidence’ is found.

In the UK, between 2000 and 2011, six major British anti-terrorism acts were passed. These were tied to the government’s anti-terrorist strategy known as Prevent, which has an educational dimension. Schools and universities are supposed to act as part of the government’s anti-terrorist strategy. In 2011, the then Conservative education minister sought to strengthen the educational dimension of the anti-terrorist strategy by setting up the Preventing Extremism Unit within England’s education ministry. He instructed the chief inspector of schools to “ensure that children are safeguarded from extremists and their unacceptable messages” (Gove, 2011). In such situations where the role of the police and the role of teachers become confused and intertwined, trust between schools and students and their families is undermined. Although the ministry also provided examples of approaches to teaching resilience against extremism, such as lessons on how to deconstruct media representations and propaganda, little emphasis has been given to supporting teachers in such initiatives (Bonnell et al., 2011). There is a real risk that, without such training and support, efforts by schools to implement Prevent may undermine children’s rights, for example, Article 13 (freedom of expression) and Article 14 (freedom of thought conscience and religion) under the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) (UN, 1989).

Directly and indirectly, education policy discourses have begun to address the education of Muslim children and youth with reference to security, radicalization and extremism (Coppock, 2014), rather than developing human rights education to counter extremism of all kinds so that young people develop solidarity with each other, regardless of characteristics such as religious faith (Davies 2006, 2008). The media’s tendency to focus on protecting young people from the dangers of radicalization often results in the playing down of concerns about achievement gaps between minority and mainstream youth and discrimination in the wider society more generally. Teachers too are distracted from the task of closing achievement gaps and so enabling greater social justice. Where the security services or the police are involved in anti-radicalization programs there is a real risk that educational goals may take second place to security concerns. Such initiatives may be ill conceived, possibly undermining, rather than strengthening, social cohesion. In Britain, for example, governments have focused almost exclusively on threats from Islamist terrorism and have thus neglected far-right racist and xenophobic agendas (Osler, 2011a). The targeting of Muslim children by such policies may well be in contravention of the CRC Article 2 (non-discrimination).
The components of effective civic education identified by the AACU task force can be strengthened by a human rights framework, an argument that is further elaborated upon below. At the same time, educators need to address complex questions related to citizenship and human rights within unequal, divided and stratified societies, whether they are addressing local, national or global contexts. Furthermore, teachers and their students in Europe may need to challenge policies designed ostensibly to support social cohesion and challenge extremism, as they may risk undermining students’ human rights and the principles of the Council of Europe.

Across Europe, the civic education of diverse racial, cultural, ethnic, religious, and linguistic groups continues to pose a number of challenges, not least because of the gap between Europe’s human rights rhetoric and a growing ‘them’ and ‘us’ political discourse. This discourse distinguishes between ‘our’ mainstream values and ‘their’ values, particularly in relation to minoritized Muslim-heritage communities. Schools and universities face the additional challenge of recognizing students’ religious identities within apparently secular (but never neutral) school systems (Osler, 2007; Berkeley, 2008). These challenges have been compounded by public, political and media responses to terrorist attacks. For example, in Paris it appeared that the predominant message of those who marched in defiance of the attackers on 11 January 2015 equated human rights with freedom of expression, thereby eclipsing other rights that are also currently under threat, such as freedom of religion, non-discrimination, security, and protection for minorities.

Civic Education Founded in Human Rights

In this section of the chapter, I consider whether human rights education is sufficient to underpin civic education at different scales, and how it might be strengthened to support education for cosmopolitan citizenship and social justice. According to Hopgood (2003), although there may be growing skepticism about international human rights institutions, this does not detract from the power of human rights discourses in popular struggles for justice. I argue that if human rights education is to support everyday struggles against inequalities and contribute to justice and peace in the world, it needs greater theorization.

On March 17 2003, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, Sergio Vieira de Mello, addressing the 59th Session of the UN Commission on Human Rights in Geneva, said:

The culture of human rights must be a popular culture if it is to have the strength to withstand the blows that will inevitably come. Human rights culture must be a popular culture if it is to be able to innovate and to be truly owned at the national and subnational levels.
Vieira de Mello thus acknowledges the gap between the grand rhetoric of human rights deployed at the global level, and everyday struggles for justice; and he recognizes the power of human rights in local contexts and within local cultures. Furthermore, he sees the potential for embedded human rights and anticipates the realization of a popular culture of human rights through education:

‘Education’ is the word we use to describe this process, and it deserves more attention. We must work harder at communicating the human rights story through all available means, not least electronic media. Security will be enhanced as we fill in the lacunae of ignorance, empower the dispossessed and enable them to recognize and claim their rights. (Vieira de Mello, 2003)

The importance of human rights education has been acknowledged both by researchers addressing civic education and by the international community. In reviewing civic education research to determine principles appropriate to a global age, Banks et al. (2005) conclude that human rights should underpin such education. They provide us with a set of principles that helps promote dialogue across difference (Osler, 2016), something that, in a classroom, “can help ensure that all voices are recognized and all points of view are considered” (Banks et al., 2005, p. 12).

In 2011 the international community formally recognized the importance of HRE when the UN General Assembly adopted its Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training. The Declaration offers the following definition of HRE:

Human rights education and training comprises all educational, training, information, awareness-raising and learning activities aimed at promoting universal respect for and observance of all human rights and fundamental freedoms and thus contributing, inter alia, to the prevention of human rights violations and abuses by providing persons with knowledge, skills and understanding and developing their attitudes and behaviors, to empower them to contribute to the building and promotion of a universal culture of human rights. (OHCHR, 2011, article 2)

The Declaration distinguishes between education about rights, that is, knowledge of human rights principles, values and protection mechanisms; education through rights, including learning and teaching in ways that respect the rights of educators and learners; and education for rights, which focuses on empowering learners to exercise their rights and respect and uphold those of others. Although this definition is open to critique, it useful in assisting in the categorization of existing research and practice and in analyzing how previous human rights-based research has addressed education about, through and for rights (Osler, 2015).
Here, I explore the possibilities offered by combining Black feminist and postcolonial theory with human rights concepts in order to provide a framework for the analysis and enabling of social justice in and through education. I consider in particular intersectionality theory, the concept of recognition, and the ‘right to narrate’ (Bhabha, 2003). I argue that the use of narratives can help bridge the rights gap between a utopian human rights vision and learners’ actual experiences.

In teaching for human rights, a key starting point is an acknowledgement of multiple axes of differentiation – including economic, political, cultural and experiential. It is important to recognize the complexity of subsequent human experiences and societal developments, rather than reducing or artificially separating these dimensions. The concept of intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1982), which signifies the complex interweaving of strands of social life, enables us to better interpret the complex ways learners experience justice/injustice and equality/inequality. Avtar Brah and Ann Phoenix understand intersectionality as:

signifying the complex, irreducible, varied, and variable effects which ensue when multiple axis of differentiation – economic, political, cultural, psychic, subjective and experiential – intersect in historically specific contexts. The concept emphasizes that different dimensions of social life cannot be separated out into discrete and pure strands. (2004: 76, my emphasis)

Intersectionality theory complements human rights-based approaches to justice since it gives emphasis to the whole person and addresses the stratification and differentiation within society undermining social justice. It also supports human rights-based initiatives in its concern with social change and social action.

While human rights acknowledge the whole person, the human rights framework does not necessarily invite consideration of how various elements of human identity interact and interweave. Intersectionality encourages consideration of complexity, and helps avoid simplistic analyses of injustice. So, for example, a basic rights-based approach may require an individual to select a particular characteristic, say gender, as the basis of discrimination, over other factors, such as religion, ethnicity or nationality. Intersectionality theory recognizes that it may be impossible to claim that person X is experiencing discrimination simply because she is a woman, and that the category ‘women’ is in fact differentiated. The cause of an individual being disadvantaged in a particular context and at a particular time is the result of a complex combination of factors. Take, for example, the case of an Arab Muslim woman living in a European city, holding EU citizenship but not recognized as a citizen. Her gender, her ethnicity, her religion, and her perceived nationality are not just layered on top of each other but all come into play in a complex way to deny her rights in the specific economic context and prevailing political climate of city Y. The ways her identity and her opportunities are
perceived by fellow citizens, including pro-feminists, may impact negatively on the range of options open to her.

A key concept within human rights is that of universality. Rights belong to all human beings and are derived both from our shared humanity and from human struggle. Although the concept of cosmopolitanism and understandings of the universal have been very influential in early 21st century scholarly discourses relating to multicultural, international and human rights education, it has been argued that, in practice, the Enlightenment principles which inform the modern human rights project have sometimes functioned to standardize culture though education at the expense of cultural difference (Foucault, 1995; Popkewitz, 2007). To understand the concept of universality within human rights, it is important to look closely at human rights instruments and their specific provisions, as they relate to culture.

The 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) proclaims human rights as “a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations” and calls for their “their universal and effective recognition and observance” (UN, 1948, preamble). Article 18 confirms that “Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief” thereby acknowledging that religion, an aspect of culture, should not be seen from the standpoint of an individual’s conscience, as something immutable or fixed. Article 27 states that “Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community” (my emphasis) again implying individual choice, but other than this there is nothing specifically about how rights are applied in different cultural settings. Article 26, which addresses education, does not specifically mention culture, although it does acknowledge parents’ right to “choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children”, subject to the general restriction that any right should not be interpreted as implying any activity “aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms” in the UDHR (UN, 1948, article 30).

Schooling, a key means of reinforcing (or potentially negating) culture, is therefore something over which parents are entitled a direct say, according to the human rights framework. Nevertheless, parents are not free to choose a form of education that would deny children their other rights or violate the general principles of justice and equality. Thus, the UDHR does not itself suggest standardization of culture. There is a claim about the universal nature of rights, and of universal principles, but the implementation of these rights takes place within a specific cultural context. Rights need to be applied within a cultural context, but the broad human rights principles of justice and equality should prevail. Culture (as a constantly evolving set of practices) does not trump these general principles. Thus, all members of any cultural community are subject to the principle of non-discrimination, and to the principle of equality of dignity.

Mainstream and powerful interest groups generally have few concerns about the homogenizing or standardizing impact of education on culture, but minorities do. By
its very nature, culture is not fixed, but fluid and subject to change (Appiah, 2007). Although cultural artifacts may require special protection and preservation, living, evolving cultural practices generally do not. Nevertheless, minorities and indigenous people in particular remain vulnerable today to the denial, expropriation and reduction of their cultures, just as in the past they were vulnerable to the very denial of their humanity. In recognition of this vulnerability, and in response to the struggles of minorities for recognition, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (UN, 1966) accords special cultural protection for minorities under its Article 27.

Some feminist and postcolonialist scholars have also challenged the notion of the universal by seeking to illustrate how discourses promoted by the powerful often serve to regulate the knowledge and values of the colonized (Mohanty, 1984; Spivak, 1999). These critiques remind us of asymmetrical power relations which need to be considered in any analysis and in curricula addressing human rights, cultural diversity, and justice. There is the risk that if rights and principles are applied without dialogue and without consideration of people’s specific social contexts, then human rights, which are designed to be liberating, can become part of a hegemonic discourse, used instead to control.

Asymmetrical power relations need to be explored in contexts where learners may be encountering real difficulties in securing their rights, and where their experiences lead them to identify a considerable gap between human rights rhetoric and everyday realities. Power relations also need to be examined in contexts where legal mechanisms for the protection of rights are generally strong, and mainstream populations may have few concerns about their rights. When educating the more privileged, a hegemonic discourse of rights may serve to mask genuine human rights violations among the least powerful members of the same communities, neighborhoods and nation.

A further key human rights concept is that of recognition. The UDHR opens with the concept of recognition: “recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family” (UN, 1948, preamble). The concept of recognition of equal and inherent dignity and equal and inalienable rights is fundamental to the human rights project. Article 6 states that “Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law” and Article 7 affirms this equal recognition extends to equality before the law and protection under the law against discrimination. Yet legal recognition is, I would argue, insufficient in human rights advocacy and human rights education.

According to Bhabha (2003, 2004) and Butler (2006), a postmodern ethics permits us to address the power struggles and asymmetrical power relations in which histories and identities are given recognition. The modern human rights project and legal framework grew out of a period of war and atrocities characterized by processes of dehumanization. Recognition of equal human dignity is, as we have seen, essential to that project. Butler’s analysis is in keeping with this: her starting point is that violence stems from processes of dehumanization and lack of recognition.
Schaffer and Smith (2004) also illustrate the centrality of the ethics of recognition and the importance of narrative in strengthening human rights. They acknowledge and explore the real risks of narrative when vulnerable individuals and groups challenge entrenched power imbalances, but they insist that narratives, by drawing on specific localities and differing cultures and traditions of moral understanding, can and do shape and refine the language of rights. Todd (2007) discusses the challenges of ambiguity and contradiction between the ideals expressed in human rights standards and the reality of learners’ lives. She argues that we need a “theoretical framework that faces directly the difficulties of living in a dissonant world” (2009: 213). She suggests that without it human rights education, which is intended to promote justice, may in fact undermine this same purpose.

Nussbaum (2006) draws on the concept of narrative to illustrate how her human capabilities model might be applied in education. Arguing that a neglect of the humanities and arts in education is dangerous for democracy's future, she focuses on the capabilities of critical thinking, ‘world citizenship’ (what Osler and Starkey (2005) refer to as ‘education for cosmopolitan citizenship’), and imaginative understanding. Through schooling:

Young citizens [...] learn to ask questions or not to ask them; to take what they hear at face value or to probe more deeply; to imagine the situation of a person different from themselves or to see a new person as a mere threat to their own projects; to think of themselves as members of an homogenous group or as members of a nation, and a world, made up of many people and groups, all of whom deserve respect and understanding. (Nussbaum, 2006: 387)

Processes of learning that empower students to ask questions and probe texts, that allow them the chance to develop the imagination, that encourage them to identify with and express solidarity across boundaries, and that lead them to recognize themselves as fellow citizens in a cosmopolitan nation and in a wider global community, are key within human rights education. Nussbaum draws on the ideas and stories of Rabindranath Tagore to argue and illustrate how the ‘narrative imagination’ is central to realizing such learning outcomes. Bhabha (2003) likewise emphasizes the importance of ‘the right to narrate’ in offering some pointers to those wishing to decolonize curricula and education policy, a means to allow learners their own places and own identities within an inclusive collective history:

To protect the ‘right to narrate’ is to protect a range of democratic imperatives: it assumes there is an equitable access to those institutions – schools, universities, museums, libraries, theatres – that give you a sense of a collective history and the means to turn those materials into a narrative of your own. (2003: 180-181)
The recognition that Bhabha proposes is one that humanizes, rather than dehumanizes. The form of education or curriculum which might follow from this must necessarily include opportunities to explore and reflect on various identities and cultural attributes; and create personal narratives and processes of self-learning. Effectively, learners need opportunities to investigate and challenge official narratives or one-sided textbook accounts (Osler and Starkey, 2010; Osler and Zhu, 2011), as well as other exclusive (and excluding) narratives (Adami, 2014). They need to develop new collective narratives through which they can together make sense of the world (Delanty, 2003; Osler, 2011b). The potential of combining Black feminist and postcolonial theory and human rights frameworks for the analysis and enabling of social justice in and through education are elaborated further in Osler (2016).

Civic Education for Action

The AACU advocates a civic education for action (CLDE, 2012). Along similar lines, this chapter argues that civic education at various scales – from the local to the global (‘education for cosmopolitan citizenship’) – needs to be founded in human rights; it needs to be adequately theorized so as to enable social justice; and should enable students to acquire long-lasting skills and dispositions for the strengthening of democracy.

Effective civic education also implies a form of learning that engages with students’ own identities and prior experiences, extending both of these in the process. Osler and Starkey (2005) have characterized citizenship as a status, a feeling and a practice. The status of a citizen is generally related to nationality, and is an either/or status. Nationality is important, for it guarantees certain basic rights; for example, it entitles the individual to a passport, which gives her the right to enter and leave the country. This status, however, is also a means of excluding the other, and is often taken for granted by those who have it. But there is another inclusive status: all persons are holders of human rights. In a learning community such as a school or university, not all learners will be citizens of the country in which they study, and not all will aspire to citizenship status. This is another reason why civic education should be underpinned by human rights, so as to ensure inclusivity.

But citizenship is also a feeling, a sense of belonging. This feeling may be linked to status, but it is also related to wider questions of security and inclusion, to guarantees about political, social, economic and social rights, and to assurances of non-discrimination. Citizenship implies recognition of an individual’s identity. For these reasons, civic or citizenship education needs to address both status and feeling.

Finally citizenship is a practice. It is the engagement of the individual in “acts of citizenship” (Isin and Neilsen, 2008). The practice of citizenship does not depend on either status or feeling, although someone who holds citizenship status and who feels
included may be more likely to engage in the practice of citizenship. Yet those without status and those who experience exclusion often struggle for recognition and for rights, and such struggles are usually collective, with people working together for justice. Such struggles involve many acts of citizenship.

Education for cosmopolitan citizenship needs to engage with learners as holders of human rights (status); to support them in achieving a sense of belonging (feeling); and to equip them with skills for action (practice) so that they can make a difference. Effective civic education is learning which engages with all three aspects of citizenship — status, feeling and practice. In this way, students’ rights are respected, their identities recognized, and their understanding of our interconnections, at all scales from the local to the global, are extended. In turn, these features of a civic education program all imply participatory, student-centered pedagogies, and an interdisciplinary endeavor founded in human rights and real struggles for justice.
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In 2006, the Spanish parliament approved the Education Act 2/2006, which introduced “Education for Citizenship and Human Rights”, in line with Recommendation CM/Rec(2010)7 (Council of Europe, 2010). The law incorporated social and civic competences for all within compulsory education. Subsequently, an assault on the course by the of the Catholic Church hierarchy, the Popular Party, and right wing media, led to a campaign for its removal. Although the Spanish Supreme court ruled the programme legal and legitimate, following the 2011 elections in which the Popular Party came into government, the HRE/EDC proposals were suppressed by an education reform law, despite a European-wide campaign (Fundación Cives, 2013). In 2000 citizenship education (CE) was introduced into schools in England with cross-party support. Following the election of a Conservative – led coalition government in 2010, CE was no longer prioritised and became effective only in schools committed to it.
The goal of this chapter is to propose a comprehensive framework to compare the aims, focuses, and effects of global citizenship education (GCE) programs. This kind of framework is necessary to integrate multiple perspectives into the objectives of these programs (Banks, 2007). There is no common understanding of GCE goals (Johnson & Morris, 2010, p. 79; Peters, Britton & Blee, 2007; Davies, 2006) or even ‘what global citizenship is’. Correspondingly, educational practices in this domain are diverse and fragmented (Mannion, Biesta, Priestley & Ross, 2011, p. 444). Multiple programs use GCE as an umbrella term to describe themselves, but their content and focus differ widely depending on the agenda, perspective and tradition in which these programs are rooted. Their focus can stretch from teaching intercultural competence (Hunter et al., 2006; Pedersen, 2010) or world geography (Beneker, Stalborth & Vaart, 2009), through developmental education (Bryan, 2012), to school programs promoting sustainability and conservation (Kerr, 2003). Without a comprehensive framework, it is hard to compare these programs directly. Such a framework would enable comparison by making it possible to determine which aspects of global citizenship are addressed, and which are not addressed by any new GCE program or any program developed within one of the older paradigms and rebranded as GCE. Such a framework may also serve as a tool for creators of GCE programs in allowing them to make a deliberate choice regarding a focus of the program, making them aware not only of which aspects of GC they choose to cover, but also of those they decide not to cover. Currently, this choice is most often made indirectly through a choice of one of the paradigms.

In order to propose such a framework, the authors first review current educational paradigms contributing to GCE searching for common elements that are central for the global citizenship perspective in education. Based on this review, we will then propose criteria regarding the aims of GCE that will cover common elements of the reviewed paradigms. These criteria will also make it possible to distinguish core GCE aims from other educational goals, often present in programs related to GCE but which are unique to a specific perspective or educational tradition.

The formulation of the definition will be followed by an analysis of implications of behavioral science and social psychological theory for the recognized aims of global
Global Citizenship Education Paradigms

Mannion et al. (2011) distinguish three preexisting types of education, each with their own history, literature, and discourse, which are now united under the umbrella of global citizenship education: civic education (CE), environmental education (EE) and developmental education (DE). They also acknowledge that within each of these three main types, there are subtypes as well as cross-types between them, e.g. education for sustainability or education for sustainable development, peace education, global education, multicultural education, human rights education, education for democratic citizenship and international education (for an overview, see: Bajaj, 2011; Mannion, 2015, in this volume). Besides these three paradigms there may also be programs not necessarily falling under one of them but nevertheless addressing competences clearly related to global citizenship, for example intercultural competency (Deakin-Crick, 2008, p. 55).

Civic Education

The first type of education preceding GCE is citizenship or civic education (CE) (Mannion et. al, 2011). Western democracies face growing difficulties related to the weakening of civic engagement (Putnam, 1995), the breakup of social and family ties (Naval & Jover, 2006), globalization, multiculturalism and migration among other issues. Especially in the context of weakening state power (Weiss, 2000), promoting active citizenship can be seen as a partial remedy to some of the arising problems (Print & Lange, 2013; Kisby & Sloam, 2009; Banks, 2007). The understanding of citizenship, as fulfilling the
obligations that individuals have towards their society, can be traced all the way back to the ancient idea of virtuous citizens fulfilling their duties to their Greek polis by actively participating in democratic governance (Aristotle & Carnes, 1984). According to this view, the education system’s role is to prepare children to actively participate in their society (e.g. Winter, Schillemans & Janssens, 2006). Consequently, although the school is not the only element of social environment that collaborates in the development of an active citizen, civic education in schools has received particular interest from many governments.

Currently, civic education and related topics such as moral, democratic or social education are considered to be essential components of a curriculum. Civic education has been introduced in nearly all school systems of European countries (Eurydice, 2005), but also in the USA, Canada and Australia (Print & Gray, 2000). What should be the content of CE differs between countries and may even be different within the same country, as the stance on what constitutes appropriate citizenship differs (Hahn, 1999, p. 233; Veugelers, 2007). However, there seems to be an agreement that the aim of citizenship education is to prepare individuals for their social ‘functioning’ in a way that benefits society. In the Netherlands, for instance, CE was made mandatory in 2006. The Dutch law states that the primary and secondary education should aim to stimulate active citizenship and social integration. This entails giving pupils the opportunity to gain knowledge about and come into contact with the different backgrounds and cultures of their peers, and to acknowledge that they grow up in a heterogeneous society (i.e., a society with different cultures and religions) (Inspectie van Onderwijs, 2006).

At the same time, the Dutch approach to CE leaves a great deal of freedom for schools to decide upon what aspects they place emphasis. Schools have to focus on two out of four topics: social skills, the multicultural society, the school as a practice ground for democracy, and the basic values of Dutch society. A notable element of these regulations is that its primary goal is give students competences to function in their national society, while a global note in the form of a multicultural aspect is only instrumental to that end, and limited to cultures present in the domestic society (Oomen, 2013). This forms a clear illustration of the difference between traditional CE and GCE. Functioning in a multicultural environment can be also addressed by programs grouped under the heading ‘cross-cultural competency education’ (CCC). Knowledge, skills and attitudes disseminated by CCC programs may overlap with the ones of GCE or CE, but they differ in their primary goal. CCC programs often focus on preparing professionals who will be able to work effectively in a multicultural environment, for instance medical personnel (Betancourt, Green & Carrillo, 2003), teachers (McAllister & Irvine, 2000) or businessmen (Johnson, Lenartowicz & Apud, 2006; Magala, 2005). Because CCC programs are mostly focused on job demands, resolving problems related to the multicultural nature of the community outside of a professional area may not be within their goals.
Environmental Education

The second type of education referred to as a global citizenship education is environmental education (EE). It gradually evolved from the study of nature through conservation education into a more politically oriented education on sustainable development (Reid, Scott & Gough, 2002; Palmer, 2002). The global dimension of ecological education can best be summarized with the popular slogan ‘think globally, act locally’. This is also supposed to make salient the so-called ‘Netherlands fallacy’, which refers to the flawed assumption that the countries’ impact on the environment is contained within their own national borders (Ehrlich & Ehrlich, 1990). The fallacy applies to any country that takes into consideration consequences of their action only on their own soil, but at the same time ignores global interconnectedness. The prominent presence of global warming dilemmas in the public debate illustrates a growing awareness of the ‘Netherlands fallacy’. Stakeholders, for instance, have begun to realize that penalizing greenhouse gases emissions in one country just moves the sources of emission elsewhere, as it was in the case of Amsterdam Schiphol airport (Gordijn & Kolkman, 2011).

Developmental Education

The third traditional type of education is developmental education (DE). DE is mostly concerned with issues of global justice, making it the most politicized and activist of the three domains. As a consequence, this type of education remained on the margins of official educational policy in the past, and was promoted mostly by NGOs (Mannion et al., 2011; Marshall, 2005). In early 2000, DE received substantial state support in some countries. An example is the Netherlands, where the Ministry of Foreign Affairs supported DE through its subsidy agencies SBOS (Subsidiefaciliteit voor Burgerschap en Ontwikkelingssamenwerking/Subsidies for citizenry and development work) and NCDO (Nationale Commissie voor Internationale Samenwerking en Duurzame Ontwikkeling/National commission for international cooperation and renewable development). The goals of the NCDO are a good illustration of the aim of DE, explicitly tied to articles 24-26 of the Human Rights Declaration:

NCDO works on citizenship that does not stop at national borders: global citizenship. It works from the conviction that a sustainable and just world is everyone’s responsibility and that everyone can contribute by donating, by consuming responsibly, by saving energy, by voting on coherent policy or by being active in politics to tackle poverty and underdevelopment as a professional or private person. Everyone has the right to adequate and healthy food, to health, to education, clean
The sense of global solidarity is essential for a world [...] based on equality. (NCDO, 2013)

The state-supported shift towards GCE in the Netherlands, closely matches the rationale behind the official policy discourse about the global curriculum in UK education, which was discussed by Mannion et al. (2011). From the governmental perspective, GCE is an educational response by developed countries to the presumed ‘fact’ of an arising global world economy and society, and threats related to it. International solidarity is to a large degree considered to be a means to protect one’s local society from these threats. In addition, countries like the UK and the Netherlands see themselves as leaders in the process of solving global issues. This perspective can be illustrated by another passage from the NCDO mission statement:

We live in a time of rapid shifts. Advancing globalization makes our life closely interwoven with that of other parts of the world. This applies in the field of safety, climate, financial stability, migration, energy, and food security. Traditional development and foreign policy are no longer adequate tools to fulfill our international responsibility. (NCDO, 2013)

Critical Global Citizenship Education

An alternative approach to DE, which has been advocated by scholars who position themselves outside of a Western cultural tradition, is referred to as critical global citizenship (CGC), taking a so-called decolonial or postcolonial position as a point of departure (Andreotti, 2007, p. 77). This approach criticizes traditional DE education for attributing global inequality to a “lack of ‘development’, education, resources, skills, culture and technology” on the side of the ‘underprivileged’ rather than to “complex structures, systems, assumptions, power relations and attitudes that create and maintain exploitation and enforced disempowerment”, for not trying to eliminate differences rooted in the colonial history, and for ignoring the asymmetrical nature of power relations and globalization between the global North and South (Andreotti, 2006, p. 97). As a result, potential dialogue is replaced by universalism, assuming the Western perspective to be the only one. In this perspective, victims of social injustice are considered to be uncivilized, whereby the goal of development would be the assimilation of non-Western cultures into the Western (global) culture. In this reading, actions taken with the intention of reducing inequalities may reinforce colonial assumptions and hegemonic power relations.
To resolve this issue, Andreotti (2011) redefined the goals of DE. Instead of enabling individuals to contribute to the improvement of the present conditions in the world, CGC education should strive to “empower individuals to reflect critically on the legacies and processes of their cultures and contexts, to imagine different futures and to take responsibility for their decisions and actions” (2006, p. 97), while at the same time not promoting absolute relativism.

Limitations of Preexisting Paradigms

Traditional CE is both narrower and wider than GCE. CE may focus on citizen duties to the individual's own country, but ignore the interests of a broader global society. The exclusive nature of citizenship is already present in the ancient roots of the concept of a citizen which applied only to free Athenians, excluding slaves and women: as such, the majority of inhabitants of a region were not considered to be citizens. This exclusive understanding of citizenship could also be a source of contestation of the term ‘global citizen’ (Byers, 2005). CE is broader than GCE as CE often covers detailed knowledge of one’s local political system and teaches specific skills needed to participate in it (Galston, 2001, p. 219). The competency understanding of CE has been criticized for instance by Andrzejewski and Alessio (1999, p. 1) for focusing on breeding complacency and teaching rituals – namely: “obeying the laws, paying the taxes and saluting the flag” – instead of promoting a sense of social responsibility. They suggested GCE should overcome this issue. Similar objections have been raised by Andreotti (2007) regarding traditional developmental education. According to her, DE assumes that a Western perspective works towards sustaining the status quo.

