EXPLORING WHAT BEING AND BECOMING A GLOBAL CITIZEN MEANS IN CONTEMPORARY UNIVERSITIES: INTERNATIONAL INDUSTRY KEY INFORMANT AND MOBILITY STUDENT PERSPECTIVES

Kathleen Lilley
B. Phty, M. Sports Phty (Hons), Grad Cert Higher Ed

A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

School of Public Health
Griffith Health
Griffith University
July 2013
ABSTRACT

The nature of contemporary society is characterised by global complexity, change and ongoing challenges. Flexible and adaptive local and global employees of the future need to be equipped with a global mindset and disposition that extends beyond competencies and vocational skills. Educating global citizens is a popular aim of contemporary universities, yet there is little organisational evidence showing how the concept translates to practice. The overarching question explored in the research program was *What does being and becoming a 'global citizen' mean in contemporary universities from concept to practice?* Two studies gathered in-depth information from international industry key informants and international mobility students through semi-structured interviews. The integrated findings extend our understanding of the philosophical and theoretical foundations of the global citizen, as well as providing a clearer understanding of the role and responsibility of the university.

The studies were designed to capture multiple perspectives to build an explanation of the global citizen and reveal new knowledge that could inform the internationalisation of the curriculum (IoC). Study One examined key informant perspectives of the conceptual and practical aspects of the global citizen, and the university role in and responsibility for translating the aim of educating global citizens into practice. Study Two explored Australian and European mobility students' experiences, focusing specifically on their stories of change, personal growth and development, as well as their mindset for thinking during the change process. The integrated analysis of findings provides considerable insight into what being and becoming a global citizen means in contemporary universities.

The research unraveled the ambiguity of the global citizen. Industry key informants use the term global citizen or closely interrelated terms to describe the 'ideal global graduate'. The findings demonstrate that the global citizen is underpinned philosophically, epistemologically and ontologically by moral and transformative cosmopolitanism. The global citizen has a humane disposition, engages with diverse others and is able to make interconnections of knowledge across complex constructs. While the 'ideal global graduate' is considered as open, tolerant, responsible to self, others and the planet, it is conceptualised beyond narrow definitions, lists of attributes and technical efficiencies.
The global citizen may wear many guises. The idea of being definitive about the picture of the global citizen was compared to the complexity of constructing a human face from a one-dimensional identikit creation. The research identified what the global citizen means in practical terms by identifying a set of broad markers, clustered together as an 'Identikit' for the global citizen. The central markers suggest that the global citizen is prepared to move out of the comfort zone, engages beyond family and peers, and has a mindset for thinking differently (social imaginary, reflexivity, relationality and criticality). The global citizen presents a mature outlook, and considers their life beyond narrow expectations. The 'Identikit' offers a tool of recognition for academic staff and introduces students to the practical basis of becoming a global citizen.

Being and becoming a global citizen involves a development process described as global citizen learning. It is explained through the four lenses of transformative learning theory (Dirksen, Mezirow, & Cranton, 2006) and Barnett’s (2004) Zone 4 of learning. Moreover, the research provides theoretical and practical insight to Bennett’s (2008) description of the ‘global soul’. The ‘mindset, heartset and skill set’ of the global citizen are intricately interwoven into the process of global citizen learning.

The research informs top-down, middle-out, and bottom-up organisational change processes and identified enablers and constraints for educating global citizens at each of these levels. The research proposes that global citizen learning could be synthesized with organisational strategies for IoC and suggests ways of integrating global citizen learning with vocational learning. Organisational, global citizen learning needs to be marketed to students in meaningful terms, to expand and reframe their expectations of learning beyond obtaining a degree.

