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ABSTRACT
GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP IN A LIBERAL ARTS CURRICULUM: MEANINGS FOR FACULTY WORK

By
Graham McKeague

This research study examined how faculty understand the term *global citizenship*, and the ways in which their understanding of this term provides meaning for their work. Higher education institutions in the U.S. are increasingly shaped by a globalized perspective. College graduates are now expected to have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to enter a workplace shaped by globalization. Colleges and universities have responded to this need through a process of internationalization, however these efforts are often sporadic and uncoordinated in practice (Hudzik, 2015).

A growing number of colleges and universities have started using the term *global citizenship* to help provide direction for campus internationalization. Rather than having a fixed or stable meaning, global citizenship is a contested term that is understood in many different ways (Gaudelli, 2016; Lapayese, 2003; Schattle, 2009). This presents a challenge for college campuses who are appropriating the term for institutional practice even while the meaning is debated.

Deardorff (2009) has argued that faculty play a crucial, yet overlooked, role in the development of internationalization and global learning on college campuses. She states that faculty across academic disciplines must be given the opportunity to contribute to institutional questions of internationalization. This is especially important in the process of internationalizing the curriculum.
This research used a case study methodology to explore faculty understanding of global citizenship at a single institution in the U.S. The setting was a faith-based liberal arts college with a long established tradition of global learning and preparing students for engaged citizenship in the world. Tully’s (2014) framework for understanding global citizenship was used as a basis for examining how faculty understood global citizenship.

The findings from this study affirm the wide range of understanding attributed to the concept of global citizenship. The faculty participants understood global citizenship along a continuum of meaning rather than within fixed categories. Some faculty fully embraced global citizenship, while others were skeptical of the term or rejected it entirely. As a result, the ways in which global citizenship had meaning for faculty work also varied.

Themes emerged regarding the ways in which global citizenship had meaning in the areas of curriculum, as part of shaping institutional identity, and the position of global citizenship as a disputed term in this particular case. The ways in which faculty came to understand global citizenship was also examined, with their personal background, their academic department, and colleagues within the college emerging as most influential. The study concludes with implications for practice, including recommendations for integrating global citizenship within a liberal arts college.
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INTRODUCTION

This study is presented in three parts. Part One includes three chapters: first, an Introduction that provides the rationale for the study and presents the research question and sub-questions. Chapter two provides a review of the literature on global citizenship and global citizenship education, and presents additional context and basis for this research. The third chapter presents a description of the conceptual framework and research methodology used in this study.

Part Two reports the research results with a description of each faculty participant’s understanding of global citizenship. This is presented across three chapters in a way that best captures the variation in understanding and meaning that emerged in this study related to global citizenship. Early in the data collection phase it became evident that there was a wide variation in the understanding of what global citizenship meant for each faculty participant. Discerning the most appropriate way to describe and categorize these various aspects of meaning became a significant element of the data analysis process. With this in mind, the faculty participants are represented in three categories in Part Two along with a summary of the major themes.

Part Three provides a conclusion of the research findings, connections to prior theory and practice, recommendations for implementing global citizenship, limitations, and suggestions for future areas of research.
PART ONE
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

U.S. higher education institutions are increasingly connected within a complex globalized knowledge economy (Hudzik, 2015; Rhoads & Szelényi, 2011; Stearns, 2009; Stromquist & Monkman, 2014). Universities and colleges face growing pressure to prepare students for a world with “rapidly shifting economic, political, and national security realities and challenges” (Brustein, 2009, p. 249). University graduates are now expected to enter a globally oriented workplace that is “characterized by interdependence, complexity, and change” (Hovland, Musil, Skilton-Sylvester, & Jamison, 2009, p. 469). Bataille & Brown (2006) state that “universities have a responsibility to provide students with the knowledge, skills, and experiences to become informed and productive citizens of the state, nation, and the world” (p. 141).

In response to these pressures, colleges and universities have increasingly focused on developing global learning agendas. In recent years the words “internationalization” and “globalization” have become “frequently uttered on college campuses across the United States” (Gore, 2009, p. 282). Hovland (2014) adds the following:

Over the last ten to fifteen years, more and more colleges and universities have adopted mission and vision statements that link their degrees to successful preparation for a complex, globally interconnected world. Such language represents both implicit and explicit commitments by institutions that their graduates will have the capability to meet the demands of future economic, social, and civic challenges and opportunities. (p. 3)

As Hovland (2014) suggests, there is an important link between university mission statements and degree programs as a means to prepare students. However, he
also notes that different ideas over global learning often exist within a single institution, with a lack of “well-organized, campus-wide discussions with multiple stakeholders” (2014, p. 3) to help define the meaning of global learning.

Alongside efforts to better define global learning on individual college campuses, organizations such as the American Council on Education (ACE) have advocated for increased internationalization since the 1950s (Gore, 2009). Other higher education organizations and advocacy groups have also been active in the area of global education. For example, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) launched the Shared Futures: Global Learning and Social Responsibility project to examine global learning models and explore questions of “diversity, identity, citizenship, interconnection, and responsible action” (Hovland et al., 2009). However, despite this increased attention to internationalization, both nationally and on individual campuses, research has shown that there are many challenges to overcome (Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008; Hayward & Siaya, 2001; Hudzik, 2015; Siaya & Hayward, 2003). These challenges include persistently low rates of study abroad participation and a lack of organizational action in implementing internationalization plans. As a result, the overall level of knowledge among students regarding other countries and international affairs remains low, leaving American college graduates underprepared for a global workplace (NAFSA, 2003).

This study focuses on the particular challenge colleges and universities face in understanding global learning within undergraduate education. Debate continues over what specific skills and attitudes students should learn in order to prepare for the global workplace, and over how these outcomes can be assessed (Deardorff, 2009; 2015). Ideas
include the ability to work in international contexts, an awareness of other cultures, adaptability to function within diverse settings, developing cross-cultural communication skills, and knowledge of global issues (Deardorff, 2009; Herrin, 2004; Noddings, 2005; Schattle, 2008, 2009; Stearns, 2009). Organizations such as NAFSA, AAC&U, and ACE have worked to help universities and colleges define a set of global learning outcomes, yet more research is needed in this area. This work is especially important as a way to guide institutions in their internationalization efforts, especially as they design international programs and seek to create frameworks for assessment (Deardorff, 2009).

In recent years the concept of global citizenship has emerged as an increasingly prominent way to discuss internationalization and global learning on college campuses (Boni & Calabuig, 2015; Braskamp, 2008; Coryell, Spencer, and Sehin, 2014; Green, 2013; Hanson, 2010; Jooste & Heleta, 2016; Jorgenson & Schultz, 2012; Lilley, Barker, & Harris, 2016; Rhoads & Szelényi, 2011; Schattle, 2008, 2009; Stearns, 2009; Wynveen, Kyle, & Tarrant, 2012). “Perhaps more than any other concept, the idea of global citizenship has emerged since the late 1990s as a key strategic principle in higher education” (Schattle, 2009, p. 3). Scholarship on global citizenship often focuses on how individuals relate to others, both locally and globally, and seeks to understand the rights and responsibilities each person has towards others on a global scale (Davies & Pike, 2009). This discussion is also frequently presented within a wider framework exploring the changing nature of what it means to be a citizen in light of globalization (Heater, 2004; Noddings, 2005; Kahane, 2009).

Citizenship has traditionally been understood as pertaining to national identity, national interests, national rights, and national responsibilities. With the advent of
globalization this framework of understanding is changing with citizenship and identity now being discussed in more global terms (Dower, 2003; Pike, 2008). In light of these changes, global citizenship is not a settled term or concept and is still being debated (Jooste & Heleta, 2016; Jorgenson & Schultz, 2012). Bowden (2003) goes so far as to say global citizenship is “under-theorized and problematic” (p. 349). In the midst of this ongoing debate, colleges and universities are adopting the term global citizenship even as it is still being defined. Lewin (2009) states why this may be the case:

Everyone seems to be in such a rush to create global citizens out of their students that we seem to have forgotten even to determine what we are even trying to create. Perhaps we avoid definitions not because of our rush to action, but out of fear of what we may find. (Lewin, 2009, p. xviii)

The avoidance of definition has caused confusion over the meaning of global citizenship and the ways it is understood in practice on college campuses. One important question that remains is to ask in what way is global citizenship understood within U.S. higher education as a way to help shape campus internationalization, and to more clearly define student learning? Framing the question in this way provides focus in two main areas: first, it presents an emphasis on specific campus internationalization efforts, and second, these broader internationalization efforts are connected with student learning.

Questions of student learning provide a way to think about issues related to faculty and the curriculum. Hovland, et al. (2009) provide an example of scholarship examining these connections as they consider the importance of intentionally developed curriculum for global learning within undergraduate education. Research on the role of faculty and internationalization, as well as the emergence of thinking more deeply on internationalizing the curriculum are key aspects to consider.
In light of the challenges presented related to internationalization and global learning, this study focuses on how faculty at a single institution understand the term global citizenship, and how this understanding provides meaning for their work. The goal of this research is to comprehend how global citizenship is understood and implemented within higher education, and contribute to the ongoing discussion on global citizenship in practice.

**Background to the Study**

Several themes within higher education in the United States align to present the background for this study: increased pressure for colleges and universities to internationalize, the means by which campus internationalization takes place, the push for global learning outcomes, the emergence of global citizenship education, the challenge in defining global citizenship, potential pathways for global citizenship education, and the role of faculty in campus internationalization.

**Increased pressure for internationalization in U.S. colleges and universities.**

Internationalization “has become a key theme and widespread phenomenon in higher education” (Kreber, 2009, p. 1). Kreber goes on to discuss the influence of globalization on higher education and the four main motivations for campus internationalization: political, academic, cultural/social, and economic. Political motivations are often connected to national policy and stability. The academic motivation includes the reasoning that “by encouraging greater internationalization across teaching, research, and service activities, the quality of higher education can be enriched” (Kreber, 2009, p. 3). The cultural/social motivation is focused on understanding culture, language,
and diversity, while the economic motivation is most closely aligned with globalization and the need for universities to be competitive, attract foreign students, and increase income.

The influence of globalization has many implications for higher education (Schattle, 2008; Stromquist & Monkman, 2014) and results in different institutional priorities based on their motivation for internationalization. One way this is evident is through annual rankings for universities, which are not simply presented by comparing universities within a single national higher education system. Instead, rankings such as those provided by the Times Higher Education World Reputation Rankings or the QS World University Rankings Service, rank universities on a global scale and point to universities operating within a global frame of reference. Universities increasingly hope to attract the top students and faculty from a global pool of applicants and prioritize achieving a high ranking each year. This practice is so prominent that Hudzik (2015) states student mobility “has been the most visible facet of higher education internationalization” (p. 18). However, campus internationalization is often more complex than simply seeking to recruit more international students. For example, Hudzik (2015) adds that the concept of mobility also refers to “the mobility of ideas” (p. 13) and should consider the immobility of many students to pursue study abroad as part of their studies. It is worth noting that internationalization on campuses often seeks to consider the flow of both people and ideas within a global framework.

Internationalization has become an increasingly visible aspect of U.S. higher education for study on individual campuses (Rhoads & Szelényi, 2011). “Everyone in the academy, especially college presidents, now extol the virtues of developing “global
citizens”” (Braskamp, 2008, p. 1). In addition, Gore (2009) notes the widespread use of international language in university mission statements. The University of Maryland strategic plan, for example, calls for Maryland to be the “most networked university in the world” (University of Maryland, 2008, p. 3) by dramatically enhancing its international character and reach through global partnerships, higher international student enrollment, increased study abroad and international service learning, and deep understanding of other cultures and societies. The university mission states that Maryland students should be trained as leaders in their careers and global citizens, which will be achieved through making students “globally conscious” (p. 4). President Kaler of the University of Minnesota commented on his university’s global outreach in a statement to the Board of Regents saying, “It’s very competitive right now for American universities to develop meaningful research partnerships and productive student exchanges around the world … last year, faculty and staff conducted research in 87 countries on all seven continents. This work elevates our global reputation and brand” (University of Minnesota, 2014). Internationalization has also become visible through high profile campus initiatives. For example, the University of South Florida has enacted a Global Citizenship Project as the primary goal of their Quality Enhancement Plan 2013-2018 for reaffirmation of accreditation (University of South Florida, 2015). These examples provide a snapshots of the ways in which internationalization is an increasingly important and prominent aspect on university campuses.

At a national level the U.S. government has also actively encouraged colleges and universities to pursue internationalization efforts. The Lincoln Commission was established in 2004 and set forth ambitious goals for study abroad participation by 2017,
including matching the demographics of study abroad participants with those of the general undergraduate student population (Lincoln Commission, 2005). Increasing the numbers of U.S. students studying overseas has been supported at the national level as a way to help ensure global leadership, future security, and economic prosperity through international experiential learning (CIEE, 1988, 1990; NAFSA, 2008).

**The means by which campus internationalization takes place.** In light of the pressures and motivations for internationalizing campuses, the term “internationalization” can apply to many different things within higher education. Jane Knight provides a helpful definition: Internationalization is “… the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education” (Knight, 2003, p. 2). The process of developing campus internationalization is typically conducted through study abroad programs, international student recruitment, internationalizing the curriculum, establishing branch campuses overseas, and developing international partnerships with other universities and scholars. Though these processes are often evident on individual college campuses, there is no set definition of what a campus must do in order to internationalize.

Hudzik (2015) discusses the importance of viewing campus internationalization as still “evolving and filling out” (p. 17). He uses the term *comprehensive internationalization* (CI) to discuss the importance for institutions to consider internationalization beyond student mobility, and to view international and comparative perspectives as part of their core mission. This should be reflected in all aspects of the “teaching, research, and service missions of higher education” (Hudzik, 2011, p. 6). CI does not mean that every institution must seek to implement the same internationalization
program or agenda. Rather, internationalization will “find a friendly home” (Hudzik, 2015, p. 21) if it is aligned with the particular fit of an institution. The importance of an idea such as CI helps to illustrate the fact that internationalization is not consistent across college campuses. Kreber (2009) notes that internationalization can mean different things to different stakeholders within higher education. However, internationalization is not a new concept (Hudzik, 2015) and it is “particularly since the 1990s that internationalization is seen to be relevant across traditional programs or disciplines” (Kreber, 2009, p. 7). As internationalization has become increasingly integrated into teaching and learning this has led to a focus on defining learning outcomes.

**Push to demonstrate outcomes of internationalization.** The intentional and coordinated assessment of student learning outcomes in campus internationalization efforts is of growing importance (Hovland et al, 2009). In her survey of assessment practices, Darla Deardorff (2009) found that in 2003-2004 only 38% of schools were already assessing intercultural outcomes. In 2006-2007 this number had risen to 47% of schools. It is not just individual institutions that are focused on assessing student learning outcomes. The ACE, the Forum on Education Abroad (FEA), the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA), and the AAC&U have all emphasized international learning outcomes and assessment through various projects and initiatives.

As Deardorff (2009; 2015) notes, assessing international learning is difficult and quickly gives rise to a number of questions including: What are the best ways to define learning outcomes? What are the best ways to assess these outcomes? Deardorff (2009) argues that addressing these questions can happen when all stakeholders are committed to
defining and assessing international education. This includes administrators, faculty, and students working together in an integrated way to determine learning goals and then measure how these goals are achieved. She cites Clayton (2008) who states that these learning goals will likely entail both personal and group goals, along with academic and civic objectives. Viewed in this way, international learning meets the learning goals of individual students, encourages students to work together in diverse teams and in different communities, and fosters civic learning both locally and globally, making use of specific academic knowledge and theories. Taken together these outcomes are increasingly framed within the concept of developing *global citizenship*.

**The emergence of global citizenship education.** The language of global citizenship has emerged on college campuses in recent years as a way to conceptualize internationalization and student learning in a globalized era (Jorgenson & Schultz, 2012). Martha Nussbaum (2002) outlines the responsibility universities face as they educate students within changing broader cultural conditions: “Today’s universities are shaping future citizens in an age of cultural diversity and increasing internationalization” (p. 291). This is occurring, she notes, in a time of increasing diversity within universities that is reflected by changes within university curricula:

The new emphasis on “diversity” in college and university curricula is above all, I would argue, a way of grappling with the altered requirements of citizenship in an era of global connection, an attempt to produce adults who can function as citizens not just of some local region or group but also, and more importantly, as citizens of a complex interlocking world. (Nussbaum, 2002, p. 292)

Hovland et al. (2009) state that “scholarly debate on the theory and practice of global citizenship is deep, growing, and interesting” (p. 470). Schattle (2009) surveyed
how the term global citizenship has become increasingly prominent in framing internationalization efforts on campuses. Deardorff (2009) also noted the increased use of the term global citizenship and states that it may provide a means by which universities can better define and assess their internationalization efforts. Using global citizenship as a framework could allow universities to focus on specific outcomes they wish to see developed in their students. This is possible at the philosophical level (examining the purpose of global learning) and at a pragmatic level (understanding what students should be expected to know and how they should act as citizens). A small number of studies have shown how global citizenship education can be integrated into campuses in a way that aligns with the particular mission of each institution, whether at a community college, teaching institution, or a research university (Hovland et al, 2009; Schattle, 2008; Stearns, 2009).

In a broader sense Rhoads & Szelényi (2011) describe the need for higher education to address renewed ideas of citizenship within a globalized context:

We see the idea of citizenship, and what constitutes citizenship as key to understanding today’s world and the growing influence of globalization. Furthermore, we believe universities have a central role to play in challenging the foundations of us-versus-them thought in forging more expansive notions of citizenship. (Rhoads & Szelényi, 2011, p. 7)

Overcoming the “us-versus-them” mindset has often been addressed on college campuses through study abroad programs where students meet different people and cultures through travel and personal interaction. Research on campus internationalization has often focused on examining study abroad (e.g., Vande berg, Paige, & Lou, 2012) which has traditionally been viewed as the major avenue for global learning, however more recent studies have examined the importance of internationalizing the curriculum
(e.g., Hovland et al., 2009; Nolan, 2009). This reflects the ongoing development of “internationalization-at-home” on U.S. campuses, and the fact that a low number of U.S. students participate in study abroad each year. Despite the evolving understanding of internationalization and global learning, issues of definition and outcomes remain unresolved. This includes issues of meaning associated with understanding global citizenship.

**Problems of definition.** Even as colleges and universities have begun to use the term global citizenship to provide a framework for their internationalization, a clear definition for the term is still emerging. Writing for NAFSA in January 2012, Madeleine Green summed up the current debate on defining global citizenship within higher education in her article title, ‘Global citizenship: What are we talking about and why does it matter?” (Green, 2012). Green argued that global citizenship is a useful term for international educators for three main reasons: (1) global citizenship places the focus on learning outcomes not simply the process of learning, (2) global citizenship encourages students to think about their responsibilities to their communities and the world, and (3) global citizenship provides conceptual and practical connections to other disciplines. In answering the question of defining global citizenship, Green used Schattle’s (2009) work as a basis for her understanding.

Schattle (2009) summarized three primary concepts as a foundation for understanding global citizenship: awareness, responsibility, and participation. In addition he listed cross-cultural empathy, personal achievement, and international mobility as important secondary concepts. In Schattle’s (2009) view global citizenship begins with self-awareness, or an ability to understand one’s self first, and to be comfortable in
diverse contexts. From this starting point comes an awareness of others where the shared experience of humanity as a whole is understood, regardless of national identity. This wider awareness of the world leads global citizens to feel a sense of responsibility for others beyond their immediate culture. In addition to responsibility comes an ability to perceive issues from multiple perspectives. However, simply being aware of others is not sufficient and responsible action is often called for. Schattle (2009) notes that two key themes emerge here as “principled decision making and solidarity across humanity” (p. 12). Morais & Ogden (2011) took Schattle’s concepts a step further and summarized the literature on global citizenship under three dimensions: social responsibility, global competence, and global civic engagement.

This however is not to suggest that there is agreement on what approach should be taken in framing global citizenship. In North America scholars have typically presented global citizenship “primarily in moral and ethical terms” (Schattle, 2009, p. 7) with a focus on the mindset and behaviors of individuals rather than the work of an organization or institution. Schattle (2009) notes a contrasting approach has emerged in Europe with more emphasis placed upon institutions (global governing bodies that transcend national boundaries) rather than individuals (e.g., Held, 1999; Linklater, 1999).

There is also sustained debate over the ways in which individuals should view themselves as global citizens (Falk, 1995; Nussbaum, 1997; Dower, 2008; Pike, 2008; Cabrera, 2010, Tully, 2014). Are global citizens individuals who travel widely, experience many different cultures, or hold multiple passports? Or, are global citizens more concerned with global issues such as environmental sustainability, poverty, or promoting equality? What are the specific ways global citizens should relate to others at
the local, national, and global level? How does global citizenship align with conceptions of national citizenship? Can we use the term global citizen in a constructive manner?

Global citizenship is rarely conceptually or operationally defined. As a result, there is a need for educators to examine these questions of definition given the increased use of the term global citizenship within higher education (Morais & Ogden, 2011). Deardorff (2009) has argued that a more precise definition of global citizenship is needed in order to guide the development and assessment of learning outcomes, and shape programmatic goals within individual institutions. Arriving at a single binding definition of global citizenship is perhaps unattainable, however there is a need to move toward a more precise definition as a precursor for defining learning goals and shaping curriculum as part of campus internationalization.

**Potential Pathways to Global Citizenship Education.** Despite the challenges in defining global citizenship there are potential emerging pathways for global citizenship education. The AAC&U Shared Futures project is one example of how global learning is being defined and envisioned at colleges and universities. At the heart of this project is the idea that global learning cannot simply occur through a study abroad program or a handful of globally focused classes. Instead, “responsibility for global learning must be shared across curricular and co-curricular activities in intentional and developmentally appropriate ways” (Hovland et al., 2009, p. 467). The project identified seven key student learning outcomes including: gaining a deep comparative knowledge of the world, understanding historical legacies that have shaped the world, developing intercultural competencies, understanding democratic principles and practices around the world, and believing that individual actions influence the world in which we live (Hovland, 2005).
These learning outcomes have been heavily influenced by Martha Nussbaum’s (1997) work on liberal education and preparing students to engage with others from diverse national, cultural, and religious backgrounds. Her approach to questions of twenty-first century citizenship at the local and global levels has influenced the work of the Shared Futures project in answering key questions for liberal education: “What does it mean to be a responsible citizen in today’s global context? And how should one act in the face of large unsolved global problems?” (Hovland, 2005, p. 1).

In answering these questions the concept of “developmental pathways” has emerged as a way to conceptualize global citizenship education. This approach recognizes that greater focus and intentionality is needed in structuring student learning across the whole curriculum. Rust (2001) states that there is little discussion of the methodological or theoretical issues that define international education. However, these discussions are vital to the task of global citizenship education which involves helping students to understand their “civic identity” (Knefelkamp, 2008) at the local and global level. “As institutions aim for complex developmental outcomes such as global citizenship, they need to design and assess clear pathways through which students can move through the curriculum toward that goal” (Hovland et al., 2009, p. 471). This includes how the faculty design the curriculum, assess learning, and teach courses, as well as how the institution as a whole fosters student learning and development (Musil, 2006). The emerging curricular pathways concept for global citizenship education therefore envisions learning outcomes spread across the whole curriculum and included in every course (Stearns, 2009). With this type of approach it may be possible “to map global learning onto the best theory and practice of liberal education” (Hovland et al.,
2009, p. 467). Viewed in this way, global citizenship education necessitates the role of faculty who are engaged in thinking about global learning.

**Role of faculty in internationalization.** Previous studies have highlighted the need for greater understanding of the motivations for, and methods of, faculty engagement in the process of internationalization on college campuses (Dewey & Duff, 2009; Finkelstein, Walker, & Chen, 2013; Friesen, 2012; Klyberg, 2012; Stohl, 2007). Deardorff (2009) has argued that faculty play a crucial, yet overlooked, role in the development of global learning. She has focused on the role of faculty in integrating global learning outcomes into the curriculum:

> It is important to work with faculty in the disciplines to ascertain how these goals [global citizenship goals and outcomes] manifest themselves within the different disciplines “Such goals can most often be stated through specific courses and should address how global learning goals apply to particular courses” (2009, p. 350).

Deardorff (2009) envisions this process including an examination of both teaching strategies and co-curricular activities that relate to global learning.

Faculty members are a primary point of contact for students within the institution, shaping students through classroom engagement, readings and assignments, and through their advising/mentoring roles. Faculty play an essential role in helping to foster global learning for students. Bataille & Brown (2006) argue that faculty should seek to shape their campuses through sharing their understanding of global perspectives and understanding of cultural differences. This approach leads us to ask the question of how faculty can best be equipped to lead students in this internationalization-from within-process. How can faculty incorporate more international, global, and cross-cultural perspectives into their work within their institution? Green & Olson (2003) state that,
“Because the faculty role is so central, an institutional commitment to engaging faculty in expanding their international work and developing their interest and capacity should be a central focus of an internationalization strategy” (p. 69). Until this happens more widely there will often be very real limits on the impact of campus internationalization and global learning across the curriculum.

**Purpose & Significance of the Study**

This chapter has presented the growing importance of internationalization on college campuses, the emergence of global citizenship as a way to discuss global learning as part of internationalization, issues related to defining and implementing global citizenship, and the significance of including faculty in efforts related to internationalization.

This research used a case study design to examine how faculty understand the term global citizenship, and the ways in which this understanding provides meaning for their work. It is increasingly important that university graduates know how to work with others from diverse backgrounds, who see the world in a different more globalized way, and address global issues in ways that cross multiple aspects of life (Schattle, 2009). More clarity is needed on how global citizenship should be defined so that students can be best prepared for their place in the workplace and larger society. For this to occur, faculty play a key role in shaping the curriculum for global learning.

The setting for this research was at a faith-based liberal arts college in the United States. This choice intentionally situates the research within the context of liberal education, which has an established commitment to global learning and global citizenship
education (Hovland et al, 2009; Nussbaum, 2002). This study builds upon existing research by understanding these issues through the faculty perspective at one institution using an in-depth qualitative approach. A qualitative institutional case-study design is frequently used in researching internationalization within higher education (e.g., Hudzik, 2015; Rhoads & Szelényi, 2011). As Deardorff (2009) stated, it is important to understand more clearly what colleges mean when they say that they want to develop global citizens.

**Research Questions**

The primary research question for this study is: How do faculty understand global citizenship and how does their understanding of this term influence their work? Related sub-questions:

(i) In what ways do faculty understand the term global citizenship? Is it connected to specific educational practices (attitudes, knowledge, or skills; a general framework)?

(ii) How have faculty come to understand the term global citizenship? (Have they travelled or lived overseas, participated in study abroad?)

(iii) How does their academic discipline, department, or the institutional context shape their understanding of global citizenship?

(iv) How does the faculty understanding of global citizenship influence their work? Does it influence specific teaching methods (active learning methods, including international perspectives in scholarship, content selection, digital
Does it shape their scholarship and research?
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

This study examines how faculty understand global citizenship and how their understanding of this term provides meaning for their work. Global citizenship has become an increasingly prominent term within higher education as a way to describe internationalization among U.S. colleges and universities (Coryell, Spencer, & Sehin, 2014; Jorgenson & Schultz, 2012). Rather than having a fixed or stable meaning, global citizenship is a contested term that is understood in many different ways (Gaudelli, 2016; Lapayese, 2003; Schattle, 2009). This chapter outlines the history, development, and current use of the term global citizenship more broadly, before discussing its use within higher education more specifically. The final sections of this chapter bring together two important elements for understanding global citizenship within higher education in making the case for more research in this area. First, the need to make sense of what is happening in practice as global citizenship is used at the institutional level. Second, the importance of including the faculty perspective in understanding global citizenship.

Higher Education in a Globalized World

Globalization is shaping higher education in the U.S. and around the world in significant ways (Rhoads & Szelényi, 2011; Stearns, 2009; Stromquist & Monkman, 2014) and more colleges and universities are focused on developing global learning among their students (Gore, 2009; Hovland et al., 2009). The U.S. does not have a formalized national policy for internationalization in higher education, though 2012 saw the U.S. Department of Education release a “first-ever, fully articulated international
strategy” document which emphasized the importance of four priorities: (1) a world-class education for all students, (2) global competencies for all students, (3) international benchmarking and applying lessons learned from other countries, and (4) educational diplomacy and engagement with other countries (U.S. Department of Education, 2012, p. 1). Hudzik (2015) notes that the broader national motivations for internationalization focus on traditional themes of jobs, national security, and diplomacy.

Within the U.S. each individual campus must decide on their particular approach to how internationalization will be enacted. Internationalization efforts are now widely practiced on college campuses: in a 2013 survey, 86% of U.S. institutions indicated that they mention internationalization in their mission statement or strategic plan (Green, 2014). From Knight’s definition, internationalization is “… the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education” (Knight, 2003, p. 2). Internationalization is typically conducted through study abroad programs, international student recruitment, internationalizing the curriculum, establishing branch campuses overseas, and developing international partnerships with other universities and scholars (Kreber, 2009).

Campus internationalization efforts continue to face challenges including persistently low rates of study abroad participation, and a frequent lack of organizational action in implementing internationalization plans (Eddy, Barber, Holly, Brush, Bohon, & Green, 2013). In addition, Hudzik identifies a problem of leadership within universities:

There are few university presidents, vice-chancellors, or rectors who don’t espouse the importance of internationalization. Yet, many fail to exert effective leadership for action to bring internationalization from a concept to reality and to engage the organizational change required to make it happen.” (2015, p. 58).
As a result of the difficulties campuses face in implementing internationalization efforts, students graduating from U.S. institutions often have little knowledge regarding other countries and international affairs compared with other nations (NAFSA, 2003).

The term global citizenship has become increasingly prominent in framing internationalization efforts on campuses (Boni & Calabuig, 2015; Braskamp, 2008; Coryell, Spencer, and Sehin, 2014; Green, 2013; Hanson, 2010; Jooste & Heleta, 2016; Jorgenson & Schultz, 2012; Lilley, Barker, & Harris, 2016; Rhoads & Szelényi, 2011; Schattle, 2008, 2009; Stearns, 2009; Wynveen, Kyle, & Tarrant, 2012). The use of the term global citizenship may provide a means by which universities can better define and assess their internationalization efforts (Deardorff, 2009), yet the study of global citizenship practices at individual college campuses remains limited at this stage. The term global citizenship is not well defined and needs more focus to be beneficial in guiding campuses in their internationalization efforts (Hovland et al., 2009). This chapter begins with a discussion of the ways in which global citizenship has been understood before focusing on global citizenship within higher education.

**Historical Roots & Development of Global Citizenship**

This section provides a broad discussion of the term global citizenship including the historical roots of the term, its development over time, and the current usage. It is important to understand the wider background of global citizenship as a foundation for discussing its use within higher education.