Although this critique of traditional DE has many merits, there are several reasons why the alternative approach cannot be seen as a valid or a complete recipe for GCE. Andreotti (2006) acknowledges these reasons herself. Firstly, she recognizes that a critical reflection on and perception of the complexity of issues without reaching a resolution might lead to a feeling of helplessness, internal conflict, paralysis, and critical disengagement, instead of motivating people to work towards overcoming the issue. Secondly, there are no standard working solutions to implement this kind of transformative education. Furthermore, it requires very unique teachers (Andreotti, 2011). In addition, the approach itself is rooted in a specific perspective that is not necessarily valid outside of the context in which it was developed. For instance, the world is bigger than the few Western European former colonial empires and their former colonies that are at the center of her perspective, and even in these countries many school children do not originate from the country’s culture or are of mixed cultural origin.

Another point of critique to add is that promoting the attribution of inequalities to a historical colonial context may create a sense of responsibility among individuals
originating from former colonial empires. However, it can do little good or even harm people from cultures outside of the colonial ‘exchange’. What may be even more important is that it can have negative consequences for the ‘victims’ of colonial exploitation, as it provides external attribution for their misfortune, and may reduce their motivation to act to improve their own situation, as well as breed animosity towards ‘Whites’, labeling them as colonialists to whom the blame for their misfortune can be attributed. Lastly, the approach of critical global citizenship contains many idealistic assumptions. For instance, it supposes that at some point all individuals would be able to engage, and remain engaged in critical reflection concerning their own position and other’s perspectives. Furthermore, it assumes that critical reflection would motivate people to engage in dialogue on equal terms with ‘others’, which is unrealistic from a psychological point of view. This is due to the fact that the construction of ‘others’ as ‘others’ – onto which one projects what one considers to be highly desirable but cannot find in oneself, as much as one does not want to see in oneself – fulfills important psychological functions in the construction of a self (Kilomba, 2010). In general, a critical look at the implementation of programs developed within earlier paradigms reveals that they often fail to provide the support for actual education promoting global citizenship (e.g., Andrzejewski & Alessio, 1999).

Integrating the Approaches

Preexisting paradigms related to GCE overlap to some degree, but each of them also has its own unique elements. None of the preexisting paradigms includes all the aspects of global citizenship included in all other paradigms. This indicates that there is a need for a unified GCE framework. With large variations and diversity among different conceptualizations and theoretical departure points of GCE (Davies, 2006; Peters, Britton & Blee, 2007), GCE still must become more than just an umbrella term and convenient catch-all phrase facilitating the acquisition of resources for programs related to each of the traditional types of education.

What are the commonalities among the paradigms gathered under the GCE heading? If one considers some of the definitions related to GCE, it is clear that all these definitions, and all the types of education mentioned above, involve evoking a sense of social responsibility, which will be followed by active engagement – even if the educational practice fails to reach this goal. In the case of programs focusing on the global type of citizenship, this responsibility extends beyond one’s social group. For instance, Dower (2002) defines a global citizen as somebody who accepts that she or he has obligations in principle towards people in any part of the world: for instance, to help alleviate poverty; work for international peace; support organizations trying to stop human rights violations; or play one’s part in reducing global warming (p. 146).
NCDO uses the following description of the global dimension of citizenship: “The global dimension of citizenship is manifested in behavior that does justice to the principles of mutual dependency in the world, the equality of human beings and the shared responsibility for solving global issues” (NCDO, 2012, p. 30). Global citizens or “globally minded citizens” (Hanson, 2010, p. 76) “view the world and its inhabitants as interdependent and work to develop the capacity to act, to advance both their own enlightened self-interest and the interest of people elsewhere in the world, by understanding the interconnection of all living things” (Appiah-Padi, 2001). A literature review by Morais and Ogden (2010) also indicates that social responsibility, (global civic) engagement and global competence form three overarching dimensions of global citizenship consistently noted in the literature.

Representatives of the critical perspective on GC challenge the notion of competence seeing it as a static attribute and identifying it with specific skills and knowledge promoted by the establishment, and instead define citizenship as an ongoing practice (Mannion et al., 2011, p. 453). The critique often stems from a semantic difference of the term ‘competency’. Critical authors interpret the term ‘competency’ narrowly, as a synonym for a specific set of skills. We define ‘competency’ as readiness to act, which according to the knowledge, skills and attitudes (KAS) model is a combination of these three elements (Bloom et al., 1956). Scholars advocating for the critical perspective propose replacing competence with critical reflection (Mannion et al., 2011, p. 453; Andreotti, 2007; Vougelar, 2007; Veugelers & Vedder, 2003). In fact, critical reflection requires a certain competence as well, which suggests that critical reflection has to be considered as a form of behavior in a broad sense. However, it is important to point out that the ability to reflect critically is not the ultimate goal of GCE. Critical reflection is instrumental and explicitly or implicitly expected to lead to a certain behavior. Therefore, the difference between critical and standard GCE rests not on the final goal but in the means: traditional (G)CE may aim to promote a certain behavior believed by program creators to be appropriate for a (global) citizen, critical citizenship promotes reflection in the hope that as a result individuals will be able to find ways to act in order to address issues rather than do what they were told by the designers of the program. However, the ultimate goal of GCE remains the same. They all strive to prepare students to actively contribute to our future society. Global Citizenship remains a framework for action (Davies, 2006).

Based on the above analysis on commonalities and following two premises, we would like to propose a definition for a GCE program that could be used to distinguish GCE programs and GCE perspectives within programs from similar approaches.
**Premises**

1. Citizenship education is to prepare its students to participate actively in society by accepting not only rights, but also certain responsibilities to society and the environment, even if they do not have formal roles (Greenberg et al., 2003).

2. Globalization is characterized by the existence of ‘the global’: cultural, environmental, political, and economic interconnections and flows (Steger, 2009; WHO, 2014). Taking this broader context into account is what differentiates global and ‘not global’ citizenship programs.

**Definition**

A global citizenship program is a program aiming to prepare students to actively face the challenges of a global society in a way that benefits global society. It promotes at least one competence needed to address at least one global challenge.¹

There are at least three important implications entailed by the aim of GCE described by this definition.

Firstly, since the core of global citizenship education as we defined it is creating a potential to act, theories explaining engagement in behavior and reasoned action can be applied to it. This includes but is not limited to: Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) (Bandura, 1999), value expectancy theory (Bernoulli, 1738/1954; Neumann & Morgenstern, 1947), theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991), self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1986), and bystander effect model (Latané & Darley, 1968). The theory of planned behavior explains the link between beliefs and behavior. An individual’s behavioral intentions are shaped by one’s attitudes and subjective norms, but eventually actions are also shaped by perceived behavioral control to cover non-volitional behaviors, so that one’s behavioral intention and one’s actual behavior can be predicted. This component of ‘perceived behavioral control’ finds its origin in Bandura’s (1977) self-efficacy theory. Self-efficacy is defined as the conviction that one can successfully execute the behavior required to produce a particular outcome. This is considered to be the most important precondition for behavioral change, since it determines the initiation of behavior.

Secondly, there are already numerous controversies about appropriate solutions to contemporary global issues. Since the core of global citizenship education is to increase people’s abilities to tackle challenges of the future that are yet unknown,

---

¹ Some authors interpret ‘competency’ narrowly, as a synonym of a skill (e.g., Andrzejewski and Alessio, 1999). Here ‘competency’ is defined as a readiness to act, which according to KAS model is a combination of knowledge, skills and attitudes.
GCE aimed at providing students with ready-made solutions may be questionable. Promoting a *desire to find solutions* may be of higher value than teaching currently needed practical skills or knowledge. Building a capacity to reflect on societal problems and trying to find solutions must be a crucial aspect of GCE. *Promoting critical reflection* (Andreotti, 2006; Dam & Volman, 2004; Veugelers, 2007) may be a step in this direction, but it must be accompanied by a sense of self-competence if it is going to lead to an action (Bandura, 1977).

Thirdly, implication is a consequence of the uniqueness of GCE in respect to the beneficiaries of behavior and acts that GCE aims to stimulate. The global citizen’s activity should be beneficial not only for oneself or one’s in-group (as it is the case of republican citizenship (Dagger, 2002), but it should also benefit the social environment beyond one’s in-group. An individual should not only be concerned about her- or himself and his or her kin, but also about wider humanity (Pogge, 2008). This is not an easy goal. The assumption that just reflecting on global injustices will evoke motivation strong enough to stimulate individuals to act is unrealistic (Dobson, 2006). From the kin selection evolutionary perspective (Hamilton, 1964), the more distant ‘the other’ is to ‘us’, the less evolutionarily beneficial helping her or him is.

To reach the goal of inducing an extension of an individual’s sense of social responsibility beyond one’s social group, a successful GCE program must aim to overcome an innate preference to help ‘similar others’ or in-group members. The classical stream of research on helping behavior and liking has confirmed that individuals are more willing to act for the benefit of (e.g., Levine, Prosser, Evans & Reicher, 2005; Stürmer, Snyder, Kropp & Siem, 2006) and collaborate with (e.g., Krupp, Debruine & Barclay, 2008) others whom they perceive as similar to themselves; similarities do not only refer to physical appearances but also to socially constructed identity issues. Therefore, a successful GCE program should allow realizing similarities between oneself and people from distant cultures. It has to provide opportunities for participants to learn to redefine the ‘us’ to include members of different ‘foreign’ cultures. In this light, programs teaching about differences in perspectives between ethnic and social groups or exotic features of other cultures, may have exactly the opposite effect to the intended. In addition, focusing on commonalities among out-group members may facilitate seeing them as a homogenous construct consisting of uniform stereotypical members (Quattrone & Jones, 1980; Rubin & Badea, 2007).

GCE programs should rather stress similarities between groups and acknowledge individual differences between members of out-groups. Acknowledging that differences in perspectives between individual members of the same ethnic or cultural group are likely to be bigger than between groups could help to break down the homogenous view of the out-group as being different from ‘us’. Developing a rich knowledge about ‘the others’ can help seeing them as individuals in a personalized way that can potentially allow for decategorization of out-group members and help to reduce the effect of in-
group favoritism (Brewer, 1996). Extensive knowledge of the diversity among different group members and similarities between oneself and them increases the capacity to see ‘them’ as ‘us’, which in turn is a confirmed determinant of helping behavior (Levine, Prosser, Evans & Reicher, 2005).

**Action Model of Global Citizenship**

To establish what may be done to stimulate individuals to act as global citizens, taking active responsibility also for the wellbeing of more remote ‘others’, it is useful to draw on the Helping Behavior Model (Darley & Latané, 1968). This model places the focus onto the circumstances under which individuals are willing to engage in behavior benefiting outsiders. This theory was developed to establish the factors explaining whether a bystander will lend help to an unknown person in need, and it explains the phenomenon that the probability of help is inversely related to the number of bystanders (Slovic, 2007). According to this theory factors like ambiguity, cohesiveness and diffusion of responsibility play an important role. We will attempt to translate this theory into the context of GCE. Latané and Darley’s (1968) original model outlined a model of five processes that determine whether a bystander will engage in helping behavior: noticing the event; interpreting it as an emergency; assuming responsibility; determining if one has the means to help; and considering the cost.

The first two processes, (a) to notice the event, and (b) to interpret it as an emergency, translate into a global context as global awareness. The primary condition for one to deliberately engage in solving global issue is to acknowledge its existence and interpret it through a global citizenship ‘lens’ as an emergency within the global community. In other words: recognize that there is a problem that requires an intervention. This stage can be identified as ‘knowledge’ according to the classical Bloom’s taxonomy.

The third process, assuming responsibility, corresponds to the attitude component of civic competence (Bloom et al., 1956; ten Dam et al., 2011) and the motivational function of GCE. In order to become actively engaged, one has to assume responsibility for resolving an issue. Some scholars suggest that gaining awareness of unjust deprivation of out-group members by advantaged group members is enough for them to experience guilt or moral outrage (e.g., Horn & Fry, 2012), which will in turn push the advantaged to take action to mitigate the issue. What is threatening is not so much the idea that their own countries have more than they should, but that poor countries have less than they should (Chow, Lowery & Knowles, 2008).

However, this assumption can be rejected by taking into account the evidence from the aforementioned in-group favoritism effect (Brewer, 1996), bystander effect research, diffusion of responsibility, blame attribution or moral disengagement
People are well equipped to avoid taking responsibility: the bystander effect and diffusion of responsibility research show that the more people share responsibility, the less responsibility is experienced by each individual (Darley & Latané, 1968). The motivation to help resolve the issue can be diminished even further if blame can be shifted to another group, for instance politicians, corporations or governments (Bandura, 1999). The most self-serving and therefore tempting choice of scapegoat is the victim, as we are prone to hate our victims (Aronson, 2004). According to research related to the theory of ‘just world fallacy’, blaming the poor for their poverty not only allows a person to avoid the feeling of guilt, but it also allows her or him to maintain a sense of self security by maintaining the illusion that bad things do not happen to good people (Harper & Manasse, 1992).

Finally, blaming the victim also works on the second process. Since the misfortune is a deserved punishment for the victim the issue is resolved: there is no need to stop or prevent it. In this context, providing knowledge about the etymology of global issues and the victims is crucial for GCE. Knowledge of the situational causes of the misfortune or injustice prevents attributing the responsibility for the suffering to the victim. Besides the ways described earlier of encouraging individuals to feel responsible for remote others, GCE may seek to evoke a sense of interdependence (Dobson, 2006). Positive interdependence has been shown to affect one’s motivation to act in the interest of an out-group member (Brewer, 1996). In a nutshell: GCE programs can strive to stimulate a sense of social responsibility that extends beyond the borders of one’s in-group. This can be achieved by challenging stereotypes and the decategorization of out-groups, stressing intra-group similarities, preventing blaming the victims for their misfortunes, and understanding global interdependence.

In the fourth process of the bystander model, one must determine if one has the means to do what is needed to provide help. This stage is synonymous with the skills component of competence (Bloom et al., 1956; ten Dam et al., 2011). Several theories agree that before behavior is produced, one needs to have a sense of competence (Ajzen, 1991; Bandura, 1986; Darley & Latané, 1968). In other words: if one does not know what to do, or is convinced that one’s effort is pointless, it is unlikely that one will act. Bandura (1977) expressed it by including the concept of behavioral capability as a pivotal part of his social cognitive theory. According to this theory, in order to act an individual must believe that he or she knows what to do and is able to do it. Two expectations influence behavior: self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations. Self-efficacy refers to the conviction that one has the ability and skills to perform the act. Outcome expectations are the belief that a behavior will produce the desired outcome. For example, assuming that a person feels personal responsibility for the wellbeing of farmers in a far away country, one might decide to buy fair trade products if: (a) one is convinced that one is able to afford and recognize these products (self-efficacy); and (b) one believes buying fair trade products actually has a fair chance of mitigating a
problem (outcome expectation). When translating outcome expectations to global issues, we must recognize that only very few people on the globe are in the position to have singlehandedly a substantial impact on them, so this is where 'act locally' and the importance of small contributions and grass roots movements come into play as means of exerting personal impact and stimulating a sense of GC self-efficacy.

Self-efficacy expectations also form a challenge to critical concepts of citizenship, which suggests that individuals should choose their course of action as a result of critical reflection (e.g., Dam et al., 2011; Mannion et al., 2011; Veugelers, 2007). If the reflection fails to provide or to come close to a constructive solution leading to action mitigating the global issue, the reflection may result in low self-efficacy and low outcome expectations, which in turn produce disengagement and helplessness. The arguable success of Service Learning in promoting civic engagement (Youniss, McLellan & Yates, 1997; Kiely, 2004; Hurd, 2008; Giles, Stenson, Gray & At, 2001) suggests that a sense of self-efficacy can be easily achieved by experience, either in following the behavioral prescriptions of a program or in executing the actions that one chose as a result of reflection. Therefore, in GCE a balance must be found between teaching solutions, practicing, reflection and teaching how to find solutions.

In the fifth and final process of the bystander effect theory, the costs of helping behavior is considered. The acceptable cost of helping is determined by multiple factors. For instance, according to expectancy-value theory, the rationally acceptable cost is relative to the outcome value measured by expectations and expectancies (Bernoulli, 1738/1954; Neumann & Morgenstern, 1947). One is unlikely to develop an intention to engage in behavior for which the expected positive results are of less utility than the costs, or an act that has a very low subjective probability of producing a positive effect. For instance, if a person believes that most likely only a small fraction of the fair trade premium paid by him or her will make it to the farmers but the majority of it will be consumed by salaries of labeling organizations and corrupted cooperatives’ management or wasted otherwise, this person is unlikely to reason to buy fair trade products.

Other factors affecting acceptable costs include the aforementioned psychological distance to the beneficiary, along with one’s amount of resources and social capital (Horn & Fry, 2012).

The norms of one’s in-group also constitute a very important factor determining psychological costs of global civic behavior. For instance, Latané and Darley (1968) stress that the risk that someone may show oneself as incompetent or laughable in front of onlookers must be calculated into the costs of helping behavior. According to Ajzen, the effect of the perceived group norm on the GC behavior cannot be overestimated (1991). Group norms form the third determinant of the behavioral intention together with self-efficacy and attitude. People will be much more likely to engage in GC activity if they perceive the activity to be socially accepted and common. Acting in line with accepted norms brings additional benefits; acting against it brings extra costs. Furthermore,
individuals will often engage in behavior conforming to the norm without any prior reflection or elaborate reasoning. On the other hand, acting against subjective prescriptive or descriptive social norms carries additional costs and requires more often deliberate psychological effort. To summarize: people will be more likely to act as global citizens if they perceive such acts as common and socially accepted. In this context, GCE programs affect not only skills, knowledge and attitudes of the participants, but can also embed participants in social networks of individuals engaged in global issues, or even create such networks.

Conclusion

The review indicates that GCE could become a unifying framework for various types of education currently using it as an umbrella term. Authors of educational programs and interventions claim the term GCE and develop their own definitions of GCE matching contents of their programs often rooted in earlier paradigms or particular organizational or political objectives. This leads to large variations and diversity among different conceptualizations of GCE with some overlap between them. To overcome this, we postulate a unifying GCE framework. Such a framework allows a direct comparison of content and focus of various GCE programs, as well as a more deliberate choice of content in cases of new educational initiatives. In order to achieve this, the proposed framework is not based on any specific political agenda, but instead uses behavioral science and theory of globalization as a foundation.

By translating the helping behavior model to the global citizenship framework, the following stages might be distinguished. To become actively engaged, a person must:

1. Become aware of a global issue².
2. Acknowledge the need to resolve or at least address the issue.
3. Assume responsibility for resolving the issue.
4. Determine that one has the means to do what is needed (self-efficacy).
5. Believe that benefits outweigh the personal costs.

While this theory predicts whether a person will intend to engage in GC behavior based on reasoning, in order to have a more predictive potential for otherwise motivated behavior, it needs to be amended with social norms influence (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Ajzen, 1991). Normative influence can dramatically change behaviors’ subjective cost or even evoke behavior directly.

² Global issues in this context are issues related to cultural, environmental, political or economic global flows and interconnections.
GCE can address any of these five stages: stage one by raising global awareness, and stimulating information seeking; stage two by encouraging a reflection on the global situation; stage three by promoting intercultural understanding, and teaching decategorization, interconnectedness, about sources of inequalities, and one’s place in the global system; stage four by practicing global citizenship, and learning from role models; and stage five by creating a climate of support for global civic activity and building social networks.
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In Europe, two recent trends in higher education have been contributing to the transcending of borders, both practically and imaginatively.

On the one hand, policy makers, politicians and university administrators have been implementing a process that has come to be known as ‘internationalization’. Also referred to as the Bologna process, this trend has resulted in the restructuring of many national university systems and institutions, and in the flow of both students and faculty between nations within Europe (Curaj et al., 2012; Brooks & Waters, 2011; Teichler, 2004, 2009).

Simultaneously, many university teachers and curriculum developers have been giving increasing attention to programs that emphasize ‘education for global citizenship’ (Andrzejewski & Alessio, 1999; Ibrahim, 2005). Like internationalization, the notion of global citizenship is not uniformly accepted, and is often contested (Davies & Evans, 2005; Andreotti, 2006). As understood herein, education for global citizenship is a set of related attitudes, knowledge and skills that equips people to: (a) recognize the ways individuals, locales, regions, and countries connect to and with wider global processes (e.g. social, economic, political, environmental); and (b) act with that recognition, and the social responsibility that comes along with it. The rise of global citizenship education is helping young people transcend social, cultural, political and epistemological borders.

Most of the time, processes of internationalization and global citizenship take place independently from one another. Politicians and university officials work together to advance the internationalization agenda, while educators meet at conferences to explore the ways they can better equip students for the interconnected world of today. Internationalization and global citizenship education are rarely considered in the same frame.¹

Focusing on the Going Glocal program offered by University College Roosevelt, an international undergraduate honors college in the Netherlands, this chapter illustrates how global citizenship education can contribute to a rebalancing of the

¹ For one notable exception, see Gacel-Ávila (2005).
internationalization process: one that favors the social, cultural and pedagogic priorities of an ‘internationalization at home’ approach, rather than the political and economic interests that flow from the more dominant ‘internationalization abroad’ (Knight, 2008) emphasis.

**Internationalization in European Higher Education**

Issues relating to internationalization in European higher education started to take a central place in debates about university policy and practice following the signing of the Bologna Declaration in 1999. The agreement committed twenty-nine European countries to a process that would ensure comparability of standards and quality in higher education qualifications across the continent.

Throughout the past decade and a half, the Bologna process has helped transform Europe’s education landscape. Among other things, it has led to a Europe-wide system of comparable degrees, most easily recognized in the split between bachelor and master degrees; a Europe-wide course credit system (ECTS); an increase in student and faculty mobility within Europe; and international cooperation in the area of quality assurance. However, ‘internationalization’ is much broader than the Bologna process, and it is also less easily described. For Frolich and Veiga (2005) for example, “the internationalization of higher education is a complex, multidimensional and often fragmented process” (p. 169). In turn, De Wit (2002) argues that “as the international dimension of higher education gains more attention and recognition, people tend to use it in the way that best suits their purposes” (p. 14).

Even though internationalization takes shape differently depending on the university and/or national context, Knight (2008) has identified two main elements to the process. The first element Knight terms ‘internationalization abroad’, i.e. education that crosses borders. In this sense, she highlights internationalization as the formation of strategic alliances with foreign universities or institutes, the mobility of students and faculty, the mobility of projects and programs, cross-border collaboration on research, and the standardization of quality and qualifications. The second element Knight terms ‘internationalization at home’: activities that help students to develop international understanding and orientations and intercultural skills. This is the much more curriculum-orientated component of the process: it is about delivering an education that equips students to be active in and better prepared for the interconnected world that

---

they will undoubtedly have to negotiate after university. ‘Internationalization at home’ thus focuses on the development of student competencies.

In addition to these two broad elements, it is important to understand the professed reasons for internationalization. What drives and justifies the process? De Wit (2002) finds four main arguments for the promotion of internationalization across Europe’s education system: political, economic, academic, and social-cultural. The political benefits of internationalization relate to foreign policy, national security, technical assistance, peace and mutual understanding, and European integration. Economic benefits concern the promotion of economic growth and international competitiveness, the needs of the labor market, and the development of additional sources of university income. Academic benefits include developing international dimensions in research, extending academic horizons, improving the quality of scholarship, and increasing the profile and status of the university. Social and cultural benefits include creating intercultural understanding and competence among students and faculty.

As a means to connect the internationalization process to education for global citizenship, I offer two additional observations.

First, the process remains disproportionately tilted toward ‘internationalization abroad’. In other words, the internationalization process as it has been playing out across Europe places much more attention on the crossing of geographic borders (mobility, collaboration, exchange, etc.), than on the content of students’ learning. As a result, the internationalization process plays out more concertedly at the level of policy and planning than in pedagogy.

Second, it seems to me that the political, economic and academic rationales for ‘internationalization’ overshadow, and sometimes even silence, the social and cultural ones. To state it somewhat differently, universities are being asked to internationalize because it is good for the Netherlands or Europe, because it makes economic sense, or because it will make our institutions and departments academically and/or economically more competitive. Less often, we are asked to internationalize because it is good for our students and their learning.

Given these observations about the internationalization process, I will demonstrate the social and cultural value of global citizenship education and its ability to ‘internationalize at home’. As a means to do so, I describe University College Roosevelt and its Going Glocal program (2011-2015).

**UCR: An ‘International’ College**

Located in the south-western portion of the Netherlands and forming part of Utrecht University, University College Roosevelt (UCR) offers an ‘international’ liberal arts and science undergraduate degree program to its 600 students. Founded in 2004, UCR is
one of Europe's first such undergraduate colleges. Its origins can be attributed directly to the Bologna process: it was only after ‘internationalization’ became a top priority for the Netherlands Ministry of Education, Science and Culture that UCR was founded.

When UCR opened its doors to its first intake of students, ‘international’ meant three things. First, all education at UCR was conducted in the English language. Second, one-third of its student body and one-third of its faculty were of non-Dutch origin. Third, its liberal arts and science program was inspired by both the USA’s LAS college model and the UK’s Oxbridge college system.

It was a simple ‘international’ model premised upon the dominant arguments of the day. UCR’s pioneering proposition for a new type of university made political, economic and academic sense to the ministry and its education officials, and it fit squarely into the government’s commitment to implement the Bologna Declaration. At that time, we paid almost no attention to internationalizing what and how we taught.

More than a decade later, ‘international(ization)’ looks quite different at University College Roosevelt. This transformation is in great part attributable to the lessons learned and experiences gained following the successful completion of its four-year education for global citizenship pilot project, Going Glocal. A focus on global citizenship education has helped UCR refocus its internationalization efforts toward home: that is, toward our curriculum and content; and toward emphasizing the development of intercultural competencies in our students. As a case in point, the college’s most recent strategic plan now includes ‘global citizenship’ as one of the university’s foundational pillars. According to the plan, “UCR [now] expects its students to not only do well academically, but to develop themselves into global citizens.”

The ‘Going Glocal’ Program

Designed as a four-year program (2011-2015), Going Glocal set out to develop and promote education and research on global citizenship in the Netherlands. Its main aim has been to foster education geared towards social responsibility and the exercise of critical citizenship across the education system in the province of Zeeland. To this end, the program connects students of UCR and primary and secondary students in Zeeland to communities in Opuwo, Namibia and Oaxaca, Mexico, in order to promote intercultural understanding and learning based on a south-north dialogue. In addition to offering a transformative learning experience for the university and school students directly involved, the program has also produced materials and curricula for global

3 The Going Glocal program was made possible thanks to the co-financing of University College Roosevelt and the Subsidies for Citizenship and Development Cooperation (SBOS) program of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
citizenship education, undertaken and published research, and developed a global citizenship measurement instrument.

The notion of ‘glocalization’ (Robertson, 1995) is central to the program (hence the name Going Glocal) and to its conceptualization and operationalization of ‘global citizenship’. Emphasis on the local in the global, and vice versa, allows us to treat globalization as something that is rooted in and shaped by our immediate surroundings. For this reason, participating students are expected to reorientate their inherently international outlooks toward their immediate community. This encourages students to recognize the extent to which global processes are implicated in, and affected by, one’s everyday life. The program also emphasizes that such recognition must be connected to action; again, action that is not only directed ‘out there’, but also ‘right here’.

In addition to the above, the program avoids binary constructions of the world between so-called North and South, developed and underdeveloped, first and third worlds. Instead, it challenges this normative modality of comprehending the global order of things by freeing up space for students to question their own assumptions and worldviews. In doing so, the aim has been to open the way toward true transformational learning (Freire, 1974; Giroux, 2011). Unlearning is meant to be as much an outcome of Going Glocal as (re)learning.

On the basis of these insights and priorities, the program was designed to offer groups of 15 students the opportunity to take part in three learning modules over the course of an entire academic year. The three modules equate to two regular UCR social science courses (each 7.5 ECTS), and are used to fulfill degree requirements. Interested students apply to Going Glocal and undergo a selection process, including a written application and interview, in order to take part in either a Namibia or Mexico rendition of the program. Students opting for the Namibia version focus on the topic of youth, modernity and development, while those opting for the Mexico cycle orientate toward global justice and activism. During the course of the program, students are guided by a socio-cultural anthropologist, a human geographer, a sociologist, and a political scientist with long-standing experience in Namibia and Mexico, as well as by a lecturer of pedagogy. While the team of social scientists coordinates the field trips and university courses, the educationalist oversees the outreach element of the program, during which UCR students teach on related topics of ‘glocal’ relevance in local primary and secondary schools. This Zeeland schools outreach component of the program makes up part of the first and third modules, while the second module takes place entirely in either Namibia or Mexico.4

---

4 The 2012 round of the program focused on Namibia, and the 2013 round on Mexico. In 2014 two groups of students (30 in total) participated simultaneously, with half focusing on Namibia and half on Mexico.
‘Going Glocal’ in Namibia

To illustrate the content and ethos of this project in global citizenship education, I will offer an in-depth description of a single program cycle: the Namibia version of Going Glocal.

