Global Citizenship Education in Post-Secondary Institutions: A Review of the Literature

Lynette Shultz (lshultz@ualberta.ca), Shelane Jorgenson (shelane@ualberta.ca)

Introduction

Educating for global citizenship has become a shared goal of educators and educational institutions interested in expanding their own and their students' understanding of what it means to claim or to have citizenship in the twenty-first century. Efforts toward this shared goal are complicated by the multitude of definitions and conceptualizations that are, at the least, contested, and in many cases, in significant tension with one another. If the large and globally interconnected issues of our time, for example, climate change, increasing intensity and extensity of poverty, and increased militarization, are to be addressed, we are challenged to create educational institutions that remain relevant to students as they find their place within this global context. As Chris Shiel (2008) in *The Global University: The Role of Senior Managers*, states, it may seem simpler to focus on the economic and competitive aspects of globalization and the local working contexts than to take a place in addressing the justice/injustice issues before us. However, universities, along with other institutions and organizations, are beginning to make explicit their commitments to accept there is a pivotal role for higher education in resolving the current and emergent global problems.

Global citizenship education has been suggested as a way in which universities can respond to the demand for opportunities to engage in relevant, meaningful activities that enhance students' global perspectives and help them to contribute to a more peaceful, environmentally secure and just world. The president of the University of Alberta, Dr. Samarasekera, stated the following in her Dare to Deliver (2007) university plan:

> Vision: "To inspire the human spirit through outstanding achievements in learning, discovery, and citizenship in a creative community, building one of the world's great universities for the public good." (p. 5)

> Alberta needs and deserves the benefits that a globally recognized institution brings to its citizenry, who move globally, and its industry, which engage globally. A great research and teaching institution offers leaders of tomorrow an opportunity to study at a level

competitive with the world's finest universities. Such an institution will attract the best

and brightest students and scholars to Alberta and retain them here in Alberta (p. 4).

This vision opens a wide range of possible approaches to global citizenship education.

Conceptualizing Global Citizenship Education

Transdisciplinarity

The complexity of global and interconnected problems is increasingly being recognized as an

emergent phenomenon with non-linear dynamics and uncertainties that exist within highly

political social contexts (Klein, 2004; Max –Neef, 2005; Gibbons, 1994). In 1994, Gibbons

described a growing shift in modes of knowledge production with "older homogenous modes of

knowledge" (p. 516) replaced by complexity, hybridity, non-linearity, reflexivity, heterogeneity,

and transdisciplinarity (p. 516). As Max-Neef (2005), a Chilean scholar, identifies, current

problems cannot be adequately understood from specific individual disciplines and universities.

If there is to be significant movement toward addressing these problems, the complexity of

analysis must be coherent with such problems. This calls for more than interdisciplinarity or

multidisciplinarity, which are "accumulations of visions emerging from participating disciplines"

(p. 6). Transdisciplinarity is "more than a new discipline or super-discipline, it is actually a

different manner of seeing the world, more systemic and more holistic"(p. 15), introducing a

kind of quantum logic as a substitute for linear logic (p. 5), and breaking with the assumption of

a single reality (p. 5, 10-11). Max-Neef suggests we view discipline and transdiscipline as

complementary, as transdisciplinarity rests on a coordination of empirical, pragmatic, and

normative research and is constituted by explicit values, ethics and philosophical positions that

extend beyond disciplinarity. Max-Neef is adamant that, while transdisciplinary approaches at

the university level are challenging, it is urgent that we engage this level of work. "It is clear that

if such an effort is not undertaken, we will continue generating every greater harms to Society

and to Nature, because of our partial, fragmented, and limited visions and assumptions" (p. 16).

Global citizenship education has largely been approached as a disciplinary or interdisciplinary

project. The possibilities that a transdisciplinary approach might bring are significant. It is

important then to understand what values, ethics and philosophical perspectives underpin such

educational efforts. Dower (2003; 2008) theorizes global citizenship as based on a normative

claim that we have a certain duty to all humans; that all humans, without exception, are worthy of moral respect; and an existential claim that we are bound together with all other humans. Global citizenship, as an ethical practice, aims to expand inclusion and power, and provides a normative, purposive, and conceptual framework that requires the complex thought suggested by transdisciplinarity.

Citizenship

Lynn Davies (2006) suggests global citizenship education has grown out of the practice of global education which had its focus in international awareness through participatory learning and engaging in holistic learning activities (p. 6). She argues that adding citizenship into the concept reflects the shift towards a focus on human rights and responsibilities, implying a more active role that moves beyond an awareness of the issues. Held (1999) describes citizenship as primarily about the rights and obligations available to members of a state, but his description also includes the formal and informal relationships between individuals and the state. Citizenship is also closely linked to processes of identity and participation. These relationships and processes serve to both reflect and challenge existing social contracts, binding citizens, including individuals, groups and communities, to each other. As Abdi and Shultz (2007; 2008) propose, any understanding of citizenship should bring with it a concern with entitlements, exclusion, access, and equity. Therefore, educating for global citizenship has its roots in justice. Linking human rights and global citizenship suggests that justice entails the equitable redistribution of both goods and burdens within society, engaging in processes of reciprocal recognition, and the extension of authentic and inclusive processes of engagement. Linking global citizenship with social justice means ensuring that the collective projects and practices to which we give our assent do not, intentionally or unintentionally, secure a better life for some at the expense of a much worse life for others. Baxi (2000), in a call for transdisciplinarity, links such work with a wider urgency for human rights and citizenship accountability with new modes of knowledge, discourse, and institutional frameworks needed across all sectors in both the North and the South. Klein (2004), Baxi (2000), Abdi (2006), Shultz & Abdi (2007; 2008) and others provide strong evidence that citizenship education can become neutralized and therefore weakened to the extent that it becomes not what people (individual and collectively) have a right to, but what is prescribed within the realm of the world system. Therefore, any project of global citizenship

education must include a commitment to creating engaged civic and institutional platforms that are widely inclusive and include both structural and historical-cultural analysis.

White and Openshaw (2005) highlight the difficulty of designing educational policy and practices around global citizenship and observe that rather than engage in the essential conflict inherent in citizenship education, educators and policymakers have tended to "soften citizenship" to make it into a politically neutral, if not banal, concept. Davies (2006) perhaps sums up the dilemmas for policymakers and educators when she points out that an emphasis on rights is not a blueprint for action but rather, a means to address the issues that face the human community with justice as the end of such processes. Andreotti (2006) builds on Davis' critique and locates current efforts to educate global citizens within the post-colonial predicament. While Andreotti prefers the term "planetary citizen" to global citizen, she shares an understanding with others that this citizenship, like many global issues, transcends national boundaries that can seem arbitrary in light of issues such as climate change, food shortages, global health issues, forced migration, or increased trafficking of humans, guns and drugs. In order for global citizenship to be in service to an improved quality of life for all humans, Spivak (2004) proposes the goals of education must be to learn to unlearn (for example, the colonial mentality), learn to listen, relearn with a global perspective, and learn to reach out and engage with those who we might consider "other".