University graduates increasingly are faced with complexity, uncertainty and unprecedented challenges in their personal and professional lives. Their ability to flourish and prosper demands vocational expertise and a global ‘mindset, heartset and skillset’. Being and becoming a global citizen is significant to all university actors. The conceptual, practical, organisational and pedagogical implications of this research offer significant insight to educating all students as global citizens of the future.
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1.0 Introduction to thesis

1.1 Background

Globalisation and a dominant neoliberal economic paradigm have fundamentally changed the form and function of the contemporary university (Hyslop-Margison & Sears, 2008). As part of this paradigm, neoliberal education policy has steered higher education towards training, employment, and reskilling. Not only is education considered in terms of human capital formation (Henry, Lingard, Rizvi, & Taylor, 2001), higher education is commonly framed as students’ investment in their future prosperity as employees (Henry et al., 2001; Richardson, 2008; Scholte, 2005), which shifts the emphasis from public good to private good (Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2009, p. xii). This ‘self-capitalising model’ of education (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010, p. 152) has replaced the more liberal humanist conceptualisations of higher education (Marginson & Sawir, 2011; Nussbaum, 2010; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). Internationalisation of higher education in the late twentieth century has evolved reactively in step with globalisation, favouring a competitive model in which education is traded as an international commodity (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2010; de Wit 2013, p. 14).

Internationalisation of higher education continues to spread in OECD countries (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010, p. 22), and is predominantly conceptualised and operationalised through an ‘economic rationale’ (de Wit, 2002, p. 89), to the detriment of value-embedded concepts such as sustainability, equity of rights, and access (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2010, p. 31-33). Whereas internationalisation was expected to produce graduates who are competent and able to work effectively in a global environment (Knight, 1997), from the Australian perspective, there is limited evidence showing that internationalisation has broadened graduate outlooks (Gallagher, 2011). In this respect, Green (2012, p. 28) argued that the instrumental and commercial focus of internationalisation should be secondary to both educating global citizens, and centralising the focus of internationalisation on student learning.

Internationalisation of the Curriculum (IoC), which aims to influence the learning experience of all students, is gaining popularity as an element of comprehensive frameworks for internationalisation (Bourn, McKenzie, & Shiel, 2006; Childress, 2007; Hudzik, 2011; Jones, 2013a; Leask, 2012; Qiang, 2003). IoC has been criticised for avoiding transformative approaches in teaching and learning (Richardson, 2008), and for not engaging in the social imaginary of globalisation (Rizvi, 2007).
Recently, Leask (2013c) has included the ‘imaginary’ as a tool via which academics should consider more expansive possibilities for the context of internationalising their disciplinary curriculum. However, the challenge of engaging staff in this process of internationalising the curriculum is acknowledged (Caruana, 2010a; Leask, 2013c; Leask & Bridge, 2013; Mak & Barker, 2013). Specifically, Leask and Bridge concluded that future empirical research is needed to expand knowledge about the way students become “global souls” and develop their student ‘mindset, skillset and heartset’ (Bennett, 2008). Bennett described being ‘global souls’ as, “seeing ourselves as members of a world community, knowing that we share the future with others- requires not only intercultural experience but also the capacity to engage that experience transformatively” (p. 18). Currently IoC strategies implicitly or explicitly aim to educate all students as global citizens, but a great deal of uncertainty surrounds how this can be achieved.

The global citizen is not well understood in higher education. There is little consensus on what a global citizen means conceptually in higher education or how it is implemented from policy to practice (Bourn, 2011, p. 563). Barrie (2004, p. 269) described global citizenship as an overarching graduate attribute that represents “an attitude or stance towards the world”. Yet, there has been scant in-depth analysis of the process that students undergo to become ‘global citizens’ within the internationalisation process or as an outcome of internationalisation of the curriculum (Jones, E., 2009; Jones & Killick, 2013). Research into the process of how students learn to become global citizens is rare.