Schattle (2009) has traced the development of global citizenship from roots in the cosmopolitan tradition. The term cosmopolitan dates back to ancient Greece and refers to
the idea that “the inherent dignity and well-being of each human person warrants equal respect and concern” (p. 3). The cosmopolitan ideal also envisions a universal concept of responsibility where the individual citizen feels a sense of responsibility to those beyond their immediate region. (Schattle, 2009) notes how Socrates famously declared himself to be a citizen of the world in describing his affinity with all of humanity, while Gaudelli (2016) begins his introduction to global citizenship by reflecting on Diogenes and his “proclamation of world citizenship” (p. 2). Schattle also references Immanuel Kant’s “linkage of world citizenship to universal human rights” (2009, p. 4) in developing a philosophical foundation for global citizenship. Appiah (2006) notes two strands that constitute cosmopolitanism: (1) a sense of obligation to others beyond family and national citizenship, and (2) an interest in the particularity and difference of human lives, not simply a general interest in human life. Caraus (2015) discusses recent concepts of cosmopolitanism in presenting a “cosmopolitanism of dissent” that seeks to oppose unjust systems and forms of power (p. 1), and is distinct from other forms of cosmopolitanism such as rooted cosmopolitanism, postcolonial cosmopolitanism, and radical/agonistic cosmopolitanism (p. 4).

Cabrera (2010) outlines an approach towards “institutional global citizenship” (p. 258) that is rooted in cosmopolitan thought and views global citizens as: (1) reaching across boundaries of nationality or citizenship, (2) helping to secure fundamental rights within a system of global institutions, and (3) working towards putting this type of system in place. For this to take place, Cabrera argues, would involve reforming aspects of the globalized systems already in place today. This approach provides a helpful link to how the term global citizenship has developed over time from its roots in
cosmopolitanism and is often intertwined with discussions of globalization and individual identity.

**The Influence of Globalization.** The emergence of twentieth century globalization and its influence in the early twenty-first century has shaped the development of the term global citizenship. In the immediate aftermath of World War II the establishment of organizations such as the United Nations (UN) brought the idea of global citizenship into focus in an institutional form after the devastation of global conflict (Schattle, 2009). However, global citizenship is often not simply understood as an institutional form, and there has been sustained debate over the ways in which global citizenship exists relative to discussions of individuals and national citizenship (Gaudelli, 2016). Understanding global citizenship is often framed within a tension of situating the individual within broader global systems. For example, Kahane (2009) notes the importance of approaching global citizenship education in a way that allows students to reflect on their place in the world as a global citizen.

The concept of what it means to be a global citizen has often been shaped by a wider discussion on the influence of globalization on ideas of citizenship. Globalization can be thought of as the “intensification of worldwide social relations” (Giddens, 1990, p. 64) yet it is often the technological, communication, or economic connections that are most evident (Gaudelli, 2016). For the purposes of discussing global citizenship, it is also important to recognize the political aspect of globalization. This means that individuals today are often not simply citizens in a localized sense. In Europe, for example, individuals are a citizen of an individual country yet also a citizen of the European Union (EU). Rhoads & Szélényi (2011) note that globalization itself is not a new idea, yet there
is something unique about the ways in which contemporary globalization is manifest. They acknowledge the “ubiquitous nature of how one group is brought to bear upon another” (p. 4) as the world becomes more interconnected. As a result they see an explosion of hybridization where one culture influences another through a shared cultural form. For example, they describe how American rap music is helping to shape the local music scene in Shanghai in an example of a “creolized mixture of global influences” (p. 5). Rhoads & Szelényi (2011) also state that interracial marriage and migration patterns are diminishing the idea that individual identity is tied to a particular ethnicity or race.

Of particular concern for Rhoads & Szelényi (2011) is the way in which globalization is seen to drive forward a particular vision of interconnection between cultures and people. They focus on the economic aspects of globalization and on “the increasing role that capitalism and free-market ideology play around the world” (p. 11). They view global capitalism as rapidly advancing forms of cross-cultural contact largely driven by the U.S. as the world’s largest economy. Globalization is shaping how individual people relate to each other across cultures, yet there are additional layers of connection beyond cultural communication at the individual level.

The second half of the twentieth century saw the influence of many powerful multi-national organizations such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank (WB), and the World Trade Organization (WTO). These organizations along with regional partnerships such as the EU, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) have complicated the contemporary idea of citizenship and individual national identity. Through the complexity of international law, multinational corporations, international treaties, the
UN, and other international organizations we have (as individuals) become familiar with the concept that what we do is connected (in some way) to others on a global scale. Even in light of these corporate and political organizations spanning nations and regions, it is necessary to consider individual ideas of identity.

For Schattle (2009), the first step towards becoming a global citizen is awareness of others. This leads to asking, if we are aware of our connection to others on a global scale, what specific type of connection do we in fact have with others, especially those beyond our own national borders? Rhoads & Szelenyi (2011) have reason for concern as they specifically consider the influence of neoliberal ideology as a force of globalization. Viewed through a neoliberal lens, becoming a global citizen might entail awareness of others driven by market demands and expectations.

Looking back to the influence of Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher in the 1980s, Rhoads & Szélényi (2011) have traced the rise of neoliberal ideology emerging from the West and extending to nations around the world. They view the belief in liberalizing trade, and the push towards privatization, as having a profound effect on the broader public good, including public universities. They write, “under the banner of neoliberalism, the nation-state is redefined to serve the needs of the corporate sector” [which leads them to ask] “what kind of citizenry can we expect a corporate-driven global capitalism to fashion?” (p. 14). They are not alone in having concerns regarding the economic influence on global citizenship education (e.g., Giroux, 2004; Pashby, 2012).

Writing from a faith perspective, Volf (2015) is also concerned with the dominant market-based understanding of globalization and how it shapes individual identity. He
discusses the large rise in global religious adherence since 1970, notes that this trend is likely to continue well into the future, and argues that religion and globalization are both necessary in the twenty-first century for human flourishing. Chidester (2002) makes the case that as globalization is reshaping ideas of citizenship, it necessitates thinking about the place of religion and citizenship, as both are “a process of negotiating human identity in time and space” (p. 15). Juergensmeyer, Griego, & Soboslai (2015) also discuss the changes globalization is bringing to traditional understandings of identity. They argue that religion has a place in the emerging identities of a globalized world, symbolized by the image of the public square as a place of civil engagement (e.g., the Occupy Movement, the Arab Spring, etc.). They advocate for the idea of a “new ethic of common concern” (p. 117) that can exist within a global civil religion. These perspectives are a reminder that globalization is not simply an economic reality, but is incredibly complex and influences multiple aspects of cultural life and human interaction.

Rhoads & Szelényi (2011) state that current thinking about citizenship has not kept up with the complexities of today’s world shaped by globalization. They find that the idea of citizenship is “much more confounding than is typically acknowledged” (p. 17). Neoliberalism shapes one form of citizenship based upon the role of the individual within a competitive economic environment. In essence, the citizen is ideally seen as a consumer or driver of wealth within the global marketplace. Rhoads & Szelényi (2011) see this as an unsatisfying understanding of citizenship, and they have argued that we must go deeper in our understanding by rethinking traditional ideas of citizenship.

**National Citizenship and Global Citizenship.** Traditional conceptions of citizenship have often begun with considering where an individual citizen resides and the
nation in which they have legal status (Heater, 2004; Schattle, 2009). This notion of citizenship focuses on the idea that an individual has certain rights and responsibilities: for example, a right to vote in elections (local and national) and a responsibility to obey the law. There are political, economic, and social elements of citizenship that integrate in order to provide a picture of a citizen as one who has legal status in a particular nation, enjoys certain rights, is expected to act responsibly, and contributes in some way to the economic and social well-being of the nation. The emphasis here is on the idea of national citizenship or a sense of responsibility to one’s local (or national) context.

Rhoads & Szelényi (2011) have argued that this understanding of citizenship no longer encapsulates the way in which the world functions today. There are millions of people around the world who have multiple national citizenships, and they cannot be neatly categorized according to a single concept of national citizenship. In addition, there are millions of transnational migrant workers, or guestworkers, who have some form of legal work status in a country where they have no legal citizenship status. Their experience of citizenship is curtailed as they are not able to fully exercise their ability to be citizens through full political participation. In addition, they often have little or no political representation. The presence of refugees in humanitarian aid camps in various locations around the world (who may be considered stateless) further complicates the picture of national citizenship. We might ask if it is perhaps no longer adequate to simply consider one’s local context, or where one resides, when thinking of citizenship.

The question becomes in what ways is global citizenship a unique or necessary progression in understanding citizenship today (Gaudelli, 2016)? Dower (2008) answered this question by presenting global citizenship as a way to “inform the character of
citizenship” (p. 50) by focusing on the core virtues of human beings. In addition, he argued that global citizenship is “one of the best ways to revitalize citizenship” (p. 51), that is, to help individuals to become better citizens in their local context. This echoes Nussbaum’s (1996) articulation of global citizenship that is rooted in a cosmopolitan ideal that emphasizes moral obligations to others around the world, yet also provides the basis for “genuine multicultural citizenship within a country” (cited in Dower, 2008, p. 50).

Nussbaum (1996) further elaborates on the Stoic idea that global citizenship does not imply a rejection of local identity or affiliation. Instead, it is helpful to think of identifications as a series of concentric circles ever-widening. At the center is the individual, the most immediate circle represents the closest links (family, for example), then local neighbors, then fellow city-dwellers, then national citizens, then ultimately the final circle of humanity as a whole. In this way individuals are conscious of, and connected to, all of humanity yet local identity is preserved. Both Dower (2008) and Nussbaum (1996) see no contradiction between local conceptions of citizenship and global citizenship. In their view, understanding a shared sense of humanity among all people serves to strengthen shared values within a nation, especially as nations themselves become increasingly multicultural.

This way of thinking about local citizenship and global citizenship is not shared by everyone. For some scholars, it is necessary to explore more fully the ways in which citizenship is expressed at both national and global levels. They argue that it is not enough to say that we are at once both local and global and leave it so broadly defined. Stewart-Harawira (2008) stated that for all of the discussion around global citizenship,
traditional ideas of citizenship still revolve around an individual’s relationship with the nation-state. Richardson (2008) has gone further by saying that there is a “close and continuing connection between national identity and citizenship” or what he has called “the persistence of the nation” (p. 56) The concept of global citizenship has so far failed to develop regular political structures, has no general civic structures, nor has it produced a sense of emotional bond that is typically present in national citizenship. Viewed in this way global citizenship cannot be a natural extension of the political, civic, and economic expression of citizenship we may find in a national context. Determining what global citizenship means in light of globalization (one the one hand) and persistent national citizenship (on the other hand) is important for educators to consider (Dower, 2003; Stearns, 2009).

The concept of global citizenship is perhaps further complicated by the fact that an individual cannot, in terms of legal status, become a global citizen (Dower, 2008). There is no legal body or transnational government that has the ability to bestow such a designation of citizenship. This has led some critics to challenge the premise of global citizenship to begin with (Nagel, 2005) yet proponents of global citizenship argue for a different way of thinking about the term (see Brockington & Wiedenhoeft, 2009). They argue that global citizenship is not about legal status but rather about an internal way of being or a particular mindset. In light of this broader history and development of global citizenship the current understanding of the term can now be discussed.
**Current Understanding of Global Citizenship**

Global citizenship has emerged within aspects of the broader culture to represent a number of different meanings. For example, the organization ‘Global Citizen’ was created in 2012 to address issues such as ending extreme poverty, promoting education, and providing access to clean water. They promote active participation and the formation of a community of global citizens (Global Citizen, 2016). A separate organization, ‘Global Citizens Network’ focuses on providing cross-cultural travel opportunities for people through “authentic immersion experiences” (Global Citizens Network, 2016).

The UN has emphasized global citizenship as a major education priority. A 2015 United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) report aimed to provide direction for educators in developing curriculum and to guide policymakers. It emphasized three main learning outcomes for global citizenship education (GCE): (1) cognitive, which focuses on acquiring knowledge and understanding about local, national, and global issues, (2) socio-emotional, with a focus on a sense of shared humanity, empathy, and respect, and (3) behavioral, with an desire to encourage action for a peaceful and sustainable world (UNESCO, 2015, p. 15). This report built on earlier work by the UN on global citizenship, including a 2014 report that established the idea “that GCE has a critical role to play in equipping learners with competencies to deal with the dynamic and interdependent world of the twenty-first century” (UNESCO, 2014, p. 9).

Within the business world global citizenship has been used by companies to represent their work in areas such as sustainability, education, and human rights. Fed Ex and Citigroup, Inc. are two examples of companies that produce an annual global
citizenship report documenting detailed accounts of their work in the area of citizenship around the world (Citigroup, 2015; Fed Ex, 2016).

Other meanings have been attributed to global citizenship that have seemingly little connection to ideas of sustainability, ending poverty, community action, or promoting world peace. For example, *Global Citizen Magazine* offers advice on investing, lifestyle, travel, real estate trends, and challenges facing business leaders aimed at “ultra and high net worth individuals in the Middle East” (Global Citizen Magazine, 2016). The emphasis here is on a globetrotting lifestyle characterized by travel, wealth, and global mobility epitomized by the desire for secondary citizenship and secondary residence. A global citizen in this frame of reference is more focused on issues such as immigrant investor programs and tax planning. Atossa Abrahamian has written about this phenomenon in her 2015 book *The Cosmopolites: The coming of the global citizen* in which she documents the buying and selling of citizenship as an emerging industry. She asks a number of important questions including, “What does citizenship mean when it becomes detached from any kind of civic engagement and political identification – when it is a matter of convenience, not community?” (2015, p. 16-17). As a result of her research she presents what she sees as a troubling concept: the global citizen as wealthy and free to move across borders and between citizenships. In the end she writes that “geography, ethnicity, and religion matter less than wealth, Internet access, and business savvy … the idea that the citizen is, above all, a consumer is taking hold worldwide” (2015, p. 159).

The idea of being a global citizen seems to have broad aspirational appeal. A recent poll of more than 20,000 people in 18 countries by the British Broadcasting
Corporation (BBC) found an increase in people identifying with global citizenship. Identification with global citizenship, rather than national citizenship, was especially prevalent in countries such as Nigeria, China, Peru, and India, whereas in countries such as the U.S. and Germany the opposite occurred (Grimley, 2016). The BBC findings acknowledged the difficulty in accurately defining global citizenship and noted that the poll left the definition open for participants to interpret for themselves. The various views represented in the broader culture regarding global citizenship present a lack of concrete definition, and reflect vagueness in understanding the term that is also often present within higher education.

**Complexity in Understanding Global Citizenship.** Understanding the current understanding of global citizenship is a complex task. Gaudelli (2016) describes the complexity of understanding global citizenship by first considering the term through its separate components, “global” and “citizenship”. He notes that “global” may convey a wide range of different meanings, “from peace and human rights to cultural diversity and religious affiliations” (p. 11) but it especially signifies the “conception of scale” (p. 12) where something is present or has significance everywhere in the world. He challenges this idea by noting the significance of isolated linked realities in particular locations around the world, that are not present everywhere, as a justified use of the term “global”. The “citizenship” aspect he views as equally difficult to discern. He summarizes the development of citizenship, particularly from roots in Europe, to a post-World War II period with shifting ideas of citizenship that became more dependent on national ideas of identity. He notes newer emerging ideas of citizenship which are more global in nature, especially marked by the large numbers of people who travel and work across borders,
the growth of undocumented residents, and the global digital community provided by
social media, which he sees as “arguably a global civic space” (p. 14). In joining the
words “global” and “citizenship” there is no inherent concrete direction and meaning to
the term.

In seeking to gain greater clarity in understanding global citizenship it is helpful
to discuss the term under two main areas: (1) the types of global citizenship that have
emerged today, and (2) discussing the goals of global citizenship. This section moves the
discussion closer to a focus on global citizenship education by transitioning from a larger
theoretical view of global citizenship (globalization, national citizenship, etc.) to the
individual as a unit of discussion (e.g., what constitutes a global citizen). This section
also introduces Tully’s (2014) types of global citizenship as a framework for presenting
the current understanding of the term. Deardorff’s (2009) work on definition and
assessment for global learning on campuses will help to further frame the discussion on
global citizenship education.

Types of Global Citizenship. Discussions on establishing global citizenship
typologies are often based on understanding broader concepts such as citizenship and
individual identity, local and global duties, moral responsibility, and social justice,
related in some way to the influence of globalization. Three typologies are presented
below based on the work of Oxley & Morris (2013), Rhoads & Szélényi (2011), with
particular emphasis on Tully’s (2014) typology. A summary of these global citizenship
typologies is presented in Table 1.

Oxley & Morris (2013) outline eight categories for consideration in understanding
global citizenship education: (1) political, (2) moral, (3) economic, (4) cultural, (5) social,
(6) critical, (7) environmental, and (8) spiritual. The first four categories are grouped under the area of cosmopolitanism with an emphasis on understanding both commonalities and difference. The last four categories are advocacy related and seek to describe our relationship to the world. These two areas are presented by Oxley & Morris (2013) to recognize the frequent relationship between cosmopolitanism in the literature on global citizenship, yet affirm contrasting views of global citizenship from what they see as a particular advocacy perspective. Their typology aims to present global citizenship as having “a complex, shifting and overlapping range of meanings” (p. 305) rather than firm categories of understanding.

Rhoads & Szelényi (2011) present a citizenship/global citizenship typology along two axes: (1) individualist – collectivist, and (2) locally informed – globally informed. They focus on the perspective an individual has of themselves in the world and how to reconcile the “key tensions” (p. 26) between local and global, and between individual interests and collective action. They argue that global citizens should follow a globally-informed collectivist type whereby individuals “value and are committed to a broader sense of the social good” (p. 28). Global citizenship is best described using a globally-informed collectivist type and this is necessary based on their assessment of the nature of current global challenges. In order to address these challenges a collectivist, rather than an individualist approach is needed. They allow consideration for local action despite their emphasis on a global perspective, however they hope that local concerns are informed by broader global concerns. This typology is helpful in presenting two lines of discussion within global citizenship in considering the relationship of local and global, and the ways in which global citizens identify themselves in the world.
Table 1:

*Summary of Global Citizenship Typologies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Key Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxley &amp; Morris (2013)</td>
<td>Political global citizenship</td>
<td>Relationship between the individual and the state and other polities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moral global citizenship</td>
<td>Focus on ethical position of Individual and groups in Relation to each other; human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic global citizenship</td>
<td>Focus on power, capital, labor, resources; international development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural global citizenship</td>
<td>Symbols that unite or divide members of societies; arts, media, language, science, technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social global citizenship</td>
<td>Interconnections between individuals and groups and advocacy for ‘people’s’ voice; global civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical global citizenship</td>
<td>Challenges presented by inequalities, oppression, critique of social norms to advocate for action; postcolonialism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental global citizenship</td>
<td>Advocating changes to human action related to natural environment; sustainable development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spiritual global citizenship</td>
<td>Non-scientific, immeasurable aspects of human relations; caring, loving, spiritual and emotional connections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: (Cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rhoads &amp; Szelényi (2011)</th>
<th>Locally informed collectivist (Type 1)</th>
<th>Notions of rights and responsibilities shaped by local concerns; engaged in local and national issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Globally informed collectivist (Type 2)</td>
<td>Responsibility on broader global scale; hope for collective action to address global issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally informed individualist (Type 3)</td>
<td>Focus on attainment of individual rights; little recognition of global issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globally informed individualist (Type 4)</td>
<td>Global understanding; promote self interest on a local or global scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tully (2014)</td>
<td>Modern-Civil</td>
<td>Privileges a Western perspective; international law; global systems; universal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diverse-Civic</td>
<td>Does not privilege a Western perspective; diverse; grassroots, community, advocacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study particularly focuses on Tully’s (2014) typology as a means to help simplify the complex and overlapping ideas in understanding of global citizenship. Tully (2014) discusses two distinct types: (a) Modern-Civil and (b) Diverse-Civic. Though his typology consists of fewer aspects than those presented by Oxley & Morris (2013), and is different than Rhoads & Szelényi (2011), he presents sufficient scope and detail to outline a number of main ways in which global citizenship is discussed today.

Tully (2014) notes that approaching global citizenship brings an inherent complexity because it brings together “contested histories of meaning” (p. 4) from the
fields of globalization and citizenship. His Modern-Civil citizenship type notes a Western understanding of global citizenship that is most visible in systems of international law and global institutions. Tully (2014) writes that when European nations built their modern nation states (and the forms to sustain them) they also competed against each other during the period of colonization. Over time, the idea emerged that citizens of Western nations had the cosmopolitan right to travel freely to wherever they wanted in the world, to study, explore, and bring religion. In turn, a host country would acknowledge their cosmopolitan duty to open their doors to this activity. The various elements of modern civilization (such as systems of government, economic structures, legal frameworks) were introduced in a way that kept so-called “developing” nations dependent on more “developed” nations. Tully (2014) adds that military protectionism and other means now enforce this historically established relationship, and any nation states that choose to rebel against this system are treated as “failed” or “dangerous”. This form of modern citizenship has led to “informal imperialism, inequality, dependence, and war” (Tully, 2014, p. 32). It emphasizes a form of citizenship that is (from a Western perspective) universal and superior, and what everyone else should aspire to, once free of their “particular and inferior ways” (p. 32).

Tully (2014) continues by explaining that this logic provides Western nations with a right and a duty to enter into other societies to free them through the institutional forms of modern citizenship. This form of citizenship is focused on the extension of Western values, often achieved through institutional frameworks. It is “the globally predominant modern mode of citizenship” (p. 33). It is enacted through various institutions (educational, military, political, economic) within the nation state and through
international law. Participation in this type is through established forms such as voting, participation in political parties, and using existing public spaces (p. 271). Tully (2014) asks how an alternate vision for citizenship can be presented that will oppose this normative ideal often presented as a universal goal for all people.

Tully (2014) further describes the Modern-Civil approach as affirming “four tiers of citizenship rights and responsibilities” (p. 12) which underpin modern global citizenship: (1) individual civil liberties (e.g., ownership of private property, liberty of speech, freedom of faith) which are dependent on capitalism and economic interconnection, (2) representative government, (3) social and economic rights, and (4) the rights of minority groups within a diverse culture. Tully (2014) critiques the modern form of citizenship because it established norms of citizenship that do not include all people and discourage new and emerging forms of citizenship. He lists examples of these emerging forms, such as increased recognition of minority groups, greater rights for women, and more assistance for those in poverty. He adds that:

We can see that the globalization of modern citizenship has not tended to democracy, equality, independence and peace, as its justificatory theories proclaim, but to informal imperialism, inequality, dependence and war. This tendency is intrinsic to the modern mode of citizenship as a whole. (Tully, 2014, p. 32)

In contrast, Tully’s (2014) Diverse-Civic citizenship perspective views citizenship as fundamentally based on relationships rather than as a status within an organizational framework. It focuses on negotiated practices with an emphasis on praxis. In this type there is no sense of a universal pattern of citizenship and it is therefore not identified with a dominant Western perspective. The relationship between the governed and those who govern is based on a foundation that is interdependent and interactive. The Diverse-Civic
view understands the rule of law to be first a network of relationship of negotiated practices before it is an organizational reality. The telos of civic life is eco-centric and oriented towards the public good, rather than egocentric and protecting the liberty of individuals (Tully, 2014, p. 64).

Tully (2014) describes four cooperative expressions of citizenship that are in response to what he calls “the crisis of global citizenship” (p. 85) by which he refers to the difficulties citizens have in responding to global problems: (1) Practices of negotiation that are focused on a particular issue and use non-violent means to bring the powers that be to the negotiating table, (2) Practices of social and economic cooperation with grassroots means to produce social and economic outcomes such as microcredit, local food production, local community-based organizations, (3) Practices of ecological cooperation do not treat natural resources as a commodity, and (4) Practices of non-violent ethics as a means for engagement in the public square. This brings the change we want to see in the world and Tully (2014) cites the example of Gandhi as an ideal model of civic citizenship.

He adds that in practice such competing types of global citizenship can be difficult to reconcile:

[The] way that formerly disparate activities, institutions, processes and languages have been gathered together under the rubric of 'global citizenship', becomes the site of contestation in practice, and formulated as a problem in research, policy and theory, to which diverse solutions are presented and debated. (Tully, 2014, p. 4)

He continues by saying that we understand global citizenship not through application of a universal rule, but by looking case-by-case at a number of overlapping relationships and similarities. This means that the use and meaning of the term is a
“negotiated practice”. Tully (2014) views global citizenship as being in the apprenticeship phase as a field of study (and is learning its way towards practical abilities) and should be shaped within the Diverse-Civic type rather than the Modern-Civil. Tully (2014) also considers the ways in which existing systems of civil structures may be reformed or opposed. He is committed to non-violent measures for change. Tully (2014) discusses human rights as an example of how civil and civic citizens might work together. He outlines the civil approach to human rights (they are self-evident and can be declared by an authority) in contrast with the civic approach (human rights are not self-evident and must be proposed, negotiated, questioned, and extended democratically, not authoritatively). He proposes that civil citizens and civic citizens can work together in the area of human rights, though he favors civil leaders learning from civic citizens (p. 326).

Tully (2014) provides two categories that cover many of the most prominent aspects of understanding global citizenship. For example, he recognizes the complexity of the task of approaching global citizenship, he discusses the relationship of Western and non-Western ideas of citizenship, provides a critical lens for reflecting on global issues and inequalities, and he considers the roles of institutional and individual action. These types of issues are relevant in shaping the ways in which global citizenship education is approached and curriculum is developed within a university setting.

On the one hand global citizenship can be understood in terms of a Western idea of individual rights established by legal frameworks, democratic principles, and market-driven economics. In its fullest expression this type of global citizenship is used as a way to extend Western values and influence around the world, often through institutional forms and transnational organizations. In contrast, global citizenship is also evident as a
more grassroots type of citizenship with a focus on issues of social justice built upon relationships between individuals and groups across the world based around shared values. These two main types of global citizenship are important to understand as they shape the particular ways in which global citizens should live in practice. This leads to a consideration of the goals that global citizenship seeks to achieve.

**The Goals of Global Citizenship.** There have been many different attempts to articulate the ways a global citizen should think and act in the world. It is important for educators to consider this process in order to determine what they will define and measure as desirable goals for their students.

Schattle (2009) has presented three primary concepts for understanding the goals of global citizenship: awareness, responsibility, and participation, followed by cross-cultural empathy, personal achievement, and international mobility as secondary concepts. This framework shows a range of ideas that include aspects of motivation, actions, and emotional capacities. These kinds of goals are present in other discussions of global citizenship.

Pike (2008) states that a fundamental aspect of global citizenship is that an “individual’s awareness, loyalty, and allegiance can and should extend beyond the borders of a nation to extend to the whole of humankind” (p. 225). Dower (2008) sees global citizenship starting with the idea that all humans share a moral status and have moral responsibility toward each other. Though global citizens cannot claim legal status, Dower believes that a political aspect of global citizenship is appropriate as we have the ability to operate within a global civic society, whether through Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) or a national government in addressing global issues. He states
that if a certain level of global citizenship exists because each person has a fundamental moral status, then there must also be room for a form of global citizenship that is encouraged, developed, or fostered through education.

Rhoads & Szelényi (2011) view a global citizen as “marked by an understanding of global ties and connections and a commitment to the collective good” (p. 27). Viewed in this way, even local actions can represent global citizenship if they are done with concern for others and informed by global understanding. Cabrera (2010) takes this further by elaborating on the relationship individuals should have towards others as global citizens. He states that simply having an approach that identifies an existing system of moral belief is too amorphous and instead we need a “developmental global ethic approach” (p. 28). This does not look to what we already have established but instead looks to the ongoing formation of a relatively new conception of global citizenship shaped by Falk’s (1995) idea of a citizen pilgrim.

Global citizenship has also been connected with addressing ecological concerns and caring for the planet (Schattle, 2009). For others, it is primarily a political orientation to actively engage in local and national issues of global importance. Viewed in this way it is the act of political participation itself, even aside from the outcomes, which constitutes exercising global citizenship. For some people global citizenship has more to do with international mobility and professional opportunities than it does with political or civic engagement (Falk, 1994). Davies & Pike (2009) stated that global citizenship is more a “state of mind” (p. 67) that entails a broader awareness of different nations, and understanding the rights and responsibilities of individual citizens at multiple levels. Lilly, Barker, & Harris (2016) examined global citizenship through perceptions of the
‘ideal global graduate’ and found that they display “openness, tolerance, respect, and responsibility for self, others, and the planet” (p. 10).

There are a number of overlapping proposals regarding the specific outcomes or ideals that should be fostered through global citizenship education (Table 2).

Table 2:

*Outcomes of Global Citizenship Education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Outcome 1</th>
<th>Outcome 2</th>
<th>Outcome 3</th>
<th>Outcome 4</th>
<th>Outcome 5</th>
<th>Outcome 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cabrera (2010)</td>
<td>Global rights through institutional forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall &amp; Stoddard (1999; 2006)</td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Interaction with other perspectives</td>
<td>Understand diversity of cultures</td>
<td>Develop intercultural skills (e.g., language)</td>
<td>Understand global processes</td>
<td>Prepare for citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis &amp; Pike (2009)</td>
<td>State of mind</td>
<td>Broader awareness of different nations</td>
<td>Understand rights and responsibilities of individuals on many levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deardorff (2009)</td>
<td>Global knowledge</td>
<td>See world as interconnected place</td>
<td>Relate successfully with others from different cultures</td>
<td>Engage at local and global level on important issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dower (2008)</td>
<td>Shared moral status</td>
<td>Moral responsibility</td>
<td>Universal norms</td>
<td>Trans-national obligations</td>
<td>Political outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Knowledge of Global Dynamics</th>
<th>Cross-cultural Awareness</th>
<th>Awareness of World Conditions</th>
<th>Understand One’s Perspective is Not Universal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hanvey</td>
<td>(1976)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nussbaum</td>
<td>(1997)</td>
<td>Cross-cultural understanding</td>
<td>See humanity in other people</td>
<td>Literature &amp; Arts</td>
<td>Awareness of differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>(2008)</td>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Allegiance beyond national borders</td>
<td></td>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhoads</td>
<td>&amp; Szelenyi (2011)</td>
<td>Understand global ties and connections</td>
<td>Importance of local actions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to collective good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schattle</td>
<td>(2009)</td>
<td>Awareness (primary)</td>
<td>Cross-cultural Empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility (primary)</td>
<td>Personal Achievement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nussbaum (1997) has argued that citizenship education should be cooperative, foster cross-cultural understanding, and an awareness of differences beyond simply learning facts about others. She argues for the development of a “narrative imagination” in order to understand lives of others, “both in concrete circumstances and even in thought and emotion” (p. 112). The goal of this approach is that students see the world beyond their locality (ideally through arts and literature) and that they recognize humanity in other people. Cornwell & Stoddard (2006) stated that students should think critically about their own positionalities while interacting with other perspectives. This aligns with Lilly, Barker, & Harris (2016) who say that “being and becoming a global
citizen is more than a technical efficiency; it involves a process of thinking differently” (p. 13).

Brockington & Wiedenhoeft (2009) have helped to provide a summary of both global citizenship and global competence perspectives as a way to further define these terms; Hanvey (1976) has proposed five dimensions for global perspective: (1) an individual’s consciousness of the fact that their perspective is not universal, (2) awareness of world conditions, (3) cross-cultural awareness, (4) knowledge of global dynamics, and (5) awareness of the problem of human choices on the global system. Cornwell & Stoddard (1999) state four outcomes for students as: (1) understanding the diversity of cultures, (2) developing intercultural skills (such as a second language), (3) understanding global processes, and (4) preparing for citizenship (whether local or global).