Globalization and global perspectives
Many authors credit the recent attention to global citizenship education to the surge of globalization. In the past thirty years, the world has undergone a transformation in its global connections and interactions. Unlike other forms of globalization in history, which include the exchange of goods and movement of people, recent decades have seen a major change in the intensity and extensity of these exchanges and movements. As Brodie (2004) argues, current globalization entails processes that are multi-leveled and multi-directional. The processes of globality reveal a shifting and breaking down of barriers of time, space, and nation, leading to a linking and enactment of a global community where there are at least possibilities of inclusive, transnational public spaces and transnational citizen-subjects (p. 325). In conjunction with this, social, economic and political developments, such as international conventions that give people

common rights and entitlements, have grown in number and variety. New terminology found in the literature, such as global civil society, global ethic, and global citizenship, signify the development of a new global reality of transnational identities (Dower, 2000. p. 560). This also suggests a shift from the vast dependence on "western" conceptualizations of social, political, economic, and environmental realities. However, limits to the widening of access and contribution from across the globe are imposed by other aspects of globalization. Processes of globalism reflect a political positioning that promotes a transnational worldview of governance, and institutional structures (Brodie, 2004). Of concern is the current neoliberal globalism ideology that gives primacy to economic relations, the freeing of a global market, deregulation and the erosion of the public sector. The impact of this ideology on those outside the dominant economic, social, and political groups, i.e. those on the periphery, has been a powerful force of de-development and de-citizenization. (Abdi, 2006, Abdi & Shultz, 2007; 2008; Battiste, 1998; Giroux, 2004; Mohanty, 2003; Mamdani, 1996; Stromquist and Monkman, 2000)

Global interconnectedness, through both globality and globalism, has resulted in what authors such as Lapayese (2003) see as social problems being redefined as global problems (p. 493). Local, national, and global boundaries have become increasingly obscured and porous, making responses to these social problems more complex (Brodie, 2004). In response to this complication, education has been called upon to prepare people for multiple and evolving forms of activity as citizens (Lapayese, 2003). This is further complicated by the lack of shared understandings of global citizenship which has resulted in the concept being taken up in different ways by different interest groups. As Sahlberg (2006) points out, globalization, or globalism according to Brodie's (2004) conceptualization, has increased economic competition within and between countries, and the level of economic competition is viewed as the prime indicator of a country's wellbeing. Education premised upon this aspect of globalization has a purpose of creating more economically competitive citizens who are advantaged because of particular knowledge, skills and attitudes. Scholarly work in this area often refers to education as a core domain for building human capital (Salzberg, 2006; Porter et al, 2004). The definition of a global citizen, within this construct, is a person who participates and reaps the benefits of this participation in a "borderless world". Because this individual has the "human capital" to move freely across the world to access opportunities, he or she is able to compete with the 'best' in the

world. Education for this type of citizen provides students with the necessary skills to successfully participate in the global market. As well, it provides opportunities for international travel and cross-cultural experiences.

Underpinning this notion of a competitive citizenry is the concept of economic rationality, in which people act in ways that maximize their economic advantage (Apple, 2000). In this human capital approach, according to Apple, the emphasis is on students as future workers who must acquire the appropriate skills and knowledge to compete effectively in the world. Apple regards this as having had a major impact on the kind of education promoted in economically competitive nations. In the increasingly interconnected global market, a descriptive knowledge about the world is beneficial to the individual working and competing in this context. As a result, education for global citizenship is encouraged to the extent that specific competencies such as knowledge about other countries and languages foster the education of an individual that will succeed economically in the world.

The emphasis on economic capacity as the major motivation for education for global citizenship is critiqued by academics and practitioners. Criticisms of the lack of analysis of global issues, ,uncritical approaches to social and political structures, failure to critically reflect on one's position relative to the rest of the world appear in several articles that articulate a vision of what education for global citizenship should uphold (Shultz, 2007). According to the literature an emphasis on economic capacity. Without critical analysis and reflection, the critics of competitive citizenry claim, the perpetuation of inequality will not be addressed, but rather seen as a legitimate impact of economic advancement and advantage.

Given these tensions, it would seem important to find ways to bring global perspectives and multiple worldviews into policies and programs in post secondary institutions. Linking local and global issues and perspectives is core to global citizenship education. Efforts to internationalize and/or deepen global citizenship education need to support relationships of reciprocity. Therefore, attention to the intentions and processes of partnerships and the impact of each institution's global citizenship education on other people in the world are important in the overall agenda to educate for global citizenship.

Post-secondary Global Citizenship Education: Current programs and practices

The Role of Leadership and Policy

Policies and programs of internationalization at post-secondary institutions have greatly contributed to the increasing focus on international issues and global citizenship. According to Shiel & McKenzie, (2008), the editors of a recent publication, *The Global University: the role of senior managers*, post-secondary institutions are using internationalization as "a strategic aim" to develop "active global citizens" (p. 6). However, in spite efforts to create programs that foster this aim, many programs and courses fail to be implemented or are discontinued if institutional commitment from senior staff is not in place. Through the experiences of several senior managers and policy analysts presented in *The Global University,* it is made clear that change towards internationalization and fostering global citizenship education in post-secondary institutions depends on strategic commitment from all levels of governance.

Luker (2008) asserts that many current models of post-secondary education position education primarily as a business and, as a result, universities are used for business purposes via marketing and commercialization. In these programs, financial resources and prestige are key components of the sustainability of global citizenship projects. If programs of global citizenship education provide the institution with an element of prestige and therefore attract students and funders, the program's longevity is more assured. Luker, however, is adamant that universities must "acknowledge the damage of colonialism and commercialization of higher education" (p. 10) and he calls for universities to move away from international relations based on financial self-interest. Money, although important for an institution to operate, should not be what he calls the "driver for internationalization" (p. 13). The catalyst for such projects needs to come from a shared view about the purpose and requirements of global education as well as a realistic assessment of the university's position within centre-periphery relations and connections (Ibid).

Broadbent and Woodman (2008), both in senior administrative positions at Roehampton University, in London, UK, give a thorough description of their dynamic global citizenship and social justice education program. A major focus of the program has been Crucible, a teaching and learning centre, which combines human rights, social justice, and citizenship education.

Through the combination of formal and nonformal education, including a cross-faculty citizenship education course with strong links to community partners and non-formal education activities, the authors indicate that undergraduate and graduate students are highly engaged in active global citizenship education. Broadbent and Woodman conclude that it is necessary to embed global citizenship education in the usual workings of the university through policy and programming. For example, social justice is a key part of the university vision and is reflected across university programs.

In efforts to secure the success of implementing global citizenship programs, Petford and Shiel (2008) highlight the importance of linking programs to the strategic vision of the institution. One of the most crucial roles of leaders is to articulate this vision and ensure that it corresponds to the institution's general vision and ethos (Jones & Lee, 2008). The authors recount the events of their personal endeavours to create a *Centre for Global Perspectives* at Bournemouth University in the UK. The step of linking to the vision is made evident in terms of its importance in garnering consistent support from different levels of management. These authors warn that "without persistent support from leadership to bring the agenda into a 'coherent whole', the initiative would have floundered on several occasions" (p. 24). By stating the vision in strategic documents and policies, there is evidence that initiatives have more sustainability.

In addition, Mallea (2008), Past President and Vice Chancellor of Brandon University, presents nine management lessons learned from work at the University of British Columbia to establish global citizenship as an institutional goal:
1) There is a crucial need for an institution to act, and also be seen to be acting, as a responsible global citizen in areas such as purchasing and investment.
2) A university's intellectual, moral and social mission in developing global citizenship needs to be translated into concrete and sustainable policy and practice.
3) The goal of global citizenship is embedded within each of the university's core functions: teaching, research, and service.
4) The significance of employing communication, consultation, and dissemination processes (both internally and externally) that are demonstrably inclusive and transparent.

5) It is fundamentally important to establish an appropriate balance between centralized and decentralized initiatives.

6) There is a need to allocate sufficient and sustainable resources to support the implementation of these initiatives.

7) Universities need to introduce annual assessment processes to determine whether or not specified targets and timelines are in fact being met.

8) Emphasis must be placed on the creation of an incentive and reward structure that encourages and recognizes successful performance.

9) Senior university administrators must recognize that the preparation of global citizens is an ongoing process not an end state. (p. 54 -55).

Formal and Non-formal Education programs

In scanning various programs of global citizenship education at post-secondary institutions, several trends emerge. One of the most obvious trends is that despite the common commitment to educate students for global citizenship, no two programs of global citizenship education are alike. Each institution of higher education has created its own unique initiative consisting of various forms of policy, programming, pre-requisites, credentialing and student and community involvement. What follows is a sample of the different kinds of global citizenship education programs in effect at post-secondary institutions.