The first module begins as a regular course on the first day of the spring term. The students are especially enthusiastic, anticipating an adventure that will lead them to ‘Africa’ where they will ‘help’ those in need. Even before introductions, they are given their first assignment. They must write an in-class essay that details what they know about Africa, and about Namibia. Once completed, they submit the essays to the lecturers in a sealed envelope marked with their names.

During the introduction to the program, the lecturers strive to adjust student expectations. They will not be travelling to Namibia ‘to help’, but rather ‘to share’: to share time and space with their Namibian peers and to share themselves with others. The program is a dialogue, an exchange, not an act of consumption. It is as much about unlearning as it is learning. These are points that the lecturers will re-enforce many times throughout the coming months.

The above aims require inevitably a concomitant reversal in the classroom, and the lecturers strive to de-centre the usual hierarchy by relinquishing much of their authority. Here, teachers become facilitators of dialogue and exchange, moderators, and creators of learning opportunities. They will challenge ideas often, and directly so, but they won’t impart knowledge. Peer teaching, group work and independent research based on the interest of the student also contribute to the pedagogic approach.

During the first module, it is not only the teaching style that generates critical thinking and ‘unlearning’, but the interdisciplinary, holistic and challenging nature of the course content itself. Students begin by exploring the notions of ‘youth’, ‘development’, and modernity/tradition. For nearly two months, they unpack some of the normative ideas that have dominated, often silently so, their own reflections on the world. What are the popular constructions of ‘youth’ in Western Europe (Wyn & White, 1997; Ansell, 2005)? Are these models relevant to other social and cultural contexts (De Boeck & Honwana, 2005)? What is ‘development’ (Arndt, 1987; Meillassoux, 1974; UNDP, 1990; Sachs, 1992; Sen, 1999)? What constitutes ‘progress’, and who has the right to decide? How have the ideas and practices associated with modernity helped to fetishize ‘progress’, as well as produce ‘development’? And what is the relationship between ‘tradition’ and modernity, development and progress (Gusfield, 1967)?

A body of anthropological literatures helps embed these broad social scientific problems in a postcolonial African context, helping students to orientate geographically, historically and epistemologically. In what ways have scholars approached the study of modernity in Africa (Geschiere et al., 2008; Comaroff & Comaroff, 1993)? What does it mean to be ‘modern’ or ‘traditional’ there (Ferguson, 2006)? Why, in the postcolonial
African context, should modernity be understood relationally (Probst et al., 2002)?

During the second half of the semester, students undertake a survey of Namibian studies in further preparation for the summer field trip. They study the history of Namibia in the world in order to better understand how it has shaped, and been shaped by, its longstanding interactions with other peoples and places. The students also read, discuss and teach one another topics relating to contemporary Namibian culture, society and politics. The emphasis during this part of the course also involves reflecting on the ways Namibia’s history – especially its colonial and apartheid past – continues to shape the present. It is in this middle part of the term that students begin their guest teaching in local primary and secondary schools. Following the content of their course, they develop original learning materials as a way to share their emerging insights with local primary and secondary school students.

After having participated in the first four months of the program, students have still yet to be formally exposed to the concept of ‘global citizenship’. Although they may be thinking about it for themselves, no content to date has set them in that direction. In fact, the lecturers have made a point of never using or referring to the notion. Instead, students have been encouraged to come to recognize the socially, culturally and economically situated nature of their own knowledge, something that will be drawn upon during and after their field trip to Namibia.

The program’s second module, lasting a month, takes place in Namibia during UCR’s summer period. First, UCR students spend three days in the capital city, Windhoek, where they are offered an orientation program that is designed and delivered by a group of Namibian youth. The intensive days include a tour of the city and its neighborhoods, meetings with local youth organizations, visits to the university and polytechnic, language lessons, and a great deal of socializing. The remaining weeks are then spent living in the rural town of Opuwo, Namibia (pop. 7000), located 900 kilometers away.

Each morning in Opuwo, the students serve as assistants in local schools or as interns at a youth-focused community-based organization. Each afternoon, they work in collaboration with a group of young Namibians in order to complete a community project. In 2012, the two groups of young people worked together to rehabilitate a community swimming pool. In 2014, they worked on numerous smaller projects including a basketball tournament, a drama performance, and the publication of a school newspaper. The task of taking part in the daily functioning of a local school or organization, as well as working with local youth on a shared project, offers the opportunity for UCR students to engage in a process of what I call ‘structured hanging-out’. The emphasis here lies not on the importance of completing tasks or work, but rather on the informal interactions that take place around it. In addition to these two main activities, UCR students and Opuwo youth share time together during the evenings (dancing in local clubs, talking together, cooking). On weekends they journey together to local tourist spots for fun and relaxation, or head to the village for family visits.
Throughout the field trip, UCR students are asked to keep a journal. There is no strict format or expectation for its completion, and thus each student fills the pages with what she or he finds most relevant. Daily entries afford them the space and purpose to reflect on their experiences – on their unlearning and re-learning. In their journals they recount the day's events, detail the challenges faced and/or overcome, and unload frustrations and difficulties. The journal becomes a sort of physical, emotional and intellectual record of the student’s experiences in Namibia. In addition to this intrapersonal reflection process, the lecturers hold 90-minute group supervision sessions at the end of each day. These class meetings are held outside, in the shade of a tree, with cool drinks, crisps and beer. During the sessions students share their experiences, thoughts and feelings with the other members of the UCR group. Students may become upset or angry during the discussions, as they may be feeling challenged by everything around them – by too much difference, by the relative deprivation, by gender and age inequalities, by the color of their own skin. After the first two or three meetings, it becomes evident that many of them are trying to synthesize their everyday experiences in Opuwo with their theoretical learning from the pre-course in the Netherlands. However the lecturers insist that, for now, they discard all of that big theory and focus only on being present and sharing. The field trip is about experience and practice: not big ideas – not thinking. “Be here. Share. Have fun,” they are told. By the end of that first week, students are already referring to those early evening supervisions as ‘group therapy’.

On the last day of the field trip, at the departure breakfast, the lecturers hand the students their original essays in the sealed envelopes. They open and read their essays to themselves. Many laugh; others blush with embarrassment. A few share their early ideas – their former knowledge – with the rest of the group; everyone laughs. They recognize their own unlearning.

The third and final module takes place back on campus and in the surrounding province during the fall semester in the Netherlands. Student participation in the program is now dominated by frequent visits to their previously assigned local schools. This time, students are able to lead classes in what is now being referred to as ‘global citizenship’ based on the practical experiences they have had in Namibia. During this part of the program, students develop additional teaching materials that are eventually distributed to all primary and secondary schools in the province. The materials vary: they include short films, children’s books, pamphlets, sample lesson plans, a newspaper, art projects, and a compilation of stories written by children in Opuwo for their peers in the Netherlands.

During the fall semester, the UCR students are also required to write a reflection paper about their experiences in the program. For this assignment, they are asked to finally try and synthesize their book learning (theory) with their lived experiences (practice). They consider how their time and (un)learning in Namibia helped shape their understanding of the concepts central to the preliminary course (‘development’, youth,
tradition and modernity, progress), and how those same concepts might now help (or hinder) them in trying to better connect with the lives of their new Namibian friends. The third module’s above foci – teaching about the issues they encountered while in Namibia, and reflecting in written form about their experiences – enable students to continue to actively engage and reflect. They are continuing to learn from an experience that has already passed, and they will likely continue doing so even after they have completed the program and their degrees.

**Toward Internationalization at Home**

While the Bologna process has helped achieve a more integrated, mobile and symmetrical higher education landscape in Europe, its emphasis on internationalizing abroad continues to prioritize the political, economic and academic benefits of the process. Just as University College Roosevelt did when it began its journey into internationalization more than ten years ago, many university programs provide a rather narrow understanding of what constitutes international education. Students are indeed being offered greater opportunities to study in English, spend semesters abroad, or even complete degree programs in foreign countries, while university researchers are finding increased opportunities to collaborate with foreign colleagues and tap more distant funding pots. But much less attention is being paid to the content of university curriculum, and to the social and cultural benefits of internationalization. At many universities, the ‘internationalization at home’ opportunities for students remain quite limited.

Following the establishment of its pilot project on education for global citizenship, UCR redefined and reoriented its international outlook in favor of an ‘internationalization at home’ approach. UCR remains committed to teaching in the English language, to hosting foreign students and faculty, to providing semester abroad opportunities, and to further developing its own variation of the US/UK modeled liberal arts and sciences program. But UCR’s *Going Glocal* program has introduced a new and now highly valued component to the college’s vision of internationalization. This program in global citizenship education contributes to a form of internationalization that focuses much more on the needs of learners, rather than the institution or governments. Such ‘internationalization at home’ equips students with the skills, attitudes and capacities to engage constructively, ethically and reflexively in an interconnected and globalized world.

Global citizenship education can and should take many different forms. But based on our recent experiences at UCR, a path toward ‘internationalization at home’ via global citizenship education should prove a worthwhile endeavor for other universities on the continent as well, especially those that prioritize the needs and interests of their students. With more universities adopting ‘internationalization at home’ programs
and curricula, the internationalization process will find a better balance between the priorities of our policy makers and those of our primary beneficiaries: young learners who will continue to have to negotiate and affect change in an increasingly unjust and unequal world.
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DECOLONIAL PRACTICES OF LEARNING

Rolando Vázquez

“I came to understand pedagogies in multiple ways [...] as transgressing, disrupting, displacing, inverting inherited concepts and practices [...] so as to make different conversations and solidarities possible”.

(Alexander, 2006)

The Challenges of Interculturality for ‘Global Citizenship Education’

How can we confront the task of ‘global citizenship education’ in a world that is deeply divided between the privileges of the ‘global consumer society’ and the suffering of the impoverished majority of the world population? What does it mean to become a ‘global citizen’ in such a divided world? Is it possible to avoid the trap of turning ‘global citizenship education’ into yet another tool for reproducing the privilege of the few? Can a program on ‘global citizenship education’ serve to make the consumer society aware of how its privilege is built on the destitution of others? Can the ‘global citizenship’ student become aware of his or her implication in global inequality? Can the student become committed to an ethics of ‘global interculturality’? Can we envisage the possibility of opening truly horizontal intercultural dialogues?

This chapter will present the pedagogical philosophy implemented in the Mexico track of the Going Glocal Program of University College Roosevelt in the Netherlands. This program included a field trip that brought students from the college to meet with social activists and their communities in two prominent Mexican indigenous regions: Oaxaca and Chiapas. The field trip sought to open a continuous intercultural encounter with the Unitierra in Oaxaca, with Gustavo Esteva, with various collectives of women, young artists, Muxes, and Indigenous communities struggling for alternative ways of living, with the migrant shelter of Padre Solalinde ‘Hermanos en el Camino’, with the Cideci-

1 The ideas presented here were developed in a dialogue and in cooperation with the co-coordinator of the field trip Rosalba Icaza from the Institute of Social Studies in The Hague, and our partner in Mexico Gustavo Esteva from the Universidad de la Tierra (Unitierra) in Oaxaca.

2 For a complementary discussion on the need to transform global citizenship education through place-based ‘glocal pedagogy’, see Greg Mannion’s chapter in this volume.

3 To know more about the Going Glocal program of the University College Roosevelt, see the introduction to this volume.
Unitierra in Chiapas and the collectives that gravitate around it, and with the reality of autonomy in the land of Oventic. All these experiences gave the participants a sense of the possibility of enacting alternative worlds, the possibility of envisaging a notion of freedom not based on individuality and economic progress but on dignity, communality and relationality.

Promoting intercultural dialogues across global divides requires us to un-build the assumed privilege of the west: the assumed superiority of being modern; of being ahead in the history of progress; of being the one holding the camera. It requires us to challenge the linear conception of history and recognize that we will only be able to understand our complex global/colonial reality (Escobar & Mignolo, 2010) and the ways in which we inhabit it and become ourselves through an open dialogue with others. A dialogue across global divides can bring us in relation with the open diversity of the world, a diversity that is always in excess of our own world of meaning. Such an experience is at once humbling and empowering.

African-American feminism shows that global divides are marked by intersectional forms of oppression, across race, class, gender (Collins, 2000). African-American, Chicana and decolonial feminism (Lugones, 2010) have brought to the fore the challenge of thinking about a global social reality that is rife with tensions. The global consumer society, that appears today as the standard of humanity, has to confront its implication in the history of global coloniality. The spectacle of the consumer and his ‘readymade’ identities, the cult of the self promoted by the fashion and marketing industries, the ‘selfie worlds’ of social media, should all be thought about in relation to the depletion of the planet and the silencing and destitution that keeps on impoverishing and denigrating the life of the majority of the world population. In other words, we face the challenge of thinking about the intimate relations between the mediated consumer society, the impoverishing of the oppressed, and the ecological devastation of the earth. All of them have to be understood as interconnected in our awareness of our world-historical reality. An intercultural and decolonial consciousness recognizes the irreducible diversity of human experience, but at the same time it is aware of the powers at play that configure today’s global injustice.

A decolonial and feminist reading of our world-historical reality was the basis of the design and implementation of the Mexico track of the Going Glocal program. The course that included a field trip in Mexico posed serious challenges. How could we avoid producing yet another experience of academic tourism, in which the students from a wealthy consumer society visit far-away places, exoticizing the other to flesh out their Facebook profiles and their CVs for the dream of a future career? We needed to avoid academic tourism; we needed to avoid the practice of consuming the life and locality of others without investing one’s own humanity. How could we use a framework of global ethics with decolonial content in a time that is more and more dominated by the logic of competition, performative identities, and market-oriented education? Could
we envisage the course as a platform for truly intercultural encounters across global divides? It is almost ironic that in the age of global connectivity, one of the greatest challenges is to foster experiences of intercultural exchange. How can we enter a relation with others, recognizing their own worlds as equally valuable and enriching? Let us see how Fornet-Betancourt presents the idea of intercultural exchange.

[F]or intercultural exchange to transcend the mere abstract, it will have to root in the context of thinking in tangible historical processes, which in turn requires [...] committed thinking. [A thinking] grounded in the concrete struggles of marginalized cultures whose struggle is quite obviously not merely for formal recognition but for their right to economic, political and religious self-determination [...] the right to configure their respective worlds according to their values. (Fornet-Betancourt, 2009, p. 159)

The program was precisely directed to open an intercultural exchange grounded on the concrete struggles of various social movements in Oaxaca and Chiapas. This helped us to overcome the abstract position in which the university student finds him or herself as a ‘global consumer’, or rather a consumer of the global. It helped us to overcome the abstract view in which globalization appears as an interconnected series of networks. It gave us access to an intercultural experience through which we could recognize, on the one hand, our positionality and privilege in a deeply unequal global system and, on the other, the diversity and dignity of other worlds.

The Decolonial Framework

We live in a world-historical reality that is marked by social injustice and ecological devastation. The dream of global modernity is standing on processes of destitution, extraction and inequality. Decolonial thought teaches us that the history of progress cannot be disconnected from that of systemic violence and profound suffering. There is no modernity without coloniality: the history of modernity’s progress and civilization cannot be separated from the hidden history of destitution and denigration (Mignolo, 2000; Quijano, 2010). The history of the civilizational project of the West and the history of modernity is at one and the same time the history of global coloniality.

When we look at the origin of the project of western civilization, we find the colonial encounter. It is only through the colonization of what came to be named America that Europe began to build its self identity as the center of world geography and as the present of history: as modernity (Dussel, 1994).

The emergence of the global economy centered in the Atlantic, with its mass production of global commodities such as cacao and sugar, cannot be understood
without accounting for the enslavement of the peoples of Africa. Transatlantic enslavement marks the birth of a global system of production and accumulation controlled by Europe (first Spain and Portugal and then the Netherlands, England and France), a system that was built on racism and the dispensability of human life.

Thinking about global history through the question of slavery brings into focus a world system erected by privileging accumulation and profit over life. Global trade centered in the West and global commodity came hand in hand with the dispensability of life. Haciendas and plantations were the first forms of massive exploitation of labor for the production of global products and the accumulation of wealth in the metropolis. Empires and commercial companies were in charge of maintaining this system of global inequality. Today we live in the legacy of those historical processes. The denizen of the consumer society enjoys the consumption of global commodities at the expenses of the exploitation of human life and the extraction of the earth (Bauman, 2004).

**Pedagogies of Positionality and World Travelling**

The Mexico track of the Going Glocal program was organized around a field trip to Mexico. The participants had to cross the geographical distance between two radically different worlds – the wealthy world of the consumer society in western Europe and the world of social struggles against the violence of neoliberal globalization in indigenous regions of Mexico: Oaxaca and Chiapas. The geographical trip did not guarantee that the participants would be able to travel beyond their world of meaning, beyond their position as consumers of the world, or beyond the ‘selfie tourist’ position. Lugones helps us to differentiate tourism from world travelling: between consuming the world and relating to the world.

I think that it is precisely the case that tourists and colonial explorers, missionaries, settlers, and conquerors do not travel in the sense I have in mind. That is, there is no epistemic shift to other worlds of sense, precisely because they perceive/imagine only the ‘exotic’, the ‘Other’, the ‘primitive’, and the ‘savage’, and there is no world of sense of the exotic, the Other, the savage, and the “one in need of salvation” separate from the logic of domination. Those conceptions of others are inextricably connected to epistemic imperialism and aggressive ignorance. (Lugones, 2003, p. 18)

Academic tourism is complicit with the logic of domination of the modern/colonial world. It reproduces the dominant gaze with its univocal worldview: an abstract view from nowhere; a view that hides both the observer and the place of observation. Truly world traveling – or what we may call intercultural traveling – means delinking from the
structures of domination that configure the colonial divides: the power differen-
tials that mark the distinction between the two locations.

By traveling to other people’s ‘worlds’, we discover that there are ‘worlds’ in which
those who are the victims of arrogant perception are really subject, lively beings,
resisters, constructors of visions even though in the mainstream construction they
are animated only by the arrogant perceiver and are pliable, foldable, file-awayable,
classifiable. (Lugones, 2003, p. 18)

How can the inhabitants of western consumer societies avoid reproducing modern/
colonial forms of representation when they are travelling across global divides? How
can they avoid seeing the global south as backward, poor, and in need of becoming like
them? The one semester course prior to the field trip mobilized pedagogical practices to
prepare the group for an intercultural travel across worlds of meaning. Let us hear the
reflection of Marius d’Hond, one of the participants in the program in 2014.

[The program was structured around the visit to the indigenous communities
in Oaxaca and Chiapas, which allowed us to ‘experience’ the structural other of
European identity. This stands in contrast to methodologies which try to understand
the other without leaving the zero point position of seeing but not being seen, which
results only in a reduction of the other to one’s own scheme of knowledge. (d’Hond,
2015, pp. 11-12)

One of the core objectives was to enable the participants to experience their concrete
location in the colonial divide. This was done through discovering how we belong to
a locality: a place of enunciation that is hidden under the narrative of modernity. The
course also mobilized a pedagogy of relationality that was focused on transforming the
classroom from a space of discrete individualities into a place of convivial exchange,
a place to learn from each other (Illich, 2009). The academic logic of competition and
individuation was replaced with one of learning with others and of getting to know
each other. The course presented Mexico not as an object of study, but as a place for
intercultural learning, where we could encounter different worlds of meaning.

The preparatory course was thus not so much about Mexico as it was about making
the participants aware of their positionality in the modern/colonial order.
This is what two participants of the 2013 program wrote in their reflection paper:
“Through reading articles that were created by scholars from the other side of the world,
we discovered our own place. We managed to put ourselves into perspective and started
to see the (limits of the) paradigm of Western education” (Ribeiro, Bártolo & Zwart,
2013). Participants in the course became aware that their conception of the world was
not a given, but historically situated. They learned how their worldview is entwined with
the complex history of global/coloniality. A pedagogy of positionality was put in place to begin dismantling the position of abstraction that characterizes the modern systems of knowledge (Haraway, 1988) and education and that reproduces modernity’s worldview. Becoming located enables the validation of other locations and ways of relating to the world, thus avoiding their subsumption under the dominant parameters of intelligibility, under the dominant gaze. Intercultural recognition is at loggerheads with the arrogant perception of seeing others as lacking, as lagging behind.

The recognition of one’s own positionality is a process of humbling that enables us to recognize other positionalities as equally valid worlds of meaning. “One inhabits the realities as spatially, historically, and thus materially different: different in possibilities, in the connections among people, and in the relation to power” (Lugones, 2003, p. 17). Situating oneself means to unlearn the assumed abstract position of the global consumer. A decolonial positionality – a positionality aware of its location in the modern/colonial order – is a necessary condition to participate in an intercultural process of learning.

We wanted to contribute to pedagogical practices that are capable of “making evident one’s own place of engagement and enunciation. It also means building the possibility of relationality rather than individuality and competition” (Walsh, 2014). Who are we? How are we connected to other worlds through our practices of consumption? These were guiding questions oriented to reveal the positionality of each one of the participants. They created a rough path that could be followed thanks to the companionship and dialogues generated through a relational pedagogy.

**Intercultural Travelling**

The program used decolonial thinking to create in students the awareness that global divides are not produced by a lack of modernity, but as a consequence of inequality and violence that has accompanied the civilizational project of the West since its inception. We came to think that the notion of glocal citizenship should not take its orientation from an abstract ideal of a unified humanity, nor from a futuric utopia in fashion, but must be oriented towards a located consciousness of the infinite diversity and plurality of the world. It has to respond to the ethical demands that interpellate us once we recognize how we are implicated in global injustice, in the colonial divide.

Through the program, we came to the intercultural encounter with the recognition of the partiality of our own knowledge. The process of humbling served to unlearn normative ways of tagging ‘the other’ as underdeveloped, poor, racialized, victim, backward etc. Through recognizing one’s own partiality, we were able to recognize the other person in the richness of her difference.

Simone van Dam, a participant in the 2014 group gives us her testimony of how this happened:
Being aware of where you are and where you come from when facing “the other” can shake you. It can make one a partial being – one that is aware of the way one is implicated in relation to ‘the other’. This happened during the fieldtrip in Mexico of the Going Glocal program; being in Mexico and meeting various groups and people with different worldviews and experiences humbled many of our group. (van Dam, 2015, p. 10)

An intercultural encounter is only possible through the breaking down of the hierarchical dichotomy between the self and the other (Panikkar, 1988), between the civilized and the barbarian, between the consumer and the poor. The othering of the other, the question of alterity, is the other side of the constitution of the self as a fictional abstract unitary self.

Listening to other perspectives has helped us to see ourselves through the eyes of the others. It is a way that helped me to become aware of my ‘whiteness’, my privileges and the way I am ‘implicated’. (van Dam, 2015, p. 12)

The recognition of one’s privilege and one’s own implication in the modern colonial divide restitutes the partiality of the self. This creates the possibility of listening to other realities, reaching out and entering a pluriversal world. The un-building of the abstract position of knowledge comes hand in hand with the un-building of the abstract subjectivity that is obsessed with the cult of the self, its own identity, and its own performativity.

A World Where Many Worlds Can Fit

The world as an object of knowledge makes us believe that the totality of the world can be encompassed with our systems of information. An example is the utopia of totality emanating from the mega data of the all-seeing Google eye. The total view of the world, the reduction of the image of the world as total representation, makes invisible its pluriversality. Pluriversality (Mignolo, 2011) cannot be accounted for through a series of objects and data: it is constituted by different worlds of meaning, different forms of relating to the real that are not reducible to representation. The diversity of the world is always already in excess of the modern systems of representation that reduce the real to a series of ‘information’ enclosed in the surface of modernity’s empty present (Vázquez, 2009). The world as surface, the world as an object of representation finds its complement in the abstract subjectivity of the knowing subject; the absent subject of knowledge that has no place other than its abstraction from the world.

To open up the enclosure of abstraction heralds the possibility of enacting relational worlds, of reaching out to the ‘other’, by acknowledging our own partiality and
vulnerability, and by recognizing the relation with the other across global divides not as a source of guilt but as the very possibility of ethics and of a meaningful life. As we have seen, for decolonial pedagogies the challenge posed by global divides is not simply a matter of information – it brings forth a deep questioning of the ways in which we relate to the world, to our communities, and to ourselves.

To summarize, the Mexico track of the Going Glocal program enacted a decolonial pedagogy aimed at locating ourselves in the modern/colonial divides – recognizing our belonging to a specific place in the modern/colonial geographies of power and knowledge. It was about discovering our place of perception under the abstraction of modern knowledge. The program also directed its efforts to configure an open community of learning, breaking with it the schooling logic of individualization. Finally, it was about enacting possibilities of learning with others and not about others: Mexico and the people we met were not seen as our ‘objects’ of study, but simply as other communities of learning, as other worlds we could participate with in moving towards an intercultural understanding of the world.

A pedagogy for global justice should be one that counteracts the position of epistemic privilege – of holding the right to speak about the world without placing oneself in the world. It moves towards a humble position of openness towards others. It makes us capable of recognizing the radical power of listening to the realities, the life experiences, the notions and practices of freedom that are not enclosed or defined by our parameters of certainty – by the modern horizon of intelligibility (Vázquez, 2012).
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TEACHING AS LEARNING IN THE ‘GLOCAL’ CLASSROOM: THE CONTRIBUTION SCHOOLS BASED OUTREACH CAN MAKE TO HIGHER EDUCATION GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP PROGRAMS

Vicki Haverkate

What are the potential benefits of incorporating interaction between higher education and primary and secondary schools into global citizenship education programs? Using the schools based outreach element of the Going Glocal program at University College Roosevelt (UCR) in Middelburg, the Netherlands as a case study, the following discussion aims to shed light on this very question. The primary focus is on advantages for students, but there is also comment on what this example suggests can be offered to communities and to our thinking about global citizenship education as whole by the approaches of this project.

Global citizenship education has evolved from various educational traditions such as citizenship (civic) education, environmental education and development education (Mannion, Biesta, Priestley & Ross, 2011). It is a response to a wider movement to promote international awareness and connectedness (Friedman, 2015, in this volume) and to a longer tradition of a perceived need amongst educators and governments to stimulate social responsibility and civic and political engagement or ‘citizenship’ through education (Hicks, 2003; Onderwijsraad, 2003). Global citizenship, as a blend of the two, requires individuals to be linked to others internationally; a situation which most agree is largely unavoidable in today's world (Appiah, 2007; Beasley-Murray, 2015, in this volume; Friedman, 2015, in this volume), and also to respond to their global connections in a responsible way.

The use of the term ‘glocal’ (Robertson, 1995) stresses the understanding that being global – being connected to and influenced by that which is outside our own current environment – is simultaneously shaped by our immediate circumstances and experiences. The glocal citizen could be defined as one whose actions are determined by the local but also have global reach (Robertson, 1995). Turning global citizenship education into glocal citizenship education, however, should embrace more than just describing the global in the local or vice versa. It should encompass attempts to encourage a critical consciousness of the current inequalities in global interactions (Andreotti, 2006; Esteva, Babones & Babcicky, 2013; Mignolo, 2009) and appropriate responses to this.
Going Global is used here as a case study because the program specifically seeks to strengthen active global citizenship amongst university students by connecting them to both international and local situations and by stimulating them to think global but act local; to become global in their citizenship (Friedman, 2015, in this volume; Vázquez, 2015, in this volume). The program aims to do so in a way that is as equitable as possible, and attempts to avoid perpetuating unfairness in global connections by making students aware of how their own worldview is shaped by their epistemic privilege (Braidotti, 2011; Mignolo, 2009). Vázquez (2015, in this volume) explains in more detail how this was applied to Going Global.

Going Global is made up of three distinct but interwoven elements, namely two university courses and a schools based element, connecting students with the local community: the ‘outreach’.

As discussed elsewhere in this volume (Friedman, 2015; Sklad & Park, 2015), students are involved in the program for a full calendar year. Beginning in January, they take one of two courses: ‘Youth, Modernity and “Development”: a Namibian perspective’ or ‘Global Justice and Activism in Mexico’. At the same time, they begin giving guest lessons at local primary or secondary schools. The second part of the program is the summer trip to either Mexico or Namibia, which aims to give students new perspectives on global issues and connects them to a group of people and a set of local circumstances abroad. Friedman (2015, in this volume) and Vázquez (2015, in this volume) discuss just how profound the impact of this trip can be for students. The final semester at UCR is the moment in which students come into contact with selected theory about education for global citizenship (Andreotti, 2006; Banks, 2004; Carabain, 2012; Davies, 2006; Hicks, 2003). They also continue to give guest lessons in schools and begin to translate their own learning (from Mexico or Namibia and about global citizenship education) into accessible learning activities for primary or secondary school pupils.