The term *global competence* is sometimes used as a way to articulate the outcomes of global citizenship (Table 3). Brockington & Wiedenhoeft’s (2009) summary is helpful as an example of how global competency might be described: Wilson (1994) sees five attributes of global competence: (1) substantive knowledge, (2) perceptual understanding, (3) capacity for personal growth, (4) ability to develop international interpersonal relationships, and (5) the ability to act as a cultural mediator. Lambert (1994) also notes five attributes though they differ from Wilson: (1) knowledge, (2) empathy, (3) approval of others, (4) foreign language competence, and (5) performing tasks in another culture. Byram’s (1997) list includes (1) knowledge of others, (2) knowledge of self, (3) skills to interpret and relate, (4) skills to discover and interact, (5) valuing others, and (6) relativizing one’s self. Deardorff (2009) provides a similar list of
outcomes, including the ability to develop certain attitudes, to grow in knowledge, to gain certain skills, and foster both internal and external capacities.

Table 3:

Outcomes of Global Competency Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Outcome 1</th>
<th>Outcome 2</th>
<th>Outcome 3</th>
<th>Outcome 4</th>
<th>Outcome 5</th>
<th>Outcome 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Byram (1997)</td>
<td>Knowledge of others</td>
<td>Knowledge of self</td>
<td>Skills to interpret and relate</td>
<td>Skills to discover and interact</td>
<td>Valuing others</td>
<td>Relativizing one’s self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deardorff (2009)</td>
<td>Attitudes (respect, openness, curiosity)</td>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Comprehension</td>
<td>Skills (listen, observe, interpret)</td>
<td>Internal (adaptable, flexibility, ethnorelative view, empathy)</td>
<td>External (behavior, communication)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambert (1994)</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Approval of others</td>
<td>Foreign language competence</td>
<td>Performing tasks in another culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson (1994)</td>
<td>Substantive knowledge</td>
<td>Perceptual understanding</td>
<td>Capacity for personal growth</td>
<td>Ability to develop international interpersonal relationships</td>
<td>Ability to act as a cultural mediator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brockington & Wiedenhoeft (2009) view global citizenship as extending the concept of global competency by teaching students how to respect and communicate with others who are different form themselves. This ability to communicate across cultures “will be of fundamental importance to the global citizen” (p. 121).

Darla Deardorff (2009) has researched the ways in which intercultural competence (as an aspect of global citizenship) has been defined and assessed. Through her influential work in this area she notes four main themes of global citizenship: (1) global knowledge, (2) understanding the world as an interconnected place, (3)
intercultural competence to relate successfully with others from different cultures, and (4) engagement at the local and global level on important issues. These themes are helpful in directing attention to the ways in which higher education institutions can consider defining, implementing, and assessing global citizenship.

**Global Citizenship and Education**

This section discusses the ways in which global citizenship is understood within formal education. (Gaudelli, 2016) has traced the development of global citizenship education as a growing area of study. Within higher education global citizenship is frequently used in conjunction with describing campus internationalization and institutional aspirations for global learning, yet it is not well understood at the classroom or curricular level (Deardorff, 2009).

**Global Citizenship Education in Primary and Secondary Schools.** Civic education has historically been used as a way to develop citizenship and in the formation of national identity. Global citizenship education has become an increasingly common part of curricula for younger children (Cabrera, 2010), and mandatory at the primary and/or secondary level in many nations around the world including Costa Rica, Argentina, Singapore, the U.K., Hong Kong, Shanghai, and Canada (Leduc, 2013). If global citizenship education is to be accepted as an important educational goal, then what does this imply for national citizenship education?

Moon & Koo (2011) examined this question through a longitudinal study of the content found in ethics and social studies textbooks in the South Korean primary and
secondary school system. They wanted to understand what effect introducing ideas of
global citizenship into the required national curricula might have on traditional notions of
nation, national identity, and constitutional rights. They found that national conceptions
of identity remained strong, yet global citizenship grew in importance especially in the
1990s and 2000s. They also noted an increase in the use of learner-centered teaching
methods which have encouraged students to become more self-directed learners in a
global context. An Israeli study of the national history curricula found a different pattern.
Researchers noted the increased nationalization of the history curricula over the last
twenty years despite education policy directives for a more global emphasis (Yemini,
Bar-Nissan, & Shavit, 2014). They attribute this trend towards nationalization to the
national political situation and pressure within Israel to define its Jewish-ness within its
own geographical context. The history curricula is seen as both a reflection of the
political situation and as a force to shape the current reality.

These studies may suggest that the ability to present global citizenship as a
prominent and desirable goal of education is closely connected to an overall sense of
national identity, stability, and prosperity. Pashby (2011) analyzed conceptions of global
citizenship education in the U.K., the U.S., and Canada and described the need for deeper
understanding of the citizen-subject beyond normative patterns. This perspective
encourages examining the subject of global citizenship education to address often
“unresolved power dynamics inherent to traditional citizenship education” (p. 430). Her
work points to the ease with which global citizenship education can become uncritically
appropriated within curricula, and used to perpetuate global inequities.
**Global Citizenship Education in Higher Education.** The use of the term global citizenship within higher education is growing and has become increasingly prominent in framing internationalization efforts on campuses (Deardorff, 2009; Gacel-Ávila, 2005; Gore, 2009; Hovland et al, 2009; Green, 2013; Hovland, 2014; Jorgenson & Schultz, 2012). Schattle (2009) traced the emergence of global citizenship education in the 1980s as a new model for thinking about a global society. He noted one example where the National Council for Social Studies (NCSS) referenced the importance of global citizenship as early as 1979. Schattle (2009) also discussed a 1984 address by the NCSS president, Carole Hahn, as a “forerunner to the sorts of philosophical arguments in favor of global citizenship that would emerge with much greater force during the 1990s” (2009, p. 5). Jorgenson & Schultz note “an ever expanding discourse and associated practices claiming to educate and prepare post-secondary students for global citizenship” (2012, p. 2).

Cameron (2014) notes that the vagueness of the term global citizenship perhaps contributes to its widespread use. It can be taken to represent many different and often contradictory ideas. Though there is likely an element of truth to Cameron’s point, it seems that there can be more substance to the term than simply a convenient umbrella concept. Within higher education, it often appears to be used as a way to bring more focus to internationalization efforts on campus, and especially to identifying outcomes for students (Jorgenson & Schultz, 2012).

Using global citizenship as a framework can allow universities to focus on defining the outcomes they wish to see developed in their students. Prior research has focused on the areas of study abroad and internationalizing the curriculum (Hovland et
Killick (2012) conducted research at a British university to examine undergraduate students as they encountered “Otherness” through study abroad. His findings point towards the importance of study abroad, but also internationalizing the curriculum, and viewing college campuses as diverse places in which students can develop global citizenship. A small number of studies have also shown how global citizenship education can be integrated into campuses in a way that aligns with the particular mission of each institution, whether at a community college, a teaching institution, or a research university (Hovland et al, 2009; Schattle, 2009; Stearns, 2009).

In light of this however, Lilly, Barker, & Harris (2016) state that universities rarely approach global citizenship education with a theoretical basis or present evidence of outcomes.

Jorgenson & Schultz (2012) discuss the AAC&U Shared Futures project as an important example of the broader ways in which global citizenship has grown within U.S. higher education. They note four areas of global citizenship education that have emerged across individual campuses in the U.S. and beyond: (1) an institutional commitment that includes aspects such as revising mission statements, academic planning, and strategic vision to highlight global citizenship education (e.g., University College London, the University of British Columbia, and Fairleigh Dickinson University), (2) framing education abroad as global citizenship education (e.g., the University of Alberta, James Madison University, and the University of Guelph), (3) universities developing global citizenship certificate programs (e.g., Lehigh University, Drake University, the University of Alberta), and (4) specific global citizenship courses with particular focus on teacher preparation programs. Jorgenson & Schultz (2012) present these institutional
exemplars, yet also argue that colleges and universities must be careful to consider the many complex aspects of global citizenship education as they develop policies and practices.

**Global Citizenship Education and Study Abroad.** A number of studies have examined global citizenship as it is being defined on college campuses by focusing on study abroad programs (for example, Hovland et al., 2009). Study abroad programs, or some form of International Experiential Learning (IEL), are commonly found at universities as a prominent aspect of fostering global learning on campus. Planning and implementing these learning experiences is a complex endeavor and calls for making important decisions that reflect the priorities of the institution. Vande Berg, Paige, & Lou (2012) describe the changing dynamics of study abroad programs in seeking to improve and better assess student learning. They describe the tensions involved in measuring the effectiveness of study abroad programs. On the one hand a university could think of study abroad as successful and measure their effectiveness in terms of the numbers of students who are participating each year. This favors a belief in the idea that students will learn simply through immersing themselves in a different culture. Vande Berg, Paige, & Lou (2012) note that this idea been supported by federal government funding strategies for study abroad programs and is widespread on campuses.

Each year the Institute for International Education (IIE) *Open Doors* report presents data on student abroad participation in terms of numbers of students and percentage of students participating at an institution. Where study abroad participation rates are high, institutions can use this to promote their campus internationalization. At Michigan State University (MSU), to choose one example among many, annual news
releases highlight the fact that MSU is in the top ten schools in the U.S. for both study abroad participation and international student enrollment. These stories are largely focused on numerical growth and have referred to this as reflecting the mission of the school to be global (for example, MSU, 2011). More recently, the language has changed and become more aligned with the desire to create global citizens (MSU, 2013; 2014; 2015). Focusing on numbers is only one way to think about global citizenship, and increasingly the focus is placed on the quality and outcomes of learning experiences, and not simply increased participation (Vande Berg, Paige, & Lou, 2012).

In one such example, Talya Zemach-Bersin (2008) reflected on her study abroad experience in Nepal and Tibet by highlighting the sense of confusion she felt as an American student who was expected to become a global citizen through her immersion in another culture. She asks, “Why had we not analyzed race, identity, and privilege when those factors were informing every one of our interactions?” She continues by saying that her “education may inadvertently be a recipe for the perpetuation of global ignorance, misunderstanding, and prejudice”. Zemach-Bersin (2009) has also studied the way in which study abroad programs have typically been marketed to undergraduate students. She found that advertisements portrayed “a distinct example of the commercialization of higher education” (p. 305) in a number of ways. The adverts often talked about the study abroad experience in a way that made the education appear as a commodity that could be purchased. In addition, the presentation of the experience indicated that specific educational goals could only be obtained through a study abroad program, that is, through contact with another culture. The adverts also tended to include words and images that placed the student at the center of the experience and marginalized the hosts and the host
culture. In this way students were encouraged to view themselves as of primary
importance in relation to other cultures and people in other cultures. She notes that this
presents “unintentionally imperialist and colonialist themed rhetoric” (p. 317). This
encourages students to see themselves as global citizens, yet often misses the goals of
those who design study abroad programs to develop cross-cultural respect and awareness
of others. This is one example of the ways in which study abroad programs contain many
questions related to program design, the overall mission of the institution, and the
intended outcomes for students. Zemach-Bersin’s (2009) discussion of study abroad
programs reflects the growing sense that study abroad is not always attaining the learning
goals it seeks. The traditionally stated outcomes of study abroad programs (students who
are “transformed” by the experience) often do not hold up under assessment (Vande
Berg, Paige & Lou 2012).

Despite the growth of study abroad programs a very small number of students in
the U.S. actually participate each year. According to the most recent IIE Open Doors
report during the 2014-15 academic year, 304,467 students participated in study abroad
programs, showing an increase of 5.2% over the previous year. The report also indicates
that over the past two decades U.S. student participation in study abroad has more than
tripled. Despite this impressive rate of growth these numbers still represent only 1.6% of
the overall U.S. undergraduate student population and 14.8% of all U.S. students
pursuing a bachelor’s degree (IIE, 2015). The educational scope of study abroad is
growing yet remains very limited.

Even in light of the record participation numbers in study abroad programs, more
needs to be done beyond a reliance on these types of experiential learning experiences. In
addition, study abroad programs face challenges to better structure student learning and help students develop aspects of global citizenship as Zemach-Bersin (2009) has described. Finding ways to supplement study abroad programs as part of campus internationalization and global citizenship education is essential. One main way this can be achieved is through faculty involvement and internationalizing the curriculum (Hovland et al., 2009). There is therefore a need to examine more fully the role of faculty in the process of campus internationalization and in global citizenship education (Gore, 2009).

**The Role of Faculty in Internationalization & Global Citizenship Education**

One of the primary ways in which global citizenship education can occur on campuses is through the role faculty, teaching and learning, and the development of curriculum (Hovland et al., 2009). Hanson (2010) notes that there is minimal research on how faculty, or specific courses, might influence students towards global citizenship. For some faculty this will be easier said than done based upon their background, life experiences, role, rank or position, and their academic discipline.

Lattuca & Stark (2009) discuss the role of faculty in program planning and course planning in presenting their Academic Plan (AP) for conceptualizing curriculum development. They present the idea of ‘contextual filters’ as a way to frame aspects that influenced faculty as they designed courses. This consists of thinking about Content, Context, and Form. Thinking about Content included questions about the importance of a faculty member’s background and characteristics, their views on academic fields, and their perspective on the purposes of education (2009, p. 118). Faculty considerations of
Context included factors related to the department, the institution as a whole, and their academic discipline (p. 124). Thinking about Form involved many practical details regarding the arrangement of course material and the instructional process (p. 125).

Content, Context, and Form are all important for considering the role of faculty at global citizenship education. When asked about course planning, 46 percent of faculty chose content as their first step, followed by 16 percent who drew on their own background and experience as a first step (Lattuca & Stark, 2009, p. 123). The selection and interpretation of course content was often tied to the faculty member’s “own beliefs, assumptions, experiences, and reasoning (valid or invalid)” (p. 120). The importance of contextual influences on course planning varied by academic field, however program-level and institutional influences were important for faculty (p. 124), but the majority of faculty cited internal program goals and strong program leadership as important contextual influences (p. 129). Academic fields had a strong influence on faculty when considering Form, questions of course sequencing, and meeting specific learning objectives (p. 126).

Lattuca & Stark (2009) describe the ways in which faculty are generally involved in program planning and curricular decision-making. Though they viewed this process as lacking consistency a number of themes emerged in the most successful plans including a consideration of a wide range of issues, discussing curricular issues as a community, and having discussions beyond the department (p. 132). Lattuca & Stark (2009) note that the diversity of institutional types makes it more difficult to present data on the ways in which college-wide planning took place and involved faculty. However, they describe a couple of important points as a general reference point. First, they discuss the influences
on institutions to revise the curriculum: (1) adjusting academic programs to fit the institutional mission, (2) establishing or adjusting the mission, (3) adapting academic programs to fit the external environment, and (4) joining the bandwagon of innovation. They state that an institution-wide review of the mission can signal to faculty that there is a renewed focus on the mission of the college, a process that often involves a broad range of stakeholders at smaller institutions (p. 133).

Faculty play an essential role in decisions about course planning, program revisions, and ensuring the curriculum aligns with the institutional mission. The ways faculty approach this work is shaped by their academic discipline, their personal background and experiences, their department, and institutional context. Each of these areas are important to consider when thinking about the ways faculty approach integrating global citizenship into their curriculum, courses, and programs. Personal motivations and disciplinary interests play a part in this process, but there are broader influences on faculty work.

Faculty face many pressures over the course of their career with significant changes occurring within U.S. institutions. Gappa, Austin, & Trice (2007) described four main influences driving change: (1) increased competition and fiscal pressures, (2) calls for accountability, (3) increasing enrollment and a more diversity student population, and (4) the rise of digital technology (p. 1). Faculty are often expected to balance multiple responsibilities beyond teaching including research and publishing, securing funding, and service to the university. Incentives tied to promotion and tenure also directly affect the balance of faculty work and their capacity for involvement in program planning and institutional change.
Gore (2009) believes it is important to consider how faculty work can be incentivized to incorporate a new discourse about curriculum development to include more global citizenship education. One strategy may be for faculty to look for a greater diversity of perspectives to be included in their curriculum and required reading for students. Steps such these open up both faculty and students to considering a greater diversity of scholarship and opinions and over time can have great significance. Kahane (2009) provides an example of introducing global citizenship into his course, a 300-level philosophy class with an emphasis on ‘Obligation, Compassion, and Global Justice’ (p. 49). Kahane’s approach to teaching encouraged students to reflect on their positionality, specifically as privileged global citizens. He used teaching techniques such as meditation and free writing to provide ways for students to critically reflect in issues of moral obligation, global interdependence, and learning about others (2009, p. 53). He observed students reflect on their own experiences, develop a deepened understanding of global justice, and consider their role in global injustice (p. 57). This is one example of how faculty could integrate global citizenship more fully into their course planning. Patti McGill Peterson (2010) argues however that colleges and universities have not typically included the core mission of teaching and learning within their internationalization process. She adds that, “Internationalization efforts, therefore, have frequently fallen short of the goal because the faculty has remained on the periphery and not at the epicenter” (p. 134). It is not just in the area of curriculum planning and teaching where faculty integration in global learning is difficult.

In practical terms it is impossible to determine how much colleges and universities are encouraging their faculty to pursue the faculty equivalent of a study
abroad experience as these numbers are not comprehensively tracked. It seems probable that this is not happening on a large scale on most college campuses, and faculty may only occasionally travel overseas for an international conference, or on a faculty-led study abroad trip. The level of international travel or other means of cross-cultural engagement, perhaps in leading service-learning projects, attending international conferences, or conducting research in an international context is also hard to discern. It is important to understand what ways faculty have the opportunity and incentives to pursue internationalization efforts.

The preparation of future faculty is also worth consideration given the way in which faculty are typically trained in their own graduate education experience. If current faculty are limited in their participation in internationalization, will this potentially change for new faculty entering into the teaching ranks? For the vast majority of PhD students their program focus is on training to be researchers within their academic discipline. Pruitt-Logan & Gaff (2004) have called for broader doctoral degree program goals to help prepare future faculty. These goals include helping future faculty develop experience and skills in university service, professional development, and learning about changes within the classroom and curricula (p. 180). Even within this framework efforts to include an international focus may be difficult for students during their doctoral training depending on their academic discipline. McGill Peterson (2010) encourages any efforts within various academic disciplines where faculty have the opportunity for global work, and suggests that faculty find ways to contribute to an emerging international focus within their field.
More broadly, McGill Peterson (2010) recommends the following steps to include faculty involvement in internationalization efforts on campus: (1) set the process within a wider framework of an institutional vision developed with students in mind, (2) invite departments and disciplines to contribute to the overall vision, (3) integrate study abroad, internships, and other co-curricular activities within this overall framework, perhaps cross-disciplinary planning across the campus focused on larger issues of global importance, (4) seek to understand the internationalization capacity among existing faculty, (5) resource faculty to develop a plan to meet the goals of institution, and (6) revise the reward structure for faculty who pursue this work.

Though the plan listed above may be considered a worthy and comprehensive goal, there are ways in which institutions will need to adapt for faculty to become more fully engaged in internationalization efforts. Diana Bartelli Carlin (2010) has argued that the potential for internationalization exists in every classroom. She cites Green & Olson (2003) who have stated that, “Only when a substantial number of faculty members actively participate can the institution provide students with diverse international learning opportunities that are fully integrated into the educational process” (p. 69). Until this happens more widely there will be very real limits on the numbers of students who can learn about working and learning globally. The opportunities for students will be limited to interaction with international students on campus or to study abroad trips. “Making the link between faculty who are clearly internationalized on some level and the students they teach is the ultimate challenge of internationalizing US higher education” (Carlin, 2010, p. 149). Gore (2009) states that obtaining faculty buy-in for internationalization in campus is a difficult yet essential task, but Dewey & Duff (2009) highlight the fact that
surprisingly little research has been done on the perspectives of faculty in internationalization efforts and understanding barriers for their participation. How can faculty gain a greater international experience and insight that they can share with students in their classrooms?

**Developing a Curricular Pathway Approach & Faculty Integration**

Deardorff (2009) has argued that faculty play a crucial yet overlooked role in the work of campus internationalization. Faculty can help to shape both the process of global learning and the outcomes that should be fostered. The concept of a “curricular pathway” allows faculty to be part of connecting the mission of the institution to global learning outcomes. Viewed in this way, students have the opportunity to learn across the curriculum in a developmental pattern (Hovland et al., 2009). “It is important to work with faculty in the disciplines to ascertain how these goals [global citizenship goals and outcomes] manifest themselves within the different disciplines, … Such goals can most often be stated through specific courses and should address how global learning goals apply to particular courses” (Deardorff, 2009, p. 350). This process can examine both teaching strategies and co-curricular activities that relate to global learning. Following this pattern, developing global learning outcomes is not left solely to study abroad programs but the focus is instead “to truly integrate the learning across courses and cocurricular experiences on campus” (2009, p. 351). She cites Bok’s (2006) work, *Our Underachieving Colleges*, where he includes a chapter on ‘Preparation for Citizenship’. He argues for a renewed focus on educating for citizenship and civic responsibility, which is “not only one of the oldest educational goals but a goal of great significance for
educators themselves” (p. 193). Here Bok draws attention to the fact that faculty are an integral part of the process of citizenship education, a process that shapes them as well as educates students.

To understand how this process of faculty integration might become realized will require a greater knowledge of how faculty understand the term global citizenship and how this provides meaning for their work. A primary question is to ask is what ways do faculty incorporate global citizenship into the curriculum? This process may include considering the selection of course content, the purpose for the course, the design of the syllabus, choosing teaching methods, or selecting how to assess learning. It may also include decisions made in light of their academic discipline, their academic department, the mission of the institution, accreditation standards, or the broader socio-cultural context (Lattuca & Stark, 2009). Recognizing the understanding faculty have regarding global citizenship may be best understood by the ways in which global citizenship education occurs within each individual course, and in how they think about curriculum development as a whole. In this way, the development of curricular pathways may be examined at the institutional level by looking at a number of different faculty across academic disciplines.

Summary

In order to address the complexity of global citizenship education within higher education a clearer understanding of the term is needed. The “curricular pathways” approach has been proposed as one way to navigate this complexity. For this to occur, faculty need to be involved in defining and assessing global citizenship education.
Faculty can work within and across their academic disciplines in order to equip students for the twenty-first century globalized workplace. More research is needed to understand how global citizenship education is occurring on college campuses and the specific ways in which faculty are involved in the process. By doing this type of research it is possible to work towards a definition of global citizenship that can guide higher education institutions as they incorporate internationalization on their campuses.
CHAPTER THREE: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK & METHODOLOGY

This research study focused on the faculty understanding of global citizenship and the related meaning for their work. This chapter presents the conceptual framework and research methodology used in this study.

**Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework presents the elements of this study that were most important in addressing the research question. The framework includes aspects of the faculty experience that are important for understanding global citizenship. These aspects are conceptualized as occurring within certain contextual framework as presented in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1:

*Conceptual Framework for Faculty Understanding of Global Citizenship*
The conceptual framework acknowledges the multiple contexts that help to provide meaning for faculty work. It positions the faculty member at the center and within the immediate context of their academic department. The institutional context includes space to consider broader aspects of how a faculty member might make meaning of global citizenship, represented by the ‘Curricular Pathways’ and the ‘Evidence of How Global Citizenship is Understood’ parts of the framework. All of this is set within the larger context of the influence of globalization on higher education.

Elements of the Academic Plan (AP) model (Lattuca & Stark, 2009) presented in Chapter Two provide a helpful basis for the conceptual framework. The AP model outlines various aspects that should be considered when a faculty member is conceptualizing a curriculum. This includes a consideration of the various contexts in which curriculum development takes place, and the ways in which teaching is influenced by aspects such as academic discipline, faculty background, and institutional context. The conceptual framework acknowledges the different contexts that may influence the faculty understanding of global citizenship. These contexts include their current departmental context, their academic discipline, and their approach to teaching and learning. The conceptual framework also shows how personal background and educational history can influence a faculty member. Together these Influences provide a context for how a faculty member may come to understand global citizenship, and ways that this understanding has meaning in practice.

**Influences.** Within the conceptual framework the Influences are elements that contribute to the formation of a faculty member’s identity and perspective. Four main
areas are important to consider under this aspect: (1) Personal background, (2) Educational history, (3) Academic Discipline, and (4) Approach to teaching and learning.

Within this conceptual framework the influences on a faculty member include aspects such as personal characteristics and background (gender, age, ethnicity, national origin, etc.), and their educational history (degrees earned, experience with global education, study abroad, or cross-cultural learning). The influence of a faculty member’s field of study is also important given the ways in which an academic discipline shapes a faculty member’s perspective, what they choose to research, and ways it may provide opportunity for thinking about global citizenship. Finally, the faculty member’s approach to teaching and learning will influence the ways in which they integrate global citizenship into their work, and allow global citizenship to provide meaning in the classroom and curriculum decisions.

A related recent study by Katy Sian (2014) sought to understand the perspective of scholars within the field of postcolonial studies. Using semi-structured interviews she asked a range of questions focusing on the background of each scholar, the main influences on their work, and how they conceptualized postcolonialism. Global citizenship has certain similarities to postcolonial thinking in that it has influenced a range of academic disciplines, yet there is no agreed upon definition on how the term “postcolonialism” should be used. As with global citizenship, postcolonialism represents a difference of opinion from multiple perspectives, but as Sian presents, a new way of thinking about the world can emerge through understanding what the term means even through debating its current iteration.
Faculty Member. At the heart of the conceptual framework is the faculty member’s individual understanding of global citizenship. As noted in Chapter Two, Tully (2014) defines global citizenship in two main ways: (1) Modern-civil, and (2) Diverse-Civic. This model from Tully was used to help examine if faculty tend towards a particular type of definition as they understand global citizenship.

Curricular Pathways. Within the conceptual framework the faculty understanding of global citizenship leads into considering the area of curricular pathways. This is conceptualized as the area where faculty are making decisions related to global citizenship education within the context of the institution. The curricular pathway is where decisions are made through curriculum planning and content development across the institution (Hovland et al., 2009; Lattuca & Stark, 2009). This decision-making step is important to acknowledge as it provides an opportunity for themes to emerge in how global citizenship is understood spanning multiple departments, and potentially across the whole institution.

Evidence of How Global Citizenship is Understood in Practice. The final main element of the conceptual framework presents the ways in which global citizenship is understood and evidenced in faculty work. This includes a focus on how global citizenship is understood to provide meaning for faculty work, particularly in relation to teaching and learning, research, and curriculum development. In some ways this last part of the conceptual framework anticipates a later step of assessing global citizenship learning outcomes, yet the focus of this study remained on understanding what is meant by global citizenship as a necessary step towards outlining learning outcomes and identifying assessment strategies.
Research Paradigm

Merriam (2014) traces the development of qualitative research from its roots in anthropology and sociology. She emphasizes the importance of carefully designing qualitative research studies to include a consideration of the philosophical foundations of the research. However, she also acknowledges that there is no consensus among qualitative researchers on the specific philosophical and methodological approaches to qualitative research.

Creswell (2007) provides two themes that are important to consider when framing qualitative research. First, qualitative research begins with “assumptions, a worldview, the possible use of a theoretical lens” (p. 37). Second, qualitative research seeks to understand the meaning ascribed to individual problems or issues that are social in nature. To do this type of research means the researcher must consider a number of important aspects in framing their work. Among the most important aspects in the initial design is outlining the overall philosophical approach (or paradigm) for the research, and the position of the researcher (Glesne, 2006).

This research study used the Interpretivist paradigm. This was appropriate given the fact that it sought to access “the perspectives of several members of the same social group about some phenomena” (Glesne, 2006, p. 8). Using this paradigm provided a way to interpret the world from the perspective of the participants. The research questions were designed to make meaning of a social reality and the individual’s perspective of this reality. I interacted with faculty who were relevant for the focus of the study and sought to understand their perspective. This paradigm views reality as “socially constructed,
complex, and ever-changing” (Glesne, 2006, p. 8) and assumes that individuals want to make meaning of their experiences (Creswell, 2009).

The Interpretivist paradigm was a fitting approach for my research study as it was designed to make meaning of the phenomenon of global citizenship from the perspective of faculty members. The research presents how individual understanding relates to broader conceptions of global citizenship. This research was also designed to understand the participants in a detailed way and provide a rich description in the research findings (Geertz, 1973). This aligns with Creswell (2009) when he states that this approach to research focuses on the “specific contexts in which people live and work, in order to understand the historical and cultural settings of the participants” (p.8).

**Perspective of the Researcher**

Qualitative research must take the researcher into account as a key instrument in the research process (Creswell, 2007; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Denzin & Lincoln (2005) state that qualitative research can no longer be considered from a “neutral or objective positivist perspective” (p. 20). Viewed in this way, the personal story, background, bias, and perspective of the researcher become vital to the task of research. Merriam & Tisdell (2016) state that the biases or “subjectivities” of the researcher must be acknowledged, rather than eliminated, and monitored in relation to the researcher (p. 16).

I am drawn to the topic of internationalization in higher education, and global citizenship in particular, through my own personal background. My experiences and identity have been profoundly shaped by living in multiple countries, having the
opportunity to travel to over 40 countries, and as a citizen of three nations. My educational background is also internationally shaped, having completed degrees in two different countries and participated in a study abroad program.

I believe in the benefits of international education to broaden the perspectives of students as a necessary outcome of higher education. Among the benefits I consider to be most important are: (1) an empathetic understanding for the perspectives of others from different cultures, (2) knowledge of other cultures and cultural norms, (3) the ability to adapt behavior in demonstrating cultural awareness, and (4) recognizing systemic issues of wealth, opportunity, and power distribution shaped by globalization.

My view of global citizenship is still coming to fruition, but aligns with Tully’s (2014) Diverse-Civic emphasis on the relational grassroots perspective of global citizenship, and the importance of thinking about citizenship beyond the confines of a dominant Western perspective. Perhaps in contrast with Tully (2014) I do not believe that a radical distinction between the civil institutional forms of citizenship and the civic forms must be maintained. Where appropriate, the legal and institutional forms of citizenship may be desirable (or even necessary) to promote issues that have begun at the grassroots level. In this way I seek to incorporate Dower’s (2008) perspective that allows for the possibility of institutional global citizenship. Dower (2008) also addresses the shared moral dimension of global citizenship, which I believe to be essential, but recognize is complex to precisely delimit.

Tracy (2010) states that sincerity is an essential aspect of qualitative research where the researcher seeks to be both self-reflexive and transparent. This was important to consider as I evaluated the ethical implications of my work in designing the research.
Determining if the research would put anyone at risk, or place someone in difficult situation with complicated power dynamics was one important aspect for consideration. Another important element was ensuring that participants were treated with respect and that their voices and opinions were faithfully represented (Creswell, 2007).

**Research Questions**

Based upon the Interpretivist paradigm outlined above, the following central research question (and related sub-questions) sought to make meaning of the phenomenon of global citizenship from the perspective of faculty. The primary research question for this study is: How do faculty understand global citizenship and how does their understanding of this term influence their work? Related sub-questions:

(i) In what ways do faculty understand the term global citizenship? Is it connected to specific educational practices (attitudes, knowledge, or skills; a general framework)?

(ii) How have faculty come to understand the term global citizenship? (Have they travelled or lived overseas, participated in study abroad?)

(iii) How does their academic discipline, department, or the institutional context shape their understanding of global citizenship?