The most expansive initiative to educate for global citizenship was launched by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) in 2002 under the project title, *Liberal Education and Global Citizenship: The arts of democracy*. Funded by the federal Department of Education's Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education, the project set out to enhance global education and prepare future college graduates "to become more informed, socially responsible and engaged citizens of the nation and the world" (www.aacu.org/SharedFutures.globalcitizenship/index.cfm). The project funded ten participating American post-secondary institutions in an effort to modify programs and opportunities for global education for their students. These program proposals were required to meet the project's four objectives:

1) generating new knowledge about global studies

2) enhancing civic engagement and social responsibility

3) promoting a deeper knowledge and debate about the practice of democracy

4) cultivating intercultural competencies with faculty and students (Ibid).

As part of the implementation process, participating faculty and administrative teams attended a four-day faculty institute, an online faculty development seminar, and working forums for direction towards creating their programs. While there were common goals and expectations, there were no centralized enforcement procedures and each institution was left to allocate funding towards projects and programs of their own choice.

As a result of this project, ten different initiatives of varying complexity and depth of global citizenship education were instituted across the United States. Although each of the project proposals presented various courses and programs that they would implement with the money, the current status of these courses is unclear. For instance, the University of Delaware proposed a project to create a multi-year threaded curriculum that would integrate courses, international discovery and service learning opportunities, technology, general education and major study. The program would consist of three global citizen tracks for first year students including *Enacting Democracy, Global Community* and *Transnational Issues*. These tracks combined courses, study abroad, co-curricular experiences and a capping project that would credit students with a global citizenship certificate at their graduation. The results of this program are not documented at this time and currently there is no clear record or evaluation of the program. (http://international.udel.edu/projects/grants/ongoing4.html).

Since the AAC&U's project was put into practice in 2002, several other American institutions have implemented programs of global citizenship on their campuses (Grudzinski-Hall, 2007). Many have used the term "global citizenship" as an umbrella term for academic and co-curricular programs which fall under education abroad, service learning and volunteer exchanges. Haverford College in Pennsylvania, for instance, has created a *Centre for Peace and Global Citizenship*, and uses global citizenship as an overarching theme to frame the Centre's programs. The Centre encourages interdisciplinary collaboration, curricular innovation and connections to community organizations by providing funding for various programs (http://www.haverford.edu/CPGC/programs/index.htm). In addition to providing summer

internship programming, which connects students to social service agencies around the world during the summer, the Centre also provides funding for student research, service learning, campus events, conferences, workshops and faculty projects that have a commitment to peace and social justice.

An example of a smaller scale project that provides support for social justice initiatives is at Chatham University in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. The University has established programs in collaboration with private donors that provide funding for specific initiatives. In 2006, Chatham established the *Benter Initiative for Global Citizenship*, providing award grants to faculty members who work with students in experiential learning projects with global dimensions (http://www.chatham.edu/academics/benter_index.cfm). Similarly, these programs provide students with opportunities to engage cross-culturally with prescribed aims to promote social responsibility and participatory citizenship among the students.

In other small American universities, programs of global citizenship have developed with more specific academic foci and credentials for global citizenship education. At Lehigh University, a global citizenship program was developed in 2004, which provides a cross-college, co-curricular certificate of Global Citizenship. Beginning the program in the first year of Lehigh, students are required to take two to three required courses per year and participate in at least one travel/study abroad experience. The curriculum focuses on various content areas that are concerned with critical perspectives of "ethical responsibility, humanistic vales and cultural/religious/institutional awareness associated with the theme of global citizenship" (http://www.lehigh.edu/~ingc/info.html). Additionally, the program also has a *Global Citizenship House* that is open to twenty students in the program. This student residence, established in 2006, was instituted with the idea that continuity from academic experience into social experience was needed to foster an active global citizenship for the Global Citizenship program (http://www.lehigh.edu/~ingc/gc_house/index.html).

At Drake University, a privately funded university in Iowa, a *Centre for Global Citizenship* has been developed within Drake University International. In addition to providing funding for campus events, Model United Nations simulations and faculty and curriculum development with

international foci, the Centre has also formed a *Global Ambassadors Program* to complement a student's central program of study. The purposes of this program are to provide students with a combination of concentrated study, personal experience and reflection that will inform their understanding of global issues and perspectives as well as providing students with intercultural skills (http://www.drake.edu/international/cgc/ambassador.php). Through the successful completion of a variety of academic and co-curricular requirements, such as specific courses, language study, study abroad, service learning and a capping paper, students receive a certificate of achievement which appears on the students' transcripts.

It is difficult to determine how many similar programs, structured around and committed to developing and credentialing global citizens, exist.. Many post-secondary institutions have developed global citizenship education programs through smaller scale and diverse initiatives often within individual faculties or programs. At Tufts University in Massachusetts, for example, an *Ethics and Global Citizenship Program* has recently been developed as a six-week intensive program for senior high school students in the Boston area. While gaining college credit, students are engaged in talking about topics and issues of global citizenship. At the University of Glasgow, a program has been devised within the Curriculum Studies Department in the Faculty of Education to support policies that encourage the study of the principles of development education and address strategies for the elimination of world poverty and development of international social justice as a part of initial teacher education (ITE). The project's aims are to establish a model for embedding education for global citizenship in ITE, building global citizenship into the philosophy and practice of ITE and providing evidence of the effectiveness of this approach in developing global citizens
(http://www.gla.ac.uk/faculties/education/programmesandcourses/)

Despite a lack of evidence of any programs or courses that ascribe to developing global citizenship in their students, several postsecondary institutions have referred to global citizenship in their institutional missions. One of the largest universities in the UK, the University College of London (UCL), has declared that the University's primary aim is to "educate for global citizenship" by creating graduates who are: critical and creative thinkers, ambitious, idealistic, ethical, aware of the intellectual and social value of culture difference, innovative entrepreneurs,

12

leaders and highly employable and ready to embrace professional mobility (http://www.ucl.ac.uk/global_citizenship/index.htm). Currently, academic staff are re-examining their curricula to identify ways in which departments can incorporate a focus on global issues and global thinking in the classroom.

At the University of British Columbia, global citizenship is also mentioned in its mission statement. In 2002, Past President, Martha Piper stated, in several documents, the need for the University to educate for global citizenship (http://www.trek2000.ubc.ca/Martha%20Piper%20-%20Trek%202010.pdf). This statement not only gestured towards an institutional commitment to global citizenship, but it was also the catalyst for investigating the meaning of global citizenship and its best practices. Throughout 2003-04, discussion groups were held across campus to get student input into the concept of global citizenship and to make sure these contributions were incorporated into the University's strategic plan. This project coincided with several other cross-campus initiatives that aimed to foster global citizenship amongst students. For example, a *Global Citizenship Seminar Series* was created whose goal it was to educate the UBC community through various lectures and the showcasing of proactive members of the global community and pressing global issues. This joint initiative, between the Faculties of Arts and Sciences, stressed the importance of multidisciplinary learning that works to "inspire students to actively pursue university educations that will assist them in developing and promoting just, civil, and sustainable societies throughout the world" (http://www.internationalization.ubc.ca/globalcitizenship.htm). In addition to these seminars, programs such as the *Global Student Speakers' Bureau*, a global citizenship brown bag series under the *UBC Centre for Teaching and Academic Growth,* and a distance-learning course, Perspectives on Global Citizenship, were developed as an offshoot of the Global Citizenship Project completed in 2004.

Similar to UBC, the five campuses that comprise Fairleigh Dickinson University, the largest private university in New Jersey with campuses in New Jersey, USA, Wroxton, England and Vancouver, Can., emphasize global citizenship at both an institutional and program level. Since 2000, global education has been cited as a mission of the institution:

Fairleigh Dickinson University is a center of academic excellence dedicated to the

preparation of world citizens through global education. The University strives to provide students with the multidisciplinary, intercultural and ethical understandings necessary to participate, lead and prosper in the global marketplace of ideas, commerce and culture. (http://view.fdu.edu/default.aspx?id=260).