Going Global allows for investigation of how well outreach, that is to say connecting students to the community around the university, is an effective way of actualizing global theory. It will be argued below that schools based outreach can be particularly effective for several reasons. When students focus on one specific place abroad to discuss global issues, it can serve to place the global at the heart of global citizenship education. For example, school children can be brought into direct personal contact with international groups with whom university students have forged ties. In addition, it will be explained how this case study gives cause to believe that the bonds that higher education students develop with younger learners and the community around them strengthen the individual student’s ability to act ‘glocally’ to initiate change. At the same time, students encourage school communities to do the same.
The Going Glocal program raises another point of wider interest to higher education presented in this chapter. It is suggested that an important phenomenon is occurring in which it seems that students’ own learning is greatly enhanced and deepened when they translate their thoughts and experiences relating to global citizenship into something for others by teaching in schools. This sparks a central area of discussion here: ‘teaching as learning’.

Finally, some attention is also given in this chapter to the way in which the case study shows that a glocal approach, and in particular the richer narrative made possible by focusing on Mexico and Namibia and not ‘the rest of the world’, can help to structure ways of avoiding some common pitfalls in global citizenship education such as ethnocentric or passive tendencies (Mannion, 2015, in this volume).

Why Include Outreach in Schools?

Why include an outreach aspect at all? There are two reasons for this. The first is in keeping with the movement towards greater interaction between higher education and local communities. This can be traced back to a call in the 1990s from Ernest Boyer, and to Derek Bok in the 1980s, to break down the increasingly polarized spheres of knowledge in society and to recognize that whilst ‘town is not gown’ and the university has a specific role to play, there has been a tendency towards disengaged and commodified scholarship’ (Boyer, 1996). This is partly driven by pressure on academics to share their knowledge only in specialist journals, and also on students to acquire ‘credentials’ and marketable skills; to accumulate ‘career currency’, rather than to develop ‘learning’ or social abilities which are useful or meaningful for others (Boyer, 1996; Bok, 1982). Bok and Boyer were referring to the United States, but this disconnect could be seen as having lasted even longer in the European context without the emphasis that US liberal arts colleges place on citizenship (Rhoads & Szelenyi, 2011). New liberal arts and sciences colleges in Europe, like University College Roosevelt, seek, in part, to address this disconnect through their broader curriculum and more community oriented approach.

Secondly, students’ growth as global citizens depends considerably on developing a deeper understanding of the self in relation to one’s own cultural baggage, and to what Braidotti calls a “nomadic”, changing, and situated identity, one that is not only deeply rooted in one’s individual and cultural past but is also in flux, dependent on one’s present

---

1 By commodified scholarship I mean a system in which knowledge is accumulated for a personal gain, which is related to a financial imperative (see Boyer 1996).

2 Although part of Utrecht University, University College Roosevelt was founded in 2004 as a campus based liberal arts and sciences college in Zeeland, where there had not previously been a university.
sociocultural context (Braidotti, 2011). Thus, to be consistent in its glocal philosophy, Going Glocal needed to have students make a connection with the people of the local area.

But why choose schools? We could ask students to give presentations or do research in numerous other local groups or organizations, and it would still build local connections and have an impact on the learning and development of students. In a study conducted with Liverpool University’s science students working in a variety of local organizations, Hardwick noted that alongside continued learning, there was a notable impact on students’ connections with the community (Hardwick, 2013). The professional development of the academics involved benefited too. So good outreach – community based learning out of the ivory tower – can take place almost anywhere (Hardwick, 2013; Bentall, Bourn, McGough, Hodgson & Spours, 2014; Bok, 1982). But, there are three straightforward, practical reasons why connecting the students with younger learners in schools is a logical step. Most obviously, there is the ability to interact with reasonably large numbers of people (about 900 children and 20 teachers in Going Glocal’s case).

Secondly, school children are something of a captive audience and we hope that the children might also develop as global citizens as a result of the lessons. The third practical reason is the safe, controllable environment for the university students, and the opportunity to test the measurement instruments developed by the program that this, together with the sample size, provided (see Sklad, 2015, in this volume).

In the course of the project, other benefits have become clear. Placing students in schools is especially fitting for the Going Glocal program’s ethos because of its concern with the nature of education for global citizenship itself. The most interesting advantages of schools based outreach however, concern the students themselves: both as developing global citizens and as learners more generally.

Teaching as a “Glocal” Act of Self-efficacy

The benefit of schools based outreach for the development of university students as (global) citizens becomes clearer with an investigation of questions surrounding active citizenship. Does being a citizen require the individual to act consciously and deliberately to try to benefit others? Should global citizens try to ‘help’ others? What if we are not sure what the best way to ‘help’ is? What if ‘helping’ runs the risk of being a contradiction in terms? Can citizens still take action, and in what form?

These were important questions for the Going Glocal program. In the academic reflections written at the end of their course, students typically saw citizenship as

---

3 Part of a larger portfolio in which students set out their vision of what education for global citizenship should be, based on their academic investigations, and attempt to evaluate the success of their own teaching and teaching materials in the light of this.
involving ‘doing’ something, as Davis (2006) argues. However, they were not always sure what this should be. Most students also supported critical global citizenship, as advocated by Andreotti (2006). They believed one should not assume to know what others need, or that the ways of the West can provide appropriate solutions globally. Indeed, ‘helping’ can be an ethnocentric, self-serving exercise (Andreotti, 2006). But this realization left students questioning both their own and the pupils’ ability to act. University students in general genuinely want to engage actively on a global level. They are enticed by the prospect of travel and new experiences and perspectives. More often than not, however, there is also a desire to help, a rather unfortunate tendency towards *voluntourism* (Jakubiak, 2012). Doubtless, this desire to help is usually well meaning and not a cynical CV building exercise. Nonetheless, it might still be deeply misguided and lead to a potentially negative impact (Jakubiak, 2012).

*Going Glocal* asks students to be critical in their approach to ‘helping’. The ethnocentric nature of development and of aid and the unequal connections between the world’s ‘haves and have nots’ are discussed at length (see Friedman, 2015, and Vázquez, 2015, in this volume; also Esteva et al., 2013, and Ferguson, 2006). However, experience in this case shows that the inheritance of raising this awareness for any global citizenship education project is likely to be further challenges. Students' sense of being able to act is threatened once they realize that often trying to do something ‘over there’ is deeply connected with an agenda of westernization and that ‘help’ is often accompanied by specific caveats and even ‘threats’ (Esteva et al., 2013, p. 148-153). This creates a need for programs for critical global citizenship education (Andreotti, 2006), like *Going Glocal*, to allow students to maintain a sense of agency or self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977). If students feel that their actions will not have an impact, or will not have a morally desirable impact, they are likely to feel discouraged (Sklad & Park, 2015, in this volume). This can, in part, be addressed by a glocal focus – local action having global impact. For *Going Glocal*, it is important to allow students to find their own solutions locally. Students should not be told how to act but only shown how to question, think critically, and subsequently feel able to act.

Through the course of the program, it became evident that outreach in schools had a positive impact on both the perceived and actual self-efficacy of the students. Many students self-reported feelings of agency in this regard (Park, Sklad & Tsirogianni, 2015, in this volume). Interaction with schools has proved important for preserving and perhaps strengthening students’ sense of self-efficacy when faced with the complexity of global patterns of inequity and a fear of doing more harm than good. By teaching and passing on their knowledge of these very issues (just as much as sharing their knowledge of Namibia and Mexico) they are being active global citizens. Thus it is often

---

4 Voluntourism is short term volunteering abroad, often teaching English, which while superficially altruistic is ultimately self-serving and perpetuates global inequalities.
in feeling that they have an influence on the pupils that students feel the most able to make a difference.

Teaching is also the means by which Going Global students are most connected to the local area. Through interaction with schools, wider local and glocal connections can be strengthened, and the problem of critical consciousness reducing feelings of self-efficacy can be addressed. Because the students want the school pupils to have access to initiatives for environmental protection or for social justice, they are driven to look for local organizations offering this. Several Going Global students in the first three years became actively involved themselves with local organizations which they had discovered because they wanted to tell pupils that such local initiatives existed. For example, students started to work at the local asylum seeker center and for sustainable food source projects.

**Teaching as Learning**

“Teaching in primary schools contributes most to my learning.”
(Anonymous student feedback, 2014)

In addition to helping students feel enabled as global actors, it is possible that teaching in schools can have a second very important impact on students: it might improve their learning. When asked the open question: “What are the strongest features of this course so far, and of my teaching, what contributes most to your learning?” 68% of Going Global students across 2013 and 2014 specifically reported that teaching and preparing lessons had taught them the most. Whether they were referring to their development of pedagogic skills, or the ways in which teaching helped to further enhance and embed their own subject knowledge, is hard to unpack. It is worthy of further elaboration below because it has the potential to demonstrate that teaching can heighten the learning of university students.

Research into peer-to-peer instruction demonstrates the clear benefits to learning through selecting and explaining knowledge to others (Topping, 1996; Whitman & Fife, 1988). But what happens when the two parties are not peers? There is almost always an assumption that between teacher and pupil there is a more linear and hierarchical

5 According to the student evaluations and reflections.
6 One example is the City Seeds project, an initiative in Middelburg in which keen gardeners are provide with space to grow fresh fruit and vegetables they then share with families living below the poverty line. See http://www.cityseeds-middelburg.nl
7 Students’ comments are taken from individual, anonymous feedback on the course. There were 15 students in 2013 and 39 in 2014.
process in which knowledge is accumulated by the teacher and then transmitted to the pupil at a later date. However, most educators know instinctively that the process is more symbiotic and that learning happens in a continuum on both sides. Surprisingly little research has been done into all the different ways teachers continue to learn within their professional environment (Bakkenes, Vermunt & Wubbels, 2010). Research has fluctuated between focusing on the accumulation of new subject specific knowledge and teacher learning about pedagogics (Schulman & Sherin, 2004). There has been little exploration of how the processes of teaching can foster deeper learning in the sense of stimulating evaluation of, critical reflection on, and creative responses to a teacher’s existing knowledge base. Some studies, such as that of Bakkenes and her colleagues (2010), do investigate the processes teachers go through to accumulate new knowledge and understanding. Teacher development is related indirectly to access to new subject knowledge but depends largely on learning about classroom practice and pedagogy. Teachers get better as subject specialists by honing their didactic skills, by evaluating and creating things that enhance the learning of others and through peer interaction and self-reflection (Bakkenes et al., 2010), rather than by just increasing their ‘knowledge’ alone. It follows then that if universities give students the chance to teach, they might also learn about their subject more effectively.

The Going Glocal students, whom we can perhaps see in a role somewhere between being the peers of the school pupils and being their teachers, highlight the opportunities for learning offered by teaching. This has implications not only for global citizenship but perhaps for higher education and its use of outreach in broader terms. In 2013 and 2014, students first became familiar with the basics of few key learning theories (Bloom, 1956; Gardner, 2011) and with lesson planning and classroom management (Cowley, 2006). Then they began to plan classroom activities that they hoped would stimulate higher level thinking skills (Bloom, 1956) and full participation (Gardner, 2011). Many students found this interesting in its own regard, and several were prompted to study pedagogy further and even to pursue teacher training. Some of those who were not especially interested in teaching also mentioned that they felt these were valuable skills for communication and social interaction in a broader sense.

Moreover, the process of lesson planning meant that students had to once more reflect upon and analyze the nature of their own knowledge in order to make decisions about what to try to transmit to the pupils. Any educator will tell you that you truly come to understand something once you have taught it. Going Glocal students’ comments suggest that they too found this to be the case. If we look briefly at Bloom’s taxonomy, in which a hierarchy of thinking skills is set out, we can see several reasons why this might be so (Bloom, 1956). Teaching requires the use of Bloom’s higher order skills (analyzing, evaluating, and creating) (Bloom, 1956). Simply having knowledge is not enough, and understanding and applying knowledge doesn’t take you much further than giving a solid presentation. Enabling learning requires an ever-repeating cycle in which specific
aspects of the subject’s content and various pedagogical methods must be constantly analyzed and evaluated to select the most effective ones for creating bespoke pathways to learning. Going Glocal students were not necessarily aware of the way their own thinking was pushed in this way, from knowledge and understanding about global citizenship to creating something new: namely a set of enabling factors for the pupils’ learning. Indeed, not all of them achieved it all of the time. However, it can be argued that through being made conscious of Bloom’s distinctions as evidenced in their lesson planning, students’ were stimulated to evaluate and create (Bloom, 1956). For example, students who created a lesson in which they evaluated that there would be a greater impact on pupil learning if the class did not just get to know a few facts about Namibia, but tried to analyze the nature of stereotypes about Africa and then even attempted to create ways of breaking down those stereotypes, shows that the students must have processed their own learning about Namibia to a higher level (Bloom, 1956).

The Benefits of a ‘Second Local’: Glocal focus and negotiating problems in global citizenship education

The previous two areas of discussion have shown how schools outreach can support the self-efficacy of university students as global citizens, and that teaching might be able to extend students’ own thinking about global issues. It is also useful here to elaborate on how Going Glocal’s use of glocal thinking might be a tool for considering how helpful the glocal can be to global citizenship education more generally.

In this volume, Mannion (2015) identifies several weak areas or “risks” in much current global citizenship education. Amongst them are ethnocentrism, neocolonialism, the transmissive approach, and a lack of political or environmental discourse (Mannion, 2015, in this volume). He then suggests that a glocal perspective might help ameliorate these concerns (Mannion, 2015, in this volume). Indeed, the Going Glocal example allows us to discuss a number of points that support Mannion’s hypothesis. Examples of problems and possible routes to better approaches are discussed here, drawn from both the teaching for students in the Going Glocal program as designed by UCR, and the teaching that occurred in schools outreach as designed by students.

Mannion raises the concern that global citizenship education can be blighted by ethnocentrism when a narrative is created in which ‘we’ are global and ‘they’ are local (Mannion, 2015; Roudomentof, 2005). It has been established that the glocal approach strives for understanding of the global in the local and vice versa, and that this might reduce the dichotomy (Robertson, 1995). However, the problem of ethnocentrism might well remain largely intractable unless both the global connections and the specific, individual circumstances of the societies abroad that are presented to learners are explored. There is a need to avoid creating a homogenous, simple ‘global’ whilst ‘we’
are local and thereby complex. Thus, in *Going Glocal*, the glocal is manifest in another conceptually important way, namely the specific emphasis on communities in Mexico and Namibia as examples not only of the global but also of what can be termed the ‘second local’.

For *Going Glocal* students, deep investigations into specific global contexts – getting to know Opuwo (Namibia) or Chiapas (Mexico) well, both in the lecture hall and while actually there – is key to trying to reduce ethnocentrism. Clearly we can never fully understand all other societies and should avoid making generalizations, so perhaps trying to relate to just one, a ‘second local’, is a good way to begin the education of a global citizen. Developing a rounded, full color perspective on a ‘second local’ and recognizing its citizens as also global – connected not isolated – and also fully local – with just as complex and ‘situated’ a set of current circumstances (Braidotti, 2011) as citizens of Middelburg – can highlight similarities in the human experience. In this way, the ‘second local’ might reduce polarizing ‘us’ and ‘them’ constructions, which can be focused on difference and are often inherently ethnocentric.

Students visiting Mexico and Namibia also experienced being in a minority⁸, which Braidotti (2011) argues is a valuable tool in confronting ethnocentrism and understanding positionality. Park, Sklad and Tsirogianni’s chapter in this volume shows how some of the *Going Glocal* students responded to this in 2013 and 2014 (2015). School pupils are not given such travel opportunities, and yet there is also some evidence that *Going Glocal*’s way of connecting them with a ‘second local’ can make some roads into weakening ethnocentrism among younger children, for example by raising their awareness of the existence of different perspectives and ways of knowing. Some of the university students, such as those who devised a simple but extremely popular music video exchange between a Dutch school and a Namibian school, worked hard to present both groups as equally local and equally global, to present Opuwo as a culturally rich, culturally individual ‘second local’ and to counter stereotypes. Although it is very hard to quantify, such initiatives did have a positive impact on school pupils. For example, in informal, semi-structured interviews conducted by students in which they surveyed individual pupils’ thoughts about Namibia and Mexico, the vast majority of youngsters from the two classes questioned (one primary and one secondary) made comments that demonstrated that received knowledge and stereotypes had been challenged⁹. In observations of lessons made by UCR staff, it was also noted that pupils often made comments voicing their surprise at similarities between themselves and young people

---

⁸ For some students (but not all) this was the first time they had experienced this (Park, Sklad and Tsirogianni 2015 in this volume).

⁹ Data is taken from 24 primary and 19 secondary school interviews. Pupils made comments such as “not everything that you hear and think about people in other countries is true, there is more than you think” (Anonymous 10 year old).
in Chiapas or Opuwo. This seems to imply that a glocal approach, especially one that makes use of the perspectives of a nuanced ‘second local’ rather than a vague and generalized global, might be more able to recognize and rein in ethnocentric tendencies in schools’ education for global citizenship.

However, it is more difficult to be confident that the neocolonial perspective taking Mannion describes has been fully avoided by Going Glocal so far (Mannion, 2015). In Going Glocal, a paradox has been created by some of the environmental and political responses to global problems that students have called for pupils to make. This is because lessons have often drawn on themes related to consumer choice. Fair trade is a particularly useful topic for making exploitative transnational patterns tangible for young learners, and Going Glocal students based many lessons on this. But emphasis on trade (fair or exploitative) can trap glocal citizenship education in the clutches of neoliberal market capitalism and neocolonialism if we do not ensure that the attention given to consumption and to being a ‘good’ consumer as a means to self-efficacy, and thereby ‘successful’ global citizenship, is minimized.

It is inappropriate to suggest that children can become better, more empowered citizens through what they buy. Children’s patterns of consumption are rarely self-determined and therefore schools should avoid implying that the global citizens in the class are those who can persuade an adult to be a more ‘fair’ consumer on their behalf. Given the higher cost of much of the produce marketed as ethical or fair, this places a socioeconomic barrier to being a (good) global citizen. One rather extreme example of how entrenched in consumerism global citizenship education can become is the toe curling ‘Me to We’ project which even has its own, for-profit, ethical clothing range marketed at school children during lesson time (Jefferess, 2012). Even when buying fair trade is carefully framed as something adults can do, there is still a danger of falling back into the old mind set of ‘helping’ through ethical consuming, and of thereby implying western superiority as global citizens because of the ability to make such purchasing choices. In this model, the relationship between the producers of fair trade goods (often in the global south) and the consumer (in the global north), however interconnected and glocal, is not equal and can indeed veer towards neocolonialism.

There were some inspiring examples in Going Glocal in which students demonstrated an alternative to the fair trade trap. Several students, often those who had focused on Mexico and had read Esteva’s accessible discussion on reducing scarcity by deprioritizing growth (Esteva et al., 2013, p. 88-90), were able to present ‘self-sufficiency’ as a model for non-consumer based citizenship. Self-sufficiency, termed simply as trying to preserve resources and reduce one’s need for consumer goods by making use of what is readily available and recyclable, has the potential to be more helpful as a glocal topic in schools

10 David Jefferess explains how the ‘Me to We’ project uses celebrity and branding, and runs a for-profit division as well as a charity. See Me to We (2015): http://shop.metowe.com
than fair trade. Firstly, it is easy to find examples locally of anything that is homemade or home grown. Next, discussing examples of self-sufficiency found in a ‘second local’ offers room for much more equitable global comparisons. There are few barriers to students or children trying self-sufficiency for themselves, and teachers can avoid what Mannion (2015, in this volume) calls the “transmissive approach” of simply teaching ‘about’ global issues: as the class who made soap and deodorant with the Going Glocal students found out. Finally, self-sufficiency is also intrinsically linked to protecting the environment, which Mannion (2015) suggests can be under emphasized in global citizenship education.

A glocal framework may also be useful in enabling political factors, which Mannion (2015) argues can be underrepresented, to be investigated by learners. For example, unequal interconnectedness was another key theme for Going Glocal: several students chose to investigate causes of migration and the Dutch government’s approach, specifically that of the local council, towards asylum seekers. As such, students were planning glocally-connected lessons that helped pupils to investigate local political responses to particular global issues. It was interesting to see that these students also made use of the ‘second local’ by inviting asylum seekers as guest speakers to share their individual stories.

Conclusions

The Going Glocal program supports the view that making schools based outreach integral to the structure of higher education programs for global citizenship can be advantageous for all concerned. Outreach can be pivotal in establishing the glocal focus in global citizenship education, both in the university and the schools involved. This in itself is a worthy goal because of the advantages of glocal approaches. Being glocal can help to recognize not just connections but the nature of connections across the world. It can demonstrate that interaction globally is caught in a web of structural inequality and cogitative bias and, in highlighting these problems, perhaps offers an opportunity to reduce them.

Placing Going Glocal students in school classrooms can be said to have had the most significant positive impact on the students themselves. But benefits for pupils, teachers, and universities – which could be applicable to further global citizenship programs and indeed other disciplines – can be extracted from this case. For example, schools can be encouraged by universities to become the hub of a network of wider local initiatives with global impact. At the same time, connecting with schools can help to make universities more glocal institutions in themselves. Learning can be shared and cultivated in a community rather than banked in an ivory tower (Bok, 1982).

For university students, teaching is a glocal act in itself, connecting their global knowledge to a local setting in a useful and meaningful way that can enhance their
‘self-efficacy’. Beyond this, the potential of teaching as learning for university students can be recognized. Teaching can offer students a means to defragment and reconstitute their own existing knowledge following their academic courses and international experiences. It might also offer ways to stimulate further and deeper learning in a democratic and symbiotic manner. This is because the practical context of the classroom experience takes the students through higher levels of thinking. Analyzing, and evaluating their existing knowledge to create lessons and materials (Bloom, 1956) can give them new cognitive hooks on which to hang both their academic research and their personal perspectives. Thus outreach can offer students real life scenarios (in the classroom in this case) as a way to scaffold connections between the complex theories they study and practice.

Problems and risks within global citizenship education were highlighted by this project too, as were some of the ways in which a glocal focus can mitigate a few of them. For example, attempting to loosen the grip of ethnocentrism and neocolonialism by developing the ‘second local’ has been shown to have some potential, as has the glocal approach’s possible ability to give more room to environmental and political factors. In short, schools offer university programs for global citizenship education the chance to be glocal in practice, and also to hone the thinking of both students and program designers for the benefit of a wider network of future learners.
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TOWARDS A UNIFIED VISION AND ASSESSMENT OF THE MULTIFACETED CONSTRUCT OF GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Rebecca McGuire-Snieckus

The term ‘global citizenship’ has gained increasing prominence in higher education discourse over the past decade (Knight, 2013). But what do we mean by ‘global citizens’? What are the core traits that determine global citizenship and how do we determine whether the impact of international initiatives in higher education fosters these identified traits? The aim of this chapter is to explore the multifaceted concept of global citizenship, to provide a critical reflection on the different ways in which global citizenship has been assessed, and to make a call to action for a comprehensive tool that encompasses all relevant global citizen concepts.

During the past thirty years, the international dimension has increasingly become a focus in higher education. Initiatives designed to increase cooperation and exchange in teaching and research during the 1980s helped stimulate an increase in proactive, rather than reactive, approaches to higher education institutional strategies in Europe (de Wit, 2010). While early international initiatives were typically viewed as an ‘add on’ to core strategy in higher education, they are increasingly viewed as central (International Association of Universities, 2003). In 1998, the international dimension was identified as a quality indicator in the World Conference on Higher Education Meeting of Higher Education Partners (WCHE) World Declaration. The declaration emphasized the importance of staff and student mobility and knowledge exchange in teaching and research. Recently, in the United States, 48% of higher educational institutions reported international or global education to be among its top five strategic priorities in 2011, compared to 24% in 2001 (American Council on Education, 2012). A survey of 156 higher education institutions worldwide revealed that 70% of institutions reported an international strategic plan (International Association of Universities, 2003). By 2025 it is expected that the demand for international education will increase to 7.2 million students, from 1.2 million students in 2000 (Knight, 2013).

A new lexicon of terms and associated meanings that describe the international dimension of higher education has emerged, including those that are curriculum focused (intercultural education, global studies, international studies, peace education, multicultural education), mobility focused (academic mobility, education abroad, study abroad), and cross border focused (global education, education across borders, borderless education, transnational education) (de Wit, 2010). Knight (2013) has
charted the evolution of international education terminology: from terms used in the last 50 years (international education, international development cooperation, and comparative education); the last 30 years (internationalization, multicultural education and intercultural education); the last 20 years (globalization, borderless education, transnational education); and the last 10 years (glocalisation, knowledge enterprise and global citizenship).

Global citizenship discourse has its roots in ancient Greece, and is underpinned by the central goal of harmony between people in the Polis (de Witt, 2010). It is sometimes linked to the concept of cosmopolitanism, an intellectual and aesthetic position of openness towards people, places and experiences from different countries (Matthews & Sidhu, 2005). However, banal cosmopolitanism – consumption of global travel, food, brands, icons – ‘does not necessarily extend to ethical and moral commitments to a global community’ (Matthews & Sidhu, 2005). Moreover, concerns have been raised about international initiatives in higher education amounting to producing learners as ‘intellectual tourists, voyeurs and vagabonds’, ‘agents of civility and democratic nation builders’ or as ‘multicultural consumers of ethnic, racial and (inter)national difference’ (Roman, 2003; Bannerji, 2000). Thus global citizenship pedagogy tends to center around an understanding of loyalties, memberships, identities, rights, responsibilities, in the context of globalization (Matthews & Sidhu, 2005). The concept of citizenship has circulated in the realm of political science with an emphasis on the political and social ties that bind citizens in pursuit of the collective good (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). Rousseau’s notion of the social contract is based on the concept of free will, in the context of reciprocal rights and responsibilities (Bertram, 2003). Waltzer (1978) defines citizenship in relation to membership, rights and responsibilities. The UNESCO view of global citizenship education centers on ‘the values of tolerance, universality, mutual understanding, respect for cultural diversity and the promotion of a culture of peace ... inspiring action by international organizations, states, civil society and individual citizens’ (Pigozzi, 2006).

Nussbaum (2002) notes that the ‘liberal arts education’ model in colleges and universities should be reformed to equip students with the challenges of global citizenship, including: the Socratic ability to criticize one’s own traditions and carry on an argument in terms of mutual respect for reason; the ability to think as a citizen of the world and not just a local region or group; and the ‘narrative imagination’, or the ability to imagine what it would be like to be in the position of someone very different from oneself. Indeed, liberal arts education can be traced back to ancient Greece as the mark of an educated person and essential to participating in civic life. Here, the role of education was seen to shape good citizens with an understanding of civic duties, rights and responsibilities (Ornstein and Levine, 1985). According to Gacel-Avila (2005), the goal of global citizenship education should be: to foster understanding in students of the interdependence between people and societies; to develop an
understanding of their own and other cultures, and respect for pluralism; and to
develop global consciousness, including understanding of and receptivity to foreign
cultures, and issues of socioeconomic concerns and ecology. Schecter (1993) maintains
that global citizenship education should be pragmatic (gaining knowledge and skills
for employability in a global context), liberal (intercultural sensibility and capacity
for appreciating cultural differences), and civic (with a sense of multidimensional
citizenship). McGregor (1999) suggests that global citizenship education should
include a civil component (community involvement including learning through
participating in the community and community development), a political component
(skills in decision making, conflict resolution, public life skills), and a social and moral
responsibility component.