(iv) How does the faculty understanding of global citizenship influence their work? Does it influence specific teaching methods (active learning methods, including international perspectives in scholarship, content selection, digital technology, international students in the course), curriculum development, etc.? Does it shape their scholarship and research?
Research Methodology: Case Study

My research implemented a case study approach in order to research the faculty understanding of global citizenship at a faith-based liberal arts college in the U.S. This research followed Stake’s (2005) concept of an instrumental case study in order “to provide insight into an issue or to redraw a generalization” (p. 445). This study researched a particular case in-depth to examine the primary research interest (faculty understanding of global citizenship and the meaning for their work). Merriam (2014) described a case study “as an in-depth description and analysis of a bounded system” (p. 40). For Merriam (2014) it is the intrinsically bounded nature of the case, that is, the unit of analysis that defines a case study. This case is bounded within the parameters of a single liberal arts institution as a means to examine faculty work in a particular context. This case study approach also focused on studying a phenomenon within its real-life context. In order to begin to understand complex situations Flyvbjerg (2006) argues that the case study method is appropriate and important as a way to gather data about “context dependent … expert activity” (p. 222). Faculty at a liberal arts college can be considered as experts within the contexts of their academic discipline, departments, and classrooms.

A case study method allows the researcher to decide on a specific unit of analysis (Yin, 2009). This case study keeps the larger unit of analysis, the institution as a whole, in mind while analyzing the understanding of individual faculty. When considering a case study design, and the units of analysis in particular, Yin (2009) warns that focusing too heavily on the smaller units of analysis can significantly change the nature of the research study. It was important for me to keep the larger unit of analysis in mind throughout the case study.
The case study method is often used when researching issues related to internationalization on college campuses. Rhoads & Szelényi (2011) provide an example of this approach in their study of four universities and global citizenship using a case study methodology. Hudzik (2015) also used case studies as a way to examine examples of comprehensive internationalization within higher education. Two additional related examples using a case study method include Iuspa (2010), who employed a mixed-method approach to examine the process of internationalization at Florida International University, and Jiang (2012) who used a case study method to study the rationales and strategies for internationalization at Chongqing University (China).

Site Selection

Miles & Huberman (1994) identify four areas that should be considered when selecting the research site and the individuals who will participate in the study. These are, (1) the setting where the research will take place, (2) the actors or participants, (3) the events that will be observed, and (4) the process of events that unfold in the study.

My research studied faculty members at a faith-based liberal arts college. A liberal arts college is an appropriate choice for this type of research because they have traditionally focused on both cross-cultural learning and civic education (McTighe Musil, 2006; Schneider, 2004). Hovland et al. (2009) found that liberal arts colleges in particular “link their vision of global learning to interdependence, social justice, leadership, and responsible citizenship” (p. 469). This typically entails an emphasis within the curriculum on learning a second language, studying subjects such as international relations, history,
or political studies, and often includes a study abroad or international service learning experience (Brockington & Wiedenhoeft, 2009).

The site for the study was Middlewood College, a private, faith-based, liberal arts college in the United States. This site was selected for five main reasons: (1) the institution has over one hundred academic programs, including majors representing a wide range of academic disciplines. This large number of programs was beneficial in researching the potential differences in understanding related to global citizenship across academic disciplines, (2) given the overall size of the institution there is a relatively large number of faculty (over two hundred and fifty) which presented a large enough pool for selecting research participants, (3) the institution has an established commitment to global learning including over 40 faculty-led study abroad programs offered each year, (4) this institution has a focus on liberal education and preparing students as citizens, and (5) the school has included preparing students to be global citizens into the current strategic plan for the institution. This plan includes providing support for training faculty in diversity and cultural competency.

**Institutional Setting**

The institutional environment at Middlewood College provided an important backdrop for this study. The college was in the midst of an ongoing multi-year curriculum review process during my research, with the required curriculum at the college under close examination. As a result of this review process, some faculty and academic departments sensed uncertainty regarding their place as part of a larger
redrafting of the curriculum. At the time of my research this process was ongoing with no firm direction yet established on proposed curricular changes.

Some of the factors driving the need for change were external to the college and in many ways reflected the broader pressures on liberal arts colleges generally. The college was sensitive to the rising costs of a college education, especially a private liberal arts education, and the financial strain this can put on students and their families. Traditionally the curriculum has included a large number of classes that have been strongly shaped by the historical legacy of the college. This includes a strong historical commitment to foreign language instruction, for example. One question that is larger in nature, for Middlewood and other liberal arts colleges, is the degree to which a liberal arts education curriculum should remain intentionally broad, or should the curriculum be narrowed in scope with a greater focus on career preparation and vocational education.

A recent Curriculum Guide (CG) was introduced at Middlewood to assist in shaping the changes to the curriculum. The importance of citizenship as a guiding principle emerged among the elements presented in the CG. This had important implications as a backdrop for this case study in examining global citizenship. In particular, the attention on citizenship included a focus on both local citizenship and global citizenship. This was consistent with the historical legacy of the institution as a place to prepare students for civic action in the world from a faith-based perspective.

This case study therefore found Middlewood College at a point in its institutional history where curricular changes were in process, yet the final consensus on how the curriculum will be constituted had not emerged. Considerations of global citizenship were wrapped up in this conversation, especially as the college had identified
understanding citizenship more broadly as an essential element for student learning. The proposed changes were asking questions about the identity and vision of the college in the midst of a broader national conversation about the value and importance of a liberal arts education. Faculty were deeply invested in this process and in finding ways to present their opinions on how the curriculum should evolve. Themes related to change, uncertainty, and how global citizenship fits into the institutional mission all emerged in this study through the faculty voice.

**Participant Selection**

This research study used a purposeful sampling strategy (Merriam, 2014) to identify participants who could provide the most helpful responses in relation to the research question (Creswell, 2009). This approach recognized the importance of purposefully selecting participants according to specific criteria. For this study two main criteria guided the selection process.

First, faculty selection aimed to include diversity within departments and across departments to include faculty from a number of academic disciplines. Lattuca & Stark (2009) identify the fact that faculty can be drawn from across four main academic fields: Humanities, Social Sciences, Sciences, and Professional Fields. Having reviewed the academic programs at the research site, faculty were identified for participation drawn from the fields of History and Languages (Humanities), Political Science, Economics, and Geography (Social Sciences), Biology (Sciences), and Education, Engineering, Social Work (Professional). Establishing a range of academic disciplines helped to provide a basis for researching a broader concept of how faculty understood global
citizenship within the institution as a whole. In addition to drawing faculty from across academic disciplines, this study included a smaller sample of faculty members from within the same department. This provided an opportunity to study the faculty understanding of global citizenship within a couple of individual departments as part of the study.

Second, the selection process sought to identify faculty with a demonstrated interest in international education and global citizenship more specifically. This was mostly evident through their participation in leading study abroad trips, but also through their academic discipline, research interests, their teaching emphasis, or broader service at the institution.

The selection process was guided by the insights of individuals at the institution who were positioned to identify faculty according to the criteria outlined above. Faculty were identified and selected based on a process whereby a colleague who was aware of their work and interest in global citizenship recommended them for this study. Among the individuals who were positioned to make such recommendations are the Director of Study Abroad, the Director of the Institutional Office on Civic Learning, and the Chair of the Political Science department. These individuals have many years of experience at the institution and regularly interact with faculty in two main areas associated with this study: global education and citizenship education. In addition, these individuals are either part of, or deeply aware of, the work of institution-wide planning committees examining issues related to citizenship education at the institution, and the curriculum revision process. I arranged meetings with each of these individuals to explain in detail the nature and design of the research study. From this point, faculty members were identified as
potential research participants. A strength of this research site was that the recommenders were able to identify a list of potential participants, and in many cases a summary of why they would be worth consideration, based on their close knowledge of the faculty member’s work. In addition, the college’s focus on faculty-led study abroad trips, along with a commitment to a large service-learning project each year, meant that these recommenders had significant contact with many faculty who could be considered for this study. Once an initial list of recommendations had been established an email was sent to each potential participant outlining the purpose of the research, and provided an option to seek more information about the study before committing to participate. Where possible, efforts were made to ensure diversity across the participants in areas of gender, age, ethnicity, and faculty rank.

Data Collection and Analysis

Creswell (2009) outlines several types of data that can be collected in qualitative research studies, several of which were used in this study. I collected data using semi-structured interviews with faculty members in order to gather rich insight into a phenomenon. Glesne & Peshkin (1992) state that interviews “provide the opportunity to learn about what you cannot see and to explore alternative explanations of what you do see” (p. 104). Patton (2002) outlines six types of interview questions including background or demographic questions, knowledge questions, and questions about opinions and values. Merriam & Tisdell (2016) state that conducting pilot interviews is vital in order to gain feedback on questions and gain practice in interviewing. I conducted
two pilot interviews with faculty members and included feedback from these interviews in making revisions to the final interview protocol (see Appendix C) used in the study.

Using semi-structured interviews provided direction for each interview yet allowed for the possibility of new data or unexpected insights to emerge (Merriam, 2014). The interview questions focused on the faculty understanding of global citizenship, how they came to develop understanding, and how their understanding provided meaning for their work within the institution. Each interview was audio recorded and detailed notes were taken during each interview. These notes allowed me to keep track of participant responses, identify emerging themes during the interview, and note particular ideas to which I could return with follow up questions and prompts.

In addition to interviews I collected additional data from participants including course syllabi and faculty CVs. There were many additional supporting documents available through the university website including departmental documents, and institutional documents (such as mission statements, committee documents, and institutional planning documents). These documents helped to present a more complete understanding of the faculty member’s understanding of global citizenship within the institutional context. Merriam & Tisdell (2016) note that documents can be used in a similar way to interview data as a way to further understand the phenomenon being researched.
Table 4:

*Overview of Research Questions and Data Collection*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In what ways do faculty understand the term global citizenship?</td>
<td>Interview questions, CV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways have faculty come to understand the term global citizenship?</td>
<td>Interview questions, CV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does their understanding of global citizenship provide meaning for their work?</td>
<td>Interview questions, course syllabi, institutional documents, perspective from Study Abroad director, (committee minutes, policy documents)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within a few days of each interview I transcribed and reviewed the data by re-listening to the recording and verifying accuracy. Interview memos were written up as soon as possible after the interview was concluded and this provided a way to capture additional thoughts and insights on the interview data. The transcripts were coded using Nvivo software to identify main themes in keeping with the framework of thematic analysis (Glesne, 2006). The additional documents gathered in the study were also analyzed using this software.

Following Merriam (2014) the data was analyzed on an ongoing basis throughout the data collection process. Without this type of approach she warns that data collection can become “unfocused, repetitious, and overwhelming” (p. 171). An open coding approach provided initial category construction. The initial larger list of categories was coded further and grouped while ensuring that they covered all of the relevant data, that each unit of data belonged in a single category, and that all of the categories were at the same conceptual level (Merriam, 2014).
Validity & Reliability

In social research it is important to consider the quality of the research design. Yin (2009) has outlined a number of areas which should be considered when designing a research study. First, construct validity ensures that the correct measures are identified to research the concepts being studied using multiple sources of evidence. This study used a combination of interview data, document data from the participants, and data gathered from the university website. Second, member checking was used to allow the participants the opportunity to review interview data and provide necessary feedback which was incorporated into the study results. Third, external validity concerns whether a case study is generalizable and using theory in designing the case study can be helpful. In this case study the use of Tully’s (2014) concept of global citizenship was used as a way to determine the ways in which faculty understood global citizenship.

Reliability is concerned with the extent to which the study findings could be replicated by conducting the same case study (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Yin, 2009). Merriam (2014) notes that this is difficult in qualitative research which focuses on studying human subjects and where the researcher is an instrument. The emphasis then shifts to a consideration of whether the results are consistent with the data collected. This can be achieved through demonstrating a clear chain of evidence (audit trail) describing the decisions made at each step in the research process. This study incorporated an audit trail approach and included a research journal capturing my reflections, questions, and the decision-making process. Through reflexivity I sought to minimize bias and errors achieved through maintaining a case study protocol, a database of research materials, and carefully documenting each step of the research process.
Researching Human Subjects

Research involving the use of human subjects must take into account issues of consent, privacy, and potential risk. Before data collection began, approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board at Michigan State University to ensure ethical standards of research were established. Involvement in the study was voluntary and participants were free to cease participation at any time. Participants could also choose whether or not to answer specific questions, and, if desired, could have withdrawn from the study at any time. The purpose of the study, along with potential risks, was outlined to each participant prior to the data collection. Interviews were conducted in private office spaces and pseudonyms were used to mask individual identity, along with employing other techniques to protect individual participant identity. The data were stored in locked storage space and in password-protected electronic files. All data will be kept on file for a minimum of three years.
This study examined the perspectives of nine faculty members and the ways in which they make meaning of global citizenship within their institutional context. The setting for this research was a faith-based liberal arts college in the United States. Each person participated in an interview, eight of which were conducted in person, with one interview conducted via Skype. Additional documents such as course syllabi and copies of faculty CVs were collected as part of the study. This was supplemented using data gathered from the university website. The participants represent a range of academic disciplines, years of experience, academic ranks, and vary greatly in their understanding of the term global citizenship (see Appendix A). The study was designed to allow faculty to voice how they understood global citizenship, but also allowed freedom for them to specify what this meant for their individual work.

In addition to the nine faculty participants, John, the Director of Study Abroad programs, was also included in the study. His inclusion was based on a number of reasons: (a) his role involved working directly with faculty in planning and implementing global trips. His insights provided an additional perspective on global citizenship within the institution, and on faculty understanding of global citizenship, (b) many of the faculty participants cited John as an example of a global citizen, and someone whom they respected as an influence on their own thinking in this area, and (c) he was able to provide additional information on the wider discussions related to global learning, global citizenship within the curriculum, and the institutional planning process. Where it is most appropriate and helpful, his insights and comments have been included to further highlight faculty understanding within the institution.
The following three chapters present the findings from this research study by discussing the faculty participants in three distinct categories. One overarching finding from this study is that faculty did not make meaning of global citizenship within well-defined categories or present a shared understanding of the term. The Conceptual Framework in Chapter Three presented Tully’s (2014) types of global citizenship as a potential organizing framework (Modern-Civil and Diverse-Civic), however it soon became evident that this binary typology was inadequate. The faculty participants in this study understood global citizenship along a continuum of meaning rather than within established categories of reference (see Appendix B). On one end of the continuum some faculty fully embraced global citizenship and did not find significant reason to doubt the importance of the concept for their work. This category I have labeled as “The Confident” because they are confident in using the term global citizenship and believe it to be a clear and compelling way to understand global learning. Five of the faculty participants in this study tended towards this part of the continuum.

On the far end of the continuum one faculty member in particular, Eric, was not persuaded that the term global citizenship was coherent or viable, and he found that it had no meaning for his work at the institution. He falls under the category of “The Unconvinced”. In studies with a smaller sample size it is perhaps less unusual to find a category with only one participant. For the purposes of this study, the creation of a separate Unconvinced category was warranted given the clear distinctions of understanding this faculty member presented from the others in the study. In addition, in a number of interviews (for example, John) references were made to a wider uncertainty, and perhaps opposition, to the use of global citizenship within the institution. These
references are presented in more detail in the following chapters and indicate that Eric is very likely to represent wider sentiment within the college that is worth presenting in detail.

Three faculty members are clustered around the middle section of the continuum. They presented a thoughtful and engaged wrestling with the term global citizenship and its meaning for their work. This category of faculty, labeled as “The Skeptical”, are enticed by the value of global citizenship, yet they each have an element of doubt in mind that is not fully resolved.

The findings are presented in these three categories as a way to discuss the understanding of global citizenship evident within this case study. Major themes will emerge related to the institutional understanding of global citizenship through the faculty voices presented in this study. The three categories will be described in order, beginning with the faculty who are confident of global citizenship, then the middle group of skeptical faculty, followed by the unconvinced faculty member.
CHAPTER FOUR

The Confident: Global citizenship is clear and compelling

Defining global citizenship was an essential starting point for each interview as it provided a basis for understanding each faculty member’s point of reference in thinking about the concept. Five faculty participants indicted their affirmation of global citizenship. The faculty in this first category were, Walter, Mary, Alex, Rosa, and Rachel and their understanding of global citizenship is presented in this chapter.

Defining global citizenship

A number of key themes emerged from the first group who are Confident that the concept of global citizenship is important. Alex’s response captured a number of main themes for this group:

Global citizenship … awareness and empathy I guess would be the two things that come to mind most quickly for that. Awareness of global issues, just general, geographical, linguistic awareness. And then I would hope global citizenship, for me, would mean, yes, an empathy for the other.

Awareness and empathy for others emerged as major themes across this group of faculty. Awareness was often conceptualized as an awareness of the experience of other people, though for Walter it also included a strong sense of environmental awareness, that the actions of an individual can affect the lives of others around the world through climate change. The concept of awareness was also evident in a number of more nuanced ways as this group of faculty considered a definition of global citizenship. As Alex articulated, awareness could be related to understanding global issues, geographical
awareness or linguistic awareness. In many ways the idea of awareness ran through the responses of this group almost as a state of being, where global citizenship makes you aware of the presence of others in the world. Often this awareness of others was presented as an awareness of people who are facing issues of inequity, injustice, or other hardships. Once this initial awareness is realized then further realizations and choices follow. As indicated above, this second stage could be considered under the umbrella of empathy.

The language of empathy for this group included phrases such as being able to “see the world through the eyes of others”, or to understand “the world as a place where we don’t necessarily look out for ourselves as number one”. Invoking empathy led to introducing ideas of responsibility towards others, a willingness to advocate or act on behalf of others to promote peace and justice, or appreciating more deeply the ways in which people are connected globally. Rosa described this as, “a responsibility to understand what’s going on in the world”.

This group of participants described global citizenship as more than a mindset or an attitude. They described the concept of global citizenship involving actions such as caring for others, promoting peace, advocacy, and living responsibly. Ideally, there should be an awareness of others that then causes self-reflection and informed action in the world. This process of self-reflection involves personal or individual awareness that each person, as a human being, is connected with others globally. Global citizenship, for this group, also entailed a sense of equality with others, a shared humanity that should be promoted where possible.
This sense of “interconnection” can also often lead to a deeper awareness of national citizenship. Citizenship, when considered globally, forces deeper reflection on national identity and concepts of national citizenship. What does it mean to be a U.S. citizen, a Canadian citizen, etc.? In addition, Rosa described the importance of knowing about the actions of national governments, and how this affected people in countries around the world. Her national-level perspective of global citizenship was more unusual within this group of faculty who tended to view global citizenship at the level of the individual person.

One of the key distinctions for this group of faculty was that they did not tend to wrestle with the legitimacy of using the term global citizenship. They embraced using the term because they were confident in it. They were quick to provide a definition and sense of meaning for the term global citizenship. This is in contrast to the faculty members in the other categories who sought to both define and legitimate global citizenship from their response to the initial question of the interview onwards. In essence, the three categories of faculty could be divided almost solely in response to the first question, which intentionally asked for their understanding of the term global citizenship. This first group of faculty overlooked questions of whether global citizenship should be used at all, did not extensively deliberate over nuances of meaning, and moved quickly to consider how global citizenship shaped their understanding of the world.

This group of faculty were less concerned about precisely defining global citizenship than faculty in the other categories. Rachel stated that she “never really had to give a definition before”, yet it became clear in her interview that she had extensive experience with global education, and had used the term global citizenship for many
years. She later added that she would be “hesitant about everybody giving the same
definition”, and that “there’s room for different understandings”. Mary came closest to
affirming the need to clearly define global citizenship, yet ultimately articulated her
belief that a “common definition” was a valid goal rather than a “perfect definition”. Alex
described her understanding of global citizenship as “bendy” and that she was not aware
that there was “a” definition of the term. It did not matter to her whether the term
ultimately had a precise definition. Rosa mentioned that she hadn’t really “been part of
conversations defining that [global citizenship]”, but she was clear in her own mind what
it meant, and it hadn’t occurred to her to think about other possible definitions.

The lack of deliberation over defining global citizenship did not mean however
that this group of faculty were less engaged with global learning or specific aspects of
global citizenship. Rather, instead of focusing their time or effort considering a precise
definition, this group of faculty were much more concerned with discussing the actions of
global citizenship. Rosa sums this up well by stating:

> If the process of trying to define it [global citizenship] brings people to
a better understanding of their own role, then that’s great. If it just becomes
a pedantic exercise of academia, then I’d say no. But hopefully that kind
of discussion would bring about new ideas and new understanding of what
you can do and how you can do it. More action rather than just academic
thought.

Walter’s views align with Rosa’s as he stated, “I guess defining it would be less
important to me than making sure, in some sense, that it’s understood, it’s embraced”.
Most of the faculty in this group acknowledged that there could be debate over defining
global citizenship, that different opinions exist, but they did not consider this to be a
major issue worth dwelling on. This group was much more comfortable than other groups
in having a more general sense of global citizenship as a concept rooted in notions of 
connection with others, knowledge of others, a responsibility to others, and action on 
behalf of others. Beyond this basis, their emphasis for further reflection was more 
focused on concrete expressions of global citizenship rather than more abstract 
conceptions or definitions of the term.

This idea was echoed by John (Director of Study Abroad), who talked about the 
historical emphasis on “the life of the mind” at the college, but recently sensed a move 
towards a better understanding of action or engaging with others. This insight is in line 
with the faculty who were Confident of the importance of global citizenship and their 
desire towards action.

**Student Learning Outcomes**

The faculty in this category described a number of student learning outcomes for 
global citizenship education. These outcomes aligned closely with their thoughts in 
defining global citizenship and focused in three areas: (1) understanding, (2) skills, and 
(3) identity.

First, this group identified the category of understanding as an important learning 
outcome. This outcome comprised multiple related aspects including, understanding 
other people, understanding other places, and understanding cultures at multiple 
structural levels (systems).

Understanding *people* entailed understanding the reality of others, what they 
experience, and how they live. Walter stated that students need “a lot of fairly specific 
content-rich information” in order to deeply and empathetically understand others. He
believed that by offering “coherent narratives about different parts of the world” students would naturally grow in their understanding and empathy. This might start with the basics of a culture, such as appreciating different food, but the faculty in this group were much more concerned with students being able to understand deeper levels of culture. They described this as understanding the perspectives of others and being able to reflect on cultural differences in a constructive way.

Understanding *places* was most closely associated with student learning through study abroad programs, a central aspect of global citizenship education for Rachel and Alex as language professors. For Walter, understanding other places included a chronological aspect where students gain a sense of how history shapes other places and cultures. The importance of a deeper understanding of the complexity of other cultures, and how cultures interact with each other, was associated with learning about other places.

This led to a final area of understanding as a learning outcome, understanding *systems*. Faculty in this group wanted students to understand the ways in which systems and government shape cultures and people within cultures. For Mary this entailed students learning about themselves as individuals within a larger global system, and how their personal choices can be powerfully shaped by broader systems. Rosa focused on students learning about how issues in an area (such as education or healthcare) can be understood in the U.S. and in other countries using a comparative approach. A related area of learning was helping students to understand the role of the U.S. as a nation in relationship to other countries.
Second, this group hoped students would learn the *skills* necessary for engagement across cultures. The language they used to describe this outcome included ideas of cultural competence, cultural sensitivity, cultural humility, learning to adapt to others, and the ability to be open to the perspectives of others. For Rachel, a modern-language professor, learning a foreign language was an essential element to understanding and integrating with another culture. She also highlighted the importance of students learning tolerance, expressed through the ability for students to learn how to get to know others with whom they might disagree. Walter expressed a similar learning outcome, where students might not approve of how others see the world, but should still develop the capacity to get to know others through learning about their experience. These insights reflect an important nuance: learning about others with whom they may disagree is one student learning outcome, but developing the skills to engage in this type of learning process is discrete and important goal.

Third, this group wanted students to have a learning outcome associated with a globally shaped sense of *identity*. This was mainly expressed along two lines of identity. The first line was identified along religious lines: a *Christian identity* where students would gain a greater sense of what it meant to be Christian, and how to live as a Christian in the world. This identity is situated within the broader theological concept of the world belonging to God, and students discerning how best to live with others who are fellow human beings created by God. The second aspect of identity was for students see themselves as a *global citizen*, that is, as someone who is connected with others globally and to whom there is some level of obligation. Mary called this a “moral obligation”. Walter referred to this identity by saying “it means recognizing that you are not merely a
citizen of a particular nation … but to some degree your life is linked to the lives of people all over the world”. Rosa expressed that students needed to be “active citizens” and see themselves as such wherever they happen to live. A related question is to ask about what constitutes the characteristics of a global citizen.

**Characteristics of a global citizen**

Middlewood College states that it hopes its graduates will be global citizens and faculty participants were asked what they think this means. This group portrayed global citizens as having a certain mindset and living in defined ways. First, global citizens were described as having a mindset characterized by a curiosity to learn about other people and places. Walter stated that the first reaction of global citizens should not be fear of others, but a curiosity to get to know others. This curiosity goes well beyond simply learning facts or specific aspects of a culture. Alex explains that a global citizen would, “… go beyond the headlines. I would think that a global citizen, a graduate of our programs, I would hope, would have that curiosity to do that”.

This reflects a sentiment expressed by other faculty in this group, that graduates of the college, as global citizens, would be broadly curious about the world, that their curiosity would allow them to go beyond headlines and stereotypes, and continue a deeper pattern of learning. This mindset also includes an openness to other perspectives, a desire to get to know others from different cultures personally (with a goal of overcoming narrow-mindedness and prejudice), and being sympathetic to how others live around the world.
This mindset was expressed in conjunction with certain ways of participation or acting in the world. Global citizens like to travel, to have direct contact with people around the world, and live productive lives. Mary explained that if students don’t learn how global citizenship applies to their lives, that is, if it is only intellectual knowledge, then “I don’t feel like I’ve done my job”. Walter summarized a global citizen as someone who lives according to “informed action” in the world. For Rosa this type of lifestyle includes a careful consideration of how to share resources with others, being concerned with others both locally and globally, and being responsible to care for people in need around the world. For her this is rooted in the Christian idea of God valuing each person in the world equally.

One comment by Rachel stood out in the section asking about the characteristics of a global citizen. She, along with Alex, emphasized the importance of global citizens learning the language of the other person or culture. She recognized that not everyone would agree with this perspective, but she advocated for language learning as an important way to truly understand others as a means to developing cultural competence. Later she expressed her opinion that “I don’t think you would ever be 100% a global citizen. It’s a constant goal to work towards”. Rachel clearly articulated the concept of always seeking to become a global citizen, but not ever achieving it.

The faculty in this group were asked to describe their background, especially anything that they felt might have contributed to their understanding of global citizenship from their education, academic discipline, and previous cross-cultural experiences. They were also asked to discuss what they considered to be the main influences on their understanding of global citizenship. Faculty responses in this category presented the
importance of their educational background and training, the ways in which their prior travel was influential, and how these influences relate to each other.

**Personal Background**

Three of the five faculty members in this group described their understanding of global citizenship being rooted in formative childhood experiences. Walter immediately began talking about his upbringing and how attending a very conservative church had instilled a strong belief in him about the equal value of people around the world. He used the expression that this type of upbringing “plants a seed” that “God cares about people all over the world and there are no special people”. Two experiences shaped him in particular. First, he recalled missionaries coming to his childhood church and recounting stories of their work in places like China and Brazil. Second, he described visiting a Navajo Indian reservation when he was 15 years old and coming to the conclusion that “you don’t have to be White middle-class to be a nice person”. He reflected that these early experiences were “really eye-opening and broadening” and paved a foundation for his later education and scholarship.

Mary’s story had similar themes as she lived on an Indian reservation in New Mexico until she was 10 years old. She recalls referring to herself as “Anglo” and stated that this time period “was an early formation experience that I think has impacted everything else”. She describes herself as always having an awareness of the world being larger and more diverse than the little town in which she lived, and that later in life she imagined living and working overseas. In both cases, Walter and Mary instinctively referred back to their childhood as deeply formative for their understanding of global
citizenship, especially in broadening their perspective on the world through learning from others.

Alex’s understanding of global citizenship was shaped by the fact that “since I was little everybody I knew was an immigrant”. Her parents emigrated from Europe and she grew up in a culturally diverse Canadian town filled with “identifiable ethnic communities”. She places her interest in global citizenship in an understanding of being bi-cultural “right from the beginning”. Rosa and Rachel, unlike Walter, Mary, and Alex, did not go back into their pre-college years to describe influences on their understanding of global citizenship.

Walter, Mary, and Alex also detailed the importance of travelling cross-culturally, especially while they were studying in college or immediately afterwards. In fact, all five of the faculty in this group were able to describe a deeply meaningful cross-cultural travel experience around their college-going years. Mary travelled on short trips to Haiti and Mexico while in her undergraduate studies. She moved to Eastern Europe for a year right after college and worked with an organization helping to care for orphans. While working internationally she was also asked to teach, and she attributes this experience as the beginning of her involvement in global citizenship education. Through readings in high school and college she had some exposure to understanding cross-cultural differences, and she was determined to avoid being labeled as “an ugly American” while in overseas.

Alex moved from Canada to the U.S. to attend college and later took a semester off in her sophomore year to travel to Europe to visit a friend’s family. She described this experience as “very formative” and noted how she was very comfortable with “idea of movement”, that is the idea of people moving across cultures, and seeing the world “a
little more broadly.” Rachel also took a three-week international trip in her sophomore year, which she stated as an important aspect in forming her interest in modern languages.

Walter recalled taking a month-long road trip through Mexico right after graduating from college in order to practice his Spanish. He remembered this experience as very influential in allowing him to see other parts of the world, getting to know other people who were friendly, hospitable, and worthwhile, and creating an openness in him which would “broaden more increasingly into a kind of a notion of global citizenship”.

In a similar fashion, Rosa moved to Central America right after graduating from college, spurred by a sense of adventure and the opportunity to participate in a two-year internship program. Rachel took a break during her undergraduate studies to live and work among migrant workers for two years.

**Educational Background**

The faculty in this group all shared a sense of the importance of cross-cultural travel in forming their understanding of global citizenship. Their educational background and training seemed to play a less consistent role in shaping their understanding. For some, like Walter and Alex in particular, their academic training and education was intertwined with global learning. For Mary and Rachel this educational connection was less clear. Rosa’s educational training ranked somewhere in between the other faculty in this group.

Walter described his doctoral studies as especially important in shaping his understanding of global citizenship. His undergraduate education had been focused on
Western civilization but in his PhD studies he began, for the first time, to take “an interest in other parts of the world and their history”. He was required to select a minor field and he decided to study history in regions outside of the West because of his experience with learning a foreign language. Alex also described her formal education as an important influence. She had always loved learning languages in high school, and this pattern continued after her undergraduate studies when someone recommended focusing on modern language study as a beneficial career move.

Mary did not specify a connection between her undergraduate education and global citizenship, other than stating one class on intercultural communication helped her in Eastern Europe. Neither her bachelor’s degree nor her graduate program provided any influential global aspect to her education. Rachel studied modern language in her undergraduate program, earned a master’s in linguistics, followed by a PhD in language and linguistics. Though her education was focused in foreign language study, she did not make any clear connection to how this might have shaped her understanding of global citizenship. For Rosa, her formal education seemed to play a significantly less important role in shaping her understanding of global citizenship.

It is interesting to note that four out of the five faculty in this group attended Middlewood College as undergraduates. Indeed, of the nine faculty in this study a total of six attended Middlewood as students. Of this first group, Rosa mentioned that professors encouraged her to think broadly about the world during the time she was a student, though it is Alex who most strongly associated her Middlewood undergraduate education with shaping her global understanding. When asked more generally about influences on her understanding of global citizenship her first response was, “Well I do think I’m a
product of a Middlewood College education.” Rachel makes no real mention of her Middlewood undergraduate degree as influential and Mary noted the lack of consistent global focus in her undergraduate classes while a student. It is one compelling aspect of this study that so many of the faculty studied at Middlewood and later returned as faculty. Furthermore, it is perhaps surprising that the faculty in this group did not make more meaning of their undergraduate studies in relation to understanding global citizenship, especially given the institution’s long history of global learning.