Despite its being framed as 'global education', rather than 'global citizenship education', the vision of the institution is to prepare and develop global citizens through global education. The Global Education program has connected this vision statement with five concrete goals of the global education curriculum:

1. To integrate global education into the teaching of all disciplines;

2. To teach students how to access, interpret, evaluate, and make responsible use of information and communications technology;

3. To teach students to develop critical-thinking skills appropriate to the information age and to the increasing pressures for intercultural understanding, negotiation, and problem solving;

4. To graduate students who are employable in the new markets for labor, that is, not only skilled for their first jobs but for a lifetime of learning and career changes;

5. To graduate students with a strong sense of the ethical implications of globalization (Ibid).

Together, the vision, mission statement and goals have helped global education remain an ongoing priority for the University. In the past several years, five programs directed towards educating global citizens have been supported including: the United Nations Pathways; Global Virtual Faculty; Global Issues Gateway website; Global Scholars and Florham Scholars (Ibid).

Global citizenship education programs have also emerged through partnerships with non-governmental organizations, development/social justice organizations and with other academic institutions. At the University of Guelph, for example, the *Guelph Global Learner Program* was developed through a partnership with Canada World Youth to provide international volunteer and learner programs for students during the spring semesters. Through various volunteer placements in countries such as Costa Rica, Peru, Ecuador, Botswana and Benin, students earn academic credit towards their program of study. Part of the requirement for academic credit also calls for students to organize campus activities upon their return to Guelph. These activities,

coordinated by the Global Learners, are framed as 'Global Citizenship activities', whose aim is to promote international understanding on campus. The program coordinators believe that the Global Learners Program "is an opportunity for students to apply their theoretical knowledge in an international context and to increase global citizenship across campus" (http://www.studentlife.uoguelph.ca/citizencommunity/global.cfm).

In Europe and Australia, the EU-AU Global Citizenship Program exemplifies programs that are developed through partnerships between nations and institutions. The program offers students from three Australian universities and four European universities with an interest in globalization, international relations, development studies and languages, an opportunity "to prepare themselves as global citizens and leaders" (http://www.iueu.edu.au/webpages/gcp.html). As part of their undergraduate degree accredited by their home university, the program provides students with scholarships to study at another university overseas. Distinguishing itself from other basic institutional exchanges, the program declares that it provides students "with a deeper understanding of the cultural and political dimensions of change, and of their potential role in developing a conception of citizenship geared to the needs of rapidly globalizing world" (Ibid).

Program Trends

One of the most obvious trends in this brief overview and sampling of programs of global citizenship education at post-secondary institutions relates to their location. It appears that the majority of global citizenship education programs are located in the United States and, to a lesser degree, in Canada, the UK, and Australia. The use of "global citizenship" to frame post-secondary educational programs is rarely found outside of these countries. Tye's (1999) study of global education programs in 50 different countries corroborates Hick's (2003) critique that global education is often the purview of Western, privileged students and universities. In response to this critique, some argue that this is just a matter of time and attention to educating about the global context is beginning to take place in Southern institutions as well. In *The Internationalization of Higher Education: a Paradigm for Global Citizenry*, Gacel-Ávila (2005) offers an important perspective on the absence of global citizenship programs in regions such as Latin America. She asserts that the effects of globalization are divergent and felt unequally across nations. Thus, universities do not make internationalization and global citizenship

education the priority that they should because they don't have the resources or systems in place for co-operation with other institutions (p. 121). For instance, Gacel-Ávila states that universities in Mexico "largely underestimate the personal and intellectual growth stimulated by contact and empathy with other cultures" and therefore neglect intercultural and international perspectives (p.128). Instead of allocating a budget, planning and evaluation procedures for international activities, initiatives with an international dimension are kept marginalized from development policies and institutional priorities. Gacel-Ávila argues that processes of internationalization, which contain an education for intercultural understanding, peaceful coexistence, democracy and global citizenship, can provide global society with an education that meets today's needs and demands characterized by globalization and interdependence (p. 121). For Gacel- Ávila, this change of institutional direction can be accomplished by regarding education and international cooperation as activities that influence all human beings on the planet and embedding this understanding within post-secondary education institutions in all countries.

Even if international co-operation were strengthened, as Gacel-Ávila suggests, current programs of global citizenship have gate-keeping mechanisms that privilege a global elite. Study and volunteer abroad components that many of the global citizenship programs involve and/or require for credits are often costly. (For example, a four-week program in Botswana, part of Guelph's Global Learner Program, costs students approximately $4800 CDN.) By making such travel excursions mandatory for credentials, the case at Drake and Lehigh universities, the possibility for participation is largely dependent on student financial capacity. Despite evidence of scholarships and fundraising to offset these costs, the cost and time needed still appears to preclude many students from participating.

Zemach-Bersin (2007) makes several arguments about these elitist trends found in study abroad programs in the United States. For instance, she points to the Lincoln Commission research reports, which show that most students who study abroad are enrolled in small liberal arts colleges where programs of global citizenship are most prevalent. Furthermore, students of color are underrepresented in study abroad programs with a considerably lower percentage of such students studying abroad in comparison with white students (p. 22). In programs such as Lehigh that only accept thirty students per year to the global citizenship program, issues of access based

on student finance and personal experience prohibit the inclusion of various demographics into the program. As a result of this, Zemach-Bersin argues that "individuals are constructed into global citizens through their ability to access elitist modes of attaining citizenship... global citizenship, therefore, is an identity available and granted to some but not to others" (p. 21-22).

Another common theme of the global citizenship educational programs is the absence of definitions of global citizenship. Although Oxfam's definition of global citizenship is cited on several program websites (for example, at Emory College), it is difficult to discern how the Oxfam definition is being applied within the programs which reference it. This absence relates to the overall lack of consensus on global citizenship. In the absence of a definition within institutions, programs and courses lack coherence and common goals. This makes it difficult to understand the impact of such education efforts on students, the institution, and society.

Courses

In some cases, global citizenship education is approached through an activity based (either formal or non-formal education based) or single course based approach rather than a programmatic approach. In other cases, formal education in the form of specific courses provides the backbone of global citizenship education. There is a range of approaches to global citizenship education and many universities look to individual courses and activities to achieve an overall global citizenship education. At UBC, an interdisciplinary online course called *Perspectives on Global Citizenship* has recently been implemented. This course was developed in congruence with the University's aim to "equip graduates with the knowledge and competencies which will enable them to work and participate as global citizens" (http://olt.ubc.ca/distance_learning/courses/course_catalog/?CA=31281). Comprised of twelve weekly modules, the course is designed to complement a student's major and challenge them to consider the roles and responsibilities that each has within their political, social, cultural and professional contexts. The class is also offered to students from several other partner universities in Hong Kong, Australia, New Zealand and the UK. Modules in the class cover a range of topics including meaning, possibilities and challenges to global citizenship, media bias, world issues such as wealth and poverty, environment and sustainability (Ibid). In addition to being presented with different perspectives of global citizenship and engaging with students from different

countries about the concept, students are led to develop their own definitions of global citizenship.

Several classes of global citizenship education use service learning and experiential learning abroad to introduce the concept of global citizenship and develop students into global citizens. At James Madison University in Virginia, the course 'Global Citizenship in a Service-Learning Context in Dominican Republic' has recently been developed to give students the opportunity to engage in one or two intensive service-learning projects over a four-week period in the Dominican Republic. The course seeks to address definitions and issues of global citizenship, development and service through the use of service-learning (www.jmu.edu/international/docs/nafsa 2007syl.doc).Working with both American and Dominican professionals, students experience and learn about contemporary social, political, cultural and economic conditions within the Dominican Republic through service-learning, structured outings, cultural events, guest speakers, course readings and assignments. Through ongoing structured reflection, students are also led to discover, articulate, integrate and act on what they learn from their experiences.