While some argue that global citizenship constructs may be too abstract to be
meaningfully operationalized (Davies, 2006), there have been several attempts to do
so. The assessment tools created reflect different approaches to international initiatives
in higher education, whether by ‘competencies’ (attitudes, skills and knowledge),
‘rationale’ (defined by intended outcomes), or ‘process’ (progressive integration of
an international perspective) (De Wit, 2002). Roman (2003) suggests that there is a
distinction between dominant conceptualizations of global citizenship as being either
from ‘above’ (‘national and global competitiveness, efficiency, consumption, and
productive citizenship’) or ‘below’ (‘values of civic global responsibility, service to
community, respect for the environment, and a shared sense of belonging to a common
human community across national borders’). It has been suggested that the dominance
of ‘wanting to travel’ and ‘wanting to contribute’ as main reasons for seeking cross border
student experiences indicates a complex set of motivations that may be interpreted
as being both from ‘above’ (the gaining of cultural capital through the collection of
experience abroad) and ‘below’ (altruism and responsibility to others) (Sin, 2009; Roman,
2003). Many scales focus on constructs relating to global ‘competence’, ‘effectiveness’,
encompasses experiences (effective global participation, collaboration across cultures),
skills (identifying difference, ability to assess intercultural performance), knowledge
(globalization, world history), and attitudes (non-judgmental, risk taking, openness,
and diversity). Der Karabetian (1993) uses Sampson and Smith’s (1957) model of ‘World
Communication Competence’ in their assessment. It includes constructs such as general
cultural understanding, culture-specific understanding, and positive regard for the
other. Arasarthnam’s (2009) Intercultural Communication Competence Scale includes
cognitive (communication competence complexity), affective (empathy), and behavioral
(adapting behaviors or communication, seeking interaction, friendships with people of
other cultures) dimensions. Chen and Starosta (2000) focus on the affective aspects of
intercultural communication, namely open-mindedness, suspending judgment, self-
monitoring, interaction involvement and empathy.
‘Multicultural effectiveness’ is defined by van der Zee and van Oudenhoven (2000) as: the ability to work well in a new cultural environment; the ability to manage people from other cultures with a sense of wellbeing; and having attitudes such as flexibility, extraversion, open-mindedness, orientation to action, emotional stability, and curiosity or adventurousness. Kelly and Meyers (1992) focus on ‘cross cultural adaptability’ with dimensions including personal autonomy, emotional resilience, perceptual acuity, and flexibility. The Inter-cultural Adjustment Potential Scale (Matsumoto et al., 2001) assesses psychological skills for intercultural adjustment including empathy, openness, emotion regulation, tolerance for ambiguity, interpersonal security, flexibility, emotional commitment to traditional ways of thinking, and critical thinking.

Bhawuk and Brislin (1992) assess intercultural sensitivity using the ICSI by exploring an individual’s ability to modify their behavior in an international context with respect to individualism and collectivism, flexibility in the unfamiliar, and open-mindedness to differences. Preuemger and Rogers (1993) assess cross-cultural sensitivity using the CCSS with constructs including cultural knowledge, attitudes, beliefs and lifestyles. The Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) (Hammer et al., 2003) assesses an individual’s reactions to cultural difference according to six stages. The first three stages (denial, defense and minimization) are described as ‘ethnocentric’ (an individual’s own culture is experienced as central to reality) whereas the last three stages (acceptance, adaptation and integration) are described as ‘ethnorelative’ (an individual’s culture is experienced in the context of other cultures).

Gudykunst, Wiseman and Hammer (1998) assess cross-cultural attitudes, including dimensions that are affective (ethnocentrism), cognitive (stereotypes) and conative (social distance). Ang et al. (2011) assess cultural intelligence with the use of dimensions that are metacognitive (how cultural knowledge and understanding are acquired), cognitive (general knowledge about culture), motivational (energy applied to learn and function in cross-cultural situations by magnitude), and behavioral (when interacting with people from other cultures, the ability to act appropriately).

Other scales focus on concepts such as ‘responsibility’ and ‘justice’ and may or may not include competencies. For instance, the Global Responsibility Scale (Starrett, 1996) includes dimensions of global social obligation, responsibility for people, and social conservatism. The Global Beliefs in a Just World Scale (Lipkus, 1991) assesses constructs such as interpersonal justice, social political justice and cynicism/fatalism. Shultz et al. (2008) incorporate four domains into their assessment, namely: civic principles, civic participation, civic identities, and civic society and systems. Morais and Ogden (2011) assess global citizenship according to social responsibility (altruism, disparities and global justice, empathy and altruism, personal responsibility and global interconnectedness), global civic engagement (global civic activism, political voice, involvement in civic organizations), and global competence (intercultural communication, self-awareness, global knowledge). The Global Perspective Inventory
(Braskamp et al. 2014) assesses interpersonal (social interaction and social knowledge), intrapersonal (affect and identity), and cognitive (knowledge and knowing) dimensions. Across different assessments there is much conceptual overlap and divergence, even among constructs that on the surface appear to overlap. For instance, ‘empathy’ is conceptualized as a ‘social responsibility’ (Morais & Ogden, 2011), an affective dimension of communication competence (Arasaratnam, 2009; Chen & Starosta, 2000), and a psychological skill for intercultural adjustment (Matsumoto et al., 2001).

Suggested and actual uses for assessments designed to measure global citizenship constructs include program development (Morais & Ogden, 2011; Hunter, 2004; Sperandio et al., 2010), program evaluation (Glover et al., 2011; Hett, 1993), assessing impact of abroad experiences (Morais & Ogden, 2011; Tarrant et al., 2013; Matsumoto et al., 2004), measuring international student adjustment (Braskamp et al., 2008; Shultz et al., 2008), comparison of populations (Hett, 1993; Goldstein & Smith, 1999; Bhawuk, 1998), identification of correlates of GC (Lipkus, 1991; Starrett, 1996; Bush et al., 2001; Arasaratnam and Banerjee, 2011; Arasaratnam, 2009; Ang et al., 2007) and as predictive tools (Reysen et al., 2013; Ang et al., 2011; Ward et al., 2011; Reuben, 1976; van der Zee & van Oudenhovem, 2003; Suanet & van der Vijver, 2009).

Most global citizenship constructs are assessed using self-reporting instruments that maintain some inherent limitations. Social desirability – the tendency to rate oneself according to socially approved behavior – is a longstanding concern with self-assessment tools (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). There is also much evidence to demonstrate discrepancies between self-evaluations and evaluations made by others (Brown & Knight, 2002). Moreover, self-assessments are based on the assumption that responses reveal preexisting states of mind, rather than ones generated by the questions themselves. Might the cognitions actually be created by completing the questionnaire (Ogden, 2012)? When asking an individual to locate themselves on a Likert-type scale for a given concept, one must consider the extent to which such reality is framed. Are assessors constructing an aspect of an individual’s self-concept that may or may not have existed before the assessment? Indeed, some researchers have revealed how the framing of questions can be used to manipulate thoughts and feelings – particularly if the behavior being assessed is unfamiliar – though research suggests that even a focus on familiar behavior can create a shift in cognitive set (Wenzlaff & Wegner, 2000; Ogden, 2012). Moreover, completing a questionnaire can also change a person’s subsequent behavior (Ogden, 2012). Do individuals have insight into constructs that they are being asked to self-evaluate? Are individuals really able to differentiate their thoughts, feelings or behaviors to the level of detail required by numerical scales (on scale from 1-7, for instance) (Ogden, 2012)?

Notwithstanding limitations of the self-assessment methods, they do give individuals the opportunity to report their own experience. As higher education institutions increasingly value the international dimension as a quality indicator and strategic
priority (American Council on Education, 2012; International Association of Universities, 2003) assessments of such initiatives gain importance. At the same time there is the recognition of the limitations of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) of internationalization, such as percentages of incoming or outgoing students for benchmarking purposes, and that sustainable process should take into account qualitative aspects within the context of the institution’s own goals and capacities (Gruenewald, 2014). If higher education institutions hope to produce global citizens by encouraging an international dimension, it could be argued that a comprehensive assessment of global citizenship would provide insight into the particular benefits of such initiatives to the students. A comprehensive scale that incorporates all relevant constructs of global citizenship, including those captured by pre-existing assessments, as well as those that have not been operationalized by assessment tool is needed. An all-encompassing assessment of the multifaceted construct of global citizenship could be used for the purpose of program development and evaluation, comparison of populations, and impact assessment of international initiatives.
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Universities, nongovernmental organizations, scholars, and activists are calling for global citizenship development. Arguably the most beautiful among these calls suggest global citizenship as a pioneering route to an as-yet-unimagined tomorrow (Falk, 2000); a future where our contingent understandings of human rights are embraced in a manner that is respectful of cultural differences and consistent with common human dignity (Appiah, 2006; Donnelly, 2003). Such an embrace requires intercultural competence, civic skills, and an ongoing commitment to critical thinking. How might we know when students have achieved this sort of complex global learning?

In recent years, several major associations and scholars have offered responses to the twin challenges of better understanding and assessing global citizenship. The chapter that follows considers conceptual framing before detailing several assessment efforts. It then proceeds by demonstrating the strengths and shortcomings of existing evaluations before sharing a novel, conceptually integrated and theoretically grounded approach to global citizenship assessment, the global engagement survey (GES). The GES is particularly useful in respect to assessing specific program interventions, such as study abroad or glocal, cross-cultural service-learning. The intent of this chapter is to clarify the conceptual basis for considering global learning in the manner advanced in the GES, and to demonstrate the discrete fields of research that informed its development.

Conceptual Framing and Previous Research

The desire for a systematic and integrated approach to measurement of growth in global citizenship led the authors to consider major U.S. professional associations’ framing of civic, intercultural, and global learning. The leading national association concerned with the undergraduate liberal education experience, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), has for several years focused specifically on social responsibility and integrative liberal learning in a global context. AAC&U integrates key components of intercultural competence and civic development through its global learning rubric, where it suggests:
Through global learning, students should (1) become informed, open-minded, and responsible people who are attentive to diversity across the spectrum of differences, (2) seek to understand how their actions affect both local and global communities, and (3) address the world’s most pressing and enduring issues collaboratively and equitably. (2014, p. 1, emphasis ours)

This integration of intercultural competence or attention to diversity with a focus on individual actions and attention to pressing issues, along with the development of critical thinking, is also featured throughout A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy’s Future (National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, 2012), a document prepared at the request of the U.S. Department of Education. The leading U.S. association advocating that universities serve public, civic purposes, Campus Compact, responded to A Crucible Moment with a policy brief calling for higher education institutions to, among other things, “advance a contemporary, comprehensive framework for civic learning that embraces U.S. and global interdependencies” (Campus Compact, 2012, p. 8, emphasis ours). Meanwhile, AAC&U cooperated with NAFSA to develop Global Learning: Defining, Designing, Demonstrating, a publication that again emphasizes that 21st century graduates must integrate local and global civic knowledge and engagement, intercultural knowledge and competence, as well as ethical reasoning and action (Hovland, 2014). Here and elsewhere (Hartman & Kiely, 2014; Sobania, 2015; Whitehead, 2015), it is clear that U.S. theorists and administrators are also integrating the local aspects of global citizenship and learning that are highlighted throughout this volume.

Several research studies have worked to assess outcomes related to global learning and internationally engaged global citizenship development (Bowman, Brandenberger, Mick, & Toms Smedley, 2010; Lough, 2010; Lough, McBride, & Sherraden, 2009; Morais & Ogden, 2011; Niehaus & Cain, 2012), while others have made the conceptual argument that local civic engagement may facilitate cross-cultural experience (Holsapple, 2012; Jacoby, 2009; Whitehead, 2015), or even explicitly provide local opportunity for global civic learning (Alonso Garcia & Longo, 2013; Battistoni, Longo, & Jayanandhan, 2009; Hartman & Kiely, 2014; Longo & Saltmarsh, 2010; Sobania, 2015). Yet, existing research has been limited because it has neglected to consider all components of global citizenship at once or failed to identify the full range of potential program and population factors that may influence outcomes.

International Education and Intercultural Competence

Limitations in existing research developed in large part because the components of intercultural and civic learning have only recently been integrated to the extent called for
above. For example, Bennett (1993, 2012), as well as Braskamp, Braskamp, and Engberg (2014) have worked for several decades to better understand intercultural learning and the development of global perspectives. That work, however, has primarily drawn from the international education and intercultural communications literatures, pointing the research instruments toward intercultural learning to a greater extent than toward civic learning. Even when there has been some consideration of civic learning, the programs examined have not systematically targeted civic learning.

Bennett’s Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), a 50-item scale, is central to the creation of the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS), which itself suggests a progression of orientations toward cultural difference. In use in various contexts around the world since 1998, the IDI has been determined to be a statistically valid and reliable psychometric instrument for deepening understanding of an individual’s intercultural competence (Bennett, 2012). The IDI is also known to contribute understanding of immersion-readiness as well as change, which remains a useful contribution to assessing global learning.

Braskamp’s Global Perspectives Inventory (GPI) also measures intercultural sensitivity, as well as several other related outcomes. The GPI positions student development across three domains, cognitive (How do I know?), intrapersonal (Who am I?), and interpersonal (How do I relate?). The intrapersonal and interpersonal scales both have potential implications for civic learning measurement, with items such as “I can explain my personal values to people who are different from me” (intrapersonal) and “I work for the rights of others” (interpersonal). Reporting on employing the GPI with approximately 500 students enrolled in semester-length study abroad programs, Chickering and Braskamp (2009) indicate students demonstrate growth in the expected direction across constructs, yet with considerable variation among constructs. The social responsibility construct (a sub-construct of interpersonal), for example, showed the smallest gain and, at less than .10, was not considered a meaningful gain despite statistical significance across all constructs.

Chickering and Braskamp (2009) did note that some programs demonstrated significantly different (and much more positive) gains in the social responsibility scale. But, due to the nature of their research, they were unable to report on the characteristics of those particular programs. Both Bennett and Braskamp’s scales have been statistically validated and are available for university assessment on a fee-for-use basis (Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003; Braskamp, Braskamp, & Engberg, 2014). An additional commonality is that they are both entirely self-report measures, prompting respondents to express degrees of agreement or disagreement with statements frequently infused with social desirability. A comprehensive review of decades of research and programming that employs the IDI and GPI led to a collection of essays relating to international education. The edited volume and the essays within it lead to the conclusion that, “Most students learn to learn effectively abroad only when

Despite their extensive use in study abroad and international education circles, both Bennett’s intercultural learning and Braskamp’s global perspective are consistent with an understanding of global citizenship learning that is inclusive of domestic and international understanding. Whether in domestic or international contexts, Bennett writes, “More successful intercultural communication similarly involves being able to see a culturally different person as equally complex to one’s self (person-centered) and being able to take a culturally different perspective” (2004, p. 73). While Braskamp avers, “A global perspective includes both a domestic focus on multicultural education and diversity and an internationalization focus that includes global trends and relationships among nations” (2015, p. 5).

The Bennett and Braskamp scales, in other words, are conceptually consistent with glocal learning aspirations. Yet within higher education they have not been employed to compare global learning across a wide variety of program types, instead focusing predominantly on study abroad.

**Civic Learning Through Global Service-Learning and Community Engagement**

Other research has grown out of the integration of service-learning/community engagement (SLCE) and study abroad. Studies in this vein have drawn on and benefitted from the SLCE civic learning literature (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Clayton, Bringle, & Hatcher, 2013). Bowman et al. (2010), for example, considered the effects of short-term, immersive service-learning experiences on nearly 500 students’ orientations toward equality, justice, and social responsibility. The immersive learning experiences in question took place in the United States (the ‘home country’ in this case) and abroad, and ranged from two days through eight weeks in respect to the length of immersion. Coursework and targeted reflection before, during, and after the immersive experience focused upon common learning goals. Typical course objectives included, for example:

**Course 1:** To reflect upon and analyze the social, political, economic, religious and cultural forces operative in the Appalachia region through class presentations, discussions, and readings.

**Course 2:** To examine the social forces contributing to migrant work patterns and injustice, and reflect upon means to improve conditions (p. 21 – 22).

354 students participating in the one-credit immersive courses during the academic year, along with 115 students enrolled in three-credit immersive programming during
the summer, completed pre and post tests with seven scales measuring values and attitudes relevant to “the recognition and denunciation of social inequality and the importance placed on helping others” (Bowman et al., 2010, p. 24). Five of the scales employed (situational attributions for poverty, openness to diversity, responsibility for improving society, social dominance orientation, and self-generating view of helping) demonstrated Cronbach Alpha measures above the typically accepted .7 standard, while two were somewhat lower (empowerment view of helping = .63, belief in a just world = .66).

The researchers found that, in contrast to previous research in the service-learning community, short-term (two- to seven-day) immersive learning experiences can positively impact college student learning and development, in respect to equality and social responsibility orientations. The authors concluded that systematic learning objectives, course structure, and academic rigor were key in leading to the positive outcomes associated with short-term immersion. However, students in the eight-week, three credit courses did exhibit desired changes in respect to belief in a just world and social dominance orientation measures, while the students in the shorter programs did not (Bowman et al., 2010).

Hartman (2008, 2014) undertook a similar study, though the scales he employed were more derivative of conventional measures of civic engagement and efficacy. Drawing on Myers-Lipton (1998) and Reeb, Katsuyma, Sammon, and Yoder (1998), Hartman constructed a Global Awareness and Efficacy Scale and a Global Civic Engagement Scale. Pre and post tests were administered with students enrolled in the following three scenarios: (1) a typical English Composition course on campus, (2) a set of short-term global service-learning (GSL) courses lacking a focused global citizenship development curriculum, and (3) a set of short-term GSL courses with a focused global citizenship development curriculum. Results indicated that both scales exhibited Cronbach Alpha scores above .8. Additionally, while both groups of global service-learning students exhibited higher awareness, efficacy, and engagement scores than the on-campus students during the pretest, the only group to show statistically significant gains from pre to post was the GSL group with a focused global citizenship development curriculum (Hartman, 2008, 2014).

Hartman’s findings are consistent with Bowman, et al., in that they suggest the importance of focused learning objectives and facilitated content delivery as fundamental to supporting student growth in indicators related to global civic learning; drawing on years of study with the IDI and GPI, Vande Berg, Paige, and Hemming Lou (2012) found the same for intercultural learning. The Bowman et al. and Hartman studies are also susceptible to similar critiques: each study examines only one institution, each study relies entirely on student self-report, and neither study delves particularly deeply into the intercultural learning and communication capacities that are central to a robust understanding of global citizenship.
The studies reviewed thus far have a strong orientation toward either intercultural learning or civic learning, but not both. Other studies have plunged more deliberately into the complexity of understanding global civic learning holistically, but either have not been attentive to specified global learning outcomes or have been conducted in ways that are not readily scalable. In a study of more than 2,000 students participating in diverse alternative break programs domestically and internationally, Niehaus (2012) found that participation in these short-term, immersive programs is positively correlated with intentions or plans to volunteer, engage in advocacy, or study or travel abroad, or student intentionality in respect to major or career plans. Niehaus found several program factors were significant in predicting growth in the areas listed above, including whether students were emotionally challenged and able to connect their experience to larger social issues, the frequency with which students wrote in journals, the amount students learned from interactions with community members and other students during immersion, and the comprehensiveness of the reorientation program following immersion.

Niehaus’s data also suggested an international program location was significantly related to the likelihood of students expressing interest in future study or travel abroad. While Niehaus’s study is very interesting because it suggests co-curricular programming (despite most alternative breaks not receiving credit) may play a strong role in advancing student thinking in respect to service, advocacy, travel, and career path, it did not focus tightly on global learning as understood by AAC&U and the other major associations mentioned above. It is important to note that the organization with which Niehaus worked rather extensively as part of the survey, BreakAway, is highly systematic in terms of encouraging campus partners to pursue specific learning outcomes, even if non-credit bearing.

A few qualitative studies are worth mentioning here because of their importance in the trajectories of global service-learning and global studies theoretical development in the United States. Kiely (2004, 2005) produced seminal work in the field of GSL, helping educators and students better understand the processes involved in high-dissonance, contextual border crossing. Kiely’s theory of transformational learning through GSL highlights the challenge of employing pre and post tests to better understand specific interventions. His respondents demonstrate that high dissonance border crossing and the reflective processes to understand it, involve a great deal of personalizing, processing, and connecting over time that transcends the boundaries of any given program (Kiely, 2005). Further, Kiely’s research since these seminal works has indicated that, while some outcomes track to specified learning outcomes in a manner consistent with analytic and logical reflective traditions, the critical reflection tradition may lead students to outcomes that involve critique of hegemonic discourse and patterns of behavior. This critique, following from high dissonance, immersive learning, then leads students to experiment with new forms of being, thinking, and doing to create new kinds
of communities and community memberships more consistent with common human dignity. This second kind of critically reflective, anti-hegemonic outcome seems more challenging for evaluators examining program effects immediately following immersive learning experiences (Kiely, 2015).

Representing the globally engaged programming that grew out of Providence College’s Feinstein Institute for Public and Community service, Longo and Saltmarsh (2011) and Alonso Garcia and Longo (2013) made a theoretically grounded case for global citizenship programming, locally, in the context of an increasingly interdependent world. The case for the value of such glocal programming was rooted in conceptually consistent argument and some student interviews following engagement across difference in the city of Providence, Rhode Island. Following those early publications, many theorists and practitioners, including the editors of this volume, have made the conceptual case for glocal programming (Hartman & Kiely, 2014; Sobania, 2015; Whitehead, 2015), yet these arguments to date have been made largely independent of confirmatory empirical evidence. As mentioned above, both Bowman et al. (2010) and Niehaus (2012) included domestic and international service-learning in their studies, and Bennett and Braskamp agree that movement on intercultural competence or global perspectives is as relevant domestically as it is internationally, but existing studies have not integrated systematic evaluation of all components of global learning with students exposed to both domestic (glocal) and international global learning programs.

Open Source Scales Integrating Civic and Intercultural Learning Outcomes

Two studies are exceptions, however, for their choice to be non-proprietary and for their embracing of scales that speak to intercultural and civic learning. Bennett and Braskamp, as mentioned above, have employed a fee-for-service structure to determine what institutions and student populations they will include in their dataset. This not only creates a bias toward better funded institutions and their populations in terms of presence in the dataset; it also generates a situation where predominately first-generation-serving and predominantly minority-serving institutions, which for historic reasons tend to have smaller budgets and less endowment per student, struggle to find accessible opportunities for comparative evaluation (Lough & Toms, 2014). Furthermore, without releasing the full data set, there has been an opportunity missed to mine the causation related factors contributing the greatest change across institutions. Morais and Ogden (2010), alternatively, intentionally developed an open access scale for use across institutions. Their scale, which includes intercultural competence, self-awareness, social responsibility, and civic engagement, is theoretically grounded and empirically validated. They have conducted multiple exploratory and confirmatory factor
analyses, as well as expert face validity trials. Their scale also drew heavily on insights gleaned from Bennett, Braskamp, and other prominent researchers in international education. Morais and Ogden tested their scale iteratively with a total of more than 500 students. The students were enrolled in either short-term abroad experiences tied to a course on the home campus (embedded programs) or in courses covering similar academic content without an education abroad component.

Because many of the scales developed demonstrated high construct validity, and due to their commitment to open access, their global citizenship scale played a strong role in informing the development of the global engagement survey described below. Their social responsibility dimension, however, was unclear. Additionally, their dataset included education abroad students, but did not explicitly include students exposed to glocal programming, service-learning, or civic engagement.

As Morais and Ogden were sharpening tools for understanding global citizenship development among students, Lough, McBride, and Sherraden (2009) were completing research on international volunteer program outcomes. The researchers looked at a 90-item survey delivered to 983 respondents who applied for or worked with short, nonprofessional (3.8 weeks) or long-term, professional (46.2 weeks) international volunteer placements. The majority of volunteers were 25 or younger, but volunteer service was typically not associated with university-sanctioned, accredited service-learning. Following factor analysis of the 983 matched pre and post surveys, the researchers shared eleven scales with Cronbach Alphas above .70. Those scales included international contacts, open mindedness, internationally related life plans, international understanding, intercultural relations, global identity, civic activism, community engagement, media attentiveness, financial contributions, and social skills. Lough, McBride, and Sherraden’s (2009) work was also instrumental in the development of the global engagement survey, because the scale is nonproprietary and measures several targeted outcomes that hang together well. However, the research is once again based entirely on self-report data, only examines international volunteering as the programmatic intervention, and is limited to analysis of two programs. As exhibited in Table 1, significant research operates on the edges of glocal and international engagement that is plausibly supportive of robust global learning, but existing research comes from limiting perspectives or locations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Measure / Theoretical Contribution</th>
<th>Population and Intervention</th>
<th>Outcome(s) Measured</th>
<th>Theoretical Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bennett, 1993, 2012</td>
<td>Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS)</td>
<td>College students exposed to study abroad; also employed in corporate and other settings</td>
<td>Intercultural competence</td>
<td>Developed out of international education literature with limited focus on civic engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braskamp, Braskamp, &amp; Engberg, 2014</td>
<td>Global Perspectives Inventory (GPI)</td>
<td>Global Perspectives Inventory (GPI)</td>
<td>Global learning, development – cognitive (knowing and knowledge), intrapersonal (identity and affect), and interpersonal (social interactions and social responsibility)</td>
<td>Developed out of international education literature with limited focus on civic engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowman et al., 2010</td>
<td>Various relating to attitudes on equality, justice, social responsibility</td>
<td>Comparison of college students exposed to 2-7 day global service-learning (GSL) programs with college students exposed to 8-10 GSL week programs</td>
<td>Student orientations to equality, justice, and social responsibility</td>
<td>Limited to single institution; no focus on intercultural competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartman, 2014</td>
<td>Global Civic Engagement, Awareness, and Efficacy</td>
<td>College students exposed to GSL with structured curriculum compared with GSL students lacking structured curriculum</td>
<td>Global Civic Engagement</td>
<td>Limited to single institution; no focus on intercultural competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Data Limitations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiely, 2004, 2005</td>
<td>A Transformative Learning Model for Service-Learning</td>
<td>Community college students who participated in a GSL program in Nicaragua</td>
<td>Data limited to single institution, program, and site; global citizenship &amp; intercultural competence not explicit areas of focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longo &amp; Saltmarsh, 2011; Alonso Garcia &amp; Longo, 2013</td>
<td>Reframing International Service-Learning into Global Service-Learning</td>
<td>Undergraduate students in a global studies major with a sustained civic engagement focus</td>
<td>Conceptual argument with some supporting student interview data / co-writing, suggesting value in local forms of global engagement; Data limited to one program; largely conceptual argument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lough, McBride, &amp; Sherraden, 2012</td>
<td>International Volunteering Impacts Survey (IVIS)</td>
<td>International volunteers who participated in placements between 2 and 52 weeks in length</td>
<td>International contacts, open-mindedness, international understanding, intercultural competence, civic activism, community engagement; Data limited to two volunteer programs; not all constructs were fully validated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morais &amp; Ogden (2011)</td>
<td>Global Citizenship Scale</td>
<td>College students participating in study abroad programming</td>
<td>Social responsibility, global competence (including intercultural competence), and global civic engagement; Social responsibility was an unclear dimension in the scale development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niehaus, 2012; Niehaus &amp; Crain, 2012</td>
<td>National Survey of Alternative Breaks</td>
<td>US College students participating in alternative spring breaks</td>
<td>Student choices regarding major, career plans, intentions to volunteer, engage in advocacy, study abroad or travel abroad; Data limited to alternative breaks; global citizenship &amp; intercultural competence not explicit areas of focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review of the studies in Table 1 illuminates several strong approaches to evaluating outcomes in this area. Yet the diversity of studies also emphasizes the extraordinary variation in populations and interventions employed to advance the capacious ideal: components of global learning for global citizenship. A review of the above and additional studies (Hartman, 2015; Sherraden, Lough, & McBride, 2008; Whitley, 2014) led the researchers to develop a considerable catalogue of global learning intervention program factors, as summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Program Factors Identified as part of the Global Engagement Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Potentially moderating factors identified within category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The factors enumerated in Table 2 were identified as having potentially moderating impacts on high impact global learning programming, including domestic and international versions of GSL, conventional study abroad programming, local engagement across cultures, and domestic programming for visiting international students. These potentially moderating impacts include accommodations (e.g., homestay or other) and extent of language immersion or lack thereof (Vandeberg, Paige, & Hemming Lough, 2012), extent and type of community engagement (Moely, Furco, & Reed, 2008), the required or elective nature of the course or program (Lassahn, 2015), as well as whether it was credit-bearing or co-curricular (Eyler & Giles, 1999), along with demographic and socioeconomic similarity and difference among visiting students and host community members (York, 2013; Wilsey, Friedrichs, Gabrich, & Chung, 2014). These program factors were collected when program administrators completed an online form detailing the components of each program by responding to questions such as those set out in Table 3.

**Table 3: Sample Questions used in Global Engagement Survey Online Form**

Please indicate the best description of student-community language relationships for this program:

- ☐ Students are engaged in the community and the dominant language is English
- ☐ The dominant language is not English. Students are not required to have local language skills
- ☐ The dominant language is not English. Students are required to have introductory local language skills to participate
- ☐ The dominant language is not English. Students are required to have intermediate local language skills to participate
- ☐ The dominant language is not English. Students are required to have advanced local language skills to participate

From domestic cross-cultural service to intentional on campus interactions with international students and conventional study abroad, outcomes of interest are often similar if not the same. The uncertainty in respect to the sameness or dissimilarity of outcomes among these interventions is indeed one of the central reasons for more research in this area. If developmental student learning can be supported through a number of coordinated, targeted interventions spread over students’ four-year university experiences, research that employs the same outcome measures across a variety of interventions will be helpful in chronologically ordering student experiences, as well
as in making choices about scarce institutional resources and appropriate methods for encouraging student learning.