**Overall influences on global citizenship understanding**

When asked a more general question about the main influences on their understanding of global citizenship, this group gave a number of answers with little consensus between responses.

Rosa cited her work with students and how she learned from the students in the program each semester. Her understanding was most informed by her social justice work, especially focusing on the national government level, where thinking about systems and policy was most important. Alex went in another direction by stating the importance of her faith convictions and theological perspective as a basis for her understanding of global citizenship. Rachel mainly discussed the role of her department at Middlewood as an important influence. Walter also highlighted the importance of his academic department as a main influence. Mary saw her local work in the community with social justice projects as most important in shaping her understanding.
Local connection to global citizenship

The literature on global citizenship discusses the relationship of ‘global’ with ‘local’, and faculty were asked about their understanding of this connection. Faculty participants talked about their own connections to the local community and what they encouraged students to do in the local community.

Alex’s response when thinking about local connections was unique in that she described having more of an awareness for global products, food, and watching foreign movies. Her interest in the world extended to finding global influences in her local community. For the other faculty in this group the local connection to global citizenship was more apparent in aspects such as serving in the local community through social justice projects, helping in local non-profits, or in racial reconciliation efforts. These local activities were often focused in Hispanic or other immigrant communities. Mary discussed a tension where she felt it was easier to be globally focused than locally focused, and she asked why more wasn’t happening to help people in the local area. It is noteworthy that three of the participants in this group had chosen to move and raise their children in more culturally and ethnically diverse neighborhoods. In each case there was a conscious decision to move away from a more suburban and homogenous neighborhood to a more diverse community. In addition, some of the participants in this group talked about how they helped students to see the local connections to global citizenship. This largely involved helping students to get involved in service-learning projects, both as part of their formal studies and outside of class.
Department, scholars, & colleagues

This group of faculty described their academic department as more influential in shaping their understanding of global citizenship than either their academic discipline or the institution as a whole. The participants talked about the importance of their department in two main areas. First, they discussed the ways in which their departmental colleagues had been a rich source of global learning and support. Second, this group discussed the importance of curricular changes within the department as a way for them to further understand global citizenship.

Departmental colleagues were frequently mentioned as important influencers across multiple sections of the interviews for these participants. Rachel cited the former chair of her department as influential for her understanding, while Walter described at length influential colleagues from his department, including their international research agendas and global perspectives. Alex referenced how much she had learned from working alongside faculty from other countries who are in her department. Mary also referenced the importance of colleagues who were actively involved in international research on issues such as immigration. Often the support of colleagues seemed to affirm that global learning was part of the culture of the department, and participants felt that their own global perspectives would be welcomed into the work of the department. One way that this was most evident was in the process of course revisions or changes to the department curriculum.

Each of the participants in this group talked about the ways in which their department had worked to make the curriculum more globally focused during their time at Middlewood. Mary referenced a change within her department where a global issues
class was added to the curriculum in place of another course. This was largely done in recognition of the broader influence of globalization and because of the “passion for global issues” held by members of the department. Rachel, and to some extent Alex, described changes in their modern language department around eight years ago where “we redid our curriculum entirely.” These revisions were mainly spurred by faculty being attentive to student feedback. From surveying and listening to students the faculty could sense a shift away from a traditional focus on studying literature towards more applied uses:

We’re realizing that our students are not studying [languages] just to go on in literature. They’re studying so that they can use their language learning in conjunction with their other major, and be able to help people, whether it’s in medicine, business, or sociology.

This recognition spurred changes that included introducing a requirement that students pursuing a modern language major must study abroad for a semester. This added a change to faculty work in the department as faculty now needed to lead the semester programs with students. This change also necessitated a new semester-long study abroad program. Faculty from the language department, including Rachel, worked with the Study Abroad office to travel on exploratory international trips before deciding on a new program location. In addition to introducing a study abroad requirement, Rachel describes the broader impact in the department curriculum. The focus on studying literature “has almost completely been turned upside down in our department” with the introduction of more cultural, historical, and social issues. She noted, “sometimes it’s been difficult because of the training our professors have received.”
Walter also referenced a significant shift in his department around 12 years ago. Driven by faculty within the department, discussions began to emerge regarding the need to move from a Western civilization focus to a world civilization emphasis. “There was really no resistance to it to speak of. Everyone thought, you know what, it’s embarrassing that we’re still doing Western civ, and we really need to move in this direction”. Faculty conducted teaching sessions for each other as part of their departmental faculty development in order to “jump start” the move away from Western civ. He noted the fact that moving into a new academic field “can be a scary thing”. He remembered thinking, “what did I know about India, or China, or, for that matter, Africa at that time?” The departmental support and push to make the transition made it possible and he enjoyed developing a world history course “in a way that I thought would be meaningful to students”.

The participants in this group overwhelmingly mentioned colleagues from within their department, or the institution, as more influential on their understanding of global citizenship than scholars or academic scholarship they had encountered. Beyond the support of departmental colleagues discussed above, the support of colleagues from other departments was a consistent theme. When participants did mention scholars or scholarship that had influenced their thinking, they often cited theologians or authors addressing broader themes of social justice. Walter, however, described how reading authors from different parts of the world, such as Reza Aslan or Marjane Satrapi was important to him. Mary referenced the authors of textbooks used in her courses as influential.
**Perspectives on Teaching and Study Abroad**

The participants in this group were asked about how their understanding of global citizenship provides meaning for their teaching and research. One important finding is that this group of faculty were not necessarily more involved in teaching global issues or international research than faculty in the other categories. The distinction for this group lies in *how* their understanding of global citizenship framed their approach to the global dimensions of their work and shaped their reflections on their work. The faculty in Category Two (Skeptical), for example, were all deeply interested in international or comparative research, yet they thought about this work from a more critical stance.

The faculty in this Confident category were all focused on finding ways for students to hear as directly as possible from other people in different cultures. This was referenced in a number of different ways as they discussed their approach to teaching and the methods they used. Faculty participants stated their desire for students to learn directly from others in person. Study abroad programs were seen as ideal for this. However, for on-campus classes faculty described how international students enrolled in the class were often invited to share their opinion, or other international students at the college were invited to come to the class to share their experience. Mary spoke most extensively about having international students speak in class. She described her sensitivity towards students and not wanting to make assumptions that international students would want to share, or that they would be expected to speak on behalf of their culture:

> As a professor I never want to single anybody out, or have someone feel like a token. But at the same time you’ve got all of this wealth of experience sitting in your class. I’ve got to figure out how to utilize that in a way that’s respectful and not putting them on the
Mary would try to meet with the international students outside of her class and explain her teaching style, essentially offering them an invitation to participate in the classroom, a strategy that has had limited success. Walter also emphasized the importance of having international students speak in his classes as a way for students to hear directly from the narratives of others.

This group also strongly advocated for the importance of experiential learning such as study abroad, and service-learning. The idea of students being in a place long enough to truly encounter others, really getting to know people, and understanding different perspectives was a consistent theme. Asking students to journal, discuss with others, and reflect in other ways on what they were learning was also seen as essential aspect of within this approach. Associated with this idea was the importance of helping students to think about what it means to be a citizen.

The concept of having students hear stories that were “authentic” or a “first-person narrative” was a common theme for these faculty. Often this was achieved through the readings they selected for their courses and the videos professors used in class. This was often a mixture of drama and documentaries. Rosa talked about the importance of having students read sources that intentionally showed two sides of an argument and having students work through these differences of opinion in small groups. She highlighted the importance of participatory learning and dialogue. This was part of her larger approach to help students wrestle with different perspectives as a way to think about their role as a global citizen:

I think what we should be about is shaping students who are not going
to get there on their own … You’ve got to create that environment where they can struggle with questions like, exactly what is my role? And if they say, no, I don’t buy it, I don’t think I have a role as a global citizen, that’s their prerogative, but I think that somebody needs to be asking those questions.

When faculty talked about using different teaching methods it was almost entirely referred to as a way to provide a more diverse range of content, and not necessarily in thinking about how students learn. Only Mary referenced the fact that students have different learning styles and that she adapted her teaching accordingly. This was something she first learned while teaching in Eastern Europe. She noted that her end-of-course evaluations at Middlewood were always mixed because every student found something they did not like in the class. She viewed this as an unsurprising yet successful outcome in her efforts to teach more than just one group of students. Mary was also the only faculty member who referenced using the internet in a purposeful way to have students search for information on global issues. In one instance she had students spend time exploring the United Nations website to see what interested them. She believed that helping students to navigate online sources and understand how to evaluate sources of information, including social media, remains a “huge untapped area” that she needed to grow in.

Another distinction for this group of participants was the extent to which they referenced study abroad programs as an important aspect of global citizenship education. More than the other faculty participants in the study, this group discussed the positive ways in which study abroad influences student learning. In addition, three of the five faculty members had extensive experience in leading study abroad trips, with a combined total of twenty-eight trips overseas between them. Not only had faculty in this group
more experience with study abroad, but they also overwhelmingly talked about the benefits of study abroad with very little discussion of the potential drawbacks. For this group, study abroad was seen as a main way for students to learn aspects of global citizenship such as understanding others, empathy, adjusting to a different culture, making friends, and encountering new perspectives. Two of the faculty in this group had also started semester-long study abroad programs, and Rachel had moved from another institution to Middlewood in order to lead study abroad programs. Alex reflected on the importance of study abroad by stating, “So when you’re talking about global citizenship, global education, I immediately think of that [study abroad]” and she primarily talked about study abroad programs throughout her interview when describing teaching and learning.

Walter was the only faculty member who questioned study abroad in any sense, though his concern was not significant compared with the importance he placed on students travelling overseas and spending time getting to know others. His main concern was that leading a study abroad program placed a tremendous burden on the faculty member who was in charge:

Professors are encouraged to direct the semester programs abroad and that’s a lot of work. I mean, taking students away for three weeks … the work you have to do to develop the thing, to recruit the students, the college could provide a lot more support if it had the resources. We’ve all just sort of said, well we believe in international education, so we just agree to do a lot of extra work.

He also referenced the logistical challenges of some study abroad locations and how this could be difficult for a faculty leader. In general however, the faculty in this
group had the most experience with study abroad and placed a very high value on connecting these experiences with global citizenship education.

Another prominent aspect of this discussion was the importance of the South America study abroad program as a model example of global learning. Each of the faculty in this group referenced this program, a theme that continued with the faculty in Category Two. This is the program that Rosa started and has overseen as a Middlewood faculty member for more than 15 years. Often this program was referred to by participants in this study as a way to bring together many aspects of global citizenship including, learning about others, focusing on helping people who are suffering from injustice, living in a community shaped by inequality and poverty, addressing issues at both an individual and systems level, considering aspects of being a good citizen, and thinking about the role of the U.S. in the world. Walter described this program as, “a really crucial program … that’s a real big commitment on the part of the college too. That’s global citizenship in a most impressive way to me”.

For John, the Study Abroad Director, the South America program was an ideal model for his work. He connected the work of that program with broader aspects of justice and citizenship. As part of his vision he described the importance of students learning how to be in a particular place, and interacting with others in meaningful ways. He described his love of digital technology, yet he was troubled that it was robbing students of the opportunity to connect with others at deeper levels. He explained his concern that a shallower form of interaction between people undermines the prospects for establishing the practices of good citizenship, and that students no longer have time to develop these capacities because of their hectic schedule. Rosa noted that they
intentionally structure their study abroad program so that students have limited access to the internet and how this act alone has such profound meaning for students. There was an idea embedded here of the importance of being present and having time to deeply engage with others as critical elements for students in fostering citizenship.

**Research**

This group of faculty provided a mixed set of responses in terms of global citizenship and their research. As a group these faculty were less involved in research activities than the faculty in the other categories. Walter and Rachel both indicated that their research had been heavily oriented towards international issues. When asked whether global citizenship may have shaped her research Rachel stated, “Definitely. It’s shaped all my research, basically”. She mainly focused her work in the area of immigration, both internationally and the experience of immigrants coming to the U.S. Walter described “the lion’s share” of his academic work as been focused internationally. This has included taking sabbaticals overseas, speaking at conferences internationally, publishing books and articles focused on specific regions of the world, and translating books into English to give them broader access. For this group of faculty overall however, research seemed to occupy less of their interest in making connections to global citizenship.

**Support & obligations**

The faculty in this group did not feel an undue sense of obligation to pursue global citizenship as part of their work at Middlewood. They knew that the college
encouraged leading overseas trips, and all of them had the desire to travel. As with all the participants in this study, there was no obligation placed on them to lead a study abroad trip or travel overseas. The only variation on this was for Alex and Rachel as part of a modern language department that made the decision to include study abroad in the curriculum. This meant that they had a departmental expectation to travel, though they did not describe this as an obligation. Rachel added that when hiring faculty for the department they would consider whether the applicant was willing to do global work as one aspect of the hiring process.

The one area where some faculty indicated an obligation related to global or cross-cultural work was through an institutional policy document called the Diverse Perspectives (DP) document. Faculty in Category One (Confident) and Category Two (Skeptical) of the study referenced this document. Two of the five faculty in this first category mentioned this policy, and all three of the faculty in Category Two discussed it. Walter described details from the DP document which faculty approved around 15 years ago:

And one of the policies that was mandated by that document was that faculty should acquaint themselves with other cultures on a fairly regular basis. And so, we can check off a little box if we’ve gone to an international conference, or if we’ve taken students abroad, or if we’ve engaged in some kind of cross-cultural work ourselves.

The DP document was most often discussed as the annual faculty requirement to “check the box” that they had done some kind of DP-related activity. Walter described the problems with enforcing the DP policy and referenced the fact that some faculty “are very reluctant to participate” and that “some people are famously resistant to it”. He noted that the policy had little weight or consequence for the tenured faculty who chose
to ignore it. For faculty who were doing global work he reflected that sometimes they would forget to check the box, “but we’re doing it just as a natural part of our work”. Mary saw the DP document in a much more favorable light and felt that it established some helpful language for global citizenship at the institution. Her preference was that the DP document would go further, stating that the requirements to be able to check the box each year were set very low. She recalled an instance where she taught a local workshop that technically met the DP requirements, but this experience left her feeling uncomfortable: “We all check our box, but that [workshop] wasn’t enough, we barely started”.

Faculty participants in this study, across all categories, agreed most strongly with each other when affirming the institutional commitment to global education. Each faculty member in this group described feeling supported in their work in the area of global citizenship. This institutional support took many forms, but the opportunity to lead study abroad programs was most consistently cited. Faculty also referenced support from colleagues across departments, participating in reading groups, the opportunity to take sabbaticals overseas, assistance to pursue grants and scholarships for international work, and feeling a general sense that global issues were important to the school. Faculty were often very positive in their tone when describing the college’s commitment to global work and the support they felt personally in their work. The faculty members in this group did not describe any meaningful evaluation process for their global work, or that it was related to any part of the promotion and tenure process, other than perhaps being one factor in the section for describing service to the institution. Rachel and Walter had both received formal recognition for their global work through college awards.
Global citizenship at the institution

One of the crucial areas in this study was understanding the ways in which faculty understood global citizenship in the curriculum. This occurred at two levels, the departmental level and at the institutional level. The discussion about global citizenship and the curriculum centered on two main areas: (1) faculty thoughts on the existing ‘Cultural Learning’ (CL) requirement for students, and (2) the ways global citizenship education might be included across the curriculum broadly.

The CL requirement is built in to the Middlewood curriculum as a one-credit core requirement where students are expected to fulfill over 15 hours of engagement with a culture that is “significantly different” than one they are familiar with. The CL requirement can be fulfilled in a number of ways including through specific courses, domestic or international experiences, or independent study. In many ways, the CL requirement perhaps comes closest to the idea of global citizenship education within the current core curriculum, and it was under discussion for revision as part of the ongoing core curriculum review.

Alex’s discussion of the CL summarized well the faculty input from this group. She was part of the committee that initiated the CL and she reflected on her concerns at the time and how those concerns have been realized over time. She affirmed the goals of the CL policy as “fabulous” and the other faculty in this group agreed that the CL is designed to meet a real need within the curriculum. Each participant believed that students should be encouraged to participate in meaningful cross-cultural experiences while at the college. There was also agreement that the current CL model was not
working effectively. Many students were described as not wanting to participate in CL, often waiting until their final year to fulfill the requirement. Walter described it as follows:

    I think it [CL] hasn’t happened very well for quite a few students because for some of them they wait until their senior year, they’re dragged into a course in cross-cultural communication, or something like that, and they’re resistant to it.

Rachel and Alex described the challenge of having students in class who did not want to be there and enrolled “just to get the credit done, and not really have their heart in it.”

Knowing how best to restructure the CL was described as a difficult logistical question, and one that uncovered a deeper discussion about global citizenship and the curriculum. Alex asked some important questions in relation to the CL. First, should the CL be required for every student or just for students in certain programs? Second, is it better to have the requirement applied “badly for everyone” or should “we just try to do it well with a certain part of the population”? Third, does the intention of the CL actually backfire in reality when it is “glued on” for students who approach the requirement with a “chip on their shoulder”?

The faculty opinions about CL, and global citizenship in the curriculum more broadly, were framed up in the interviews by a sense of the larger ongoing discussion about the core curriculum revision. Middlewood has been debating the revisions to their curriculum for some time, led by the Reforms Committee (RC) whose task is to listen to the various voices on campus and propose a new structure. Some faculty chose to talk
more specifically about the CL itself, whereas others used the CL question as a way to discuss changes to the core curriculum more broadly.

Walter, Alex, and Rachel spoke most extensively about the broader core curriculum. Both Alex and Rachel made a strong connection between learning a foreign language and global citizenship. For them learning a language was both a means to truly understand others in a different culture, but also represented a deeper sense of global citizenship as equal relationship with others. They wondered how global citizenship could occur if English was the only language being used. Rachel described this as “the imperialism of English” and providing a “negative advantage” for English speakers. Alex stated, “if you want to be a global citizen then of course you’ll want to learn a language”.

The ongoing discussions about revising the core curriculum include proposals to reduce the number of language classes within the core. For Rachel and Alex in particular this is very concerning. Rachel added, “Here we’re saying we’re a college that emphasizes global citizenship, but let everybody else learn English, and that defeats the purpose of global education”. Walter also lamented the proposal to reduce the language requirement as he views modern language instruction as “a big part of this global awareness, global citizenship thing”. Faculty talked about how the changes to the core curriculum, including the place of language, were part of a larger narrative within higher education.

The faculty in this group talked about the overall direction and identity of the college as a whole as they discussed the core curriculum. Walter, Alex, and Rachel all referenced the broader national conversation about the importance and value of a liberal arts education influencing the institution. Two main pressures were cited as influencing the discussion about the curriculum and global citizenship education. First, the broader
push for more professional degree programs, especially STEM programs, was putting pressure on the institution. Walter stated:

the college is under enormous pressure, I think, to whittle down the non-essential aspects of the education, which is to say, those parts of the education, that don’t have a real obvious, professional, vocational cash-out. STEM, science, technology, engineering, math, and if you’re in that you’re golden, and if you’re not in that you have to justify your very existence. And I think it’s very shortsighted. I think the college is under enormous pressure to knuckle under to that national sort of drift of things, but I think in the long run it’s very short sighted because a person who does not understand themselves as a citizen of the world is a person who has a very, frankly, narrowed perspective on life, and that’s unfortunate. And what should college be but to awaken people up to the possibilities of life in this world.

Alex referred to it this way:

The core curriculum is in flux right now, but it’s the professional programs, it’s the liberal arts, it’s a broader question I think nationally.

Second, the pressure of enrollment or competition with other schools was referenced as a driver of change for the institution. Faculty related this concern directly to the core curriculum revision process which, they indicated, needed to address the size of the core curriculum as a whole. As the core curriculum discussions continued there was a shared belief that certain cuts would need to be made to the curriculum. The cuts being proposed included rethinking the CL requirement: should it be a standalone one-credit course, or should it be embedded across the curriculum? In addition, Walter, Alex, and Rachel all indicated that courses in their department were under consideration. This broader discussion also revealed the tensions involved in considering the future direction
of the institution, institutional priorities and identity, and potential challenges to global citizenship education.

As this group of faculty considered questions at the institutional level they affirmed the historical commitment of the college towards global learning, and engagement in the world. Some participants saw this commitment as rooted in the school being founded by immigrants to the U.S., perhaps making it “more open to understand issues of global understanding”, and a theological foundation that emphasized a global perspective. In the opinion of the faculty in this group, they saw that this global commitment remained strong, yet in the midst of change this ongoing level of commitment was less certain to predict. This uncertainty is perhaps epitomized by the discussion over language programs and the CL.

Walter stated, “I see two dynamics going on at Middlewood right now, to be honest with you. There’s a lot of rhetorical support given to international or global citizenship, but we’ve lost some key people”. He was further concerned by the influence of “vocationalism”, which he described as getting worse in the wake of the financial crash of 2008-09, creating a “fearfulness about the future”, and inhibiting students from making choices that might broaden their perspectives. In articulating his vision for a college education he stated, “This is your chance to really furnish your mind with the tools and the competencies that will allow you to live well in the world. Don’t just prepare yourself to live in a cubicle.”

The faculty in this group expressed their hope for a continued strong institutional commitment to global citizenship, especially the language programs and study abroad programs, yet they remained uncertain over where things would develop in the future.
Mary added that faculty needed to attend the ongoing curriculum meetings to make the case for global citizenship.

Alex specifically addressed the challenge of global citizenship and the curriculum. “I will integrate global citizenship with my teaching, but that’s because of my discipline”, however, she was skeptical about how much faculty across the college should be expected to include global citizenship in their classes; “We have so many things across … ‘X’ across the curriculum. Rhetoric across the curriculum, cross-cultural engagement across the curriculum, anti-racism across the curriculum. Yes, but at what point …? We can’t keep gluing everything on.”

In contrast Rosa stated her hope that every class contain global citizenship education, though she realized this was not realistic. If not in every class, she did add that global citizenship should be available to every student in their degree program.

Have math professors think about what it means to be a global citizen, and talk to their students about it. I think that would be great. You know you ought to be able to make those connections, or we don’t really believe that it’s global citizenship, it’s just global something for a few people.

Again, a tension was evident in considering whether global citizenship is just for a few programs, where it might fit best in the curriculum, or if it should be included for all students. Mary talked about the importance of thinking through this carefully:

So those are some of the conversations that are happening right now. If we’re saying this is core, what do you want a Middlewood College student to look like when they graduate? This [global citizenship] better be a part of it. I guess I’m hopeful that it will be, but I guess I don’t totally know.

Mary also wanted to see the college better address the issue of dealing with local and on-campus citizenship. In particular, she expressed frustration that more was not
being done for international students on campus. She described how her department was a welcoming place for international students:

So we spend a lot of time cultivating those relationships. Listening, supporting, advocating for those students, and it is true that institutionally that’s not recognized at all. I mean you don’t get closer to tenure because you’re a really great support to a bunch of international students. But yet they come here and that is a big part of our job, and we want it to be, and that’s part of how we see our role of being on campus.

Later she added that personally she was not able to pursue a research agenda and continue this level of support for international students. For her, the idea of hospitality was a core part of global citizenship, especially making international students welcome on campus. This added another dimension to the discussions over the future direction of the school and global citizenship, especially as increased numbers of international students are admitted to the school. Mary suggested that the college look again at the language of the DP document and make an institutional commitment to live up to the commitment already articulated by the school; “I think this is really important. We already say this is what we’re doing, this is what we’re going to do. It’s in our strategic document, in this [DP] document. Let’s do what we say we’re going to do”.

As a group, these faculty participants believed in the importance of global citizenship and finding ways to include global citizenship education in their classes, in their departments, and at the institution as a whole. When asked if they would call themselves a ‘global citizen’ they all indicted that they would. One interesting aspect of how they identified themselves as global citizen was their use of the word “hope”. While identifying with the label of global citizen they also sought to qualify that they felt they had not yet arrived at the goal of being a complete global citizen. Rachel summarized this
feeling as, “there’s always more and more to learn. So I think it’s a lifelong process that can never be truly 100%”. Others described themselves as “trying” to be a global citizen and not doing it “perfectly”.

This was also true for John in the Study Abroad office who talked about not having it “all figured out” but that he hoped he was thinking that way, that is, as a global citizen. His response was an interesting aspect of this study because he was often referred to by the faculty participants as an example of a global citizen, yet he himself displayed many of the same hesitancies with achieving the status of a global citizen as the faculty in this first Confident group. The aspiration of being a global citizen, and global citizenship more broadly, was evident in how these faculty discussed their understanding and hopes, both personally and for the college as a whole.
CHAPTER FIVE

The Skeptics: Global citizenship is enticing yet elusive

The second category of faculty participants in this study represent an understanding of global citizenship that is marked by a more skeptical stance than those in the first category. There is not however, in this group, an outright rejection of the concept. Instead, these faculty have often thought deeply about the term, have not rejected it, yet hold conflicted views on what it means. This group was made up of Matthew, Susan, and Brian, “The Skeptics”. They embody many tensions contained in the literature on making meaning of the term global citizenship, and the ways in which global citizenship relates to citizenship more broadly. Unlike the first group, they were much more concerned with the process of defining global citizenship, and spent considerable time thinking about ideas of citizenship. This group also introduced thinking influenced by critical theory and they discussed the role of transnational organizations. This led to conversation exploring the affect of globalization in much more depth than the faculty in the Confident category, particularly the negative ways in which globalization can influence cultures and individuals.

Defining global citizenship

The Skeptics wrestled with how to define the term global citizenship, similar to the faculty member in Category Three, yet in contrast to those in Category One. For Matthew and Brian, defining global citizenship from the offset involved broader considerations shaped by their academic discipline. Matthew immediately pointed to the
tension within his discipline, social work, of thinking about the profession in universal terms, on the one hand, and as “always the indigenous, localized practice of helping”, on the other hand. Some within social work talk about a universal framework for their work, including concepts such as global citizenship. He reflected:

I think that’s where I started wading into that literature, was thinking about this, you call it almost modern versus postmodern, indigenous versus universal framework of social work as the profession. So global citizenship for social work is very much about that set of questions.

In thinking about global citizenship he stated his indecision in knowing exactly how he should conceptualize the concept:

Is that a real thing to be a global citizen, or is that a … some people will call it all sorts of nasty words, but is that real, is that a real thing, or is that stretching way beyond what we’re capable of, and maybe even distracting us from doing the work of say, being a good social worker? I haven’t really made up my mind on that yet – I remain really interested in it, but I haven’t made up my mind on whether I think it’s possible to sort of imagine oneself as a global citizen.

Matthew’s challenge with global citizenship is rooted in some of the seminal literature in his discipline, especially work that challenged the cosmopolitanism idea of having no national boundaries, arguing instead for international social work based upon “a healthy understanding of a national identity.” On the other hand, he indicated his commitment to human rights “and that speaks to a certain level of global citizenship”. Along with an emphasis on human rights Matthew also reiterated the concept of interdependence throughout his responses. Interdependence was crucial in helping him think about the importance of how the lives of people around the world are connected, especially in light of globalization. On a more personal level he indicated his concern over the disproportionately negative impacts of the global economy for vulnerable
populations around the world. He stated that he is in favor of global citizenship if it can be defined in some way that recognizes the importance of addressing human rights, and our interdependence, on a global scale.

Matthew also discussed views of global citizenship he perceives as negative and “not what I want at all”. This alternate view of global citizenship presents a global citizen as someone who is a “wealthy globetrotter”, a view he finds students articulate when they imagine a global citizen. He further expressed concern that:

Global citizenship is this creeping Americanism, Westernization, where eventually what it means to be a global citizen will be functionally what it is to be American, culturally what it means to be American. We’ll all drink Coke, we’ll dress the same way, listen to the same music, and again, as a social worker, we’re deeply concerned about the ways that sort of levels indigenous culture, or could.

Later in the interview Matthew clarified some of his concerns with defining global citizenship by stating that it is the “citizenship” part of the term that gives him pause. In thinking about the college and trying to define global citizenship he adds:

For me it’s really defining what you mean by citizenship. What do we want students to be doing then? Maybe that’s me being too focused on operationalizing it. What would it look like for our graduates to be global citizens? I don’t know. I don’t know yet, and I think that would be a very contentious debate. I would talk about wanting to understand interconnections and social justice, and human rights. I’m sure my colleague in language would talk about everyone needing to have a basic understanding of another language. It could be pretty contentious. I think it will be pretty contentious to sort of define across an entire college what we mean when we say global citizenship, or what we want that to look like. I think it’s an ephemeral concept right now. Everybody likes it, it sounds great, but what does it mean?

Susan also discussed issues with defining global citizenship related to concerns over the influence of globalization and inequality. She immediately separated the two
words “global” and “citizenship” to highlight the ways in which they present conflicting ideas for her. First, her understanding of “global” is of a term that “is fraught, deeply”, with the concepts of inequality and dominance of one group over another immediately coming to mind. She described a “very strong” tension in her thinking about global citizenship as she sought to reconcile her thoughts on “global” with her concept of “citizenship” which, to her, is about egalitarianism, where people have the right to be and to have their say:

So when we talk about global citizenship there’s an assumption there about the world as one entity with porous borders. When we’re looking at globalization, so the outcome of globalization would be a global citizenship, when we’re looking at the activity of globalization.

This idea of global citizenship does not hold true for her as she considered her many years of work in West Africa:

If I’m in West Africa and I talk to my colleagues about global citizenship they’re going to just laugh. They’ll say we don’t have a global citizenship because they can’t leave the country, they have very little control over their own economy, they don’t even have control over their own politics. So, you know, you’re going to have to define that. I think it’s the rich who get to say “global citizenship”.

Like Matthew, Susan presented different versions of global citizenship as she was being interviewed. From the more negative viewpoint described above, she moved to consider two other ways of considering global citizenship for Middlewood specifically, and what it might mean for students to be a global citizen. The first of these was seeing yourself “as a citizen of the world, and in egalitarian relationship with all other citizens of the world.” To her, this more cosmopolitan idea of global citizenship did not seem accurate. Her next concept of global citizenship was more constructive, “I think at
Middlewood when we say global citizens we mean we should be serving the world, we should be serving each other”. In elaborating on this view she emphasized the importance of being part of a community, awareness of others and “an awareness of self as constructed by race, class, economic class, and that awareness leading to a kind of humility.” Throughout her interview Susan moved between the idea that global citizenship could describe this type of awareness and community, a more affirming posture, and a more skeptical understanding of global citizenship as emphasizing inequality linked to global systems.

Like Susan, Brian also separated the words “global” and “citizenship” to talk about his understanding of the term. Like Susan and Matthew, he offered different, sometimes competing, versions of global citizenship throughout his interview. His understanding of citizenship more generally is framed by three main features which are important as he thinks about global citizenship. First, citizenship is about motivations and why people are “active in public life”. Second, citizenship has to do with certain capacities, knowledge and skills. Third, citizenship includes dispositions such as tolerance and trust. He summarized, “So global citizenship for me, in my kind of sympathetic interpretation, charitable interpretation, would be that the broader my horizon, the more likely I am to have all these elements of good citizenship.”