Similarly at the University of Alberta, a course entitled 'Global Citizenship Field Experience in Ghana' was initiated in 2007 as a way to broaden pre-service teachers' horizons and educational experience by living and working briefly in a foreign country. The course endeavours to prepare "students to become informed and active global citizens" and help them to teach global citizenship in their own diverse classrooms in Canada (http://www.registrar.ualberta.ca/ro.cfm?id=464). Following a one-week orientation in Edmonton, the students travel to Ghana where they undergo another orientation, team-building activities with school partners, project work, seminars and actual teaching experience in a rural community for four weeks. These students also are provided opportunities to extend their pre-departure preparation by taking education courses offered in the faculty that include one focused on an international and comparative examination of education and citizenship, and/or one on globalization and education. While in Ghana, the U of A students are guided through their experience by both Canadian and Ghanaian professors.

In the *Primary Education Program* in the School of Education at Roehampton, a *Global Citizenship* course has similarly been designed for pre-service teachers. The course explores different concepts of global citizenship and its place and value in the curriculum. Considering topics such as geographical aspects of development education, human rights education, multicultural education, citizenship education and education for sustainable development, the course aims to provide a context for students to examine their own knowledge, skill, values and attitudes, and those of others in relation to contentious issues such as rights and responsibilities, power, racism, diversity and poverty (http://studentzone.roehampton.ac.uk/programmedetails/ug20062007/newprimaryeducation/index.asp)

Course Trends

What is evident from the courses described in the previous section is that each has its own methods of introducing global citizenship to students and, in various ways, each tries to develop the students into global citizens. For instance, James Madison and University of Alberta used experiential learning to introduce students to global citizenship. Experiential learning, in the forms of community service learning and cross-cultural exchanges, are featured consistently in the literature as a way to develop global citizenship. Davies (2006) suggests that "if pupils are to be educated in and for global citizenship this suggests that they should experience democracy and human rights in their daily lives at school- and not just be told about it" (p. 16). International experiences, however, do not inherently create global citizens. Sheppard (2004) notes that the knowledge, skills and attitudes (KSAs) that students learn during these experiences do not necessarily mean one is a global citizen: "international education does provide universities with the opportunity to build global citizens, but becoming a global citizen involves a choice on the part of students" (p. 38). In her own experience, international educational experiences put her on a "path" to global citizenship, but in order to develop global citizenship fully, she states that "one must derive meaning from the experience to be able to apply it to their lives" (p. 39).

Despite not having study abroad experiences as part of the curriculum, UBC and Roehampton investigate a wide spectrum of global citizenship through their extensive range of topics. In both cases, students are helped to explore the different dimensions of global citizenship through

substantial collections of readings and discussion. One of the important differences between these programs, in addition to the differences between method of delivery and the student bodies, is the aim of the course. At UBC, it is stated that the purpose of the course is to develop certain "competencies" that will allow students to "work" as global citizens. This aim is very different from Roehampton's, which seeks to provide opportunities for students to explore the concept of global citizenship and its place and value in the school curriculum. Even though both courses appear to necessitate critical thinking skills about global citizenship and how it can be used in the student's field of work, UBC attempts to create competent global citizens, whereas Roehampton's model aims more to create reflective and conscious global citizens.

International Education and Internationalization vs. Social justice
Most programs and courses of global citizenship education can be classified into one of two categories. One category is more akin to international education as a means to carry out the internationalization efforts of the university. The second category has a stronger emphasis on educating students for citizenship and social justice which includes a focus on the rights and responsibilities of the post secondary students who are attending post secondary institutions. Despite having the words 'global citizenship' in either the program or course title, in looking at the aims of each of the programs and courses, it is evident that many programs are not educating for the same thing. This section will take a look at international education and internationalization in comparison to models of global citizenship education that aim to educate about rights, responsibilities and social justice.

In an article called *Internationalizing the Student Learning Experiences: Possible Indicators*, Stone (2007) offers a working definition of internationalization as "the complex of processes that gives universities an international dimension" (p. 410). With this definition, Stone provides a list of indicators of an internationalized student learning experience collected from a range of sources. These indicators range from developing global perspectives and becoming world citizens to attracting high caliber staff and students from international origins (p. 410-411). Presented as a list of over forty indicators, internationalization could mean anything with international and global elements and foci.

One of the most commonly cited indicators is global competency. Hunter et al. (2006) describes global competence as "having an open mind while actively seeking to understand cultural norms and expectations of others, leveraging this gained knowledge to interact, communicate and work effectively outside one's environment" (p. 270). In order to assess whether or not university programs with global dimensions are producing globally competent students, the authors undertook a study of what it means to be globally competent by interviewing managers of transnational corporations, international educators, UN officials, intercultural trainers and foreign government officers. The results stated that a globally competent person "must be able to identify cultural difference to compete globally, collaborate across cultures, and effectively participate in both social and business settings in other countries" (p. 283). The authors suggest that current "global citizen-global competence curriculum" should be reconsidered based on these findings and the KSAs identified should be implemented into university curriculum (p. 283).

Brustein (2007), the author of an article called, *The Global Campus: Challenges and Opportunities for Higher Education in North America*, discusses the trend of internationalization and global competence as a direct result of shifting and changing economic, political and social realities and challenges stemming from globalization. In response to these changes, Brustein argues that it is imperative to produce globally competent students. He lists the foundations of global competence as:

> The ability to work effectively in international settings; awareness of and adaptability to diverse cultures, perceptions, and approaches; familiarity with the major currents of global change and the issues they raise; and the capacity for effective communication across cultural and linguistic boundaries (p. 383).

By using a model of global education fashioned and adopted by the University of Pittsburgh, which includes a Global Studies certificate program, Brustein shows how institutions of higher learning can provide opportunities for students to have an "internationalized education experience" (p. 385). Models such as the Pittsburgh's, which incorporates interdisciplinary study, international exchanges and language learning, will prepare students to function as what he calls "global workers and citizens." Brustein believes that if this is acknowledged as a crucial

component of contemporary undergraduate education, students will be able to successfully contribute to the demand for globally competent workers for which the lack of cross-culturally trained employees costs American companies about $2 billion dollars in losses annually (p. 384).

Another study that focuses on the intercultural aspects of global citizenship education was conducted at an American post-secondary institution, which looks at the effects of study abroad programs on developing intercultural communication skills. Williams (2005), the author of the study's report entitled, *Exploring the Impact of Study Abroad on Students' Intercultural Communication Skills: Adaptability and Sensitivity,* states that a trend in academics today is to focus on competency-based education that stresses learner outcomes (p. 357). This kind of assessment leads educators to think more closely about what kinds of skills and knowledge are needed for jobs and life today. In the increasing globalized environment, the trend for centres of higher learning is turning to internationalization of their campuses and curriculum to meet the changing demands. One set of skills Williams believes is essential for competing in a global market are intercultural communication skills that include: flexibility, open-mindedness, empathy, stability, resourcefulness and ability to deal with stress (p. 357-358). Through a series of interviews with students who studied abroad and those who remained on campus for the semester, Williams shows statistically that students who studied abroad generally showed a greater increase in intercultural communication skills than the students who did not. Hence, Williams concludes that international education, in the form of study abroad, provides the necessary skills for today's global economy.