The Global Engagement Survey

Based on the AAC&U framing and previous research discussed above, the authors integrated the strengths in existing scales and focused efforts around an understanding of global learning predicated upon three primary outcome areas: (1) intercultural competence, (2) global citizenship, and (3) critical thinking. Further, the researchers responded to critiques that most of the above measures are exclusive self-report by adding clarifying questions that are responsive to respondents’ assertions on the likert scale items. The following scale, which focuses on self-awareness as a component of intercultural competence, demonstrates how particular closed-item responses lead to relevant follow-up questions, in an effort to surface qualitative data that may serve as conformational or negating data in relation to self-report. The follow-up questions that appear depend upon students initial responses, with SD indicating strongly disagree and SA indicating strongly agree. On this scale and others, sometimes disagreeing with assertions regarding ease of performance in intercultural situations may be a signifier of experience, while it is possible that students who agree that they can perform well interculturally have very little experience in such situations.

Table 4: Intercultural Competence: Self-Awareness Scale

☐ I can easily resolve misunderstandings with people from other cultures.
  ☐ If SD or D - Can you briefly explain how you know that you are challenged to easily resolve misunderstandings with people from other cultures?
  ☐ If SA or A - Can you provide a brief example of a time you satisfactorily resolved a misunderstanding with a person from another culture?

☐ I adapt my behavior and mannerisms when I am interacting with people of other cultures.

☐ I often adapt my communication style to other people’s cultural background.

☐ I can easily adapt my actions in response to changing circumstances.

☐ My self-understanding is informed by many assumptions that are unique to my culture.

☐ I have a hard time working with people who are different from me.
  ☐ If SA or A, could you describe a point when you had a hard time working with someone who was different than you?
  ☐ If SD or D, can you describe when you have a hard time working with people who are different from you?
I have a hard time understanding the feelings of people from other cultures well.
   - If SA or A, could you describe a point at which you have had a hard time understanding different cultures well?
   - If SD or D, Can you indicate how you have become aware that you have a hard time understanding the feelings of people from other cultures well?

I work to develop and maintain relationships with people of backgrounds different from my own.

I can easily resolve misunderstandings with people from other cultures.
   - If SD or D - Can you briefly explain how you know that you are challenged to easily resolve misunderstandings with people from other cultures?
   - If SA or A - Can you provide a brief example of a time you satisfactorily resolved a misunderstanding with a person from another culture?

I adapt my behavior and mannerisms when I am interacting with people of other cultures.

I often adapt my communication style to other people’s cultural background.

I can easily adapt my actions in response to changing circumstances.

My self-understanding is informed by many assumptions that are unique to my culture.

I have a hard time working with people who are different from me.
   - If SA or A, could you describe a point when you had a hard time working with someone who was different than you?
   - If SD or D, can you describe when you have a hard time working with people who are different from you?

Following revisions resulting from pilot year analysis, the survey now contains 59 closed-ended items across the three main outcome areas. The full survey is available for consideration at http://globalsl.org/ges/. All closed items in the survey use a 5-point scale with response options: 0=Strongly Agree, 2=Neither, 4=Strongly Disagree, presuming the presence of a latent continuous variable underlying respondents’ attitudes and opinions. The survey also contains 16 open-ended questions and 15 items added to the baseline survey to assess the influence of moderating variables enumerated in Table 2, including demographic factors, past international and service experiences, and the length and intensity of the placement, among others. See Figure 1 for a visual overview of the survey structure.
**Conclusion: The Global Engagement Survey**

As universities and activists make compelling arguments to glocalize global learning, assessing the efficacy of such learning is a looming challenge. Previous research can support assessment efforts, but existing studies tend to focus on only one component of global learning (e.g. intercultural competence), only one population (e.g. students at a single university), only one type of intervention (e.g. study abroad), and/or exclusively rely on self-report measures. The GES addresses these challenges by drawing upon the best scales in previous measures, integrating existing measures in a novel manner consistent with agreed upon definitions of global learning, and adding open-ended clarifying questions to the established survey items. The addition of open-ended questions provides space not only for potentially confirmatory or negating utterances from respondents, but also creates the possibility that respondent reflections may capture unplanned, critically reflective insights tied to transformative learning (Kiely, 2015).

Additionally, the authors working with the GES have cooperated with funding agencies to ensure that primarily first-generation-serving and primarily minority-serving institutions have opportunities to participate in the survey, further diversifying the dataset. As the GES enters its third data collecting iteration, and its most ambitious to date, it is clear that participating institutions range from Ivy League institutions through community colleges, and participating program interventions range from course-based
international service-learning through study abroad without service-learning and community engaged glocal learning efforts. As the researchers consistently examine these diverse populations and program types through the same, carefully structured global learning lens, they look forward to reporting upon relationships among specific populations, programs, and outcomes.
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ON THE MEASUREMENT OF GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP: A DUTCH APPROACH

Christine Carabain and Lette Hogeling

In this chapter we report and reflect on the (empirical) definition of global citizenship in a Dutch context. In 2015, the year in which we say goodbye to the millennium development goals and welcome the sustainable development goals, the call for global citizenship seems to be more prominent than ever (Osborn et al., 2015). The eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) – which range from halving extreme poverty rates to halting the spread of HIV/AIDS and providing universal primary education – formed a blueprint agreed to in 2000 by all the world’s countries represented in the UN and all the world’s leading development institutions. They have galvanized unprecedented efforts to meet the needs of the world’s poorest (United Nations, n.d.). They have focused on underdeveloped nations and poorer people. By introducing the sustainable development goals, global issues such as poverty, food security and climate change are no longer considered to be a problem of underdeveloped nations and poorer people ‘over there’, but of all nations and people everywhere. In the RIO+20 United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, member states “recognize that opportunities for people to influence their lives and future, participate in decision making and voice their concerns are fundamental for sustainable development” (United Nations, p. 3, 2012).

Citizenship

The global dimension of citizenship is directly linked to the more general concept of citizenship. The general concept of citizenship refers to the legal relationship between citizen and state, which comprises rights and obligations, and also refers to expectations regarding social participation. The legal relationship between citizens and the state is often referred to as the ‘formal’ dimension of citizenship (Schinkel, 2008). Expectations regarding social participation are the ‘moral’ dimension of citizenship. References to this moral dimension of citizenship have been made since the days of the Greeks and Romans. In ancient Greece, Aristotle considered active political participation, apart from fulfilling rights and obligations, as an essential part of citizenship. In Roman times, Cicero reckoned citizenship as a virtue (Dunn, 2005). The normative component of this moral dimension of citizenship is important to acknowledge. There are, after all, expectations about how, to what extent, and in what way a citizen should participate in society. However, what exactly is expected from citizens differs in the perspectives of
the various citizenship theories. It should be noted that for the formal dimension there are also expectations that citizens have to meet, such as abiding by laws, paying taxes, etc. The difference between the formal and moral dimension is that the government can enforce compliance with the law, but cannot enforce social participation.

**Citizenship Theories**

The liberal citizenship theory is based on the (universal) individual rights of citizens. Liberals leave it to each individual citizen to decide whether or not to actively participate in society (Schuck, 2002). In other words, the focus of this theory is on the formal dimension of citizenship. In general, there are no expectations regarding participation of the citizens. In contrast, the basic principle of the communautarists is that people are by nature part of a sociocultural community and it emphasizes the individual contribution to the community (Dekker & de Hart, 2005). Loyalty to the community is an essential value according to this citizenship theory. Therefore, communautarists expect citizens to actively take part in society and put the common good above individual gain (Janoski & Gran, 2002). This theory substantiates the moral dimension of citizenship in the form of participation in the community at both a social and a cultural level.

Like the communautarists, republican citizenship theory also revolves around the community. However, the republicans do not focus on the sociocultural community, but on the political community (Carton, Callens, Dejaeghere, & Hooghe, 2009). Essential features of the political community are openness and democratic government (Dagger, 2002; Van Gunsteren, 1998). This theory expresses the moral dimension of citizenship in expecting citizens to actively take part in the public debate and show commitment to the community (Dagger, 2002). Finally, the neo-republican citizenship theory states that today’s society is more diverse and complex. Therefore, citizens are not only expected to participate in the public debate, but also expected to be ‘reasonable’ in living together and to accept diversity (Van Gunsteren, 1998).

**The Global Dimension of Citizenship**

Changes in modern society caused by global issues relating to justice and sustainability, e.g., shortage of global public goods and climate change, lend urgency to extending active citizenship beyond national borders. However, global citizenship is nothing new. Socrates (450 B.C.) proclaimed his land of origin to be ‘the world’. A century later, Diogenes declared himself a ‘citizen of the world’ (Follesdal, 2014).

As stated earlier, citizenship theories distinguish between citizens’ rights and obligations (formal dimension) and citizens’ contributions to society (moral dimension).
Are both dimensions also relevant for global citizenship? And if so, in what way?

It is hard, or even impossible, to transfer the formal dimension of citizenship from a national to a global level. There is no world state with a formal system of laws and duties. Therefore the formal dimension seems less relevant than the moral dimension on a global level. Although there is currently no formal legislation for a global state, ideas for global legislation have been around for hundreds of years. In his Le Droit des Gens (1758), Emmerich De Vattel describes the principles of modern humanitarian legislation. He considered it to be each person’s duty to further the interests of humanity at large and to fulfill their obligations. A citizen’s individual duty towards humanity also persists when separate nations are formed. Literature on international legislation suggests a growing consensus that, despite the exclusive authority of the state, humanity’s rights and obligations extend beyond national borders (Parekh, 2003). An example of cross-border legislation is the universal declaration of human rights. In spite of the universal nature of these rights, guaranteeing and enforcing human rights is still largely a matter for individual states (Hindess, 2002).

The moral dimension of citizenship is easier to lift to a global level. The moral dimension is disconnected from the formal legislation of nation states and targets the moral obligations of citizens worldwide. This dimension focuses on the contribution of citizens to the global community. The absence of political authority does not have to stand in the way of (voluntary) civil action at a global level (Gaventa & Tandon, 2010).

Defining Global Citizenship

As showed earlier, even though the global dimension of citizenship has been around for many centuries, in 2012 there appeared to be no clear definition for this form of citizenship (Morais & Ogden, 2010). In more recent years, several scholars have focused on describing and testing models and definitions of global citizenship (e.g. Reysen et al., 2012). In this chapter a definition of the global dimension of citizenship is presented which resonates with the (international) literature and the Dutch context. Following citizenship theories, and thereby distinguishing ourselves from most other definitions, global citizenship is defined in terms of individual behavior focusing on participation in and contribution to the global society. Additionally, we have included three principles underlying this global citizenship behavior in the definition: equality of human beings, mutual dependency in the world, and the shared responsibility for solving global issues. We expect that the endorsement of the three principles can (partially) explain global citizenship behavior. The three principles are also assumed to be interlinked (see Figure 1). In other words, people with above-average awareness of mutual dependency have a stronger conviction that people are equal and people who show greater willingness to take (co)responsibility for global issues are more likely to display behavior befitting
a global citizen. At the same time, people who are prepared to take (co)responsibility for global issues are more convinced that people are equal. In short, endorsing the principles is expected to augment the extent of global citizenship.

The global dimension of citizenship is defined as: The global dimension of citizenship is manifested in behavior that does justice to the principles of mutual dependency in the world, the equality of human beings, and the shared responsibility for solving global issues.

**Figure 1. Graphic depiction of the definition**

With this definition, we acknowledge that behavior can also unwittingly be an expression of global citizenship, for example due to ‘selfish’ motives of saving money. This ensues from the formulation that refers to “behavior that does justice to” instead of “behavior that is based on”. Global citizenship is therefore basically considered to be a behavioral expression, albeit that this behavior can be motivated by the principles of equality, shared responsibility and mutual dependency.
Principles

Even though the main focus of the definition is behavior, the three principles reflect components of knowledge and attitudes. Awareness of mutual dependency and shared responsibility suggest a certain degree of knowledge of the interdependences in the world regarding global issues, such as food security, safety, etc. The conviction that all human beings are equal assumes a social attitude. This attitude encompasses values such as respect for others, concern for human rights, and social and economic equality. The belief in human equality also includes respecting other human beings regardless of gender, ethnicity, social class and sexual orientation, as well as a commitment to a world of social and economic justice (Beneker, Van Stalborch, & Van der Vaart, 2009; Oxfam, 2006). The willingness to take shared responsibility for solving global issues is reflected in the motivation to effectively address global problems independently or cooperatively (Brigham, 2011; Morais & Ogden, 2010; Parekh & Biekart, 2009). Additionally, the belief that people can make a difference and the awareness of one’s own contribution to solving global issues are important (Beneker et al., 2009; Oxfam, 2006).

Behavior

The literature presents a wide array of themes related to global citizenship. We choose two broad areas that in our view include the majority of themes: the sustainability of nature and the sustainability of society. The sustainability of society revolves around a certain degree of social and economic fairness. Social fairness can be described as a hierarchy of ideas on the organization of a society (Merrett, 2004). Economic fairness is defined in terms of public concern for equality in procedures of wealth distribution (Rasinski & Scott, 1990). The sustainability of nature concerns humanity’s ability to pursue development that meets the needs of the current generation without jeopardizing future generations’ ability to meet their needs (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987). Although the sustainability of nature has been interpreted in different ways (for an overview of these interpretations, refer to Dobson, 2000; Lemons, Westra & Goodland, 1997; Pepper, 1993), there are certain aspects that are common to all, such as the retention of natural capital, reciprocity between man and nature, looking after the planet for future generations, and the relations between intragenerational and intergenerational equality (Touché, 2004).
Operationalization of Global Citizenship

After introducing the definition on global citizenship we now introduce the operationalization of global citizenship. Eight types of behavior related to environmental or social sustainability were distinguished (see Table 1). We do not claim that this list is exhaustive. The behavioral items are based on and inspired by studies on ecological behavior (Kaiser, Oerke, & Bogner, 2007; Kaiser & Wilson, 2004), philanthropic behavior (Schuyt, Gouwenberg, & Bekkers, 2011), active citizenship (Ten Dam, Geijsel, Reumerman, & Ledoux, 2010) and support for development cooperation (Hento, 2011). No distinction has been made between behaviors at the local or global level. Following Kaiser and his colleagues (2004) it is stated that in particular behaviors in the field of energy and water, mobility, and handling of waste have a positive effect on environmental sustainability. With regard to other behaviors it is harder to distinguish whether they affect environmental or social sustainability. Consumer behavior, searching for information and expressing an opinion about global issues, donations to charitable organizations, or volunteering may contribute to both environmental and social sustainability.

Given the theme of this book (education for global citizenship) the items presented here are those constructed for adolescents. Compared to the items for adults, they contain fewer items on political participation (e.g. voting behavior) and fewer items on consumer behavior and use of energy (e.g. using a tumble dryer, buying certain products). For more information on the construction of a global citizenship inventory for adolescents, please refer to Van Gent, Carabain, De Goede, Boonstoppel, and Hogeling (2013).

Table 1 Types of global citizenship behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of behavior</th>
<th>Items*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being efficient in the use of water and energy</td>
<td>I leave the charger in the socket once I have charged my mobile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I leave on the light when leaving the room last.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I leave the tap on while brushing my teeth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>If I can choose, I would rather have someone drive me than have to cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling and handling of waste</td>
<td>I use plastic carrier bags more than once.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I litter the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I throw away leftover food, even when still edible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* The answer categories of these items were ‘(almost) never’ ‘sometimes’ ‘often’ and ‘(almost) always’.

**Underlying Principles**

Apart from behavior, the definition also outlines three principles: mutual dependency, human equality and shared responsibility. In the academic literature there were hardly any scales to be found that operationalized these three principles. For this reason, the items to measure the three constructs were mostly drafted by the researchers themselves (Van Gent et al., 2013). In Table 2, all the items are presented.

**Table 2: Items of the principles underlying global citizenship**

| Consumer behaviour | I buy products, despite being aware they have been made by children.  
|                    | I eat meat.  
|                    | I buy second-hand goods.  
| Searching for information | I keep up to date about the problems in the world via the Internet.  
|                    | I keep up to date about the problems in the world via television, radio or the newspapers.  
| Expressing an opinion on global issues | I talk about poverty in the world.  
|                    | I hold family and friends to account when they act against the interests of the environment.  
|                    | I discuss environmental problems.  
|                    | I support charities on Facebook by clicking ‘like’ or by becoming a fan  
|                    | I share my opinion about the problems in the world online, via websites, blog or twitter.  
| Donating to charity | During the past 12 months, did you collect money for charities by means of a campaign, e.g. a sponsored walk, fasting fundraisers, sales promotion or other initiative?  
|                    | During the past 12 months, did you donate to charities via e.g. a collection, SMS campaign or other promotion  
| Volunteering | During the past 12 months, have you carried out volunteer work for a club or organisation in the field of <...>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Items</strong>*</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Equality** | I believe the norms and values of my own culture are better than those of other cultures. (-)**
Freedom of speech is less important to people in poor countries than it is to people in the Netherlands. (-)
In the Netherlands, we are richer than people in poor countries because we organise things better. (-)
I prefer people from my own culture living next to me rather than people from a different culture. (-)
I believe a child from a poor country having fewer opportunities than I have is unjust. (+)
I believe Islam is just as good or bad as Christianity. (+)
I believe that I should have a better chance of finding a job in the Netherlands than a Polish citizen who is looking for work here. (-) |
| **Mutual dependency** | I can make a contribution to solving global problems through the choices that I make in day-to-day life. (+)
If the Netherlands were to refuse entry to asylum seekers, the countries surrounding us would receive more asylum seekers. (+)
Rich countries benefit from solving poverty in poor countries. (+)
The Netherlands does not need other countries in order to earn money. (-)
Some clothing in the Netherlands is cheap, because it is made in poor countries by people earning a low wage. (+)
The Netherlands is not affected by unemployment in other countries. (-)
Protecting the rainforests in Brazil, i.e. preventing them from being cut down, is good for the climate in the Netherlands. (+)
The melting of the ice caps at the North and South Poles does not affect us in the Netherlands. (-) |
| **Shared responsibility** | The Netherlands must help poor countries to solve their problems. (+)
People in poor countries must solve their poverty themselves. (-)
The Netherlands should not interfere with how other countries treat their natural environment. (-)
I feel responsible when I see other people in the world suffering in poverty. (+)
The Dutch government should only focus on problems in the Netherlands. (-)
People have a joint responsibility to help the victims of natural disasters across the globe. (-)
I believe the Dutch government must hold other countries to account when they violate human rights. (+) |

* The answer categories of the items were: ‘totally disagree’, ‘agree’, ‘in between’, ‘agree’ ‘totally agree’ and ‘don’t know’.

** Positively formulated items towards global citizenship are marked with a +. Negatively formulated items are marked with a -.  
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The definition was presented in 2012. Following its introduction, a yearly, longitudinal study was set up amongst the Dutch (adults and youth) to understand the processes affecting global citizenship behavior. In the following four years, the study consisted of a panel and a cross sectional sample. In addition to the behavioral items and those indicating support for the three principles (see Tables 1 and 2), the questionnaire included items measuring concepts (expected to be) related to global citizenship behavior, such as social and institutional trust, social background and home situation, cultural contact, and background characteristics such as level of education, income and religion.

Even though the items were tested extensively (Van Gent et al., 2013), the first empirical results (Carabain, Van Gent, & Boonstoppel, 2012; Van Gent, De Goede, Boonstoppel, & Carabain, 2012) made us question some of the items. The initial item “I believe Islam is just as good or bad as Christianity” was later replaced by “I believe Muslims are equal to Christians or believers of other religions”. The latter statement stronger reflects equality of human beings than the initial statement, which has a focus on equality of religions. Therefore the ‘new’ item better measures equality among members of (religious) groups. The item “I believe that I should have a better chance of finding a job in the Netherlands than a Polish citizen who is looking for work here” was developed to measure the extent to which people endorse economic equality. Over the past years, the flow of Polish laborers on the Dutch labor market has received a lot of (negative) attention in Dutch media. Since the aim was a straightforward measurement of economic equality, we wanted to exclude possible effects of this media attention on Polish workers. In 2013 an additional statement was included in the survey, replacing the Polish citizen with a more ‘neutral’ nationality, namely Danish. In depth analyses showed no differences between the measurements using Polish or Danish workers. In other words: our measurement of economic equality is not affected by nationality.

Focus on behavior

One of our first decisions in the process of defining global citizenship was to focus on behavior.

For the operationalization of this behavior, we choose items that represent small and ‘accessible’ forms of behavior: (not) eating meat, buying second hand products, using your bike instead of the car, saving water in and around the house, etc. By including these types of accessible behavior, we aimed to create a measurement for all Dutch citizens. For example, just including items such as buying fair trade groceries or electric or hybrid cars entails the risk of excluding certain groups in society, e.g. those with limited financial resources. In other words, we also choose for intent oriented behavior in addition to impact oriented behavior (Stern, 2000). In 2013,
in depth analyses revealed that the relation between household income and global citizenship behavior amongst the Dutch is not simple or straightforward (Boonstoppel & Van Elfrinkhof, 2013). On the one hand, people with higher incomes are more likely to express their global citizenship behavior by means of social engagement, such as watching the news, discussing environmental issues, voting, etc. On the other hand, people in lower income groups are more likely to show higher levels of sustainable behavior by means of choices about mobility, consumer behavior and energy use, e.g. less use of a tumble dryer, more traveling by train, and more buying of second hand clothes. Although these differences in behavior are likely to be affected by differences in financial resources (saving money), these results showcase that the items allow every single Dutch citizen to be a global citizen to some extent.

Explaining Global Citizenship Behavior: The Principles

As mentioned in the first part of this chapter, we included three interlinked principles underlying global citizenship behavior in our definition. Endorsement of the equality of human beings, mutual dependency and shared responsibility for solving global issues were expected to (at least) partially explain global citizenship behavior. Studies amongst Dutch young people (Hogeling & Van Elfrinkhof, 2013; Hogeling & van Gent, 2014; Van Gent et al., 2012) show that the principles at least partly explain global citizenship behavior, be it to a varying extent. The principle of mutual dependency has a significant contribution in explaining global citizenship behavior and this contribution holds even after including other important variables such as altruism and level of education (Hogeling & van Gent, 2014). Endorsing the principle of equality and the principle of shared responsibility for solving global problems do not make a significant contribution to explaining global citizenship behavior amongst Dutch youth. However, it is important to be aware that these principles might influence this behavior, but are ‘overruled’ by concepts such as altruism and home situation. Based on the empirical results we have to conclude that the linkages in our model as shown in Figure 1 are not as strong as we expected them to be. However, this lack of explanatory power could also result from the selection of items used to measure the principles. This would beg for another round of revision of these items.

A Final Thought on Operationalization of Global Citizenship in Context

It has been argued that the concept of global citizenship can be defined on a global level. In other words: by means of a definition that is usable all over the world. The
definition was tested amongst people from a wide range of cultural contexts (Van Gent et al., 2013). However, we argue that the operationalization of the definition is highly dependent on the context. The cultural context appeared to be crucial in case of operationalizing global citizenship. One example is the operationalization of mobility. In the Netherlands it makes perfect sense to offer cycling as an alternative for car driving as means of transportation. Cycling then is a sustainable choice in mobility. But in neighboring countries this item may not fit in the cultural context. Thus, we would like to emphasize the importance of taking cultural and other contexts into account on the operationalization of global citizenship.

Acknowledgement. Parts of this chapter were published earlier in Global Citizenship: From public support to active participation, by Carabain, C.L., Keulemans, S.A.C., Van Gent, M. & Spitz, G. (2012).
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A QUANTITATIVE EVALUATION OF THE ‘GOING GLOCAL’ PROGRAM: EFFECTS OF TWO MODES OF GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION AT A UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LEVEL

Marcin Sklad

This chapter is devoted to the quantitative empirical evaluation of the effects of two approaches to education for global citizenship based on outcomes of the program Going Global, conducted at University College Roosevelt (UCR) in Middelburg, the Netherlands (see also Friedman, 2015; Haerkate, 2015; Park, Sklad & Tsirogianni, 2015; Vazquez, 2015, in this volume). In order for modern societies to respond to global challenges they require “globally minded citizens” (Hanson, 2010) who understand the global interconnection (Appiah-Padi, 2001) and are capable of acting to advance the interests of people elsewhere in the world as well as their own. Global citizenship education strives to prepare such citizens (Mannion, Biesta, Priestley & Ross, 2011). However, according to Andreotti (2011), many global citizenship programs do not reach their objective because they fail to stimulate their participants to critically examine assumptions about the ‘other’ and understand their perspectives (see Park, Sklad & Tsirogianni, 2015, in this volume for discussion).

In order to address this limitation of previous programs, University College Roosevelt designed the Going Global program, which incorporates postcolonial theory (Escobar, 2004) and critical pedagogy (Freire, 1998; Andrzejewski & Alessio, 1999; Andreotti, 2011). The Going Global program aims to promote global citizenship competency: the ability to engage in intercultural dialogue by challenging students’ assumptions about the ‘other’, learning to take the ‘other’s’ perspective, critically challenging students’ assumptions, and stimulating understanding of ‘positionality’ of their worldviews (Braidotti, 2013; Park, Sklad & Tsirogianni, 2015, in this volume; Vazquez, 2015, in this volume). It is rooted in decolonial theory, and according to this theory there is no space for true plurality and diversity without acknowledging and rethinking its position in the world by the global north (Esteva, 2013). From a decolonial perspective, recognition of those belonging to a different position without normative or pejorative connotation requires an individual to acknowledge one’s own position. Dialogue with the ‘other’ on equal terms is made possible by the acknowledgement of one’s own ‘positionality’, understanding the epistemic plurality and deliberate rejection of singular knowledge, and epistemic privileges by members of privileged groups (Mignolo, 2009).
Therefore, one of the core elements of the program’s pedagogy was becoming minoritarian (Braidotti, 2011) by visiting countries in places that form the structural ‘other’ of Europe, namely Latin America and Africa, and encountering the other from the position of the minority. The two educational interventions constituting the program were similar in their structure and goals, yet differed slightly in terms of underlying pedagogies. Therefore, it was possible not only to evaluate the program as a whole, but also to compare the outcomes each approach produced.

First, this chapter will briefly summarize the similarities and differences of the two approaches. More detailed description of them can be found in the respective chapters of this volume (see Friedman, 2015; Haverkate, 2015; Vazquez, 2015, in this volume). This particular chapter will present the evaluation methodology, including the tool designed to capture the essence of the intervention, and follow by presenting the outcomes. In the conclusion, I will discuss the effects of the program in terms of the match between the observed outcomes and explicit and implicit goals of the whole program and of each pedagogical approach. This chapter is focused on the quantitative assessment of the degree to which the program goals were met1. Finally we will consider to what degree the differences and similarities of the implicit goals of each approach are reflected in the differences of their outcomes.

Structure of the Intervention

Both interventions had the same structure. Over the four years of the program, each of the interventions had two rounds. In each round, 15 interested students were selected based on a written application letter and an interview (see also Friedman, 2015, in this volume). The selection criteria included the year of study, and the perceived level of maturity of the student. In total, 60 students of University College Roosevelt were selected to take part in the program.

In the course of the program, each participant took part in three modules made up of 60 contact hours, spread over one academic year. Two of the modules took place (for the most part) in the regular university environment, and required 150 hours of self-study on top of contact hours. The third module took place during the summer break in between the two ‘home’ modules. The summer module took the form of a field study combined with international service-learning, and took place in Mexico or Namibia. Both modules taking place in the university setting had strong elements of community based learning and problem based learning (Schmidt et al., 2007; Wood, 2003). The

1 A qualitative assessment of the Namibia program is discussed by Park, Sklad and Tsiorogianni (2015) in this volume.
learning activities in these modules were conducted in pairs or groups. The course was characterized by a non-frontal teacher-student relationship, and the lecturers surrendered much of their authority, reversing the standard order of the classroom. As a part of problem based learning, students designed and conducted global citizenship classes in local primary and secondary schools on the subject. They selected the topics and developed their own teaching material for these topics. The lecturers responsible for the intervention fulfilled the role of coaches, facilitators, and moderators, generating learning opportunities rather than directly supplying the information in an authoritative way. In reversing the usual pedagogic order, peer teaching enhances deep learning (Topping, 1996, 2005; Whitman & Fife, 1988). In addition, students promoting virtues of global citizenship become more motivated to behave in that way themselves, according to hypocrisy induction paradigm (Aronson, 1992, 1999).

The two interventions differ in choice of the structural ‘other’, determined by the country students visited and the locations within them. In the Namibian edition of the intervention, students visited the town of Opuwo, located in the rural, north-western part of Namibia. In the Mexican edition they visited indigenous communities in Oaxaca and Chiapas. In both versions of the intervention, students learn epistemic plurality. For instance, in the Namibian context students learned that they “will not be travelling to Namibia ‘to help’, but rather to share time and space with their Namibian peers and unlearn/relearn” (Sklad, Friedman, Park & , forthcoming). The difference between the two approaches was more on the mode of immersion into the position of the ‘other’. In the Namibian summer practicum, students engaged with people at local schools and youth focused, community based organizations, and did construction work at a local youth centre alongside locals, which gave students the opportunity to engage in informal contact with Namibian peers. This approach was inspired by the contact paradigm based on classical psychological study by Sherif et al. (1961). According to this paradigm, the situation of mutual interdependence, a common goal, and a friendly informal atmosphere along with equal status and contact with multiple out-group members, acts as a catalyst for processes of prejudice reduction (see also Park, Sklad & Tsirogianni, 2015 in this volume).