The other understanding of global citizenship Brian presented was more skeptical. This skepticism stems from his perspective that global citizenship can encourage people to think about citizenship in ways that are disconnected from how citizenship is typically understood and shaped:

Sometimes when people think and talk about global citizenship as a kind of cosmopolitanism, I think they lose sight of the fact that
citizenship is a rootedness for most people on the planet. That it has its seedbed in the local. And so that’s why I get skeptical about language of global citizenship which sometimes can take on a character of losing connection to where people actually live and breathe.

Other participants in this study echoed Brian’s concern over the nature of where citizenship is located and oriented as they deliberated over the ways in which global citizenship might relate to local citizenship. Brian indicated his worry that global citizenship is a kind of “rootless cosmopolitanism” which encourages people to never feel committed to one place and participate in public life in that local context. He added that global citizenship should not be about accumulating experiences in various places around the world. However, he was able to articulate a possible way to mediate his different understandings of global citizenship:

So if I think about global citizenship in those terms, I’m a citizen from a particular place, but I experience other ideas and people from across the globe, which help me to deepen what it means for me to be a citizen back in that place, or wherever I am, that’s where I think the highest aspirations of global, the concept of global citizenship, is.

When talking later in the interview about the curriculum, Brian added another positive side to global citizenship where students are exposed “to cultures and ideas across the globe”. In another place in the interview, he was careful to state that being a global citizen is not about “knowledge and a set of skills that make them [students] very competitive in the global marketplace… that allows them to move easily as a salesperson, a supplies management person, somebody working in international business, or international law”. This group of faculty presented tensions in thinking about the definition of global citizenship and introduced deeper levels of reflection on globalization and citizenship to this study.
Student Learning Outcomes

The faculty in this Skeptical category talked about students learning several outcomes in relation to global citizenship. They described the importance of students learning “cultural humility” which Matthew described as:

There was cultural competence, cultural intelligence, now people talk about cultural humility, I think that strikes me as right. You sort of engage with the Other out of a sense of humility about what you don’t know rather than a sense of competence about what you do know.

For Susan, this humility comes from an awareness of others, their needs and systemic issues of justice, and should lead to service. Matthew also wanted students to learn about the importance of justice, human rights, and the broader influence of globalization. He returned to the importance of global citizens understanding their place in the world, “a sense of interconnection and interdependence”, which he saw as especially important for people with a Christian worldview emphasis on the worth of all people. Crucially, he did not want to portray global citizens as having a sense of responsibility towards others. This, he said, can become “crippling” for students:

That’s something I’ve talked a lot about with my global social work classes too … global citizenship can become sort of oppressive to people, the idea that then I must care about every corner of the globe.

Instead Matthew highlighted the importance of global citizens knowing local connections to global issues, such as immigration. Viewed in this way he described the characteristics of global citizenship in very similar ways to Brian when he was explaining his concern about global citizenship being a “rootless cosmopolitanism.”
Brian discussed desirable learning outcomes related to good citizenship, that students would become motivated to act in public life and value citizenship. He included developing civic skills as an outcome, focused on knowledge of the system and the skills to engage it. For all three participants in this group there was a sense in which students should learn about relating to others, but also understand how this fits within larger social and global systems.

**Characteristics of a global citizen**

In describing the characteristics of a global citizen this group highlighted their preferred ideals in contrast to other concepts of being a global citizen. In doing so they acknowledged that there is more than one way global citizenship has generally been understood in practice. For example, Matthew described the hallmarks of citizenship as “to be involved, to know, to care” and that citizens “participate, they improve, they seek to understand”. He admitted that knowing exactly how this might happen at the global level was difficult. He presented a global citizen in contrast to a “global consumer”, that is someone who consumes cross-cultural experiences for personal enrichment, but with no sense of obligation towards others.

Susan also emphasized the importance of a global citizen being in community with others where “they need to participate for mutual benefit” through service. Brian contrasted one form of being a global citizen, a world traveller in the global marketplace, with his preferred ideal of “a good global citizen … that student would be someone that could engage people across lines of difference wherever they are.” Brian used the phrase “across lines of difference” several times, and this was an important idea in his
understanding of global citizenship and what constitutes a global citizen. He expanded on this by explaining that global citizens should be able to, “have an interaction with somebody they disagree with, or somebody that is profoundly different than they are, and they know how to negotiate that without their head exploding”.

As with the other participants in this study, faculty in this group were asked to describe their background and what they felt might have contributed to their understanding of global citizenship.

**Personal Background**

Susan and Brian both spoke about their exposure to different cultures growing up as an influence on how they understood global citizenship. Susan referenced having family in Europe and travelling “quite a lot” when she was younger, “so when you’re asking about global citizenship, I think that does play a role”. A number of years later she moved to West Africa where she lived for four years in a small village doing community projects, a “sort of a Peace Corps job”. During the time period when she was doing her doctoral studies she hoped to conduct research in West Africa, but war had broken out and her plans changed. However, she remembers resolving at that time to being committed to research in the region, which she continues to do at the current time.

Brian also referenced the importance of his upbringing and his mother being an immigrant to the U.S. “I was accustomed to realizing that people were from very different places around the globe.” He recalled being raised in a community with many Latino farm workers and how he often stood out as a White man. “That had a very large impact too, on the way I understood both diversity and citizenship”. His own experience
with travelling overseas did not begin until his career as a professor provided him with opportunities to visit other countries.

Matthew also did not travel much growing up, but right after graduating from Middlewood he moved to Africa for nine months with an internship program. His motivation was based on wanting to explore the world and a “stage of life” opportunity. He described this experience as “jarring” and yet it “opened up a lot of different things”. He recalled one particular account from his time in Africa where he decided to visit a region with oil refineries, spurred by his interest in human rights. He vividly remembers that the experience “affected me quite a bit” because he made a connection between his individual actions and how they may affect other people in different parts of the world:

That’s when I was really starting to struggle with, ok, every time I’ve stopped at a [particular] gas station, that’s impacted this specific piece of land, these specific people. That was maybe my first sense that you could sort of think at that level, whether you call that global citizenship or not.

This formative experience in his early-twenties “convinced” him that he needed to think differently, making him consider his actions as an American in the world. As with participants in the first category, these faculty referenced personal travel and early life experiences having an influence in shaping their understanding of global citizenship.

Educational Background

The faculty participants in this group were all very engaged in global work at this stage of their careers. For Matthew and Susan in particular this global focus was evident in their educational background. With Brian, his work experience was more influential in shaping his understanding of global citizenship, especially in his work at another
institution prior to coming to Middlewood. In contrast to the faculty in the Confident category, this Skeptical group of faculty described their education and career as more influential than their personal background in shaping their understanding of global citizenship.

Matthew and Susan both described their doctoral studies having a strong global dimension. For Susan this was directly related to her experience right after college in West Africa which shaped her desire to research literacy. Matthew’s doctoral work has a global focus including why colleges might be interested in pursuing global citizenship efforts across international partnerships.

Brian’s educational background focused in political science, especially studying the relationship between religion and politics. His interest in citizenship emerged during his studies, and later included global citizenship. Currently, he is focused on comparative studies and less on American politics. Prior to coming to Middlewood he taught at a public university where the curriculum was revised to include a more international focus. He did some work on this internationalization process, and also participated in a faculty exchange program that allowed him to spend some time teaching in Europe. He was also part of working on global issues at the Honors College at his previous school. This educational experience “had an influence on how I view citizenship, and by extension, global citizenship.”

**Overall influences on global citizenship understanding**

Faculty were asked a more general question about the main influences on their understanding of global citizenship, and how their understanding of the term may have
changed over their career. Susan and Brian talked about the importance of their academic work as shaping their understanding. Susan stressed that travelling overseas had not, in itself been a major influence, but that travel made it possible for her to learn. She cited her work with colleagues in West Africa and “just the injustice of the difference” between their lives as academics, with limited resources and opportunities, and her career in the U.S. where opportunities and resources are available in abundance.

Brian also talked about the importance of his academic work in shaping his views of global citizenship, especially discussions within political theory between those who emphasized the individual, and the response from others who focused on the importance of community and civil society. This led him to think about the ways in which citizenship is understood, not just “as a legal status, but as a cultural identity.” His work has continued to focus on the ways cultural identities are shaped, and how competing cultural identities can be reconciled.

Matthew’s response was different as he stressed two main influences. First, he described his Christian faith as a basis for his understanding of how systems in the world are broken. Second, his work at Middlewood with leading trips to Africa has shaped his understanding of human rights and the ways in which the U.S. has been involved in international affairs.

When asked about the development of their thinking on global citizenship Matthew and Susan gave similar and perhaps surprising answers. They both indicated their growing sense of suspicion, negativity, and feeling less hopeful than earlier in their careers. In both cases the sheer complexity of global issues, and especially global systems, have resulted in them reframing their views and expectations. Susan lamented
the influence of large transnational organizations and their policies keeping people 
trapped in unequal systems. For her, the importance of relationships, not simply 
professional or collegial relationships across cultures, but developing true, deep 
friendships with others has risen in importance for her work; “I mean honest human 
relationships. Those matter a lot and I think those have more capacity for change than 
most other activities”.

Matthew spoke about his more recent emphasis in trying to understand citizenship 
at all levels.

As I’ve gone further I’ve put a lot more emphasis on just understanding, 
because it just gets so complicated at the global level. It’s complicated to 
just understand what it means to be a local citizen. The politics, the culture. 
It’s just so overwhelming at the global level that I’ve dialed back to let’s 
just understand what’s going on and how it relates, and start there with 
that sort of sense of humility and finitude.

It was surprising to hear both participants speak so openly about their feelings 
tracking in a negative direction over their career, especially given their deep investment 
in global work. On the other hand this perspective is perhaps less surprising upon deeper 
reflection. Both of these faculty members were the most open in citing critical theory as 
influential in shaping their thinking. Susan cited Paulo Freire multiple times as a main 
influence. Matthew also referenced Freire’s work, along with Augusto Boal, Jürgen 
Habermas, and Theodore Adorno. In both cases they had used these authors as a way to 
think about social dynamics and structures, power, and inequality. This was a point of 
distinction with the other participants who did not reference critical theory as an 
influence, even when thinking about issues of justice and inequality. Given a more
critical stance, perhaps it is not so surprising that they both felt less hopeful as they continue to recognize patterns of systemic inequality and injustice in the world.

**Local connection to global citizenship**

This group of faculty emphasized the importance of local citizenship and strong connections between local and global. Matthew and Brian argued for an essential link between local citizenship and global citizenship. Some of their deepest concerns with the concept of global citizenship related to the idea that it would pull people away from a sense of participating in local contexts. Matthew summed this up by stating, “global citizenship for me should always tie in to your local citizenship” while Brian reflected, “I worry about when we talk about global citizenship, that that student of the world will never feel like he or she is invested in a place”.

Brian referred to the idea of being “rooted” in a particular place multiple times and this principle was essential to his thinking about global citizenship as a concept more generally. For both Matthew and Brian, global citizenship without some sense of local citizenship was not a viable concept. Susan applied the connection of the local and global in thinking about her teaching. She described her approach to teaching a local classroom of children from a Hispanic migrant community; “every child in that classroom is a citizen of that classroom. So that’s the global citizenship, everyone is acknowledged, everybody has a voice. Everyone has their stories”.

By teaching in this way, fostering an atmosphere that respects everyone’s voice, she emphasizes the broader concept of equality that global citizenship might espouse, yet within the very localized context of a classroom.
Department, scholars, & colleagues

The faculty participants in this group were asked about the importance of their academic department, colleagues, and scholars in their thinking on global citizenship. As mentioned earlier, Matthew and Susan were influenced by critical theory and writers in that vein. In addition, scholars in their disciplines provided more of a global emphasis on their thinking as they included textbooks for classes, or as they reflected on their own work. For Brian, the influence of scholars was more related to broader concepts of citizenship, or social capital, rather than global citizenship specifically.

As with the first group, this second group of faculty were not especially influenced by scholars writing in the area of global citizenship or global citizenship education. Two examples did emerge as brief references in the interviews. Brian talked about Martha Nussbaum’s work, however, he did so only to acknowledge the views of a former colleague, who tended to agree with Nussbaum’s views on cosmopolitanism, or as part of a wider discussion of citizenship. He therefore acknowledged Nussbaum’s work in this area, but did not indicate that he agreed with her views as such. The closest anyone from this group came to referencing a global citizenship scholar in education was when Matthew referenced Jane Knight’s work on internationalization:

So, you read Jane Knight? I’ve read some of her stuff, but yeah, that sort of stuff where you’re like, is this really being driven with the best interests of the discipline in mind, with the best interests of higher education in mind, or is it sort of part of neoliberal market forces that are pushing people?

The participants in this group discussed the role of their academic department in shaping their understanding of global citizenship. Between the responses, there was an
range in describing how the department discussions and priorities shaped their thinking in this area. Matthew, for example, spoke about his department as deliberately working to include more global citizenship into their curriculum. This was influenced by his own desire to see a globally-focused class added to the major, by other faculty who are involved in global work, and by updated accreditation standards requiring a move towards global citizenship education within their discipline. Overall, Matthew stated that he was much more confident about his departmental, rather than the institutional, understanding of global citizenship. The addition of a global issues class and the support of departmental colleagues were meaningful to his work.

Susan also referenced the importance of her subject area, education, and the professional standards that needed to be addressed in the curriculum. For her department the focus was much more heavily on multi-cultural education within the U.S. rather than global citizenship. She indicated that her departmental colleagues were supportive of her global work, but she did not describe the same level of support as Matthew indicated in his experience.

One telling additional comment from Matthew was his stated desire to have direct contact with the political science department as a way for him to make more meaning of global citizenship:

I wish my perspectives on global citizenship were shaped more by colleagues in political science because I sort of acutely feel my own limitation, of understanding of that. Even some of the nuances which maybe you’ve gotten into of some of these free trade documents that get into higher education, and really being under … GATT, you know, General Agreed Trade Tariffs, and really being able to understand that. Like I can read through it, I can read some commentary on it, but I’m sure my colleagues would be able to deepen that for me.
This is a fascinating insight into Matthew’s thinking as he expresses some of his own limitations, yet desire, to learn more about the complexity of this topic. In another sense this is ironic as Brian described the feeling in the political science department towards global citizenship:

Despite the fact that we have a robust international relations program here, and nearly everybody teaches in it in some ways or another, I wouldn’t say that we talked about global citizenship as a concept. And I suspect that’s because there’s a fair bit of skepticism about the concept within the department. I can’t speak for everybody. Either a skepticism or a lack of interest in the concept.

Brian did not describe the influence of colleagues in his department as such, but in the comments above he makes clear that his colleagues share his skepticism towards global citizenship. Given his own interest in citizenship it is possible that he may be the most sympathetic in his department towards global citizenship as he continues to wrestle with its meaning. For Matthew and Brian the academic department played some role in shaping their understanding of global citizenship, though in perhaps opposite directions. For Susan it seemed to play little or no role. Of all the faculty participants in the study only Matthew and Susan referenced the external influence of accreditation standards or professional learning expectations. One the one hand (social work) this caused global citizenship to be promoted and included more deliberately in the curriculum, while on the other (K-12 education) accreditation standards diminished the importance of global citizenship education.
Perspectives on Teaching and Study Abroad

In contrast to the first group of faculty participants, this group of faculty had much less experience with study abroad programs, and discussed study abroad much less frequently. In this group only Matthew referenced leading study abroad trips at Middlewood, having led three trips to Africa, “where we do talk quite a bit about what we mean when we say global citizenship”. Brian outlined some of the benefits of study abroad included exposure “across lines of difference”, a key phrase for him, and as a way to develop some positive aspects of citizenship such as “levels of tolerance, levels of interpersonal trust”.

Both Brian and Matthew talked about the potential negative effects of study abroad. First, Brian discussed the cost of study abroad:

I do sometimes worry that the experience of an international curriculum is class-based. What I mean by that is that it’s very hard for some students to travel abroad, or to have other kinds of experiences. To the extent that we want to celebrate global citizenship as an educational objective, that can be costly. So, is that one of the problems here? I didn’t travel abroad because I couldn’t afford to back in the day.

In addition, Matthew referenced his concern about taking students on overseas trips where they consume experiences; “I think it’s possible, totally agree, that some of the experiences that I’m putting out for students can just be consumed and nothing more, and I’ve seen that happen and it’s sad”.

As a group, these faculty participants placed less emphasis on the benefits of study abroad than the faculty in the Confident category, and instead talked more about the potential challenges. Susan stated that leading study abroad was too challenging for
her given the region she works in overseas. This group did provide more of a shared perspective in their approach to teaching in the classroom.

As with the first group of faculty, this group placed a strong emphasis on presenting students with a diversity of perspectives in the classroom. Despite this shared emphasis they talked about this approach in slightly different ways. Brian described his approach as “comparative” and he sought to provide students with international perspectives. Likewise, Matthew referenced his own approach as teaching students “concepts broader than the United States”. He also stressed the importance of teaching students “the chain of connection” to help students see how the global and the local are connected. This points back to his focus on “interdependence” as a core theme of global citizenship. He used the example of immigration where he felt it was important for students to know about domestic policy and immigration locally, yet also know why people were leaving their home countries to come to the U.S.

Susan also wanted students to have a sense of different perspectives from around the world, including international literature, for example. She emphasized her desire for students to understand socio-cultural issues of “ethnicity, race, language” and to see themselves as “socially-culturally constructed.” She added that she frequently points students to online resources, but with limited success. Referencing a recent class assignment she noted: “it’s amazing how hard it is for people [students] to find their way around the internet. These are people who should be way better than me, but they’re not”. She continued by saying that students view the internet as a communication tool rather than a way to gather information or satisfy their curiosity for learning. When asked why this might be the case, she replied that it was educators who were largely to blame in not
training students to view the technology in this way. She continued with her class assignment example:

Just a couple of days ago I said, “how many of you went past the first Google page?” Not one. So we were trying to find out what aid agencies were working in case study countries and what they were doing there. “Can’t find anything”. I said, “Did you go to the second page? Wait a minute, who’s gone past the first page?” Nobody. So, yeah that means I haven’t paid good enough attention to what I need to do to help students go further and use this magic tool for joining us all into global citizenship.

In general, for this group of faculty, introducing students to a range of diverse readings, using videos, and providing contrasting comparative voices were most important.

Research

This group of faculty were most heavily involved in international research. Matthew’s doctoral research focused on international partnerships between universities. For both Brian and Susan their research was often the area where their thinking on global citizenship was most strongly developed. Brian referenced the fact that his interests had developed, over the course of his career, away from a U.S.-centered approach to a more comparative approach. This was evident in his teaching, but even more developed in his research. In particular he referenced his work in understanding citizenship globally:

I might be talking about the experience of citizenship on a global scale, that now helps me inform the way I talk about what a citizen is, right. I tend to think of it more, not as global citizenship, but as comparative citizenship. So how do we compare different models and what do we learn from the comparison?
In Susan’s case, her research has provided many opportunities to work overseas, especially in West Africa, and with colleagues from overseas. It was these partnerships more than anything else that seemed to provide an understanding of global citizenship for her. In particular, she referenced her work on Unicef and DiFD projects where she described the importance of truly listening to local interests and perspectives. In this way, she advocated for local voices to be included in the implementation of projects and this, to her, was an important example of global citizenship. She placed great emphasis in her research on partnering with local educators, and making sure that they were empowered to say yes or no to aspects of the project based on their local knowledge. Of all the participants in this study, Susan perhaps most fully identified her research as an example of global citizenship over other aspects of her work.

Support and Obligations

The three faculty in this group acknowledged the support they felt from Middlewood for global work. In this regard their views mirrored those of the first group. Susan’s comments were particularly noteworthy:

I’m not so very fast at praise, but I have to say I have experienced so much support here at Middlewood … So I experience Middlewood as a place that really supports and endorses efforts to participate in global needs, and is proud to be of service to that.

She shared a recent example where she received course relief from the college so that she could have more time to dedicate to global work last fall semester.

Matthew also affirmed Middlewood as a place that valued global learning. He mentioned multiple times how pleased he was that the school had approved a new global
class within his department, stating “they didn’t have to do that” but that he had mentioned it as a personal interest when he interviewed for his role. He also referred to the support he had received to lead study abroad trips. Regarding the school atmosphere in general he stated:

I think Middlewood talks a lot about our proud history of lots of off-campus programs, but it’s not sort of a mandate in any way, it’s just sort of a part of who we are, and what we tend to be good at, and that’s great, we should do that.

Brian also saw Middlewood as a supportive environment adding, “Anybody on campus who wants to do some global work, they can find a way.” He described how he personally had many opportunities to travel and incentives for international work.

All three participants referenced the Diverse Perspectives (DP) reporting requirements as their only institutional obligation for global or cross-cultural work. Matthew saw the DP document as important for the development of global citizenship at Middlewood:

[DP] talks a lot about multicultural citizenship, which was sort of one of the precursors here, but I think that the current focus on global citizenship is in part because of that document talking about multicultural citizenship, and they’re just sort of swapping those terms.

Brian talked about DP as the main way in which faculty were encouraged to formally acknowledge their international work, though he noted that DP, “may have nothing to do with travel abroad or anything along those lines.” Like others in the study, he described the category of what constituted “DP-related activity” to be very broad.
Susan’s input on DP was unique for this study. Though she was perhaps the most engaged in global research, which she saw an important example of global citizenship, she stated:

Whenever I fill out my work, we’re supposed to indicate whether this is cross-cultural work or not, and I never check it [the DP requirement box]. It’s sort of like a secret principle.

Her unease with the DP requirement reflects her broader awareness of her identity as a teacher and a researcher and how she interacts with people both locally and globally. She referred to constantly monitoring her own positionality and power in the classroom, for example, and how, for her, she finds local ways to engage in cross-cultural engagement, not just when she is in Africa. By not checking the box she wished to oppose the premise inherent within the DP of cross-cultural work only happening overseas.

Brian stated that he was not sure about institutional recognition for global work, “I don’t recall if on campus there’s any kind of awards or honors or so forth for doing especially good global work.” Susan referenced that her work was acknowledged when people from her department wanted to see presentations on her international work, and that Middlewood acknowledged when she had received large grants for her research overseas. Though she generally affirmed Middlewood’s support, she did mention that her particular research agenda and projects meant that she often needed to get the perspectives of others outside of the institution. There was a sense in which the school supported her work by giving her flexibility to pursue her research, but that she gained a greater source of support and encouragement from other research partners overseas. The
only other obligation Susan referenced was a personal sense she felt, as an academic, to be busy with research questions.

**Global citizenship at the institution**

The faculty in this group were asked about the Cultural Learning (CL) requirement for the core curriculum. As with the first category of Confident faculty, issues emerged in how the current system operates. Susan admitted that she is not very involved in thinking about CL, but both Brian and Matthew talked in detail about the issues involved with it. Matthew stated that he is on the CL committee and is part of the process to propose new models or ideas for it moving forward. He described the ways in which the focus of the CL may change; “one of my concerns is that, so they were considering replacing a core requirement that really looked at cross-cultural learning with cross-disciplinary touches on global citizenship”. This caused him concern that students would graduate without a real understanding of national citizenship within the U.S. He challenged the underlying assumptions of the CL in its current form as assuming that:

> Engagement across cultures was a universal good, and would never be problematic or damaging potentially, for either the student or the person they were engaging with. I think as people have realized the potential dangers of intercultural engagement, there’s been a move, I’ve sensed a move from higher up the chain, to move towards more understanding, instead of engaging, and in that sense global citizenship makes sense as a turn towards let’s just understand what it means to live in the world and how it’s connected.

Though well intentioned in its design, Matthew continued by stating how the CL requirement had become ineffectual over time, and that the future was unknown for how it might be reconfigured. The original design envisioned a certain model: “professors would design these integrated courses with this engagement, service-learning, this really
rich packaged experience over a semester, with this content. Very few professors engaged with that or wanted to do that”. Matthew indicted that this was upsetting to him because the CL still fulfills a “vital role” and he was concerned that a revision would be “co-opted” into something “superficial”. By way of summary he said:

So, CL, well intentioned, went off the rails a little bit and now it’s diving into this broader debate of so, do we chuck that and go down this new road. What does that mean, what does that look like, and I think that’s kind of where we’re at.

Brian also discussed issues with CL in the curriculum, especially from the student learning perspective: “students by and large perceive it as a throwaway requirement, as a hoop to jump through, but a hoop that doesn’t have much of an effect”. He raised three main questions for the ongoing discussion of CL: first, how to overcome the perception among many students that the CL is not a worthwhile component of their education? Second, “what is the culture that we must cross, in order to be a healthy CL experience?” He described this as an “active” question. Third, should CL be integrated across the whole curriculum or not? He noted that some departments and majors essentially provide the CL requirement within their own programs. His proposed solution was to add it as an objective within each program or major and have departments show that they are fulfilling it.

Each of the participants in this group affirmed that global citizenship should be included in the curriculum, however, there was little consensus on how this should happen as they each described their individual perspectives. Matthew talked about the influence of globalization and how students needed to learn about global issues like human rights and interconnectedness. “The world is globalized … so you have to engage
with that at some level, even just understanding that”. When reflecting on the aspect of citizenship he was more conflicted. He described his trouble in accurately talking about “citizenship domestically, or even what citizenship means for Christians.” This idea that citizenship occurs at many levels, and is complicated to understand precisely, came across in other faculty perspectives. Matthew noted the emphasis at the college on understanding citizenship more broadly, especially in light of the overall direction of the institution:

There’s a lot of stuff going on with this here … projects on citizenship, and I don’t know if that has any kind of global dimensions to it or not. But that’s just trying to understand what that means as Christians, what does citizenship mean broadly, let alone in the context of global citizenship.

Brian also talked about the importance of citizenship in referencing the integration of global citizenship and the curriculum. This response indicated how he was wrestling with the idea:

I think that the curriculum ought to be internationalized. Did I just make an argument for global citizenship as part of the curriculum? I’m not so sure about that. I’ll just go back to where I started and say that by having an internationalized curriculum you really are going to heighten the likelihood that a student in later adulthood is going to be involved. Be motivated, to be involved, be competent, to be involved, have the disposition to be involved in public life. And so, for that reason I would say, yes, internationalizing the curriculum is a means to an end of good citizenship.

From Brian’s statement the process of internationalization should ideally be tightly connected to outcomes of citizenship more broadly, the characteristics of citizenship he defined at the beginning of his interview. He was hesitant to call this global citizenship, yet, just a few lines later he added:

So then, if internationalizing the curriculum really is about exposing
people to cultures and ideas across the globe. So is that global citizenship? I’m fine if that’s … if that’s what we mean by global citizenship I’d be fine calling it that.

Here, his other main idea became evident as he thought about the curriculum and global citizenship, that people should be exposed to difference. In doing so, he hoped that students might learn certain dispositions, especially trust, tolerance, and the acceptance of pluralism.

Susan agreed that global citizenship should be in the curriculum, but she framed it in terms of students learning certain attributes or dispositions. In this way her focus was similar to Brian, that students should be learning dispositions, however she focused on:

An awareness of our world systems, you know the stuff that we don’t see easily. An awareness of self as carrying power, and obligation, and our responsibility, and need. So our awareness of self and then knowing where that can lead. If you don’t know you have a need, or you don’t realize you have power, in both of those instances you can participate in destroying relationships, or participating in structures that you’re not aware that you’re just feeding yourself, instead of participating as a citizen.

Susan’s emphasis in integrating global citizenship in the curriculum is different than Brian’s, but in some ways echoes Matthew’s focus on interdependence. Susan, more than any other participant, talked about the importance of students understanding their positions of privilege and power. She said that she would be “scared” to have anyone achieve a certificate to say that they were a ‘Global Citizen’. Her emphasis was on educating students about their potential to cause harm in the world through the influence of their power and money.

At the department level Matthew and Brian talked about the ways in which their syllabi and curriculum had been revised. In Matthew’s department, social work, the move was made to include global citizenship more intentionally, yet in Brian’s department it
was not. Both participants however talked about the ways in which they had been supported in their work to globalize their course curriculum. For Matthew, as has been mentioned, this was primarily through the global issues class that he helped to introduce. He also referenced that he sought to “infuse” global perspectives in other classes in his department. Matthew has also helped to teach in the International Development Studies (IDS) program, and he described a recent audit of the authors they were using to see how diverse the IDS readings were. He felt that this exercise was valuable and hoped that they could do something similar in his main department.

Brian talked about his own work in curriculum development for his departmental work and how Middlewood had helped him in this process:

So being at Middlewood there’s this longer history and that I very quickly got invited into being a part of that through travel in China, travel to India, travel to South Africa. And those were, all those trips were partly related to development of curriculum, in particular a course in Asian politics in our department. And that did, it really did have an influence on me because it forced me to really think seriously about different models of citizenship across the globe.

He also mentioned his appreciation for the way in which the institution built into the curriculum a means for students to travel overseas on short study abroad trips as part of their program.

Each of the participants in this group gave their impressions on how the institution as a whole was working in the area of global citizenship, including challenges that might persist. Susan talked in broad terms about the challenge to global citizenship at the institution being a deeper challenge of having to overcome human nature. She wondered how students might be encouraged to move past their “human tendency to be interested in me and us”? Brian described the conceptual problem of figuring out global
citizenship as an issue for the various committees to work through in shaping the institutional direction.

Matthew spoke in the most detail about the challenges for the college and global citizenship. Similar to Brian, he saw the lack of definition for global citizenship as an issue to overcome:

So I don’t know exactly what Middlewood means by this – I don’t think they’ve defined it, and I can’t imagine they think that’s just because it doesn’t need defining, but it’s hard for me to pin down when we’re flirting with adding this as a major core component, what do we mean by that? What would that look like?

In his view the process of defining this would be lengthy and involve “lots of reports probably”. He recognized the fact that the discussion over global citizenship is wrapped up in the broader debate over the core curriculum revisions:

Because it’s part of the wider discussion about revising the core it might not even get attention for quite a while. There’s enough that’s threatening the core to begin with. So in some ways it was part of an early draft that was thrown out there, and then there was an immediate backlash to a variety of things, not all of it global citizenship, a variety of things, and so that draft has sort of retreated and it seems like the process is starting over. I don’t know where global citizenship’s going to fit into that next process. It’s hard to say.

This was perhaps the closest or most accurate account of the stage the institution has reached in terms of thinking through global citizenship and the curriculum. While the institutional commitment to global learning has remained strong, especially in the commitment to study abroad, there were more pressing concerns for curricular integration that seemed to take precedent over global citizenship.

As with the other participants in the study, this group of participants was asked if they identified themselves as global citizens. None of the faculty fully affirmed this label,
nor did they fully deny it either. Susan said she would claim it “awkwardly” while Matthew stated that he probably would “if I could make up my own definition”. He added that while “there’s a lot of cultural truth to the idea of being a global citizen” he remains somewhat skeptical. He summarized his thoughts on global citizenship as:

I think you’ve captured it from my perspective which is, as you said, a skeptical one about what this means. Thrilled by the possibility of it but deeply skeptical of what’s actually happening, and in fact worried about how it can mask these underlying narratives of consumption and market forces … I am pressing towards something that I don’t always believe in.