These models of international education and internationalization can be seen in the programs at Drake, UBC and in the AAC&U project where intercultural skills and global competency are stated as key outcomes of global citizenship education. In Drake's global citizenship program, intercultural skills are stated as one of main purposes of the program. Through activities such as study abroad experiences and service learning, the program intends to cultivate intercultural skills, which are believed by the program's managers to be part of global citizenship. At UBC, even though various campus-wide activities such as the speaker series aspire towards "fostering global citizenship" in their students, the primary aim of the course on global citizenship is to "equip graduates with knowledge and competencies" that will enable them to work in the

globalized world. Lastly, AAC&U's project to prepare college graduates to become more informed and socially responsible citizens is largely premised on developing intercultural competencies. Despite having a global focus and aim to develop in students the competencies to be able to actively and effectively work and be conscious citizens, little is said about educating students about the roles, rights and responsibilities of working and living in the increasingly globalized and inequitable world.

Other programs focus on justice in addition to, or instead of cultural competencies. This trend corresponds closely with the commonly cited definition of global citizenship from Oxfam (2006) which states a global citizen is someone who:

- is aware of the wider world and has a sense of their own role as a world citizen;
- respects and values diversity;
- has an understanding of how the world works economically, politically, socially, culturally, technologically and environmentally;
- is outraged by social injustice;
- participates in and contributes to the community at a range of levels from local to global;
- is willing to act to make the world a more sustainable place and;
- takes responsibility for their actions.

In this review of programs, no one program addresses all of these aspects directly. However, there is evidence that wide approaches that embed global citizenship within the vision, mission, and program of the institution through policy and resourced support, much of what is expressed in this Oxfam definition (or similar locally developed definitions) is incorporated. For instance, at the University of Glasgow, the program strives to address strategies for development and international social justice and embed such issues in education for global citizenship. Similarly at Roehampton, education for sustainable development, human rights, multiculturalism and citizenship are examined, providing students with a context to understand the breadth of global citizenship.

The existence of contrasting programs and courses that are also identified as international education, social justice education and/or global citizenship education, is partly a result of the

lack of consensus of what global citizenship is and how to educate for it. As indicated through the wide range of often contradictory program and course aims, 'global citizenship' has been attached to very different work and opposing ideologies. In an article entitled, *Education for Global Citizenship: Conflicting Agendas and Understandings,* Shultz (2007), provides insight on how these conflicting approaches to global citizenship are manifested within the education sector. Shultz identifies three contrasting approaches to globalization, which have vastly different implications on fostering a particular kind of global citizen. First, there is a neo-liberal approach to globalization that positions an individual in a privileged position to travel across national borders. Global citizenship in this approach is inherently linked to global economic participation where the knowledge and skills developed from education for global citizenship increase transnational mobility (at least for the most competitive citizens) (p. 252). Second is a radical approach to globalization, which examines global structures that create and perpetuate global inequality. Global citizens emerging from this perspective actively oppose global institutions and fight for the radicalization of the institutions in efforts to shift away from increased globalization toward more strengthened local and national institutions (p. 252). The third approach to globalization is the tranformationalist perspective, which views globalization as a complex set of international, national, and local relationships that have generated new kinds of inclusion and exclusion. From this perspective, the global citizen seeks to "include and engage others based on a common humanity, a shared planet, and a shared future" (p. 255).

As a result of contradictory conceptions and enactments of global citizenship that emanate from various theoretical standpoints, Shultz (2007) warns that global citizenship educators must be conscious of the underlying assumptions that inform their practice so that their introduction to and engagement with global citizenship reflects what they intend to teach. For instance, "if citizens of the wealthiest nations learn that their role as global citizens is to compete in a global marketplace, then the structures of inequality that keep members of less wealthy countries marginalized will be perpetuated, if not strengthened" (p. 257. As post-secondary institutions move toward increased expectation and engagement internationally, it is important to take a critical and reflective approach to fully understand what this engagement is intended to accomplish, and what the intended and un-intended impacts of these increased relations within the already unevenly internationalized and globalized world might be.

Assessment/Evaluation

Calls for increased support and improved policy frameworks for global citizenship education require that good evaluation practices be in place. Evaluation serves to further both the practice of educating global citizens, but also to support important critical reflection as the idea of global citizenship extends its reach into ever expanding areas. Ideally, evaluation should begin in the program planning stages. A review of the academic literature and program information reveals a significant gap in all aspects of monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment at program levels although courses are evaluated according to discipline and faculty criteria. As highlighted earlier in this review, the problems of contradictory outcomes of global citizenship education should not be underestimated and without some attention to evaluation, it is impossible to tell if the program is successful or if, in fact, it is destructive within a wider global perspective.

Given the limited evaluation that takes place in post-secondary global citizenship education programs, it is helpful to turn to other sectors to identify good practices that may be adapted to the post-secondary setting. A recent survey of evaluation practices commissioned by the OECD (O'Loughlin & Wegimont, 2007) identified strong evaluation work being carried out in the global education, development education and social movement/adult education areas. These evaluations tend to focus on the extent to which program activities help citizens understand global processes and relationships, the development of an international solidarity within global processes, and the development of skills that promote democracy, awareness, and engagement. The Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC) recently carried out action research to identify exemplary global citizenship education and public engagement work by Canadian international development organizations. Evaluations in this project developed indicators for success (or "signs of change") in learning (knowledge, skills, and attitudes), action, and social condition as foundations for understanding program impact. Evaluation work developed in a *Developing Citizenship project (http://www.teachingexpertise.com/articles/benchmarks-for-secondary-schools-1030),* initiated and supported by Oxfam, Save the Children UK/ Unicef , the Cheshire Development Education Centre, Manchester Development Education Project, Norfolk Education and Action for Development and the Department for International Development UK, established that a "whole-school" approach to evaluation was necessary to understand program

impact (as a wide ranging and inclusive approach was seen as the important way to educate for global citizenship) and evaluation indicators should address:

1) Curriculum planning and delivery for active experience of citizenship in a globalized society

2) Creating opportunities for participation within the institution and local community

3) Developing an institutional ethos and policy framework that reflects the global context of the local community

In this project, evaluation indicators were developed that distinguish "recognized", "established", and "sustained" levels of activities to address deepening levels of work in the above areas.

Creech (2001), working with the International Institute for Sustainable Development (http://www.iisd.org/pdf/2001/networks_evaluation.pdf), provides an extensive conceptual and practical examination of evaluating programs that work to extend knowledge in broad ways. Of significance for this review are some cautionary conclusions Creech provides that should inform the wide approach to post-secondary global citizenship education, particularly those efforts that strive toward policy change, suggested by many in the literature. Creech concludes that because of resource dependency, evaluations are focused on satisfying funders.

> "In evaluation, the institution looks at specific project deliverables rather than the value of the relationships that have emerged from working collaboratively. The network advantage – joint value creation, mutual capacity development and collective engagement of decision makers – which result from those relationships, goes unmeasured and unvalued" (p. 6).

Another challenge of evaluating wide networked program approaches is that members leading individual projects or activities within the program tend to focus on results of their own work and fail to find opportunities to aggregate individual successes. (Ibid)

In terms of course and activity evaluations, as well as individual student achievement, there are some noteworthy examples and studies that represent current thinking. In a study of 25 American global citizenship education programs, Grudzinski-Hall (2007) claims that "because no accepted definition of goals exist, faculty directors and program administrators can not be certain if, in

fact, they are educating students for global citizenship" (p. 22). Colleges and universities are therefore referring to their institutions' mission statements, strategic plans and funding initiatives for guidance on how to develop programs of global citizenship education. In review of the AAC&U's project, Liberal Education and Global Citizenship: the Arts of Democracy, Grudsinski-Hall states that the objectives of global citizenship education were not systematically addressed. What manifested from the project was that most of the institutions were simply "repackaging traditional programs with a new program name of global citizenship and simply creating lists of existing courses that students can or must take in order to become a global citizen" (p. 33).