In the Mexican edition, service-learning and collaboration with local youth in the spirit of the contact paradigm was reduced to a one time experience during which students helped locals with the bricklaying of a small house using a local method. Rather than providing the service in collaboration with local community, students participating in the Mexican branch of the program met with local activists and scholars, learning firsthand political principles of Latin American theory, the history of social organizations of Oaxacan communities, and the recent history of resistance in Oaxaca City. In both courses the students were given the opportunity to engage with the ‘other’ on equal footing and to become aware of their own privileged position
(as representatives of the West or global north). In the Namibian experience, this took place predominantly on a personal level, whilst the Mexican experience was predominantly on an academic level.

Both courses took critical approaches to the notion of development. The Namibian course referred to Western critique of development (e.g. Meillassoux 1974; Sachs, 1992), while the Mexican course utilized Latin American theory (e.g. Esteva, 2012; Illich, 1973) and decolonial scholarship (Mignolo, 2009; Castro-Gómez, 2007). Basing the course on literature written by the ‘other’ – literature that is traditionally not included in the dominant curriculum of the modern university (Gordon, 2011) – and giving it equal or superior status to Western mainstream scholarly literature, helps students to recognize the situated nature of their knowledge. This approach itself rejects the epistemic privilege and opens the space for epistemic plurality and dialogue on equal footing, which is the objective. It was further strengthened by a visit to the Universidad de la Tierra (University of the Earth), which is a center with a non-schooling approach to the production of knowledge and the implementation of educative, ecological and political learning principles of Latin American theory.

The last difference between the two modes of the intervention concerned the level to which the main goal was made explicit. In the Mexican edition, led by a sociologist focused on new social movements, the objectives and pedagogy were made clear from the very beginning and students engaged with the pedagogical approach and ideologies. The Namibian edition, led by an anthropologist, took a more anthropological understanding of one’s own ‘positionality’ as something hoped to be achieved by students autonomously as a result of critical reflection.

The differences and similarities presented here warrant some expectations concerning the differences in the results of each program. It can be expected that both modes of intervention would result in a better understanding of one’s own ‘positionality’, acceptance for the ‘other’s’ perspective, and improved global citizenship competence. The anthropological approach (Namibia) could result in greater improvement in the cultural domain, whilst the sociological approach (Mexico) may result in a greater increase in global civic engagement.

Methods

The quantitative effects of the program were measured primarily using the Global Perspective Scale (GPS) (Sklad & Park, 2015). The GPS instrument was accompanied

---

1 This refers to the majority of participating students.

3 A more extensive description of pedagogies implicated in each module of the project can be found in the respective chapters of this volume.
by the Global Citizenship Scale (Morais & Ogden, 2011), the Cross-Cultural World-Mindedness Scale (adapted from A Scale to Measure World-Minded Attitudes, Sampson & Smith, 1957; Der-Karabetian, 1993), the Intercultural Communication Competence Scale (Arasaratnam, 2009), and the Cultural Intelligence Scale (Ang et al., 2007). GPS is an assessment scale measuring global citizenship competences related to understanding one’s own and others’ positions, perspectives and interdependence, acceptance and openmindedness towards cultural diversity, sense of cultural competence and sensitivity to global justice issues. The GPS was constructed for the needs of this project. It consists of 21 seven-point Likert scale items, which were designed and evaluated in terms of face construct validity by an expert Delphi group and piloted before the scale’s application. The GPS demonstrated good psychometric reliability in terms of internal consistency (Table 1) and test–retest reliability (Table 2). The GPS is also characterized by appropriate convergent validity, demonstrated by correlations with results of instruments measuring other related constructs (Table 2). GPS correlated strongest to Global Competence subscale of Global Citizenship Scale (Morais & Ogden, 2011), Cultural Intelligence (Ang et al., 2007). The effects of the program were assessed using a pre test post test comparison group design. Students completed pre test on the first day of the program and post test after the completion of the program.

Post test scores of the 51 students participating in the program were compared with their pre test scores and with comparison groups consisting of 51 students at the same college who had not participated in the program. The data were collected from 25 students from the Mexico group, and 26 from the Namibia group. For nine participating students the data was incomplete or missing. The intervention group and both comparison groups consisted mainly of females (75% in the intervention group and 76.9% in the comparison groups). The oldest participant was 24 years old and the youngest was 18 (M=20.62, S=1.81). In the comparison groups, the ages ranged between 17 and 23 years (M=19.90, S=1.40). 57.7% of the program participants had never lived outside of the Netherlands, and in the comparison groups, there were 53.3% students of that type.

Results

The results of the pre-post intervention comparisons (see Table 3) demonstrated several statistically significant effects of the program.
Table 1: Reliability Analysis and Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-test α</th>
<th>Mean (Sd)</th>
<th>Post-test α</th>
<th>Mean (Sd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Citizenship - Global Perspective Scale</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>5.59(0.56)</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>5.84(0.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cultural World Mindedness (CWM)</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>4.43(0.48)</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>4.55(0.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Citizenship - Social Responsibility</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>4.06(0.52)</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>4.13(0.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Citizenship - Global Competence</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>3.49(0.48)</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>3.03(0.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Citizenship - Global Civic Engagement</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>2.75(0.56)</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>2.85(0.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Intelligence (Motivational)</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>5.90(0.73)</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>5.95(0.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Intelligence (Metacognitive)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>5.05(0.93)</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>5.32(0.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Intelligence (Cognitive)</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>4.66(0.79)</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>4.83(0.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Intelligence (Behavioral)</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>5.11(0.90)</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>5.18(0.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Communication Competence</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>5.00(0.74)</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>5.00(0.71)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. (n=143)

Table 2: Intercorrelations of the Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GPS</th>
<th>CW</th>
<th>GC-M</th>
<th>GC-SR</th>
<th>GC-GC</th>
<th>GC-MC</th>
<th>CQ-M</th>
<th>CQ-C</th>
<th>CQ-M</th>
<th>CQ-B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global perspective Scale (GPS)</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cultural World Mindedness (CWM)</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Citizenship - Social Responsibility (GC-SR)</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Citizenship - Global Competence (GC-GC)</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Citizenship - Global Civic Engagement (GC-GCE)</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Intelligence - Metacognitive (CQ-MC)</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Intelligence - Cognitive (CQ-C)</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Intelligence Motivational (CQ-M)</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Intelligence Behavioural (CQ-B)</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The post test scores of Global Perspective Scale (GPS) were significantly higher than the pre test scores in the intervention groups, $F(1,49) = 35.44 \ p < .01 \ \eta = .65$. There was no significant interaction with destination of the summer practicum; the effects of Namibia and Mexico on GPS were not significantly different, $F(1,49) = 0.39 \ p = .535 \ \eta = .09$. The post test scores of Cross-Cultural World Mindedness (CWM) were significantly higher than the pre test scores in the intervention groups, $F(1,46) = 11.65 \ p < .01 \ \eta = .45$. There was no significant interaction with the destination of the summer practicum; the effects of Namibia and Mexico on CWM were not significantly different, $F(1,46) = 0.75 \ p = .391 \ \eta = .13$.

The analysis of the subscales of Morais & Ogden (2011) scale brought the following results. There was no significant difference between the pre and post test scores of Social Responsibility (SR) subscale in the intervention groups, $F(1,55) = 1.55 \ p = .218 \ \eta = .16$. There was also no significant interaction with the destination of the summer practicum; the effects of Namibia and Mexico on SR subscale were not significantly different, $F(1,55) = 0.55 \ p = .461 \ \eta = .10$. The post test scores of the Global Competence (GC) were significantly higher than the pre test scores in the intervention groups, $F(1,56) = 9.17 \ p < .01 \ \eta = .38$. There was no significant interaction with the destination of the summer practicum; the effects of Namibia and Mexico on GC were not significantly different, $F(1,56) = 0.88 \ p = .352 \ \eta = .13$. There was no significant difference between the pre and post test scores of Global Civic Engagement (GCE) in the intervention groups, $F(1,53) = 0.45 \ p = .505 \ \eta = .09$. Here, however, there was a significant interaction with destination of the summer practicum. The Namibia group scored significantly lower in the post test compared to the Mexico group, $F(1,53) = 6.95 \ p < .05 \ \eta = .34$.

The analysis of the changes in measures aimed at cultural competence did not reveal statistically significant differences between pre and post test. There was no significant difference between the pre and post test scores of Cultural Intelligence - Motivational CQ (CQ-M), in the intervention groups, $F(1,54) = 0.06 \ p = .808 \ \eta = .03$. There was also no significant interaction with destination of the summer practicum; the effects of Namibia and Mexico on CQ-M were not significantly different, $F(1,54) = 0.24 \ p = .627 \ \eta = .06$. There was no significant difference between the pre and post test scores of Cultural Intelligence Metacognitive CQ (CQ - MC) in the intervention groups, $F(1,55) = 2.03 \ p = .160 \ \eta = .19$. Furthermore, there was no significant interaction with the destination of the summer practicum; the effects of Namibia and Mexico on CQ - MC were not significantly different, $F(1,55) = 0.37 \ p = .545 \ \eta = .08$. There was no significant difference between the pre and post test scores of Cultural Intelligence Cognitive CQ (CQ-C) in the intervention groups, $F(1,55) = 1.63 \ p = .207 \ \eta = .17$. There was also no significant interaction with destination of the summer practicum; the effects of Namibia and Mexico on CQ-C were not significantly different, $F(1,55) = 2.43 \ p = .125 \ \eta = .20$. There was no significant difference between the pre and post test scores of Cultural Intelligence Behavioral CQ (CQ-B) in the intervention groups, $F(1,55) = 0.1 \ p = .754 \ \eta = .04$. 
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There was also no significant interaction with destination of the summer practicum; the effects of Namibia and Mexico on CQ-B were not significantly different, $F(1,55) = 0.15 p = .705 \eta^2 = .05$. There was no significant difference between the pre and post test scores of Intercultural Communication Competence (ICC) in the intervention groups, $F(1,54) = 0.01 p = .912 \eta^2 = 0$. Furthermore, there was no significant interaction with destination of the summer practicum; the effects of Namibia and Mexico on ICC were not significantly different, $F(1,54) = 1.24 p = .271 \eta^2 = .15$.

Table 3: Means and (Standard Deviations) of Indicators for Control and Intervention Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Control Pre-test</th>
<th>Group Post-test</th>
<th>Namibia Pre-test</th>
<th>Group Post-test</th>
<th>Mexico Pre-test</th>
<th>Group Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Perspective Scale</td>
<td>5.53(0.57)</td>
<td>5.66(0.54)</td>
<td>5.78(0.61)</td>
<td>6.07(0.57)</td>
<td>5.55(0.48)</td>
<td>5.99(0.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cultural World Mindedness (CWM)</td>
<td>4.38(0.48)</td>
<td>4.39(0.59)</td>
<td>4.39(0.50)</td>
<td>4.58(0.39)</td>
<td>4.62(0.44)</td>
<td>4.85(0.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Citizenship - Social Responsibility</td>
<td>3.98(0.57)</td>
<td>3.99(0.63)</td>
<td>4.14(0.38)</td>
<td>4.21(0.59)</td>
<td>4.22(0.47)</td>
<td>4.34(0.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Competence</td>
<td>3.45(0.47)</td>
<td>3.53(0.45)</td>
<td>3.59(0.50)</td>
<td>3.82(0.41)</td>
<td>3.51(0.46)</td>
<td>3.65(0.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Citizenship - Global Competence</td>
<td>2.58(0.54)</td>
<td>2.78(0.61)</td>
<td>2.94(0.55)</td>
<td>2.72(0.70)</td>
<td>2.98(0.49)</td>
<td>3.15(0.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Civic Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Intelligence (Motivational)</td>
<td>5.72(0.74)</td>
<td>5.80(0.66)</td>
<td>6.17(0.71)</td>
<td>6.16(0.68)</td>
<td>6.11(0.59)</td>
<td>6.04(0.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Intelligence (Metacognitive)</td>
<td>5.02(0.90)</td>
<td>5.30(0.91)</td>
<td>5.20(0.97)</td>
<td>5.46(0.83)</td>
<td>5.00(0.97)</td>
<td>5.20(0.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Intelligence (Cognitive)</td>
<td>4.69(0.77)</td>
<td>4.90(0.86)</td>
<td>4.57(0.90)</td>
<td>4.89(0.96)</td>
<td>4.69(0.73)</td>
<td>4.67(1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Intelligence (Behavioral)</td>
<td>4.97(0.95)</td>
<td>5.09(1.04)</td>
<td>5.39(0.75)</td>
<td>5.29(0.97)</td>
<td>5.22(0.84)</td>
<td>5.28(0.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Communication Competence</td>
<td>4.89(0.70)</td>
<td>4.86(0.67)</td>
<td>5.06(0.82)</td>
<td>5.15(0.83)</td>
<td>5.26(0.73)</td>
<td>5.18(0.61)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To determine if the scores of students participating in the program had increased significantly more than those of other students, participants’ scores were compared with those of the two comparison groups. ANCOVA showed that there was a significant difference between the three groups in results of Global Perspective Scale (GPS) \( F(2,98) = 4.53 \ p < .05, \eta = .29 \). Contrast analysis revealed that the control group scored significantly lower than the intervention groups \( p < .01 \) and no significant differences between versions of the intervention \( p = .68 \). Moreover, there was a significant difference between the three groups in Cross-Cultural World Mindedness (CWM) \( F(2,98) = 6.85 \ p < .01 \eta = .35 \). Contrast analysis revealed that the control group scored significantly lower than the intervention groups \( p < .01 \). There appeared to be no significant difference between the intervention groups \( p = .104 \), and no significant difference between the three groups in results of Social Responsibility (SR) \( F(2,111) = 1.82 \ p = .168 \eta = .18 \). There was also no significant difference between the three groups in results of Global Competence (GC) \( F(2,112) = 3.04 \ p = .052 \eta = .23 \). However, contrast analysis revealed that the control group scored significantly lower than the intervention groups \( p = .042 \). No significant difference was found between the two intervention groups \( p = .104 \). Although, there was a significant difference between the three groups in results of Global Civic Engagement (GCE) \( F(2,103) = 4.37 \ p < .05 \eta = .28 \). Contrast analysis revealed that there was no significant difference between control and intervention groups. \( p = .859 \). The Namibia group scored significantly lower than the Mexico group \( p < .01 \).
There was no significant difference between the three groups in Cultural Intelligence - Motivational CQ (CQ-M) $F(2,109) = 0.69 \ p = .503 \ \eta^2 = .11$. There was no significant difference between the three groups in Cultural Intelligence Metacognitive CQ (CQ - MC) $F(2,111) = 0.55 \ p = .579 \ \eta^2 = .10$. There was no significant difference between the three groups in Cultural Intelligence Cognitive CQ (CQ-C) $F(2,110) = 1.11 \ p = .332 \ \eta^2 = .14$. There was no significant difference between the three groups in Cultural Intelligence Behavioral CQ (CQ-B) $F(2,110) = 0.11 \ p = .896 \ \eta^2 = .04$. There was no significant difference between the three groups in results of Intercultural Communication Competence (ICC) $F(2,110) = 0.97 \ p = .384 \ \eta^2 = .13$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Program Evaluations</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In this course, I learned a great deal.</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1- Strongly disagree, 5-Strongly agree)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your opinion, the overall quality of this course is:</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-Very bad, 5-Very good)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants evaluated the program at the end of the third module, and the results were positive. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 denoting “very good”, the module received average scores of “good” (see Table 4). In their self-reports they were also convinced that they achieved intended learning outcomes (see Table 5). With both destinations, students were convinced that they learned about other cultures, perspectives and stereotypes, but somewhat less convicted about being able to put global citizenship into practice and communicate about it. The main difference between the two destinations manifested Mexico students being more convinced about their understanding of mechanisms sustaining global social inequality and about the importance of locality to global citizenship.

Students evaluated the impact of the work they carried out during the outreach part of the program with school children on average between 4 (Neutral) and 6 (Agree), depending on a specific outcome. The participants were most optimistic about having encouraged the children not to judge others based on first impressions, and least optimistic about teaching the children what Namibians and Mexicans think about the Dutch, and to think critically about developmental aid (see Table 6 for details). In terms of the comparison of the two modes of intervention, students participating in the Mexico edition anticipated more impact on children in the domains of social justice and relations between West and ‘developing’ countries, while students doing the Namibia
practicum were more convinced about successfully passing on information about daily lives and cultures in their destination to school children.

Table 5: Students’ Self-Reported Evaluation of Goals (Self)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Namibia M(S)</th>
<th>Mexico M(S)</th>
<th>Total M(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have learned about the similarities and differences between me and the</td>
<td>6.21(1.00)</td>
<td>6.48(0.51)</td>
<td>6.35(0.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people in the country we visited.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have learned how to apply Global Citizenship in practice.</td>
<td>4.54(1.58)</td>
<td>5.03(1.21)</td>
<td>4.79(1.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have gained insight into the complexity of developmental aid in the</td>
<td>6.00(1.28)</td>
<td>5.97(1.02)</td>
<td>5.98(1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country we visited.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have gained insight into the perspectives of local people.</td>
<td>6.04(0.64)</td>
<td>6.48(0.51)</td>
<td>6.26(0.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have learned about other people’s perspectives.</td>
<td>6.21(0.42)</td>
<td>6.62(0.49)</td>
<td>6.42(0.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learned how to communicate about Global Citizenship issues</td>
<td>5.04(1.45)</td>
<td>5.31(0.93)</td>
<td>5.18(1.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have gained a better understanding of the importance of locality to</td>
<td>5.21(1.60)</td>
<td>6.55(0.57)</td>
<td>5.89(1.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have become more aware of stereotypes of other countries in my own</td>
<td>5.93(1.28)</td>
<td>5.66(1.11)</td>
<td>5.79(1.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have learned about the mechanisms sustaining global social inequality.</td>
<td>5.38(0.98)</td>
<td>6.31(0.76)</td>
<td>5.84(0.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have gained insight into different perspectives about the world.</td>
<td>5.97(0.82)</td>
<td>6.38(0.62)</td>
<td>6.17(0.75)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1-Strongly disagree, 7-Strongly agree.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Namibia M(S)</th>
<th>Mexico M(S)</th>
<th>Total M(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children learned about the similarities between people from Mexico/Namibia and people from the Netherlands.</td>
<td>5.82(1.22)</td>
<td>4.79(1.45)</td>
<td>5.30(1.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children learned about the resemblance between the daily lives of people in Mexico and people in the Netherlands.</td>
<td>5.64(1.13)</td>
<td>4.39(1.48)</td>
<td>5.02(1.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children learned that social inequality is an everyday reality for many people.</td>
<td>5.27(1.61)</td>
<td>5.93(0.75)</td>
<td>5.61(1.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children learned about how consumption in the West contributes to social inequality.</td>
<td>4.37(1.91)</td>
<td>5.97(0.87)</td>
<td>5.18(1.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children learned about aspects of the unequal relationship between Mexico and the West.</td>
<td>4.73(1.60)</td>
<td>4.97(1.30)</td>
<td>4.85(1.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children learned not to judge people on a first meeting but to open up to other perspectives that might change one’s judgment.</td>
<td>5.89(0.92)</td>
<td>5.62(1.40)</td>
<td>5.75(1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children learned how they might understand someone else’s judgment.</td>
<td>5.39(1.13)</td>
<td>5.48(1.35)</td>
<td>5.44(1.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children learned to think more critically about Developmental Aid.</td>
<td>4.07(1.63)</td>
<td>4.28(1.30)</td>
<td>4.18(1.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children learned that it is important to cooperate in order to come to a better understanding of the world.</td>
<td>4.80(1.25)</td>
<td>5.41(0.95)</td>
<td>5.11(1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children learned to be more critical about their own way of thinking.</td>
<td>5.21(1.17)</td>
<td>6.00(0.60)</td>
<td>5.61(1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children learned how Mexicans/Namibians think about the West.</td>
<td>4.04(1.56)</td>
<td>3.93(1.49)</td>
<td>3.98(1.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children learned about the effect the West has on Mexico/Namibia.</td>
<td>4.25(1.43)</td>
<td>4.93(1.31)</td>
<td>4.60(1.40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1-Strongly disagree, 7-Strongly agree.
Conclusion and Discussion

The Going Glocal program aimed to promote global citizenship competency: foster the ability to engage in meaningful open dialogue with members of other cultures and take the ‘other’s’ perspective, challenge students’ assumptions about the ‘other’, promote respect for diversity, and raise commitment to social justice. The program aimed to achieve these goals with a combination of regular university classes, engaging students in teaching in local primary and secondary schools, and a summer practicum abroad.

The results of the evaluation of the program suggest that the program achieved several outcomes. Participants demonstrated an increase in the average GPS score in both versions of the program intervention: the sociologically oriented, explicitly focused on social justice issues, Mexico based edition; and the anthropologically oriented, more reflexive Namibia based version. This indicates that students participating in either form of the program became more confident in their capacity to recognize and critically assess their own position and the role of social and cultural contexts in forming theirs and others’ perspectives, and to perceive issues from the perspectives of multiple others’ perspectives during the program. After the program, students endorsed values associated with global citizenship (which take humankind as the primary reference point rather than any particular nation) more than before, as indicated by the score of CCWM (Der-Karabetian, 1993) scale. Similarly, there was a significant improvement on the Global Competence subscale of Global Citizenship (Morais & Ogden, 2011) which suggests that students find themselves (a) more able to successfully engage in intercultural interactions due to being more knowledgeable about the world and more openminded, (b) seeking more understanding of others’ cultural norms and expectations, and (c) more willing to recognize their own limitations.

The fact that changes observed among program participants were significantly higher than those in the comparison group in the case of all three indicators mentioned above indicates that the changes can indeed be causally attributed to participation in the program.

The results also demonstrated a lack of change in the domain of self-reported cultural competence measured by two scales. This result may be explained by the content and construction of the scales. Majority of cultural competence measures (e.g. Kuma-Tan et al., 2007), rely on self-ratings of self-confidence or comfort. A review of the literature pertaining to cross-cultural competence measurement in the context of medical service suggests that high confidence in one’s own cross-cultural competence can be an outcome of lack of awareness and insight into cultural differences, and one’s own ethnocentrism and stereotypical perception of the ‘other’, providing cognitive comfort. Thus – paradoxically – high confidence in one’s cross-cultural competence may be a sign of its lacking. Awareness of the differences between cultures and the values
cherished by them may make one aware of the challenges of cross-cultural dialogue (see Park, Sklad & Tsirgianni, 2015, in this volume for in depth discussion of case studies). Other empirical studies have demonstrated that increasing awareness of differences between cultures can lead to acknowledging one’s lack of competency, and their authors have suggested considering a construct of cultural humility rather than of cross-cultural competency. Cultural humility involves commitment to self-evaluation and self-critique, and to developing mutually beneficial and non-paternalistic partnerships (Tervalon & Murray-Garcia, 1998, p. 123). It can be assumed that some students learned humbleness throughout the program due to the constant challenging of formerly held assumptions. Because cultural humility, as defined above, is very close to the central goals of this round of the program, the decrease in cultural self-confidence can be interpreted as a sign of the success of the program.

The hypothesized differences in effects between the two modes of global citizenship education were confirmed by the empirical results. When we compare the effects of the mode of teaching employed in the Mexico version of the program focusing on social justice, its political and ideological position and goals explicit, to the effects of the more subtle and ideologically neutral version of the program employed in the Namibia version, which relied on students own reflections and critical thinking to reach their own conclusions, we can see several differences. The Mexican edition resulted in higher self-perceived changes in global citizenship competence, especially in the importance of locality and understanding the mechanisms sustaining global inequalities. In terms of more objective pre / post test comparisons, the differences between the outcomes of the two approaches become less apparent; in most cases they produced similar patterns of change with the one exception of civic engagement. Global civic engagement was facilitated by the Mexico program and inhibited by the Namibia program. This difference is consistent with the content of the two editions. The Mexican intervention engaged students with the role models of Mexican social activists. Exposure to such successful tangible role models can lead to increased self-efficacy and motivation (Bandura, 1977). In contrast to Mexico, the Namibian intervention did not expose students to charismatic activists and politically engaged scholars offering a clear vision of solutions to global issues and inequalities. Instead, the Namibian experience exposed students to the complexity of development cooperation and encouraged deeper reflection. If such reflection is not concluded by finding a satisfactory solution, it may lead to disillusionment and passivity, called by proponents of critical global citizenship ‘critical disengagement’ (Andreotti, 2007). It is impossible to establish to which degree the differences in the outcomes of two version of the program should be attributed to differences in the pedagogical approach chosen for the two modes of GCE. Furthermore, it remains unclear as to which degree they are the outcome of the differences in the local communities to which students were exposed to in the course of each summer practicum. It is also beyond the scope of this chapter to establish what is more beneficial
for a global citizen: deep reflection which may lead to inaction, or less critical reflection and following progressive role models.
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Appendix I. Global Perspective Scale

1. I understand different social perspectives.
2. I maintain an in-depth knowledge of a society other than my own.
3. I understand a society other than my own.
4. I can see the benefit of analyzing international issues from multiple perspectives.
5. I am aware that my own cultural values influence my relationships with others.
6. I understand the connections between social, political, economic and environmental processes.
7. I can explain the role of culture in identity formation.
8. I can explain the role of social contexts for the construction of knowledge.
9. I feel capable of critically assessing global justice problems.
10. I can reflect upon global inequalities in different spheres.
11. I am able to perceive a given event or issue from more than one cultural viewpoint.
12. I am able to recognize my own position within structures of global inequality.
13. I am able to communicate efficiently and effectively in an intercultural setting.
14. I am able to work effectively in an intercultural context.
15. I can overcome intercultural misunderstandings.
16. I am able to communicate my knowledge about global issues.
17. I understand the ethical issues associated with living in a foreign setting well.
18. I demonstrate open-minded attitudes to cultural differences.
19. Diversity is important to further global social justice.
20. Understanding interactions between the local, national and international levels is necessary to analyze particular social practices.
21. I want to learn more global citizenship skills.
A QUALITATIVE EVALUATION OF ‘GOING GLOCAL’, NAMIBIA 2014

Eri Park, Marcin Sklad, and Stavroula Tsirogianni

Ways of participating in social and political life can be manifold and different contexts open up opportunities for potentially new ‘cultures of participation’ (Howarth, Andreouli & Kessi, 2014). Within the last fifteen years, in many European countries citizenship education has been incorporated into the school curriculum (for an overview see: nece.org and Eurydice). In the Netherlands, for instance, it was in 2006 that the legislation was introduced and themes of active citizenship were made compulsory for schools to cover (NCDO, 2013).

Within the University College Roosevelt (UCR) program, as described elsewhere (Sklad & Park, 2015, in this volume; Vázquez, 2015, in this volume; Friedman, 2015, in this volume), the focus is on education for global citizenship in higher education. In this chapter we are providing a qualitative evaluation of the Namibia 2014 group, which participated over the course of a year in a three modules program. Firstly, within a regular teaching course, students learnt how to deconstruct normative ideas, which hold the power of creating an invisible reality; and they learnt to self-reflect, to question what these normative ideas mean regarding their own lives. Secondly, for one month students served as assistants in Opuwo’s local schools on numerous projects, e.g. a glass distribution or a drama club project (Friedman, 2015, in this volume) so that the interaction with locals provided manifold opportunities for intergroup dialogue (Vázquez, 2015, in this volume). Thirdly, students developed teaching material to share their newly gained knowledge about their practical experiences with pupils in the Netherlands.

Within this qualitative evaluation, we explore how students from UCR as part of the dominant group related to members of a (socio-economically) disadvantaged group, i.e. Namibian students; how they categorized and recategorized themselves to resolve emotional states triggered by the exposure to potentially different worldviews. Furthermore, we consider the consequences of these identity construction processes in terms of ‘closing down’ or opening up dialogue about issues that acknowledge the reality of unequal relations and social injustice.

Theoretical Underpinnings of the Namibia 2014 Program

Under the umbrella term of ‘global citizenship education’, one finds three types of education which developed independently of each other despite practical overlaps:
civic, environmental and developmental education (Mannion et al., 2011). As part of the UCR program, a framework has been proposed with the intention to integrate these multiple perspectives and to translate theoretical considerations into methods to inspire students to sharpen their global citizenship skills. According to the Action Model of Global Citizenship (Sklad & Park, 2015, in this volume), the psychological properties and aims of a global citizenship program are (a) to install a sense of social responsibility which is not limited to in-group members; and (b) to become aware of one’s stereotypes, prejudices and decategorization processes of out-group members and to learn to critically reflect how these are an embedded part of a particular perception of the world and of one’s position in it.