Brian said he would claim the title of a global citizen but like Matthew would want to define it in a certain way. “An experience of the global certainly enriches one’s understanding of citizenship. And so in that sense I would, sure, I’ll claim it”. However, he drew the line at equating global citizenship with cosmopolitanism, which he doubts anyone can actually live by.
CHAPTER SIX

The Unconvinced: Global citizenship is implausible and impractical

The final category is made up of a faculty member, Eric, from the political science department. He represents an even more skeptical understanding of global citizenship at the institution than was presented in the previous chapter. His perspective, labeled “The Unconvinced”, was distinct because of his underlying belief that global citizenship is implausible and impractical. As a result, he does not use it in a meaningful way for his work, especially in the context of his academic discipline. This chapter presents the Unconvinced perspective and concludes with a summary of major themes from the participants across the study.

Defining global citizenship

Like Brian and Matthew from the Skeptical category, Eric began defining global citizenship using language from within his academic discipline. Like the Skeptics, he presented different opinions of what global citizenship might be, however, unlike the others he remained unconvinced on its merit during his interview.

Eric presented two visions of global citizenship, one from a macro-level perspective and the other more localized. The macro perspective might be described as his default perspective given his disciplinary leanings. First, he described global citizenship as:

A movement of people to identify themselves primarily by a world identity, a cosmopolitan identity, as opposed to having their primary identity being defined by their nation state, or by their regions, or other forms of identity.
He added that, for him, the legal connotation of global citizenship is perhaps more in keeping with his personal understanding. However, he referenced an alternative perspective of global citizenship:

The other connotation, at least in practice that I think is more, or strikes me as more familiar with, would be an emphasis on including more than just Western or American sources, and case studies, and experiences in a classroom, or as a subject of study. And that maybe is what used to be called multiculturalism to some extent.

In this definition he presents a blurring of the lines between describing multiculturalism and global citizenship as others in the study sometimes presented.

Rather than using the term global citizenship, Eric had other ways he preferred to think about the connections between people. His belief in the commonality of the human race was rooted in his Christian understanding of all people as being created by God, and having their value defined on this basis. This was not a political basis or a foundation based upon citizenship, but rather an ontological foundation. The term “human dignity” was more palatable for him and his understanding of how people are related. Using a macro-oriented category that reflected some kind of citizenship status was “almost an oxymoron” because “there’s not a human race club when it comes to citizenship.”

For Eric, citizenship implied the presence of a “distinguishable group” that others from outside the group recognize as such. He wondered, how would this understanding would work in relation to global citizenship? He also described citizens as having “duties”, “responsibilities”, and “identities” which he found incredibly difficult to reconcile with a Stoic cosmopolitanism idea. For him, the nation state and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), “for all their limitations”, remain a better or more
viable way to promote “human flourishing” than a larger transnational organization or government.

Student Learning Outcomes

When asked about possible global citizenship learning outcomes for students at Middlewood, Eric presented the idea that the college would want to move beyond, or counter, a certain “provincialism” or “an insularity”. He then continued by talking more about identity as a student learning outcome, an identity shaped by Christian faith as a matter of priority, rather than national or global citizenship. In particular, he described the fact that students should learn about their Christian identity in a way that reflected a more global appreciation, and that they should not conflate being American with being Christian.

Characteristics of a global citizen

In describing the characteristics of a global citizen Eric paused and imagined what those might be, and “not hurt anyone’s feelings who’s behind it”. He imagined that this emphasis was related to the idea that students should learn about other people and places, but even in this idea he found difficulties. First, he questioned the concept that students do truly understand how to “belong” somewhere before they can understand what that means to appreciate others in different places. He described this as:

So I guess my hesitation with global citizenship is that I think it might have a tendency to think that we can do without that grounding in who we are, and then jump straight to appreciating other cultures and other peoples and other differences.
This sense of disconnection Eric expressed in thinking about how the term might be used within the college context added to his more abstract definitional challenge with the concept of global citizenship. As with the other participants in this study, Eric was asked to describe his background and what he felt might have contributed to his understanding of global citizenship.

Eric’s background included growing up attending a diverse high school. He did not describe personal travel as an important aspect of his life, though he has been on short trips to Europe, Latin America, and Africa. This put him in distinct contrast with the faculty in Categories One and Two who described the important influence of their personal background in providing a basis for understanding global citizenship.

**Educational Background**

Eric’s educational background and training has focused on political studies, law, and religious studies. One of the major themes he discussed at multiple points was the importance of his Christian faith as a basis for his understanding of citizenship and identity. Rather than seeing his educational background directly influencing his concept of global citizenship, he described the ways in which faith identity was an essential basis for students to understand their place in the world, rather than using national (or perhaps global) citizenship as a starting point. This has come through his educational history, which has focused on examining the relationship between politics, the state, and religion.
Overall influences on global citizenship understanding

Eric’s understanding of global citizenship was especially formed by his academic commitment to understanding Christian citizenship and identity, in addition to concepts of national citizenship. He described some of the ways he understands citizenship and how this should be considered as relational and particular. Citizenship is relational because it involves “the securing of goods that are commonly needed for people to pursue a good life”. Understood this way, citizenship involves people in committed and sometimes sacrificial relationships with each other. He adds that these relationships have been “geographically particular” and bound by either “religion, or blood, or soil”. In essence, he describes citizenship as “bounded” making a broader articulation of global citizenship difficult for Eric to envision.

The discussion with Eric on local connections to global citizenship primarily focused on the ways in which national, or particular, visions of citizenship were difficult to reconcile with a broader sense of global citizenship. He reflected on Nussbaum’s idea of concentric circles of connection and citizenship but he found this to be inadequate. Eric stated that local neighbors and the people closest to us “have a claim on us in part because we can actually do the most to help them”. In this understanding it is the ability to love others and help them because they are close that is important in thinking about the responsibilities of citizenship. Moving beyond local connection becomes too abstract for Eric and the idea of citizenship begins to lose meaning. In addition, he indicated that it was problematic to help others who are far away while ignoring local neighbors.
Department, scholars, & colleagues

In many respects Eric’s relative lack of time at the institution made it more likely that he would focus most heavily on his own work and experience. Relative to the other participants in this study he did not reference the influence of his academic department or other colleagues in any significant detail. In one instance he did reflect on the fact that his department was very invested in conversations about citizenship, but not global citizenship specifically. There were a few other small glimpses of how the institution may be shaping his understanding. At one point he described some discussion topic forums where he was scheduled to talk about immigration. On another occasion he referenced the work of an institute on campus that had partnered him with an international student, and may additionally provide some international research opportunities.

Eric’s most influential scholars in this area were drawn from political theory and philosophy, and not from scholars writing on global citizenship specifically. When I asked follow up questions about specific scholars on global citizenship, such as Dower and Tully, they did not significantly resonate with him, and he instead deferred to talking in theological terms for his basis of meaning.

Perspectives on Teaching and Study Abroad

Eric discussed his approach to teaching where global issues arise in his courses. Two areas of discussion emerged most clearly when he talked about his approach to teaching. First, he described a class in which he presents students with information on “all sorts of different trouble spots in the world and injustice issues”. For example, students might read about an issue such as human trafficking in particular countries
around the world. Unlike other participants in this study, Eric did not see this as an example of educating towards global citizenship. Instead, he viewed this as “looking at the particular places” and not as global in nature. Though he would acknowledge that there are some universal aspects to the example he raised, he viewed the commonality resting on the “common core that human trafficking is a violation of a real moral reality” rather than on a shared sense of humanity. This points back to his deeper ontological basis for a universal understanding, with deep roots in his theological tradition, rather than a political reality or citizenship that is global in nature. He went on to explain that from his perspective:

My hesitation with global citizenship is global citizenship as what would be needed for the response. As if you’d need a one-world government to oversee the punishment of those violations [such as human trafficking], or the prevention of them. But as a language of concern, then it makes more sense to me.

Eric often went back and forth between the particular and the universal in seeking to make more meaning of global citizenship. In this first example from his teaching there is evidence of how he does this in the classroom.

The second main idea from his teaching was perhaps surprising. For all of the ways that Eric did not describe his personal travel, or exposure to cross-cultural situations, he talked in detail about the ways in which he wanted to make international students feel welcomed in his classroom. He referenced the large numbers of international students in his classes and the fact that he is intentional about how he includes their perspective:

You don’t want to make any international student feel like he or she has to be the spokesperson for their entire culture. That’s a heavy weight to put on somebody. At the same time you want to give the opportunity
for them to share their perspective.

He acknowledged that the course material in his classes tended to be dominated by Western male perspectives, primarily a consequence of his academic discipline, and that seemed to spur his intentionality to include diverse perspectives in class discussion. When I followed up with him on why he had this sensitivity to international students he replied that is “might be some kind of civility, just basic decency”. He continued by describing how he wanted to cultivate a “cross-cultural hospitality” in the classroom, using the same kind of language as others in the study. Whereas other participants might label this under global citizenship, for Eric this was something different.

Unlike many of the other participants in this study Eric did not reference having participated in study abroad as a student or a faculty member. Study abroad, and travel in general, did not come into the conversation in any substantial way for him and this was a distinct contrast with others who were interviewed.

In contrast to many others in this study, Eric’s research did not have an international focus up to this point in his career. He stated, “my past stuff has been mainly pretty traditional political theory”, though he seemed excited for the opportunity to pursue international research opportunities. In fact, he referenced that the institutional focus on global issues “has opened my eyes to there’s some things I need to consider for future projects.”

Like the other participants in this study Eric reported feeling no institutional obligations to pursue global work. He did not reference the Diverse Perspectives (DP) document or the DP reporting requirements, which is most likely due to his lack of experience with the institution as a faculty member. He did however acknowledge the
broader institutional environment as supportive for global work, even if he had very limited personal experience in this area.

Despite his short time at Middlewood Eric was very aware of the discussions over the core curriculum revisions and the CL:

I think it’s important. Middlewood’s discussion now is about making the core smaller … I’m more or less opposed to making the core smaller, so I would not want to eliminate the CL requirement.

Like others in the study he quickly moved to talking about his own academic disciplinary interests, in this case civics, or civic literacy, and the need to include those as an emphasis in the curriculum. He described this as, “content-based study of the culture or government you already are a citizen of”. When asked specifically if global citizenship should be included in the curriculum he replied:

No, because I don’t like the phrase. If it was … I just think it’s, I can’t get behind the wording of it because I don’t think it’s coherent, which I hope isn’t insulting, but that’s my skeptical side. If there was some other way to characterize the importance of learning about other ways, these other approaches, or you mentioned the justice thing, then I think it would be great.

Later in the interview Eric was able to provide more precision on what he considered might be important conversations to include in the curriculum. In particular he referenced the importance of hospitality:

Well I think what you would want is some, there would be some natural vehicles for that conversation that would be more natural than others. So across the whole curriculum of course you hope everyone is, and tries to be hospitable across the curriculum. You’ll have more fruitful conversation about this in some classes than you would in some classes, like an engineering class for example, although you’d want to be sensitive to this in an engineering class as well.
In terms of curriculum, Eric was much more concerned that students learn about Christian citizenship and national citizenship prior to focusing on global citizenship. In light of the importance, to him, of Christian identity, then national identity, the concept of global citizenship was a distant priority, and not one that he is able to entertain. He acknowledged the idea of “concern for people who are elsewhere” and used the issue of pollution as an example, where the actions of one group can affect others across boundaries. However, he added that, “I’m not sure citizenship is the best word to get at those concerns.”

Eric was also very aware of Middlewood’s historical roots and identity as an institution. In particular, he referenced two aspects. First, the Christian roots of the college which affirm a global perspective. However, here he cautioned against the idea of the Christian perspective trumping particular cultural identities; “I guess part of my reluctance is that the cosmopolitan seems to wash out some of those strengths of the particularities, or the fruitfulness of the beauty of bringing in the different, but have the commonality of faith”. His concern is that the college, as part of a Christian tradition, does not “wash out” some of the cultural identity of others in its work. Second, he acknowledged the change in the typical student at Middlewood, especially over the past decade. In particular, he noted the changes in Christian identity among students away from the traditional base.

In sum, he saw that the institution was “wrestling with an identity change” which was difficult because there is a “legacy and a tradition”. He wondered how the school might build on those strengths while moving into something new. The challenge to the identity of the institution was, in his perspective, also a challenge for integrating global
citizenship. He indicated his faith that Middlewood, as an institution, was a place where discussions over an issue, such as global citizenship, could be worked out and “faculty don’t quite agree with everything” that’s in the institutional plan.

In distinction to the other faculty participants Eric did not affirm in any fashion the label of a global citizen. “I’d be reluctant to take on the label right now”. The difficulties of definition and meaning, along with the relative lack of importance in light of Christian and national concepts of citizenship, make the term too difficult for him. He would also be wary of signaling to others that he might be in favor of certain policies, “the EU integrating even further” for example, if he used the term favorably. The closest he was able to come to a label of global citizenship was the idea of ‘global concern’, which he conceded was not at its essence the same thing.
Major Themes

A number of major themes have emerged in presenting the findings from the participants in this study. These themes are summarized below.

**Difficulties of Definition.** The issue of how to define global citizenship was a consistent theme across the participants. This was especially true for the faculty in the last two categories who were more skeptical of global citizenship. In most cases, faculty who had difficulty defining global citizenship found the ‘citizenship’ aspect of the term to be particularly difficult to resolve. Where there may have been general agreement on the desire to be ‘global’, engaged in the world, and a recognition that we are all, as humans, in some way connected, there was skepticism among faculty in using ‘citizenship’ as the most appropriate label to modify this further.

The issues of definition were not just confined to the precision by which global citizenship could be defined. There were also differences over whether a definition was really necessary and how the institution should define the term. For some participants these two issues went hand-in-hand, causing them to ask, without an institutional definition how can students and faculty know what they are working towards?

Central to the issues of definition were concerns over the relationship between the local and the global. Some of most pointed skepticism came from faculty who were worried about a “rootless cosmopolitanism” that would result in students not being engaged appropriately as citizens in their particular context. How should the local and global aspects of citizenship relate to each other? How does local citizenship relate to national citizenship? Citizenship was envisioned as operating at many different layers in this study, from the institution, to the local city, to the local area, to the nation, and finally
to a global scale. The idea of citizenship was further complicated by the importance of Christian citizenship for many of these faculty. As a result, citizenship was often described in multi-layered or overlapping terms. The difficulties over definition presented distinctions in the faculty understanding that shaped the overall findings in significant ways.

**A Variation in How Meaning is Shaped.** The ways in which faculty made meaning of global citizenship varied within this study. There was no clear consensus on where an individual’s understanding of global citizenship should best be rooted. For some participants it was mostly based upon their life experience, sometimes their childhood, whereas for others it was their academic discipline, or their academic department, that shaped their understanding.

Some faculty arrived at the institution with a rich life experience in cross-cultural travel and interaction, which was then fostered by the institutional environment. This appeared to be the case for faculty members who were closest to fully embracing global citizenship. Early openness and exposure to cross-cultural diversity seemed to promote a greater acceptance of global citizenship and a desire to see it lead to meaningful action in the world. Formative cross-cultural personal experiences also seemed to align with higher rates of participation in study abroad programs.

Faculty seemed to be most influenced by those closest to them. They tended to make meaning of global citizenship through colleagues in their department, rather than through their own academic scholarship or reading other scholarship on the topic. Instead, the more fully a faculty member embraced global citizenship the more likely they were to be in a supportive department that aligned with their disposition towards
cross-cultural work. The role of the institution in shaping their understanding of global citizenship was generally important, but often secondary to individual colleagues or departments.

There was some general consensus on how students should be taught global citizenship. This mainly involved presenting students with a variety of ways to hear directly from other perspectives and voices from around the world. This was most often achieved through selected readings and course content, but study abroad and service learning were also seen as optimal ways for this type of learning.

There was less consensus on how global citizenship related to research. Faculty with extensive international research were on different parts of the continuum. In general however, those with less of a research focus tended to embrace global citizenship more fully. The greater difference was in how faculty approached their work, whether skeptical or not, in their research, in teaching, or in thinking about the institution and global citizenship, rather than in considering the specific work they were doing.

**No Consensus on Curriculum.** No agreement emerged on how global citizenship should be included in the curriculum. With the exception of Eric, the Unconvinced faculty member, there was a general sense that global citizenship, or something very similar, should be included in the curriculum. How it should be specifically included was a point of debate. Some participants argued that global citizenship would ideally be in every class, or that the current CL requirement should continue as a requirement for every student. In this way the institution could remain true to its historical commitment to global learning through required core classes. On the other hand some faculty questioned whether this was the best way and wondered if a more
nuanced approach was needed. This might include reviewing the curriculum to determine where global citizenship more naturally fits, perhaps by major, and only including it in specific areas of the curriculum.

There was some broader agreement on the need for the CL to be revised in some way, whether it remained as a core requirement or not. Most faculty wanted the student understanding of the CL requirement to change so that it would be viewed more positively. Though faculty could identify that the current system was not working well, there was little of substance presented in terms of solutions at the institutional level.

At the department level more constructive work had been achieved. Faculty across multiple departments talked about changes which brought in a more global focus, especially in light of globalization and student interest. This had resulted in global learning becoming more embedded within some departmental curricula.

There was also more certainty over the integration of study abroad and service-learning, which has a long history at the college. In many ways this seemed to be at the hub of the institution’s global learning efforts, something faculty were proud of and celebrated, and an emphasis that they seemed to feel would remain in place. The space in the curriculum for students to participate in study abroad trips, either for a few weeks or for a semester, seemed to be immune from the curriculum revision discussions.

**Uncertainty Over Identity.** There was an evident level of uncertainty in how the faculty talked about the college as a whole. This was apparent at a number of levels. The faculty talked about the changes they had seen in the student body over time. This has led to more diversity within the student population, especially with more international students and students from a wider range of faith traditions. Challenges from outside the
institution were also presented, especially wider pressures asking questions about the importance of a liberal arts curriculum, enrollment pressures, and the rising prominence of STEM education. There was also a general recognition of the influence of globalization and a need for students to learn within an increasingly diverse world.

The greatest uncertainty perhaps lay in the current review process for the curriculum. There was a sense that the integration or use of the term global citizenship would not be decided institutionally until this more comprehensive review was complete. This process will likely determine how the CL will be envisioned moving forward, and determine the curricular priorities for the college. Global citizenship is currently part of the discussion, but to what extent it might remain in the conversation was difficult for faculty to predict. It is clear that some voices within the college resonate with global citizenship and advocate for its use, whereas others are more skeptical and prefer other terms and conceptions for global learning. John indicated that he thought a CL requirement would remain, but “will look very different”, adding that he thought “the citizenship piece is kind of replacing the CL piece” of the curriculum. This points to an ongoing shift within the college.

Many faculty also talked about the importance of language and global citizenship. This was not simply related to the discussions over the proposed changes to the curriculum, but also about the dominant use of English as the language often tied to global citizenship. The ways in which a reliance on English was conceptualized and enacted in global learning was of concern to a number of faculty in this study.

**Conditions Present but No Agreement.** There were many elements presented across the participants that would point towards the continued use and integration of
global citizenship at the institution. These included the historical tradition of global learning at the college, the increased emphasis on citizenship as a curricular focus, the use of global citizenship terminology as an aspiration for students, and the voices advocating for global citizenship within the school. Underlying all of this is a deep theological commitment to have students, and the college more generally, actively participate on a global scale. This was consistently acknowledged as a core value that would remain embedded within the identity of the institution and in the curriculum.

Despite the elements described above already being in place there was limited evidence that global citizenship was expressly or specifically in use as a label within the broader college identity. It appeared in the strategic plan, in some course descriptions, and in various other language used around the college, yet it did not appear to be used in a systematically integrated way. In an overall sense, all of the ingredients for the college to agree upon and use global citizenship are present, yet there was no sense of deep commitment to the term.

For example, though the faculty in the Confident category embraced global citizenship as a concept it is worth noting the relative lack of clear use for the term global citizenship in their work. Alex, for example, noted that an awareness of global citizenship had grown over the past 15 years, yet the “label” of global citizenship itself was not so prominent. Later she described global citizenship as being “taught, though I’m not sure it’s taught necessarily as ‘global citizenship’”. Rosa also noted that she doesn’t “use that term exactly” though she described much of her work within a global citizenship framework. There was an underlying understanding of the term yet the label was often
lacking in explicit use. One apparent question is whether this was an intentional or unintentional step.

For some participants, especially those in the Confident category, using the term global citizenship explicitly seemed to be less important than seeing what they believed it represented being put into practice. This may be an unintentional lack of use for the term. More skeptical perspectives, such as Matthew, Eric, and Brian, presented a more intentional non-use of the term given their hesitations with the meaning. John presented a telling insight for the institutional use of the term when he stated that the Study Abroad office had recently been renamed, and they intentionally steered away from using the label of global citizenship. This was due to the fact that “it has a lot of pitfalls” especially regarding the nature of how citizenship is understood in a more local context. This example illustrates the tension over understanding the term and the concerns other faculty voiced over the relationships between the local and the global.

Despite concerns over the use of global citizenship there are many aspects of the term that seemed to resonate with the faculty in this study. Primary among these were themes related to justice and connection to others. Though the term may be debated, there were some underlying concepts related to global citizenship that seemed foundational for participants. At its core, was the consistent idea that people are connected as human beings across the world in some way. Many participants in this study echoed the importance of words such as “humility” and “hospitality” as foundational. Connected to this was the importance of justice, that is, a commitment to work for a just society wherever a student or professor happened to be located. Citizenship that is rooted in some
way in the particular local context was seen as critical, often more critical than global citizenship, yet may have a global dimension depending on the definition and context.
PART THREE
CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSION

This study focused on the faculty understanding of the term global citizenship and how this understanding influenced their work within a liberal arts college. It adds to the literature on internationalization and global learning at colleges, and specifically on how global citizenship is understood in a particular institutional context. This chapter presents a summary of the major findings, implications for theory, implications for practice, recommendations for integrating global citizenship, limitations, and suggestions for further research.

Summary of Major Findings

The conclusion of chapter 6 presented a discussion of the major themes that emerged from the participants. These themes represent the main areas of focus for this study and help to frame up the summary of the findings that give structure to this final chapter. Four areas became evident for summarizing the implications from this study: (1) the difficulty of defining global citizenship, (2) uncertainty over definitions and implications for institutional practice, (3) the factors that influence faculty understanding and provide meaning for their work, and (4) global citizenship is aspirational and focuses on areas of significance for liberal arts education.

First, it is clear that defining global citizenship is a difficult task with little consensus on what the term means, or on the importance of defining how it should be understood. Within this discussion over definition important areas for consideration
emerged related to understanding the nature of citizenship, and identifying the relationship between the local and the global. Global citizenship may help to identify aspects of global learning and internationalization within an institution, but a precise definition seems contested and unclear.

Second, the uncertainty over definition has implications for institutional practice. In this study tensions emerged between the participant voices as they thought about how global citizenship should be included in the curriculum, and in guiding the curriculum revision process. All of this was set within the larger framework of the institution stating global citizenship is a desirable goal for students to attain. The institution provided a case study in portraying the difficulties associated with using a term in practice, such as global citizenship, that is still debated and has little broader consensus of meaning. The wider debate over the term is evident within the institution with little evidence to suggest how this might be resolved, if at all.

Third, the process by which faculty came to make meaning of global citizenship was often deeply shaped by influences beyond their academic discipline and formal education. The importance of personal background, life experience, their academic department, and colleagues, all contributed significantly to shaping what was most meaningful for faculty. This has broader meaning for reflecting on faculty work and how faculty careers are shaped.

One finding from this study relates to the experience of faculty and the potential ways this shapes their understanding of global citizenship. It is noteworthy that the faculty in the Confident category had many more years of employment, on average, at Middlewood than the faculty in the other categories. They also had more experience with
leading study abroad trips. Given the historical emphasis at the college on global learning and faculty-led study abroad trips, the question of institutional context becomes important to consider. In what ways might the institutional culture shape an understanding of global citizenship at different stages of faculty careers? On the basis of this study it seems that faculty who are in an institutional environment with a commitment to global work have the opportunity to grow in their confidence in embracing global citizenship.

It should be noted from this study that faculty seem to become more confident in using the term global citizenship as they gain greater experience, but this does not necessarily imply that they have greater understanding of global citizenship. Faculty in the other categories of this study exhibited a nuanced understanding of global citizenship yet remained more skeptical. Faculty may become more comfortable over time in embracing the ambiguity included in the term global citizenship as they are more advanced in their careers. Using global citizenship as a term to cover a broad range of meaning, or simply as one way to express meaning for their work, may help to explain this finding. It may also be the case that faculty who have achieved tenure have a greater opportunity to explore issues such as global citizenship, or feel more freedom to use a term that is often contested.

Greater understanding of global citizenship does not therefore necessarily seem to lead to having more confidence in global citizenship. Experience with travel also may not in itself be a means to grow in confidence using global citizenship, as Susan indicated in her interview. In her example, she has extensive overseas travel experience but remains skeptical of global citizenship. However, there may be a clearer connection between leading study abroad trips and having confidence in global citizenship. Perhaps the
specific experience of leading students in study abroad helps to promote greater reflection on how learning is applied across cultures, and on practices of educating towards citizenship. Faculty who assist in leading study abroad, and in fostering greater awareness and understanding of other people and cultures, may in turn be more open to embracing global citizenship.

Fourth, despite the difficulties in defining global citizenship the concept remains aspirational and points to important aspects of a liberal arts education. Only one of the participants in this study rejected outright being labeled as a “global citizen”. Even faculty who were skeptical were reluctant to entirely dismiss the label. The college as a whole has outlined becoming a global citizen as a goal for students, again pointing to the aspirational nature of the term. Two potential reasons for this might be the fact that being a global citizen has somewhat entered the common social vocabulary, as the BBC poll referenced previously might attest to. In a very general sense it might be argued that being a global citizen is an increasingly positive identity to appropriate within a world facing serious global issues. A second reason may be found in the overlap between global citizenship and a traditional liberal arts education with an emphasis on broad learning, global learning, civic engagement, and citizenship formation. Even if global citizenship is not precisely defined it may be said to contain enough elements that align with a liberal arts curriculum to be used in some way. In light of this summary several potential implications for theory and practice emerge.
Implications for Theory

Chapter 2 of this study presented an overview of the main ways in which global citizenship is understood and the way global citizenship has been included in higher education. Much of this contains elements drawn from theoretical conceptions of what it means to be a citizen, the connection we have as individual human beings to others around the world, and how we are to understand our identity as both local and global in an increasingly globalized world. In addition, the work on global citizenship and assessment outlined in chapter 2 (Deardorff, 2009) is worth considering again at this stage.

Nature of citizenship. The findings from the participant interviews aligned with the complexity found in the global citizenship literature on how to best describe citizenship in general. Is citizenship more than the rights and responsibilities found in particular localized contexts? Is a citizen someone who does not harm others, or is a citizen someone who actively seeks to help others through pursuing justice? Trying to precisely understand citizenship became a large aspect of the skepticism associated with global citizenship. Thinking about the ways in which students can be educated as citizens, in whatever context, emerged as complex in its own right. Adding additional layers such as Christian or religious identity, national identity, and global identity was often challenging. The difficulty in describing citizenship was evident in this study, yet there were also surprising ideas of citizenship that emerged in the study.

Relationship of the local and global. One of the more surprising aspects of citizenship to emerge in this study focused on the question of the relationship between the local and the global. Are we as individuals responsible for others around the world? Do
we have an obligation to help alleviate suffering or injustice around the world? What role does national identity, and national rights and responsibilities, play in this process?

A number of participants in this study identified hospitality as an important element of global citizenship. This perspective was seen as a way to bring a more localized or particular perspective to the more abstract ideal of global citizenship. This was often thought of in terms of being hospitable to others from around the world when they come to the U.S. as international students, refugees, or immigrants.

The importance faculty attributed to the concept of being present or rooted in a particular place was another surprising theme. For all of the focus on global citizenship and having a global perspective, the importance of being grounded in a local community, of understanding one’s self as a citizen of a particular location first, before appropriating a global identity, consistently came across in the study. The strength of this sentiment was surprising given the importance global citizenship places on moving beyond the local, yet the participants in this study sometimes felt that this mindset assumed too much, and participants could not be certain that students knew enough about local citizenship as a basis for engaging with the world. This perspective pushed against the cosmopolitan roots of global citizenship, which was seen as too vague and encouraging an unhealthy focus away from more local ideals of citizenship. However, this finding aligns with Noddings (2005) work on global citizenship education, which examined a number of diverse perspectives on global citizenship, and found that it was important to “recognize the power of the local in building a global perspective” (p. 122).

Tully’s (2014) conception of global citizenship was used in this study as a way to understand the term and he presented two overarching types for the term: (a) Modern-
Civil and (b) Diverse-Civic. Based on the findings from this study, these two general types were not sufficient for colleges and universities to use as a basis for understanding global citizenship education. Though the participants in this study followed Tully’s lead in placing global citizenship within a more grassroots civic ideal, additional nuance is required for his Diverse-Civic category to be used in a more meaningful way.

**Importance of definition and assessment.** The ongoing work by Deardorff (2006; 2009) and others highlights the importance of assessment and global learning on college campuses. Whitehead (2015) presents a recent summary from the AAC&U on the development of terms and practices related to campus internationalization. She traces the use of terms such as international education, intercultural competence, global citizenship, global perspective, internationalization, and finally, global learning. She presents global learning as having “emerged as a term that reflects the full scope and substance of engagement with learning in and about the world” (p. 9). Later she describes global learning as “curriculum-based learning that shifts the focus from counting numbers of courses and participants to the examination of global issues from diverse disciplinary perspectives” (p. 12-13). This may indicate the direction in which internationalization is headed, with more attention being paid to global issues within the curriculum (and not simply through study abroad), under a more perhaps generic umbrella term (global learning) that includes global citizenship among other ideas.

In this scenario, how might global citizenship specifically contribute to campus internationalization, student learning, and faculty work? In addition, how might this relate to assessment? Whitehead (2015) notes that global citizenship seems to point to the need for civic engagement, not just developing intercultural capacities, as well as self-
reflection regarding one’s place in the world. Deardorff (2006) discusses the importance of definition and assessment and how higher education administrators and faculty vary in their definitions of intercultural competency, with greater variation among faculty than administrators. This study finds a similar pattern of variation of definition among faculty in terms of global citizenship specifically. Deardorff (2009) also notes that definitions of global competence continue to evolve, and this requires ongoing attention from higher education scholars and practitioners in understanding current usage and definition. There does seem to be consensus on the fact that defining global citizenship, among other terms used in internationalization, is a complex and ongoing task.

**Implications for Practice**

The results of this study provide a number of areas of implication for practice. These areas are, (a) the work of defining global citizenship, (b) the role of faculty, (c) the relationship of definition and assessment of learning outcomes, and (d) the place of global citizenship in the curriculum.

**The work of defining global citizenship.** The work to define the term global citizenship within higher education continues even as institutions publically make use of the term. This not only has theoretical implications as the term is debated in a wider sense, but also has implications in practice on college campuses. This case study provided a continuum of definition on what the term global citizenship means for faculty within the scope of a single institution. Faculty were not only divided on their understanding of what global citizenship means, but they did not agree on the degree to which a specific definition was necessary. This has implications for administrators and
faculty within colleges and universities who are seeking to make use of the term global citizenship as a framework for global learning.