In the past, research on the global citizen has focused predominantly on the student international mobility experience, with limited attention paid to the majority of students who do not participate in mobility programs. For instance, previous mobility research has focused on attribute development (Morais & Ogden, 2010; Williams, 2005) and values, beliefs and attitudes (Tarrant, 2010; Wynveen, Kyle, & Tarrant, 2012). Mobility has been recognised as a way to enhance an altered sense of self-identity, social sensibilities, the imagination, and a broader global outlook (Killick, 2012; Savicki & Selby, 2008; Selby, 2008; Skelly, 2008). ‘Global souls’ according to Bennett (2008, p. 13) develop as a consequence of mobility. They see themselves as members of a world community and have the capacity to engage in transformative experiences with others. The transformational benefit of mobility has been attributed to facilitating a shift in students’ frames of reference (Bennett, 2008; Byram & Dervin, 2008; Killick, 2012; Schattle, 2008; Selby, 2008). Industry key informant research on intercultural
competence has been undertaken using Delphi studies to investigate the nature of intercultural competence and global competency (Deardorff, 2004, 2006; Hunter, White, & Godbey, 2006). Notwithstanding previous research, Savicki and Selby (2008, p. 346) argued that there remains insufficient knowledge and understanding about intercultural competence, growth and transformation that occurs as a result of mobility.

Understanding how students learn to become global citizens in the context of higher education is an under-researched phenomenon. According to Peters (2008, p. ii), the global citizen is context-bound between global factors and the university environment. The multiple contexts for understanding the global citizen include: political, social, and economic contexts; local and global contexts; contexts for teaching and learning; and, cultural and interdisciplinary contexts. However, the global citizen is rarely conceptualised and explored as a multi-layered construct. Nor has it been explored across multiple levels of influence. In practice, educational focus for university graduates is often operationalised in terms of graduate employment and professional training, with less educational focus on humanistic contexts (Gacel-Avila, 2005, p. 122; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010, p. 197). This thesis contrasts the neoliberal focus on education based solely on skills for employment with a cosmopolitan focus that emphasises broader approaches to learning to enhance employability.

There are emerging voices calling for the educational imbalance between the neoliberal employment paradigm and the humanistic cosmopolitan paradigm to be redressed (Delanty, 2007; Gacel-Avila, 2005; Hudson, 2007; Marginson & Sawir, 2011; Nussbaum, 2010; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). For this to occur, there is a need for greater scholarly understanding of the philosophical, epistemological and ontological underpinning of the global citizen, and what this means in the context of higher education and student learning. Although Lilley, Barker and Harris (2014) conceptualised the link between the global citizen and a moral and transformative cosmopolitanism, there is limited extant empirical evidence in the context of higher education learning to support this proposition.

From the organisational perspective, Caruana (2010b, p. 41) argued that there is an ostensible lack of enablers in the university setting for preparing global citizens beyond the disciplines of business, information technology and management. Furthermore, Leask and Bridge (2013, p. 81) highlight the uncertainty teachers experience in respect of preparing students for ‘being human’ as well as for ‘being productive workers’. Understanding what a global citizen means from the student
perspective is also under-explored. For instance, students have been shown to be skeptical about the term 'global citizen' and see it as an elitist concept (Bourn, 2010, p. 24). Students engage globally through social media and develop their own global networks; on the other hand there is a need to explore whether students' networks translate to a mindset for thinking and understanding in the global context.

In summary, there has been limited research exploring the global citizen as a personal, social and organisationally embedded construct, or in the context of becoming one as a process for learning. Furthermore, there is a great deal of uncertainty about ways to integrate the aim of producing global citizens into mainstream curricula processes in contemporary higher education. There is an apparent gap between the policy rhetoric for educating global citizens, and the conceptual, organisational, and pedagogical knowledge and processes needed to turn rhetoric into a reality for all students.

1.2 The research program overview

1.2.1 Research problem summary
Educating global citizens is frequently expressed as an aim of internationalised higher education. There is limited empirical evidence, however, to understand what being and becoming a global citizen means from concept to practice. There is little consensus on the theoretical basis of the construct in higher education or what it means practically, organisationally, and pedagogically. The nature of the student mindset during the process of becoming a global citizen is not well understood. This research program is designed to unravel the rhetoric of the global citizen construct by exploring its conceptual underpinnings, practical application, and organisational implications for educating all students as global citizens.