If one looks onto the aims of this global citizenship model, the following questions become interesting from a psychological perspective: What are the psychological phenomena accompanying (a) the process which is generally referred to as ‘sharpening one’s global citizenship skills’ and (b) the extension of a sense for social responsibility beyond the borders of one’s in-group? What kind of inner dialogues are taking place while people are negotiating and renegotiating topics that are of high personal relevance to themselves? To answer these questions, we are drawing on significant social psychological theories on prejudice and social identity.

Gordon Allport’s (1954) seminal work *The Nature of Prejudice* inspired many researchers to study the causes, effects and solutions of prejudice. Most importantly it managed to establish prejudice as a subject of enquiry during times when segregation was a big societal issue. Allport’s theory of contact hypothesis is one of the most important theories in the area of prejudice as well as in social psychology (Dovidio et al., 2011). It proposes that bringing together individuals from different groups can help reduce prejudice, negative views of others and improve intergroup relations. It and subsequent research specified the conditions of optimal contact. Some of these are: (1) People should have equal status. (2) The situation should require cooperation or offer common goals to both groups. (3) Cooperation should be encouraged, and (4) the contact situation should have institutional support.

The theory described optimal conditions for intergroup contact and promoted a vision that bringing people together to work on common goals and interests is the best way to eliminate inter-group hostility and reduce bias. The theory arose during a period when people were worried about whether desegregation was a good idea or not, as they feared that it may lead to social instability and disorder. Even those who supported the idea thought that this would need to happen gradually (Dixon & Durrheim, 2003). So from not having contact at all with the ‘other’, creating some contact between each other sounded like a very important first step. However, today at least in Western societies there are manifold opportunities for contact with groups endorsing different values and worldviews, which however do not necessarily lead to more social cohesion and less prejudiced intergroup attitudes. Hence, the reality of everyday contact is far less ideal and far more difficult and complex and involves tensions, dilemmas and conflicts (Dixon et al., 2005).
Questions about identity, perceptions of oneself and others, in-group and out-group categorization have been at the center of contact research. However, a major assumption in the Allportian paradigm is that prejudice is about the dominant group’s negative views of the minority and the goal is to change them. But when we use social categories to describe others, e.g. as ignorant or immoral etc., this also involves a categorization of oneself as ‘I am not ignorant or immoral’. We formulate our identities and self-concept through relating others to ourselves, and this process means that our perceptions about the others are as much about them as about us (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). According to social identity theory, we think of ourselves and others in terms of in-groups and out-groups. In other words: identity is a key concept in intergroup relations.

Researchers drawing on this Allportian problematic and common identity theory have focused on how group perceptions influence prejudice and how inducing people to recategorize themselves in relation to others based on commonalities, i.e. create a common superordinate in-group identity that is inclusive of others, can reduce bias. The goal is to eliminate differences and create commonalities between groups to get one side to like the other one. However, getting to like each other does not necessarily mean that the dominant group is willing to challenge the structures that sustain unequal relations and give up their own privileges (Dixon & Levine, 2011). There is growing research that looks at how feelings of mutual affection can actually undermine the disadvantaged group’s willingness for collective action, and how ambivalent and conflicting perceptions and emotions, i.e. subordination and affection, sympathy and antipathy, are at the center of our experiences when we encounter different others (Dixon, Durrheim & Tredoux, 2005). For example, Glick and Fiske (2001) look at how hostile (explicit and aggressive acts of prejudice) and benevolent sexism (prejudice disguised in the form of affectionate sweet emotions and practices) impacts on women’s likelihood to challenge it. Results show that benevolent prejudice is likely to be used by the dominant group (men) to legitimize and reinforce their privileged position and power and is much harder to be challenged by the subordinate group (women). Hence, the issue then stops being about antipathy and it becomes about social inequalities and the potential to stimulate social change.

These concepts challenge the assumption that prejudice is a negative attitude that needs to be eliminated and suggest that in our encounters with others we experience complex dilemmas and conflicting emotions about inequalities regarding power and privileges, which need to be addressed, understood and brought to awareness if we are interested in challenging the hegemonic order. We do not dismiss the possibility that being in contact with ‘the other’ could raise our awareness about the issue of inequality but we explicitly call for a more explicit reflection and understanding of the politics and emotional ambivalence in identity construction and reconstruction in instances of contact.
We are drawing on recent research on the common identity model, which looks at different strategies and functions of recategorization used by different groups and their impact on reducing bias and challenging the status quo. Dovidio et al. (2012) have found that dominant groups who are interested in maintaining their higher social status in relation to the disadvantaged out-group tend to recategorize themselves in terms of a common superordinate identity, i.e. they focus on common aspects of identity with the out-group and smooth differences out (e.g., we are all humans). By creating a common identity, this allows them to deflect their attention away from the disparities, differences in power positions, concerns and interests between themselves and the out-group members and the potential of having their worldviews challenged. One could also say that these groups have a higher need for cognitive closure (Kruglanski, 2004) and are more likely to end up in close-minded states with regards to these issues. These one-group identities are also found to be intertwined with assimilationist ideologies, i.e. the minorities need to adopt the dominant group’s values and belief systems (Dovidio et al., 2012, p. 253).

Another important aspect in the context of intercultural dialogue within a transcultural setting are principles of justice, as these have important social and psychological functions. Conceptions of justice provide a sense of meaning and control by stipulating the guidelines by which the individual orders her or his world, conducts life and predicts as well as evaluates outcomes. Just behavior is interpreted as a means of gaining approval and respect from ourselves and others. “Thus, violation of our conceptions of justice presents a threat: It […] brings into question the evaluative framework that provides a foundation for our individual and social action” (Deutsch & Steil, 1988, p. 4). Members of a group who accept common norms also share common obligations to protect those norms and to respond to their violation, meaning that the occurrence of an injustice which is not acknowledged and responded to is apt to generate feelings of alienation. Unjust events are associated with emotions such as anger, outrage, and resentment (Olson et al., 2010). The crucial point here is that the belief that a group is unfairly advantaged is threatening from the perspective of the advantaged. Significantly, this is not so much about the issue of inequality in general or that the ‘other’ group has less than it should, but that the ‘own’ group has more than it should and must therefore be considered to be unfairly advantaged (Chow, Lowery & Knowles, 2008). To acknowledge that one is part of a group which is ‘unfairly advantaged’ is what Latin American liberation psychologists refer to in terms of ‘unlearning privileges’ and what psychologists call ‘political awakening’; a process which is described in a language of senses as being ‘shaken up’, eye opening, with strong emotional components (Park, 2009, 2011a).
Central Tenets of the Going Glocal Program

Following from the above, the Going Glocal program was structured on the following key assumptions.

1. Perceptions of others, i.e. out-groups, go hand in hand with perceptions about the in-group and about ourselves/own identities.
2. Encounters with ‘the other’ are not necessarily smooth but these might involve confrontations with worldviews and values that give rise to tensions, frustrations, and conflicting emotions.
3. Conflicts have the potential of challenging the dominant view of oneself and in relation to others.

Therefore, the Going Glocal program is based on the assumption that intercultural contact programs should not focus on eliminating intergroup tensions and emotional dilemmas, but rather on encouraging participants to explore these in light of their sources and implications on social justice and change. Drawing on critical dialogue programs (Zuniga, 2003), the aim is to invite students as members of the dominant group to actively explore the issues about worldviews, value systems, and social identities, and to examine the dynamics of privilege and oppression that shape relationships between social groups in society (Friedman, 2015, in this volume; Vázquez, 2015, in this volume). Understanding oneself as a historical subject is key to understanding one’s position within a hierarchical system and opens the potential to challenge unequal intergroup relations.

Structure of the Program

Certain criteria of the contact hypothesis were used to structure the context of the intercultural dialogues within the Going Glocal program within three modules.

Firstly, students were trained over a semester on how to deconstruct normative ideas, which hold the power of creating an invisible reality, and encouraged to self reflect, to question what these normative ideas mean regarding their own lives. Secondly, for one month students served as assistants in Opuwo’s local schools on numerous projects, e.g. a glass distribution or a drama club project (Friedman, 2015, in this volume), so that the interaction with locals provided manifold opportunities for intergroup dialogue (Vázquez, 2015, in this volume). The students were instructed that they were there to learn and share rather than going there as experts (‘to help and teach’), and the reflection process throughout their time abroad was guided by two experienced instructors who have been running similar programs for years and
who had also lived in Namibia as working professionals. Thirdly, students developed teaching material to share their newly gained knowledge about their practical experiences with pupils in the Netherlands.

Regarding its evaluation, we employed qualitative methods to collect data at five different stages for four groups of 15 students (N=60) throughout the four-year project: focus group interviews, semi-structured individual interviews, student papers and field diaries. Firstly, before the module in Spring term began, all 15 students participated in focus group interviews to get a proper understanding of students' previously held knowledge about the countries they would be going to. Secondly, at the end of their spring semester, students wrote reflection papers about their learning process. Thirdly, we conducted semi-structured individual interviews with all participants directly after they came back from their field trip. Fourthly, students wrote reflection papers about their time abroad. Fifthly, we ran focus group interviews at the very end of the program.

**Methods**

In this chapter, we are focusing on student (N=15) reflection papers from the group that went to Namibia in 2014. The reflection papers explicitly encouraged students to put into practice the theoretical issues explored within the program and the course (e.g., Deutsch, Probst, & Schmidt, 2002; Featherstone, 1995; Friedman & Mueller-Friedman, in press; Johnston, Gregory & Watts, 2009; LeBeau & Gordon, 2002), to explore their experiences of contact with the students from Namibia and to interrogate their views of themselves and the students in light of different contexts, e.g., historical, global, ideological, collective and institutionalized structures.

The research questions that guided the analysis of their entries were the following: How do students from the Netherlands deal with exposure to worldviews held by people in Namibia? How do students resolve differences between their ‘selves’ and the ‘the other’ and emotional dilemmas that have arisen from these differences? In our analysis we drew on the Common Ingroup Identity Theory (Gaertner, Dovidio, Banker, Houlette, Johnson & McGlynn, 2000) to examine whether in face of clash of values and emotional conflicts students used superordinate or dual identity constructions as members of the advantaged group to position themselves vis-a-vis the disadvantaged group and resolve the tensions, i.e. high need for cognitive closure. Furthermore, we looked at the functions of these identity construction processes in terms of their need for potential cognitive closure and consequently closing down the dialogue.

Students’ papers were analyzed in a team to ensure the reliability of the analysis and we conducted a Thematic Network Analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) to explore the multiple implicit significations of an issue rather than to reconcile conflicting understandings (Stirling, 2001).
Four themes came up during the coding process that distinguished students' and their ways of relating to others, and the degree to which they opened up to opportunities of intercultural dialogue. These four themes are identical to the learning objectives outlined in the course manual.

1. The student is able to communicate in an intercultural setting.
2. The student can recognize and demonstrate awareness of the origins of her or his own cultural values and assumptions and the ways these values affect her or his perception of others.
3. The student can understand – and (in a next step also) appreciate – different social, and cultural perspectives.
4. The student can recognize – and (in a next step also) analyze – her or his own position and participation within structures of global inequality and injustice.

Results

Out of 15 students, five students fulfilled all criteria and ten students fulfilled fully criteria 1 and 2 and criteria 3 and 4 to different degrees. If one works with a conceptualization of global citizenship as a practice of (and identification with) global issues which are of a common concern, and as a culture of participation rather than a status or an identity (Biesta, Lawy & Kelly, 2009), then these results are also to be expected.

What came up from the analysis was that for some students as members of the dominant culture, it was a time of firsts: i.e. getting to know what consequences of colonialism and the contemporary global institutional order means in ordinary people's everyday life. Coming from a culturally homogenous background and having relatively little travel experience, some students realized for the first time that having white skin color also means being a member of a race that holds a subject position (Kilomba, 2008). For other students who had more exposure to different cultural contexts, encounters with the ‘other’ requiring intercultural communication and perspective taking skills, certain ‘challenges’ were not so very alien. According to the experiences and construals, students reported a diversity of emotions, which they used to sustain, define and redefine racial boundaries. Some felt unprepared for the “culture shock” they experienced, they felt “overwhelmed, unsafe, awkward and intimidated up to 85% of the time”, and felt homesick; others struggled until they “found [their] place” within their internship group; and even others reported that they had “felt at home”, that they had “the time of their life”, fell in love and did not want to leave.

Criterion 1: Intercultural communication skills. Encounters with locals in Namibia were part of the students’ daily routine. Many of them reported that “initiating conversations with locals was much easier than expected”, that they could
“easily overcome cultural differences when making new friends” and even interacted like “brothers in less than two days”, and some students even made references to superordinate representations.

I wanted to say that my friendship with [local students I was working with on the project] is different from the ones I have with my friends in the Netherlands, but while writing I realized that this is actually not true. We would hang around after school, talk or be silent, eat together, laugh and make jokes. [...] This internship was for me not so much about learning facts about Namibia, but it leaves me with a feeling of the Namibian people. Because I interacted intensely with those people I now notice how much my view on Black people has changed: I unlearned to look at African people as poor people who need my help, I see them just as people who can teach me and who can learn from me. Fortunately, I unlearned to see color. However, I also notice this is a process which is not completed after one trip to Namibia.

I have learnt that youth all over the world are mostly the same. Young people want to hang out together, go to university and have a good career. I could not imagine becoming friends with someone in Namibia before [I went there]. Maybe because I unconsciously expected ‘poor African children’ who cannot wait for me to share my life with them. But this was not the case: they lived their lives and I was fortunate enough to join them for 3.5 weeks.

Here we can see that on a first level the student’s perceptions of Namibians was shaken. Initially she says she was only able to conceive two groups, i.e. Whites and Blacks, rich and poor, as distinctive units and then she was confronted with the color of her skin. It became a marker of differences between herself and Namibians. However, this is where she stops and resolves by creating a common superordinate identity structure, i.e. friendship, common humanity. In the process of differentiation and recategorization, she recognizes the challenge of recategorizing herself as different from them in relation to her color and consequently her privileged position as White. She resolves it by saying that “I unlearned to see color” and at the end of the day they are also like her friends in the Netherlands. They did similar things like hanging out, laughing and making jokes. This common identity allowed her to communicate with them in emotionally accepting ways but it failed to touch on thorny issues of differences pertinent to status hierarchy and inequality within the global and historical context.

Criteria 2 and 3: Recognition of the origins of one’s own cultural values and appreciation of the ‘other’s’ perspectives. All students clearly demonstrated that they are able to recognize and reflect on the origins of their own cultural values and assumptions and how these values affect their perception of others (criterion 2). However, interactions with the ‘other’ become challenging and appreciation of ‘the
other’ and his or her values’ became limited if issues of his or her high personal
importance were touched upon (criterion 3), including issues of equality in the context
of communication styles and religion. In other words: five students fully fulfilled
criterion 3; the remaining 10 students fulfilled this criterion to some degree. In their
process of resolving the tensions that arose in their encounters with the Namibian
students on issues about class hierarchies and religion, they recategorized themselves
by resorting to common superordinate identities. However, instead of resolving the
dilemmas and conflicts, they left them open for further exploration.

The interesting point is that due to students’ having learnt the skill to self reflect in
the preceding course, and their reflection sessions with their course instructors as part
of their field work in Namibia, students were highly aware that encounters with
‘the other’ not running smoothly taught them as much about themselves than about
‘the other’. For example, when Justin was told by a woman that “reading is seen as a
‘White’ thing and she knew no one outside of school who had ever read anything besides
the Bible”, he is aware that he interprets this as a “personal attack” onto his worldview
and personal values:

As a dyslexic, my struggle to literacy was long and difficult. So it seems as though
these people with the natural gift of literacy that had not been granted to me,
choosing not to read seemed [like] a personal attack. I thought to myself ‘Why do
you choose to remain ignorant while the world of words is at your fingertips?’ […]
Somewhere in the back of my head I had always assumed that there were universal
characteristics of human beings: the need for shelter, desire for companionship, and
an orientation towards asking and answering great questions through literature and
philosophy. How could I treat anyone as an equal who didn’t even make an attempt
at the latter? […] This challenge proved a source of stress for me in my encounters
with locals.

His encounter with locals stirred a lot of ambivalent emotions about his perceptions of
them as ignorant and his endorsement of the value of equality. He resolves this tension
by creating a common in-group identity on the basis of universal human needs for
education, shelter and companionship, which reproduces the hegenomic discourse,
i.e. Westerners as enlightened vs Africans as ignorant. However, in doing so, he also
acknowledges that it is hard to decide whose point of view is right and whose is wrong.
He tries very hard to negotiate how to deal with this issue, which becomes so difficult
as his focus is put onto himself that he turns questions of communication techniques
applied in interactions with others into questions about moral identity construction:

Many ‘native’ Opuwoians found it difficult to understand my way of talking. I often
employ literary references and as a child I was praised for this. As one who deeply
despises being condescended to myself it was a real struggle for me to be true to my own identity but still relate to people on equal terms. Should I ‘dumb down’ my speech so that people can understand me and risk coming across as condescending or continue with the status quo and remain an enigma to all but my UCR peers?

As he tries to stick to the idea that he does not want to treat others in a way he does not want to be treated himself, Justin is confronted with the reality that he does not see them as equals insofar as they do not endorse his values and worldviews (they are ignorant). He feels frustrated and stressed and seems to be trapped in an ambivalent state, torn apart between the emotions the conflict generates (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000, p. 12). However, instead of resolving the conflicting emotions, he approaches them with curiosity and reframes the dilemma in the form of a question.

The source of the experience of ambivalence within the context of ‘Whites’ dealing with people of color has been the topic of an ongoing debate within psychology. Gaertner and Dovidio (2000) call this bias aversive racism and claim that the ambivalence associated it is rooted in the conflict between feelings and values; whereas Katz and Hass (1988) argue that ambivalence is the result of tension between negative and genuinely positive (e.g., sympathetic) feelings towards people of color. Scholars taking a more cognitive stance towards ambivalence (Operario & Fiske, 2003) propose that stereotypes toward most groups involve ambivalent belief systems (e.g., they are competent but not nice) that vary in potency depending upon the situation.

Maria, a student who describes herself as non-religious, felt very uncomfortable when accompanying others to a church service where she was more or less forced to participate and sing and dance. What becomes apparent here is that the appreciation of a different culture is a prerequisite for an open approach to communication processes, especially when topics are touched upon which are related to one’s own (socio-economic power) position within a global context. In a nutshell: it means being confronted with one’s position within a global context as a ‘White, rich Westerner’, which for many students was not part of their self-understanding as they were upholding a self-image of a ‘poor student’.

White people have restricted Black Namibians’ development to a certain extent, they were colonized. However, I often felt like they still blamed us for what happened in the past and that skin color did matter. Therefore, I believe that as much as I needed this program to learn and unlearn stereotypes, so did the people in Namibia need it. I never felt bad or guilty about being so-called privileged, because I did not think it mattered that much […] Maybe all this had a huge impact on me because my sister is a Muslim and I started asking myself the question if she also considered me and the rest of the family as ‘bad’, because we do not believe. […] I never experienced religion in the way I experience it in Opuwo, so there was this strange world opening
up to me. [...] It was very interesting, but again it was also complicated when you look at culture and your own norms and values.

Maria is feeling threatened by the idea of being categorized as unethical, as the colonizer and the White perpetrator. She attempts to resolve the threat to her identity as a moral person by diminishing the extent and consequently the importance of the impact of colonization, i.e. “restriction of development to a certain extent” and she wonders why they still blamed them for what happened in the past. She also uses passive voice, “they got colonized” to avoid assuming her position as an agent in unjust structures, as a perpetrator. As a response to these emotions, she recategorizes herself in relation to the Namibian students by creating a common superordinate identity based on the concept of common humanity where color does not matter. And so she proposes that “we both need to unlearn stereotypes”. With this superordinate identity she resolves the tension of being seen as a perpetrator by implicitly drawing a threshold in time so that the past can be declared being ‘over and done’.

However, in the second paragraph she categorizes herself as non-religious and describes how she felt uncomfortable accompanying others to a church. In this instance, the issue of religion is an issue of personal relevance for her since her sister is Muslim, which leads her to open up the discussion about differences in religious identities. This experience gave her also the opportunity to take a different perspective regarding her own family and onto herself, to pose question regarding herself ‘through the eyes of an other’, her sister. She draws on dual identities and recategorizes herself as non-religious but also as a potentially immoral person in relation to her sister. She evaluates the impact of her experience not only as a ‘new’ but a “strange world opening up”.

**Criterion 4: Recognition of one’s position within in a global setting – on race, class, gender – and allowing oneself to engage in processes of political transformation.** The issue of skin color was a recurring theme which we will be using here as an example to demonstrate the difference between students who are engaging in a ‘discursive maneuvering’ (Hook, 2012) versus the ones who fully fulfill criterion 4. The crucial point about students’ ability to recognize and analyze their participation within structures of global injustice is the issue of whether they think of themselves as historical subjects (Foucault, 1966) who are intellectually equipped and psychologically capable to question the hegemonic order (Park, 2011). Whereas it is part of ordinary life and the ‘normalizing’ order that people of color are thought of as members of a particular race, who also think of themselves in a racialized way, ‘Whites’ do not necessarily do so. For many White, heterosexual, able-bodied students, the experience as being perceived as a representative of a group (which may have – and still does – engaged in atrocities and acts of exploitation), as a member of a race rather than as an individual (Tissberger, 2007), was for some students a very new experience. This triggered a whole range of emotional responses with which students had to cope with,
including existential guilt, anger, anxiety, shame, remorse, and empathy (Cropanzano, Stein, Nadistic, 2010), of “feeling discriminated against”, insecurity and intimidation. Paula and Lana are two examples of encounters with the ‘Black Other’. Paula tries to put her theoretical knowledge into practice:

[Pupils] repeatedly told me how beautiful I was and that my skin color was more beautiful than theirs. I found myself in a difficult situation: how should I react to this? I tried to explain to them that one skin color is not more beautiful than the other, but that we are just different. But they insisted on their right.

Paula here feels threatened by the statement that her color looks more beautiful than others. But she remains open to the idea that this might be the case because “we are different”. She thus maintains dual identities, her as a White and them as Black.

Lana openly reflects on the difficulties she experienced when she became aware of her position in the world, and one can see how she worked hard on staying open during this intercultural dialogue.

I came to my first major realization of this program: the awareness that I cannot simply step out of my status as a privileged, White, middle class woman and that this influences not only how Namibians perceive me but also how I see Namibians and the world in general. [...] I was constantly reminded of my skin color, which deviated from the norm. I was not viewed as being as ‘one of them’ but rather as the White woman, with whom all the notions and stereotypes of being rich and superior in status came along. [...] I experienced similar sensations when it came to the concept of class. The most influencing confrontation concerning my privilege I had with a middle aged woman at a barbershop. She accused me of being privileged in every single part of my life and that no matter how hard she would work she could never gain the same status as I have, due to race and class differences. It was a difficult discussion for me since I agree with her on the fact that people are either born into privilege or not and I did not know what I could possibly tell her to make myself look better or give her hope for the future. I decided on showing her my agreement and surprisingly by me reinforcing her views we ended up having a peaceful discussion about privilege and beauty ideals women have to struggle with.

Lana is trying here to get the woman to change her attribution about the future of her life and the world. She wants to be nice, show benevolence and help her to see hope. But in doing so she is aware that she would be reifying the status quo the hierarchy of relations, i.e. Westerners as helpers and Africans as dependents; furthermore, a denial of privileges is also one of the most successful mechanisms to perpetuate and sustain asymmetrical power relations. But then she decides to let the woman take the
conversation where she wants. This becomes a form of help that the woman accepts to take in order to talk about her version of reality and struggles by retaining her efficacy and autonomy (Nadler & Halabi, 2006). Interestingly so, the two successfully create a common bond by focusing on similarities and referring to a superordinate identity category with which both of them actively identify: being a woman within a patriarchal system. This fusion of horizons (Tsirogianni & Andreouli, 2011) opened up rather than closed down the possibility for further dialogue with the woman.

What makes this situation so difficult to deal with is the positioning of oneself not only as a participant under conditions of a global institutional order which foreseeably and avoidably produces severe inequalities, but the positioning as a ‘perpetrator’ within an unjust global institutional order (Pogge, 2008). Psychologically speaking, the threatening point is not so much that others have less than they should but rather that one has more than could be justifiable and must therefore be considered to be unjustifiably advantaged.

Another student, who was born and raised in a Latin American country, elaborates on how learning about Namibia’s (colonial) “history, culture, customs and traditions, development, politics, economy, and even current affairs” has enabled her to question the hegemonic order that she previously accepted as part of an ‘invisible normality’ (Park, 2011).

Growing up in [a Latin American country], I always saw the world in a scale: the bottom was Africa, then Latin America, then the US, and on top [of it] Europe. Part of my drive to study here was to go up, to go to a better place, to go higher where I was. [...] And at some point in the semester I [even] considered the idea of dropping out and going back. When I came I had the idea of never going back, never going back down, today I know that I might go back and it would not implicate going down. This pyramid is just wrong. I am still struggling with these ideas, and [I do] no longer know why I am here, or remotely [know] where I [will] want to go. It all started when [we started reading and] thinking about modernity and development. [...] Before I would have just said, yep, I am from a third world country. My accepted reality of my past has been highly shaken up. I am still figuring out what/how to build with it. Through immersion in a system of meaning different from my own, I have gained a better understanding of my cultural perspective and how this influences my view, as well as my role in some global structures – especially that of inequality. Growing up in Mexico, I learned to ignore poverty, dismiss people in hunger, to blame people instead of the system for the low levels of education and lack of educational opportunities, to accept certain levels of corruption etc. Going to Namibia was an eye opening experience not only to the reality in Namibia, but also of what I choose to ignore in my own country.
Here the student acknowledges feeling confused, guilty and immoral – she recognizes her own deficiencies. She expresses an antipathy towards herself and to her in-group and she is ashamed of how she used to view the world in hierarchical terms: “I always saw the world in a scale, the bottom was Africa, then Latin America, then the US, and on top [of it] Europe”. She feels embarrassed for failing to see her responsibility and role in global structures of injustice. Her worldview and identity become fragmented but she abstains from resolving the tensions arising from this fragmentation: “I am still figuring out what/how to build with it”.

Conclusion

We have shown how University College Roosevelt students engaged in different forms of relating to people in Namibia, and how they used their identities and references to superordinate or dual identities to resolve emotional dilemmas; how it touched upon questions regarding their selves and their self-image; how it inspired them to reflect onto their lives, the values they hold, and their relationships to beloved ones. It made them reflect onto the notion of skin color, their socio-economic position and its relation to their educational background, and about their position in the world as a socio-historical subject.

All students learnt to recognize the origins of their values and all students learnt to communicate within an intercultural setting. However, students’ stories showed that the concept of an ‘ideal contact’ is not a reality.. What became salient is that the development of a position as an agent within a global setting, the sharpening of one’s global citizenship skills, means psychologically to go through a process of ‘political awakening’, which also leads to disturbing emotions and dilemmas. Research has called for more nuanced and ‘inclusive’ (Eagly & Wood, 2012) perspectives on the role of inter-group emotions and beliefs in inter-group relations, and those that sustain unequal relations and discrimination. Bonds of affection between the advantaged and the disadvantaged sometimes entrench rather than disrupt wider patterns of discrimination.

What we have learnt from the Going Glocal program, and what might show to be a valuable insight regarding future programs, might be that ‘field trips’ are as much about engaging students in projects as they are about the opportunity to be in another cultural setting and ‘giving life a chance’ to see what kind of encounters ‘naturally’ occur, and to believe in the ‘spontaneity of interactions’. Furthermore, ambivalent states and emotional tensions are something which students should be encouraged to seek. Support has to be offered to deal with these so that students feel secure enough to engage in intercultural dialogue rather than close it down. In this context, people providing guidance might want to look out for topics that are of high personal relevance to them as a ‘door opener’ to keep students open and engaged when difficult emotions arise.
The Going Glocal program provided an ideal safe setting and guidance to explore these negative and ambivalent emotions, the range of symptoms, and the significance of their interpretations. It created a context in which students’ assumptions, values, and ideas about themselves and the world can be explored, changed, and discovered, rather than justified. However, all students who voluntarily applied to participate in this program were obviously interested in exploring their own prejudices and stereotypes, so one could argue that this group represented from the very beginning the global citizens of tomorrow. This raises questions of how to cultivate such skills among people who do not have an interest. Like most traditions of research on prejudice, research on the contact hypothesis has focused mainly on the reactions of members of historically advantaged groups. So did the current program. There is much less evidence on what minority group members think about the nature and concept of contact and objectives of such programs.
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