Deardorff (2006) found that faculty and administrators agreed that intercultural competence on college campuses was important to practice and assess. There was little consensus beyond this point in her study, and this was also evident in the present case study. Each of the participants in this Middlewood case study agreed that global learning was important, but not all of them agreed that global citizenship was the best term to use. For institutional use however, it does seem that having greater clarity on the definition of global citizenship would assist both faculty and administrators in working towards a common goal for students. This could be based around the current institutional emphasis on study abroad as a way to encourage engagement with others, thinking about one’s place in the world, and learning about others. The current Diverse Perspectives (DP) policy document could be updated to include more specific language on definitions. Hudzik (2015) has identified a need for stronger leadership in the area of campus internationalization, while Lattuca & Stark (2009) discussed the influence of departmental and institutional leaders on faculty work, especially program planning. If departmental and institutional leaders can provide a definition for global citizenship that is institution-specific, and aligned with the mission of the college, then there is potential for this concept to be a significant framework for internationalization as it identifies many essential elements of a liberal education.

**Role of faculty.** This study provides a focus on understanding the perspective of faculty, a constituency often underrepresented in discussions of global learning and internationalization on campuses. The faculty participants in this study were very
invested in global learning at the institution, and believed that the institution generally saw global learning as an important aspect of the mission of the school. However, there was uncertainty as to how much the faculty voice would ultimately help determine the place of global citizenship at the school. This example of hesitancy or uncertainty of having a voice in the process of curricular review has perhaps broader implications for the role of faculty within institutions, especially as the direction for global learning is under discussion.

The place of faculty in the direction of curriculum reform will vary from institution to institution and according to particular governance structures. Varying levels of faculty interaction and input on these institutional-level decisions became evident in this case study. Some faculty sought to be very involved in the broader work of the institution, whereas others were more content to focus on their own teaching and research. Where faculty feel the greatest burden of responsibility towards global citizenship and global learning can influence their level of participation in the curricular revision process. How institutions make room for the faculty voice in the process can have deep implications for how global citizenship is understood and articulated at the institutional level.

The faculty in this study revealed a diverse set of influences on their understanding of global citizenship. For some faculty their upbringing and broader life experience largely shaped their understanding of global citizenship, yet the importance of the department and colleagues within the school was also important for many. The ways in which the institution provides opportunities for faculty interaction, both within departments and across departments, will likely influence how global citizenship is
understood and provides meaning for faculty work. In particular, departments such as political science, which may have more expertise in thinking about aspects of (global) citizenship, can be influential in shaping the perspectives of others on campus.

The type of faculty hired at the institution, and what the institution looks for in the hiring process, will shape the campus understanding of global citizenship. The acknowledgement or weight afforded to the broader life experience of faculty may have a significant influence on their beliefs regarding global citizenship, based on findings from this study. Institutions should find ways to acknowledge and ask about the broader global or cross-cultural experience of the faculty they seek to hire. By allowing faculty to express how their understanding of global citizenship has been shaped, even if this leads them to discuss areas removed from their formal academic training and career path, institutions can better assess the ways in which faculty could contribute to the institutional understanding of global citizenship. In addition, hiring faculty from diverse cultural, national, and ethnic backgrounds will contribute to the ways in which the campus is able to model learning across a diversity of cultural perspectives and in global citizenship. This aligns with the idea of hospitality as an important aspect of global citizenship.

(Gappa, Austin & Trice, 2007) have highlighted that increasing numbers of students graduating with doctoral degrees are women, members of racial and ethnic minority groups, and come from many different countries. There is an increasingly diverse and qualified hiring pool for colleges to choose from. Despite this fact, they note that the rate of hiring faculty of color is not rising quickly, and that the academe “does not benefit as much as it could from the rich diversity of qualified people who are
available” (p. 64). A greater diversity of faculty perspective will likely help institutions to refine their understanding of concepts such as global citizenship.

It is also important to consider how faculty are prepared for global learning as part of their career path preparation. For many faculty any global work will likely be a secondary interest, and perhaps not a formal academic interest, during their graduate studies or formal academic training. For faculty who gravitate towards global learning the seeds of global citizenship education may be more dormant in the educational preparation of future faculty, yet within the right institutional setting these seeds can grow into something more substantial.

With this in mind, faculty preparation should aim to be broader in scope to include other aspects of what it means to be a professor. This includes knowing how to work within institutional contexts to include deeply held personal perspectives, such as global citizenship, into their work in meaningful ways. How much attention is placed on the future faculty development of capacities such as global citizenship? In what ways can doctoral programs seek to offer future faculty the opportunity to conduct research that has an international dimension? Are future faculty learning the cross-cultural capacities to educate an increasingly diverse student body? In the face of increased student diversity this places a burden on future faculty training. Participants in this study highlighted the importance of educating an increasingly more diverse student population on campus as an aspect of global citizenship.

(Wulff, Austin, Nyquist & Sprague, 2004) describe findings from a research study that sought to understand the experience of graduate student Teaching Assistants (TAs) who aspired to become professors. One of the findings from this study highlighted the
fact that universities were not preparing future professors to make connections between their work and social needs. Global citizenship may be one area in which faculty can use their perspectives and expertise to help address social needs, both locally and globally. Where faculty have the connections, interests, and ability to participate in civic engagement, this should be encouraged and integrated into their professional work.

For faculty at liberal arts colleges who are already teaching, and often on the tenure-track, how can they be encouraged to participate in global citizenship? Faculty in this study indicated that their work in the area of global citizenship was often driven by a deep personal interest and commitment, rather than institutional incentives. Colleges might look for ways to further incentivize and recognize faculty work that is global or cross-cultural in nature. Bataille & Brown (2006) state that colleges and universities should recognize the importance of campus internationalization as a benefit not just to students, but also as a benefit to faculty. This may include additional course-relief for leading study abroad trips, time and opportunity to conduct globally-focused research, and providing ways for faculty to assist students in finding local connections for global issues. (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007) have recommended steps for colleges to take in providing professional growth opportunities for their faculty, including providing ways for faculty to develop both formal and informal collegial interactions. They also ask if there are ways to explore the relationship between faculty member’s personal interests and aspirations and their departmental responsibilities. These personal interests and aspirations may include something such as global citizenship. Many of the faculty in this study were already very involved in their local community in ways that they felt represented a connection to global citizenship. This study highlighted the importance of
collegial relationships within and across departments as an influence on their understanding of global citizenship. How might these be further recognized and included within the life of the college as a way to both incentivize faculty participation, and provide civic learning opportunities for students?

**Place of global citizenship within the curriculum.** As noted above, the development of the term global learning emphasizes the role of curricular integration, with less emphasis on study abroad programs as the means for students to learn. This encourages a greater emphasis on interdisciplinary integration across the curriculum, for students to learn within their major, and in their general education courses (Newell, 2010). The participants in this case study did not agree on the best way to integrate global citizenship within the curriculum, especially given the wider uncertainty over the curricular revision process. Despite this, two curricular aspects emerged as having potential for ongoing global citizenship education. First, the commitment to study abroad seemed firm and the college has designed the curriculum (and academic calendar) to ensure that many students have the opportunity to pursue study abroad. Second, departmental curriculum revisions were presented as an area for global citizenship integration. In the midst of ongoing institutional reform, individual academic departments may be able to continue integrating global citizenship education within their courses, or create new courses, to highlight global citizenship within academic disciplines. Given the prevalence of relatively uncoordinated internationalization efforts on campuses (Hudzik, 2015), perhaps approaching the integration of global citizenship education within departments and majors is a more viable starting point.
The study abroad model at Middlewood emphasized faculty-led trips where students not only spent time overseas with people from another culture, but they also spent time with a faculty member from the school. Braskamp, Braskamp & Glass (2015) have used data from the Global Perspectives Inventory (GPI), a national survey of undergraduate students, to highlight the importance of faculty interactions with students (especially interactions outside class that emphasize diverse perspectives) as a way to develop global citizenship. In addition, they state the surprising finding that the more a student has a sense of “belonging” in their local setting (such as a college campus), the greater their capacity for a global perspective. This may help institutions like Middlewood to continue supporting and developing study abroad programs to encourage faculty-student interaction. The idea of “belonging” may provide a way for liberal arts colleges to determine the ways in which local and global can reinforce global learning by focusing on developing a sense of community and interaction for students.

The concept of Curricular Pathways was posited in this study design as a potential way to envision global citizenship education within a liberal arts curriculum. This includes the idea of global citizenship education designed across the entire curriculum and intentionally included in every class. This case study did not find a coherent institutional curricular pathway for global citizenship education, though there was evidence of individual academic departments providing this type of approach. The ability to see a curricular pathway approach enacted at an institution seems to be difficult without a firmer resolution on the learning outcomes and definition for global citizenship education. Some faculty in this study saw this as desirable, whereas others did not. Others
seemed to tacitly affirm global citizenship education in the curriculum, but did not explicitly view it as such.

This case study focused on global citizenship, yet it also presents a process of curricular change within a liberal arts college setting. The curricular change discussions were connected with the broader organizational questions of identity within a changing external environment. The college discussions over curriculum revisions were being shaped by both internal factors and external factors. Participants in this study addressed both sets of factors as they reflected on the place of global citizenship education within a changing organizational setting. Internally the discussions over modern languages within the core curriculum provided an example of competing interests that are being negotiated as a reflection on the identity and future direction of the college. External factors mentioned by faculty in this study highlighted the college’s openness to the influence of its larger environment. These factors included the broader national debate on the values of the liberal arts curriculum and demonstrating student learning outcomes. The result for Middlewood is a process of organizational change that has included many perspectives. It has emerged as a negotiated process with input from faculty across multiple disciplines. The process includes a consideration of historical roots, the identity of the college, present realities, as well as anticipating future needs. As a result of such complexity, the process has progressed slowly and has involved multiple proposals for change, numerous revisions, and committee reviews, all seeking a way to move forward. Another question in this process is the developmental nature of the curriculum and the limits of what should be included, or excluded. Alex raised this question when she discussed the many areas that are required across the curriculum, such as faith in the curriculum, and writing
across the curriculum. Is it reasonable to add global citizenship across the curriculum and maintain the areas of emphasis that have already been established? In general, faculty did not present a clear answer to this question in this study. This case study provides insight on the process of organizational change, especially focused on curricular changes, within a changing environment and including multiple perspectives.

Religious identity was an important aspect for consideration in this study. The religious heritage and identity of the college remains an essential aspect in shaping current institutional priorities and discussions over proposed changes. Participants in this study discussed their perspective on faith and religious identity as they talked about global citizenship. This was largely done in a way that might best be described as occurring around the margins of their interviews. It is important to consider the religious elements of the findings faculty presented, especially as they might relate to the overall college. This also provides a basis upon which to offer more specific implications for practice from this case.

Reviewing the participant data as a whole helps to provide some additional insight into how a distinctly Christian understanding of global citizenship might be possible, and helps to illustrate a number of institutional priorities. First, faculty in this study referenced their personal faith commitments as means by which they approach their work broadly, and issues such as global citizenship more specifically. Second, the perspectives of faculty in this study help to illustrate a particular religious understanding and tradition.

The participants in this study displayed a wide range of description and detail when speaking about religious identity. For some, religion was referenced frequently and consistently, yet for others it was barely mentioned. The frequency of references to
religious identity and faith is one aspect to consider, yet the nature of these references is also worth examining. Though references to religion and religious identity were not as prominent as might have been expected at the outset of this study, what was shared by the participants, when considered as a whole, revealed an underlying religious foundation at the institution.

Participants in this study talked about religious identity most often as a faith commitment, a phrase that serves as an effective summative statement. Faith commitment often came across as a shared perspective among faculty that their work was rooted in a deeper tradition than their own individual identity, or even the identity of the college. In a sense, it was as though the college, and their individual place within the college, was an expression of a deeper way of viewing engagement in the world shaped by religious convictions. At the heart of this commitment was a broader positioning of faculty work, and the role of the college, that education can be approached from a distinctly Christian perspective. There was however a recognition by a number of faculty that there are other ways in which to view engagement in the world, especially through other religious traditions.

Given the foundational basis of religious identity at the college, and the ways in which faculty referenced their individual faith commitments, it is worth considering why this was not a more visible theme when discussing global citizenship more specifically. Three points of discussion are presented here by way of potential responses to this question. First, the participant statements regarding faith commitments were often made as part of a larger point. Faculty would often state something briefly, and almost in passing, about faith or religious identity before discussing another aspect of this study,
such as curriculum, the college context, or global citizenship. As a whole, faculty did not tend to dwell on the specifics of their faith commitment in significant detail. It may have been the case that the faculty participants assumed a certain amount of understanding and shared meaning was to be expected, as the college is known for its religious identity. Faculty perhaps did not want to labor the point of their religious heritage, or they did not believe it was necessary to do so.

Second, faculty comments were consistent with a particular religious heritage in keeping with the historical identity of the college. This reflects a deep religious commitment that is expressed in particular ways, often mediated through social and cultural engagement. This posture was evident in the faculty responses where aspects of faith commitment were mostly described in terms of how this commitment might be expressed or made evident. In this case, faith commitment was not simply envisioned as a privatized experience, but instead carried a public and culturally-engaged expression. The result, in this study, was that faculty presented meaning for their work as rooted in a faith tradition, but without feeling a requirement to explicitly describe this faith commitment overtly and repeatedly. This is consistent with the religious heritage and position of the college more broadly in seeking to facilitate change in the world, from a Christian perspective, through informed and meaningful action.

Third, as has been noted, the participants in this study illustrated the complexity in understanding global citizenship and implications for practice. It is perhaps the case that the faculty did not yet have the language or framework to accurately integrate all aspects of global citizenship within a religious, or specifically Christian, perspective. This
might be especially the case within an institutional setting where ambiguous meaning for the term persists.

This is not to say, however, that faculty are avoiding finding ways to integrate global citizenship and Christian faith. There was evidence to suggest that this process is underway with at least two threads of discussion around which themes are emerging. The first theme was an emphasis on the equality of all people. This was referenced by many of the faculty participants as an essential aspect of global citizenship. This seemed to carry both an aspirational dimension and an ethical dimension. This was seen as aspirational by envisioning a society in which all people are equally valued and respected, irrespective of national, cultural, or other forms of identity. This is consistent with the broader literature on global citizenship. Yet, faculty in this study identified the reason they held this view as being rooted in a specifically Christian ethic, which upholds the value of each individual as important to God. Various terms and images were used to describe this foundational idea. For these participants it was not simply that individual people relate to each other, but they also, in some way, are in relationship with God, which provides another essential basis for valuing each person. Some faculty also discussed this in terms of advocating for human rights, referencing the UN and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, but this seemed to be a reflection of a deeper theologically-rooted idea of equality.

The second theme centered on what it means to be engaged in the world as a Christian, ordered around concepts of citizenship. This included questions of how faculty viewed themselves in the world, and also what they envisioned for the students at Middlewood. Overlapping ideas of citizenship included local citizenship, national
citizenship, and global citizenship, but also Christian citizenship. Including aspects of Christian citizenship was an important consideration in discussing global citizenship. This was especially the case based upon the religious convictions of the college which emphasizes the importance of engagement with the world. Discussing citizenship in Christian terms allowed faculty to think about the ways in which to live out this theologically-motivated sense of responsibility. As responsible Christian citizens where might there be overlap with ideas present in global citizenship? This question led to at least two areas of consideration. First, a vision of citizenship that is inherently global in scope, not just local or national, fits within a Christian perspective. The Christian vision for humanity is rooted in a sense that God is concerned with all people, not just certain individuals or nations. One result of this vision is that prior and current injustices should be addressed as a way to work towards this ethic of concern for all people. It also provides a strong impetus to work towards overcoming divisions between people, often discussed in terms of having greater awareness of others, and ways to learn from others.

Second, a Christian perspective oriented the participants in this study towards enacting change in the world. A faith commitment drove faculty to see issues in the world as something that should be addressed, not simply accepted. This was most often described in terms of informed action in the world. For these faculty participants the “informed” aspect was vitally important and placed in contrast with ways of acting within society that is not informed, or avoids truly engaging with global issues. This again represents the religious heritage of the college.

The faculty participants reflected the overall position of the college in affirming a distinctly Christian vision for their work, yet this was often not expressed as prominently
as might be expected at a faith-based institution. However, it may be argued that this is in keeping with the nature of the particular faith tradition of the college, and the degree to which this religious basis for the meaning in faculty work might have been assumed. In considering future direction, the faith commitment of the college was not under question, in the eyes of the faculty participants in this study, even in the midst of organizational change.

**Recommendations for Integrating Global Citizenship**

The religious heritage and vision of Middlewood was one important dimension for this study, yet other considerations can be taken into account when thinking about integrating global citizenship education within a liberal arts curriculum. Thinking more broadly, in what ways might global citizenship education be included in a liberal arts curriculum? This study provides four potential areas and aspects to consider for institutional leaders.

First, this study discussed aspects of the curriculum and global citizenship within the curriculum. The ways in which global citizenship might be integrated into a liberal arts curriculum will likely vary by institutional context, yet this study highlighted the importance of the curriculum as a meaningful locus for faculty work. Faculty were thinking about global citizenship, and how to include elements of global citizenship education in their classrooms and curriculum, even while they were reflecting on the meaning of the term. The importance of the curriculum as a place to engage aspects of global citizenship is important to acknowledge. Often the outworking of global
citizenship through the curriculum had real meaning for faculty work. This was especially evident at the departmental level.

Study abroad was an important aspect of the Middlewood curriculum and the Confident category of participants generally presented strong connections between study abroad and global citizenship education. In order to make the greatest impact in integrating global citizenship education within the curriculum, a greater partnership could be formed between study abroad programs and the curriculum within academic disciplines. This builds on the idea of informed action and could lead to an additional step of reflection-on-informed action within the curriculum. In this way students could be provided with structured ways to reflect on global citizenship, after a study abroad trip, within the curriculum. This goal could also be achieved through cross-cultural service-learning within a local context close to campus. Reflection-on-informed action could also be integrated into the curriculum as a way to help students process their identity as global citizens. This may be especially possible at liberal arts colleges with high study abroad participation rates.

Second, the perspectives of faculty should be nurtured in seeking to integrate global citizenship on campus. Given the contested nature of global citizenship as a concept it is almost certain that faculty will offer different perspectives on the term, and how it should be applied within a specific campus context. This reality was evident in this case study. The term global citizenship conveys a range of meanings and faculty can help to shape the meaning for a particular campus. This might mean that certain aspects of global citizenship are set aside in favor of other meanings which better align with the
institution. Undertaking the work of definition would help to bring greater clarity to the campus as a whole, both in guiding faculty work and shaping student learning.

Faculty should be given opportunities to grow in their knowledge of global citizenship, in particular through interactions with colleagues. The importance of influential colleagues, both within an academic department, and across the campus, was evident in this study. Campus leaders can encourage faculty to discuss global citizenship and explore what this means within the overall college environment, and within disciplines. Faculty who are already engaged in integrating global citizenship within their departments, classrooms, and syllabi could be asked to lead workshops, summer reading groups, or other professional development opportunities. This study helps to show that faculty who are most engaged in global citizenship education often do so from a deep personal interest, and this interest should be encouraged within the campus environment. These types of opportunities may attract other faculty who are less confident in their understanding of global citizenship to explore its meaning. Global citizenship may also become a way for faculty to find common ground over their cross-cultural work and interests and thereby provide a sense of common language on campus around global work. These types of learning opportunities and broader discussions on global citizenship should ideally be kept separate, at least initially, from institutional discussions of the curriculum and important changes on campus. This case study revealed the difficulties of conflating discussions of global citizenship education within the larger institutional questions of identity, future direction, and core curriculum revision. The particular combination of events in this case showed that perhaps there was not enough consensus
already built around the concept of global citizenship, which made meaningful
discussions of global citizenship integration and the curriculum more difficult.

Third, it is important to establish a broader campus climate that is conducive to
reflection on global citizenship. This study found that faculty greatly valued the broader
campus commitment to global aspects of their work. This allowed them to explore issues
such as global citizenship and find others with whom they could work to deepen their
understanding. In addition, providing opportunities to lead study abroad trips, work on
cross-cultural research, and even create new courses with a global citizenship emphasis
were all acknowledged and valued by the faculty in this study. This type of commitment
on behalf of the college more generally seemed to largely offset other perceived areas of
difficulty that gave less meaning to faculty work. For example, the perceived lack of
value in the DP document, and the issues with the CL requirement, did not seem to be as
major an issue as they might otherwise have been, given the broader institutional
commitment to global learning. Establishing policies and setting parameters for the
college community was especially important to a number of the faculty in this study, yet
participants often recognized the complexity of undertaking this work. It seemed that, in
general, the faculty in this study valued the efforts and commitment to global citizenship
at the college, even as they perceived some frustrations with particular policies or
documents related to global learning.

The commitment to establishing a positive campus climate for global citizenship
can also extend to student life. The importance of *hospitality* as an aspect of global
citizenship came across in this study. This was seen as a way to help students, staff, and
faculty integrate global citizenship in a meaningful way by providing a welcoming
environment for students. This was viewed as especially important given the changing demographics of the student population, which is becoming increasingly diverse and has growing numbers of international students. Hospitality was discussed both in terms of the classroom context, where students have a voice to offer their perspective and feel equally valued, as well as in broader campus life. One faculty member in particular talked about her work to make the campus a welcoming and hospitable environment for international students, which for her was an aspect of global citizenship.

The idea of hospitality leads to a consideration of the local campus setting as a place for global citizenship education. The connection between global and local has been explored in this study and this has implications for campus leaders. Encouraging staff, faculty, and students to see local actions as connected to global citizenship is another way to integrate global citizenship on campus. Degree programs with internships, practicums, or other experiential learning can take this local learning and explore global dimensions of the experience. For example, students working with a local immigrant population could use this experience to further research the conditions that cause immigrants to move to the U.S., and learn more about the home country of those they interact with. Helping students to see that global citizenship is not simply a far away reality, but has local implications, was an important aspect in this study. Providing ways for international students, staff, and faculty to share their experience and insights can help to strengthen these connections.

Fourth, external factors can help to shape the campus and the integration of global citizenship. In this case study there were a number of external factors that helped to shape global citizenship education at the college. In the social work department the influence of
accreditation standards helped to shape change. The Modern Language department sought student feedback and learned that the professional intentions of their students did not match the curriculum learning goals. The curriculum seemed to be out-of-step with the broader context of how students would use their degree after graduation, so changes were introduced to the curriculum. The History department also changed the curriculum to have a greater global focus in light of broader external changes to the discipline.

Campus leaders can guide a review process whereby each department is asking whether their programs and learning outcomes are in alignment with student expectations for future employment and direction, and in keeping with standards for their academic discipline. Review cycles are often already taking place on campuses within academic departments, but doing so with a particular emphasis on global citizenship education may reveal additional opportunities and needs for curricular revision.

Institutional leaders can work to establish a campus climate that encourages the integration of global citizenship. This will most likely take a commitment of time and a willingness to provide space for discussion and reflection. Global citizenship is a contested term and offers multiple avenues for use on college campuses. This study offers a perspective on integrating global citizenship within a liberal arts context that focused on faculty understanding. Though a range of meaning is presented in this study, the value of global citizenship as a means to work towards campus internationalization remains evident.
Limitations

This study contained a number of limitations. First, as with qualitative research broadly, the results are not designed to offer generalizability. Second, the small sample size of research participants and selection of a single institution make this study limited in scope. This study may have some relevance for other liberal arts colleges, but is not intended to address all institutional types (e.g., community colleges, research universities). Third, the faculty in this study represented a certain amount of diversity including diversity in gender, years of experience, academic discipline, national citizenship, and faculty rank. The study was limited however in terms of ethnic diversity with all participants being Caucasian. This study also largely focused on tenured faculty or faculty who are on the tenure-track, and did not capture significant data on part-time or adjunct faculty who constitute a growing percentage of faculty in the U.S.

Further Research

Research in the area of campus internationalization, global learning, and faculty input in these areas is necessary and ongoing. Studies on global citizenship within higher education contribute to this larger body of work on campus internationalization, and provide a means to more precisely prescribe what students should learn in college, and how this can be assessed. Deardorff (2006; 2009) has highlighted the importance of a continual approach to defining and assessing global competence and global citizenship. Deardorff (2015), having summarized a decade of work on intercultural competence (which includes many terms such as global citizenship), identified definition and assessment as two of the three main areas for future research within intercultural
competency. This study has focused on the importance of definition and understanding global citizenship (from a faculty perspective) and makes the argument that the work of definition is an essential starting point. Additional research can seek to identify ways for the definition of terms to lead to specific learning outcomes, and then assessment, as part of the ongoing work of internationalization at liberal arts colleges. Researchers, individual institutions, and groups such as the AAC&U, ACE, and NAFSA can continue to partner in these efforts.

Global citizenship has been criticized for being too focused on a Western perspective (e.g., Pashby, 2012). This study has focused on U.S. higher education but future research could explore opportunities to include faculty perspectives on global citizenship education from international contexts. Welch (2005) provides an example of comparative work on faculty life and perspectives from different countries and education systems. Though his primary reference was not on global citizenship, he considers the ways in which globalization is shaping faculty work internationally. He writes that there are global trends that can be identified in shaping faculty work, it is still important to recognize the “powerful intersection of the local and global” (p. 205) for faculty, sentiments that seem to echo the language of global citizenship in this study.

In recent years greater attention has been given to researching faculty work and faculty careers. This includes research on the preparation of future faculty, the changing nature of faculty work, and increased numbers of contingent faculty. In the midst of this continued research it is worth considering the ways in which faculty will be encouraged to contribute to the ongoing work of the institution. This is especially the case when issues such as global citizenship, which do not fit neatly into one academic discipline or
department, are under consideration across an institution. Will faculty be able to provide significant input on the development of global citizenship in working with administrators to develop institutional priorities, programs, and curriculum? Are there ways for the promotion and tenure system to give greater weight to faculty service within liberal arts colleges, especially internationalization-related service to the institution? These are some of the enduring questions that remain for higher education in seeking to include the vital perspective faculty have to offer in shaping global citizenship education.
APPENDIX A

List of Participants

Table 5:

*Category One: Confident*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Pseudonym)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>International Experience</th>
<th>Years at Middlewood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Modern Languages</td>
<td>Extensive Led 7 semester programs</td>
<td>20+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Extensive Led 5-6 study abroad programs</td>
<td>30+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>Professor Program Director</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Extensive Over 15 years living overseas</td>
<td>15+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Modern Languages</td>
<td>Extensive Led 16 study abroad programs</td>
<td>25+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>P/t Professor</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>10+ years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6:

*Category Two: Skeptical*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>International Experience</th>
<th>Years at Middlewood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Extensive Research focus</td>
<td>8+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Significant Led multiple study abroad programs</td>
<td>7+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7:

*Category Three: Unconvinced*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>International Experience</th>
<th>Years at Middlewood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Continuum of Faculty Understanding

Figure 2:

*Faculty Continuum of Understanding of Global Citizenship*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Skeptical</th>
<th>Unconvinced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Alex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Interview Protocol

The interview will begin by focusing on your current understanding of global citizenship, then ask about how you came to this understanding, followed by questions asking about your work as a faculty member.

Section 1: Understanding of the term global citizenship

I would like to begin by asking questions related to your understanding of the term global citizenship:

- What is your current understanding of the term global citizenship?
- How important do you feel it is to define the term global citizenship?
- Are there specific learning outcomes that global citizenship education should aim to achieve?
- Many colleges state that they hope their graduates will be global citizens. What do you believe are the main characteristics of a global citizen?

Section 2: The ways faculty come to understand the term global citizenship

Up to this point we have focused on your understanding in defining global citizenship. In this section of the interview I would like to ask about how you came to your current understanding of global citizenship.

- Describe your educational background, current academic discipline, and an overview of your teaching experience.
• How did you come to be involved in global citizenship education?

• Have you ever lived overseas or participated in study abroad?
  - If so, please describe in more detail. How did this experience (or experiences) shape your understanding of global citizenship?

• What are the main influences on your understanding of global citizenship?

• How has your understanding of global citizenship developed over the course of your career?

• Are there ways in which your understanding of global citizenship has shaped your way of relating to your local community?

Section 3: Meanings for faculty work within their institution

Middlewood College has highlighted global citizenship as a desired outcome for students as a result of their education. Turning now to think more directly on the institutional setting at Middlewood College, let’s talk about how global citizenship has meaning for you as a faculty member.

• Do you think that your academic discipline has shaped your understanding of global citizenship? If so, in what specific ways?

• Do you think that your academic department has shaped your understanding of global citizenship? If so, in what specific ways?

• Do you think that the institution has shaped your understanding of global citizenship? If so, in what specific ways?
• The institution is discussing potential changes to the curriculum including the Cultural Learning (CL) requirement. From your perspective, how important is the CL requirement within the curriculum?

• In your opinion, should global citizenship education be included in the curriculum?
  - If so, in what specific ways?

• Has the institution provided any specific incentives or support for your involvement with global citizenship?
  - If so, in what ways?

• Are there institutional obligations for you to participate in study abroad or other international experiences?

• Are there specific ways in which your work in the area of global citizenship is evaluated or acknowledged? (Is this work taken into consideration in the promotion and tenure process, or through other forms of evaluation within the school?)

• What individuals or scholars have most influenced your understanding of global citizenship?

**Section 4: Global citizenship in faculty work**

In this section the questions focus on what global citizenship means for you in your work as a teacher and scholar.
• In what ways has global citizenship influenced your course syllabus planning, curriculum development, and content decisions? Please provide specific examples.

• How does your understanding of global citizenship influence your thinking about how students should be taught?

• In what ways are the global citizenship outcomes you discussed earlier evident in your courses?
  - Is there one course in which global citizenship is most emphasized?
    How? What do students study or do in this particular class?

• Do your teaching methods include global aspects [readings, using digital technology in teaching, international students in the classroom]?

• The internet can connect students directly with students and perspectives from other countries. Have you found useful ways to connect students to the concept of global citizenship by assigning website readings, blogs, etc. from other countries?

• What do you think is the greatest challenge facing global citizenship education within the college?

• Turning now from your teaching to your research. Can you describe ways in which global citizenship has shaped your research? Have you collaborated with scholars from other countries?

• Would you identify yourself as a global citizen?
  - If so, in what ways?

• Finally, are there any other areas related to global citizenship you would like to discuss?
APPENDIX D
Institutional Context

Middlewood College is a Christian liberal arts college in the United States founded over 125 years ago. With a typical enrollment of over 4,000 students the student-faculty ratio is around 15:1. Historically a large percentage of students enrolled at Middlewood are from the same denominational background as the college. The religious affiliation and history of the school has meant that the student body has remained relatively homogenous, however this has been changing, especially within the past ten years. Since 2006 the percentage of students from the same denominational background has dropped from almost 50% to 33%. In addition, the percentage of students of color enrolled at Middlewood has increased from under 5% in the early 2000s to around 14% in recent years. International students from over 50 countries typically make up between 7-10% of the student population.

Middlewood has developed a core curriculum that emphasizes a strong commitment to a traditional liberal arts education, with particular focus on knowledge, skills, and virtues oriented towards service to society. This includes a one-credit Cultural Learning requirement, a three-credit global studies course, and a foreign language requirement where students must take at least one three-credit class. This may increase based upon the number of years of language studies students have taken in high school. Ideally, between high school and college the stated goal is for students to complete a minimum of 4 years of language instruction. Since 2010 enrollment in modern language majors (French, German, Chinese, Japanese, and Spanish) has remained flat.
Over 50% of the Middlewood faculty are full professors, 23% associate professors, and 23% assistant professors. The remaining faculty are classified as instructors. Around 90% of the faculty are tenured or on the tenure track with 85% having earned a terminal degree. The percentage of faculty of color has risen from 7% to 10% since 2006.
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