1.2.2 Aim and objectives of the research
The research program aims to develop a deeper understanding of what the concept of the global citizen means and how it is operationalised in contemporary higher education.

This aim will be achieved by examining the perspectives of two stakeholder groups, industry key informants and international mobility students.
The objectives of the research program are:

1. To build a conceptual understanding of the global citizen;
2. To identify what a global citizen means in practical terms;
3. To examine the organisational enablers and constraints to educating global citizens;
4. To understand students’ experience of change associated with an international mobility experience; and
5. To explore how universities can foster the development of all students as global citizens.

1.2.3 Research design and scope

The theoretical foundations of the research program are situated within a social constructivist interpretive paradigm (Elwell, 1996). The research program aims to answer the question: What does being and becoming a ‘global citizen’ mean in contemporary universities from concept to practice? This question frames the overall case investigated in the research program. In order to answer this question, two embedded qualitative case studies were carried out to obtain in-depth information from international industry key informants, and international mobility students. The studies were designed to capture multiple perspectives of the global citizen to build an explanation of the phenomenon in contemporary universities. Study One examined the views of international key informants to better understand what a global citizen means, how one might be recognised, and the university role in, and responsibility for translating the aim of educating global citizens into practice.

To complement Study One, Study Two explores Australian and European mobility students’ experiences, focusing specifically on their stories of change, personal growth and development, as well as their mindset for thinking during the change process. Both studies seek to reveal new knowledge that could inform the IoC, and so more effectively educate all students as global citizens in the future. Each study addressed independent research questions. A cross-case analysis presented in Chapter Nine analysed and synthesised the data between both studies. The significance of the cross-case analysis is discussed in Section 1.4.3. The next section describes Study One and Study Two.
1.3 The research studies

1.3.1 Study One
The aim of Study One is to use semi-structured interviews to seek the perspectives of twenty-six industry leaders in the field of international education. This sample is referred to throughout the thesis as informants. The overarching aim for Study One is to develop a deeper understanding of what the concept of the global citizen in contemporary universities means to them, and how it might be translated from concept into practice.

The following questions guided the interview process for Study One:
1. How do informants in the field of internationalisation conceptualise the global citizen as exemplifying the ideal global graduate?
2. How would informants recognise a student acting as a global citizen (or other related term) in a practical way (e.g. interview, curricula vitae)?
3. Is it possible to recognise stages of students becoming global citizens and could/should they be measured?
4. How does the mobility experience facilitate change in students (if at all)?
5. How can non-mobility students learn to become global citizens (if at all)?
6. What is the role and social responsibility (if any) of the university to develop students as global citizens and what are the organisational implications?

In Study One, informants are asked to explain the global citizen or their preferred related term (e.g. cosmopolitan, interculturally competent, cross-cultural capability and global perspectives etc.) that represents the ‘ideal global graduate’. Discussing the ‘ideal global graduate’ enabled a more flexible approach to obtaining informant perspectives, and is consistent with the ‘ideal’ research approach used by Swedberg and Agevall (2005). Qualitative researchers use ‘ideal types’ to see how well the ‘ideal type’ matches observable phenomena, and is particularly useful for imprecise concepts or issues which have been difficult to define. The ‘ideal type’ identifies what is essential to the research problem and allows the findings to build on existing theory (Neuman, 2006, p. 55). Encouraging informants to use their own term to describe the ‘ideal global graduate’ allows their descriptions to be compared to the global citizen.

1.3.2 Study Two
An international mobility experience is acknowledged repeatedly in the literature as contributing to student transformation (Bennett, 2008; Savick & Selby, 2008; Selby,
In order to understand the phenomenon of transformation in more depth, Study Two explored the changes that students experience as a result of an international mobility experience. Semi-structured interviews are undertaken with twenty-one Australian and European public health students who completed an international mobility experience. A second interview was undertaken six months later with eleven students.