If educators for global citizenship are not educating their students through similar structuring, programming, requirements, credentialing and student/community involvement, and each of the programs and courses endeavour to achieve different goals, the question remains as to whether or not educators and administrators know if they are in fact educating for global citizenship. Noddings (2005) states that in order to assess the effectiveness of global citizenship education, educators need to identify the knowledge and skills that the students need to develop. Yet, different people and organizations identify and attribute different KSAs to global citizenship education. For example, Oxfam (2008) identifies the KSAs of global citizenship as:

- Knowledge: social justice and equity, diversity, globalization and interdependence, sustainable development and peace and conflict.
- Skills: critical thinking, ability to argue effectively, ability to challenge injustice and inequalities, respect for people and things, co-operation and conflict resolution; and
- Values/Attitudes: sense of identity and self-esteem, empathy, commitment to social justice and equity, value and respect for diversity, concern for the environment and commitment to sustainable development and belief that people can make a difference (http://www.oxfam.org.uk/education/gc/curriculum/key_elements/).

Educators that ascribe more to global competency as the building blocks to global citizenship, however, cite flexibility, open-mindedness, empathy, stability, resourcefulness, ability to identify cultural differences, compete globally, deal with stress and participate in international social and business settings as predominant KSAs to educate for (Williams, 2005; Hunter et al., 2006).

Some institutions have developed tools to measure students' cultural competence and/or global perspective. These tend to take the form of inventories. For example, at Drake University, students from one course were given a survey as part of the Global Perspectives Inventory (GPI). This evaluation inventory consists of a survey of 46 items and is designed to provide self-reports of students' perspectives in the cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal domains of student development (Braskamp et al., n.d). By answering a list of questions with "strongly agree, agree, neither, disagree and strongly disagree," the inventory claims to determine the level of global perspective that each student holds.

The American Council on Education (ACE) has developed an extensive system of assessment tools including rubrics, portfolio assessments, and proficiency guidelines to evaluate students' cultural competencies in relation to the internationalization of the university programs. (http://www.acenet.edu/Content/NavigationMenu/ProgramsServices/International/Campus).

This model of evaluation provides a very thorough example of how an individual student's international learning might be assessed. Given the focus of global citizenship on changes in learning, action, and social condition, this work may be seen to be one piece of an evaluation of global citizenship education.

Conclusions

While the trend of increasing focus on educating for global citizenship at post-secondary institutions may be considered a uniform response to urgent global issues and contexts, a review of the literature suggests that global citizenship is far from a uniform idea and, in fact, is a much contested term. However, there is a general consensus that higher education institutions have a role to play in preparing citizens that are informed and able to participate in our complex globalized and globalizing world. Post-secondary institutions join other social institutions in working toward understanding their role in addressing social, economic, and political issues of our times. While global citizenship educators must grapple with and respond to the global unevenness of internationalization and globalization, the legacies of colonialism, and ideologies that would support a system that benefits the few at the expense of the many, there is a sense of urgency embedded within most global citizenship education efforts as people in many countries work for a more just and peaceful world.

In order for global citizenship education to serve this purpose in post-secondary education, it is important to develop a broad approach that is founded not only on common understandings but strives to build on disciplinary, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary work toward a transdisciplinarity that might generate a creative and emergent understanding of how to co-create new social realities in a globalized world. This education is a call to change the way things are done; to strive toward education at its best that is based on inquiry, critical thinking, and deep engagement that results in changes in learning, action, and both local and global social conditions. This education does not belong to any one faculty or discipline or to either formal or non-formal education but should be embedded within each in ways that extend and support the work of global citizenship education. This necessitates the building relationships and knowledge networks.

There are significant gaps in the documentation of global citizenship education programming and its assessment and evaluation. It is helpful to draw on work from outside the post-secondary sector to find other examples of exemplary planning and programming. However, the literature indicates that each institution should work to develop their own coherent approach that should include policy frameworks; inter-faculty programming; formal and non-formal education programs; and community engagement including both local and international partners. It is also important to design participatory processes that thread throughout the institution thereby engaging members including senior leadership, staff, students, and external stakeholders.
The research and practice of Global Citizenship education within post-secondary contexts will necessarily examine and address both the definitional and practical aspects of this emerging field. Definitional work will relate to the nature of global citizenship based on epistemic and ontological positionings while the practical application of this theorizing will result in programs and evaluation methods that ensure coherence between educational practices and their theoretical foundations.

References

AAC&U (2008).*Liberal Education and Global Citizenship: The Arts of Democracy.* Retrieved December 27th, 2007, from http://www.aacu.org/ globalcitizenship/index.cfm.

Abdi, A. (2006). African education and globalization: an introduction. In A. Abdi, K. Puplampu & G.Dei (Eds.) *African education and globalization: critical perspectives.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Abdi, A. A., Shultz, L. (2008). *Educating for human rights and global citizenship.* Albany*, NY:* Suny Press.

Abdi, A., Shultz, L. (2007). Educating for social justice and global citizenship: Helping students make local – global links on justice issues*. Education for Social Justice: From the Margins to the Mainstream.* Background papers. Canadian Teachers' Federation. Ottawa, CAN.

Andreotti, V. (2006). The Contributions of Postcolonial Theory to Development Education. *DEA Thinkpieces*. www.dea.org.uk/thinkpieces.

Battiste, M. (1998). Enabling the autumn seed: Toward a decolonized approach to Aboriginal knowledge, language and education. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 22*(1). 17-27.

 Baxi, U. (2000). Transdisciplinarity and transformative praxis. In Somerville, M & Rapport, D (Eds). *Transdisciplinarity: Recreating integrated knowledge*. Oxford: EOLSS

Braskamp, L. A., Braskamp, D. C. & Merrill, K. C. (n.d). *Global Perspectives Inventory*. Retrieved May 11th, 2008 from http://www.gpinv.org/development.html.

Brodie, J. (2004). Introduction; Globalization and Citizenship Beyond the National State. *Citizenship Studies*, 8(4). 323-332.

Broadbent and Woodman (2008). The global university: The Roehampton University experience. In Shiel, C. & McKenzie (Eds). *The global university*. London: DEA River House.

Brustein, W. (2007). The Global Campus: Challenges and Opportunities for Higher Education in North America.*Journal of Studies in International Education.* 11(3/4). 382-391.

Caruana, V., &Hanstock, J. (2008).Internationalising the curriculum at the University of Salford: from rhetoric to reality. In C. Shiel& A. McKenzie, (Eds.), *The Global University: the role of senior managers* (30-34). London: DEA River House.

Chatham University (2007).*Benter Initiative for Global Citizenship*. Retrieved May 8th,   2008, from http://www.chatham.edu/academics/benter_index.cfm.

Davies, L. (2006). Global citizenship; abstraction or framework for action? *Educational Review, 58*(1). 5-25.

Dower, N. (2000).The Idea of Global Citizenship- A Sympathetic Assessment. *Global Society*, *14*(4). 553-567.

Dower, N. (2003).*An Introduction to Global Citizenship*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Dower, N. (2008). Are We All Global Citizens, or Are Only Some of Us Global Citizens? In Shultz &Abdi (Eds.), *Educating for Human Rights and Global Citizenship.* 39-53.

Drake University (2008).*Global Ambassador Program*. Retrieved May 8th, 2008, from http://www.drake.edu/international/cgc/ambassador.php.

Farleigh Dickenson University. (2008). *Global Education at FDU.* Retrieved December 31st, 2007from http://view.fdu.edu/default.aspx?id=260.

Gacel-Àvila, J. (2005). The Internationalization of Higher Education: A Paradigm for Global Citizenry. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 9*(2). 121-136.

Gibbon, M. (1994). *The new production of knowledge: The dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies*. London: Sage

Giri, A. K. (2002). The calling of a creative transdisciplinarity. *Futures* Vol 34. 103-115.

Giroux, H. A. (2004). Public pedagogy and the politics of neo-liberalism: Making the political more pedagogical. *Policy Futures in Education, 2*(3&4). 494-503.

Grudzinski-Hall, M. N. (2007).How do college and university undergraduate level global citizenship programs advance the development and experiences of global competencies?Ph.D. dissertation, Drexel University, United States - Pennsylvania. Retrieved July 14, 2008, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database. (Publication No. AAT 3261868).

Guelph University (2008).*Global Learner Program*. Retrieved May 8th, 2008, from http://www.studentlife.uoguelph.ca/citizencommunity/global.cfm.

Haverford College (n.d).*Centre for Peace and Global Citizenship*. Retrieved May 7th, 2008, from http://www.haverford.edu/CPGC/programs/index.htm.

Held, D. (1999). The transformation of political community: Rethinking democracy in the context of globalization. In Shapiro, I &Hacjero-cordon (Eds.) *Democracy's Edges*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Henales, L., & Edwards, B. (2000, /2007). *Neoliberalism and educational*

reform in Latin America, from http://www.tc.columbia.edu/research/publications.htm

Hicks, D. (2003). Thirty Years of Global Education: a reminder of key principles and precedents. *Educational Review,55*(3). 265-275.

Horlick – Jones, T., Sime, J. (2004). Living on the border: Knowledge, risk and transdisciplinarity. *Futures*, *36.*441-456.

Hunter, B., White, G.P &Godbey, G. (2006). What Does It Mean to Be Globally Competent.*Journal of Studies in International Education, 10*(3). 267-285.

Ingram, D (2008). *Welcome Message*: *Welcome to Lehigh University Global Citizenship House*. Retrieved May 21, 2008, from http://www.lehigh.edu/~ingc/gc_house/index.html

Innovative Research Universities (2008). *EU-AU Global Citizenship Programme Overview*. Retrieved May 10th, 2008, from http://www.iueu.edu.au/webpages/gcp.html.

James Madison University (2007*). GEIC 202: Global Citizenship in a Service-Learning Context*. Retrieved May 9th, 2008, from http://olt.ubc.ca/distance_learning/ courses/course_catalog/?CA=31281.

Jones, E., & Lee, S. (2008). Perspectives, policy and institutional cultures: world-wide horizons at Leeds Metropolitan University. In C. Shiel & A. McKenzie, (Eds.), *The Global University: the role of senior managers* (25-29). London: DEA River House.

Klein, J. T. (2004). Prospects for transdisciplinarity.*Futures.36*(4). 515 – 526.

Lapayese, Y. (2003). Toward a Critical Global Citizenship Education. *Comparative Education Review,47*(4). 493-501.

Lehigh University (2008).*Global Citizenship*. Retrieved May 21, 2008, from http://www.lehigh.edu/~ingc/info.html

Lehigh University (2008).*Global Citizenship House.*Retrieved February 22nd, 2008 http://www.lehigh.edu/~ingc/gc_house/index.html.

Luker, P. (2008). The internationalisation of higher education: shifting the paradigm. In C. Shiel & A. McKenzie, (Eds.), *The Global University: the role of senior managers* (10-13). London: DEA River House.

Mallea, J. R. (2008). The university's role in developing global citizens: A case study of the University of British Columbia. In Shiel C., McKenzie, A. (Eds)*. The global university: The role of senior managers.* London, UK: DEA.

Mamdani, M. (1996). *Citizen and subject: contemporary Africa and the legacy of late colonialism.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Max – Neef, M. (2005).Foundations of transdisciplinarity.*Ecological Economics, 53*.
5-16.

Mohanty, C. (2003). *Feminism without borders: Decolonizing theory, practicing
solidarity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Noddings, N. (2005). *Educating Citizens for Global Awareness*. New York: Teacher's
College Press.

Oxfam Development Education Program (2006).*Education for Global Citizenship: A   guide
for schools*. Retrieved January 17th 2008, from http://www.oxfam.org.uk/
education/gc/files/education_for_global_citizenship_a_guide_for_schools.pdf.

Petford, N., &Shiel, C. (2008). A holistic approach to the 'globalisation' agenda at
Bournemouth University: the role of senior managers. In C. Shiel& A.McKenzie, (Eds.),
The Global University: the role of senior managers (19-24). London: DEA River House.

Piper, M. (2005).*Trek Introduction*. Retrieved October 30th, 2007, from
http://www.trek2000.ubc.ca/Martha%20Piper%20-%20Trek%202010.pdf

Reinke, L. (2004). Globalisation and local indigenous education in Mexico. *International
Review of Education, 50*(5-6), 483-496.

Samarasekera, I.V. (2007) "Dare to Deliver: University of Alberta Academic Plan 2007-
2011." Retrieved February 21st, 2008, from
http://www.president.ualberta.ca//pdfs/DaretoDeliver.pdf.

Sheppard, K. (2004). Global Citizenship: The Human Face of International Education.
International Education, *34*(1). 34-40.

Shiel, C., & McKenzie, A. (2008). Introduction. In C. Shiel& A. McKenzie, (Eds.), *The Global
University: the role of senior managers* (5-9). London: DEA River House.

Shultz, L. (2007). Educating for global Citizenship: Conflicting Agendas and
Understandings. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, *53*(3). 248-258

Spivak, G. (2004). Righting wrongs. *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, *103*(2/3). 523-581.

Stone, N. (2007).Internationalising the Student Learning Experience: Possible Indicators.
Journal of Studies in International Education, *10*(4). 409-413.

Stromquiest, N &Monkman, K. (2000). Defining globalization and assessing its
implications in knowledge and education. In N. Stromquist& K. Monkman (Eds.)
Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures. Lanham, MD:
Rowman& Littlefield.

Tufts University (2008) *Ethics and Global Citizenship: Overview*. Retrieved May 10th, 2008, from http://ase.tufts.edu/tuftsSummerStudy/ethics.asp.

Tye, K.A. (1999). *Global Education: A worldwide movement*. Orange CA: Interdependence Press.

University of Alberta (2008).*Global Citizenship Experience in Ghana*. Retrieved May 10th, 2008 from http://www.registrar.ualberta.ca/ro.cfm?id=464.

University of British Columbia (2008).*SOCI430: Perspectives on Global Citizenship*. Retrieved May 8th, 2008,fromhttp://olt.ubc.ca/distance_learning/courses/course_catalog/?CA=31281.

University of British Columbia (2007). *Global Citizenship*. Retrieved October 20th, 2007, from http://www.internationalization.ubc.ca/globalcitizenship.htm.

University of British Columbia (2007).*Global Citizenship Seminar Series.*Retrieved December 31st, 2007 from http://www.internationalization.ubc.ca/globalcitizenship.htm.

University College of London (2008).*Education for Global Citizenship*. Retrieved March 20th, 2008 from http://www.ucl.ac.uk/global_citizenship/index.htm.

University of Delaware (n.d).*Centre for International Studies: International Projects.* Retrieved May 7th, 2008, from http://international.udel.edu/projects/ grants/ongoing4.html

University of Roehampton (n.d) ITE010N704S Global Citizenship. Retrieved on May 9th, 2008 from http://studentzone.roehampton.ac.uk/programmedetails/ug20062007/ newprimaryeducation/index.asp.

Unknown (n.d).*Perspectives of Global Citizenship*. Retrieved December 31st, 2007 from http://olt.ubc.ca/distance_learning/courses/course_catalog/?CA=31281

White, C., Openshaw, R. (2005). *Democracy at the crossroads: International perspectives on critical global citizenship education*. New York/ Toronto/ Oxford: Lexington Books.

Williams, T. (2005). Exploring the Impact of Study Abroad on Students' Intercultural Communication Skills: Adaptability and Sensitivity. *Journal of Studies in International Education.*9(4). 365-371.

Zemach-Bersin, T. (2007). Global Citizenship and Study Abroad: It's All About U.S. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices,1*(2). 16-28.

http://www.uofaweb.ualberta.ca/uai_globaleducation/pdfs/GCE_literature_review.pdf
For more information contact Lynette Shultz lshultz@ualberta.ca