The overall research program aim is to develop a deeper understanding of the global citizen from concept to practice. In Study Two this is contextualised to understand the student experience of change associated with an international mobility experience. The sub-objectives of Study Two are:

- To understand the factors common to mobility that facilitate change for students
- To identify the shared manifestations of student change, and
- To identify how the student experience of change expands our understanding of the global citizen and the student global mindset for learning in higher education.

The semi-structured interviews with students are guided by the following questions:

- What are the 'key changes' students experienced in regard to self-awareness, awareness of others, culture and society (if any)?
- Can students identify any particular perspective/s that changed after the mobility experience?
  - Why do they think this occurred?
  - In what way has this impacted on them (for instance in their lives, career goals, and relationships with others?)
- Can students explain what may have facilitated or caused the changes they experienced?
- How do students think universities could assist students who do not undertake an international mobility experience to broaden their perspectives and think differently?

The student stories offer an opportunity to explore the insiders’ explanations of what it means to change perspectives and start to think and learn as global citizens. This research program aims to expand on previous research by integrating multiple perspectives of the global citizen, utilising a cross-case analysis as explained in the next section.
1.3.3 Significance of the cross-case analysis

The 'global citizen' is a multi-faceted concept, and operationalising it from concept to practice in the context of contemporary universities is complex. There is scant research exploring what a 'global citizen' means holistically, across multiple levels of university influence. The current research program is designed to capture what being and becoming a global citizen means conceptually, and in terms of learning in higher education. The cross-case analysis of the overall case reported in Chapter Nine was achieved through an analysis and synthesis of data from the two embedded cases. The synthesis of the cross-case analysis involved an analytical reconstruction of concepts that draw on the literature to create deeper meaning and understanding. The cross-case analysis expands our understanding of the research phenomenon.

The two sources of evidence in this research will be analysed and synthesised (following Miles and Huberman (1994) analytical guidelines) and reported in Chapter Nine to capture the complexity and multifaceted nature of the global citizen in contemporary universities. Yin (2009, p. 38) contends that ‘replication’ of findings from multiple sources in case study research, through converging lines of research evidence, strengthens an explanation and expands on theory. Furthermore, triangulating different viewpoints strengthens the conceptual and theoretical understanding of the research phenomenon, enhancing the authenticity of the findings. The Principles of the Hermeneutic Circle (Neuman, 2006, p. 149) discussed in Chapter Four, also provides further interpretive balance to the cross-case analysis. The two worldviews captured in this research expand our philosophical, ontological, and epistemological understanding of the phenomenon in the context of higher education. The cross-case analysis promotes a level of understanding not possible through a single lens of enquiry.

The next section outlines the structure of the thesis.

1.4 Structure of the thesis

The thesis is presented in ten chapters (see Table 1.1). Chapters Two and Three review a wide selection of literature to establish a background of understanding for the global citizen in higher education. Chapter Two reviews the macro environment influencing the global citizen in higher education. It discusses how globalisation and neoliberalism impact on higher education policy and practice. Globalisation is also considered in the context of contemporary society and citizenship. The conflicting neoliberal and cosmopolitan paradigms in higher education are discussed highlighting how the
vocational focus of higher education has overtaken the humanistic aims of learning and social responsibility. The importance of internationalisation of higher education to the contemporary university is discussed, and its core features are summarised. Building on this literature, Chapter Three narrows the focus of enquiry and conceptualises the concept of the global citizen, as well as the process of becoming one.

The moral and transformative cosmopolitan basis of the global citizen is explained as a philosophy, epistemology and ontology for underpinning the global citizen disposition and the process of global citizen learning. Further, it is proposed that transformative learning theories offer a possible theoretical underpinning for the student mindset during the transformative process of global citizen learning (Dirkx, Mezirow & Cranton, 2006, Barnett (2004). Chapter Three concludes by presenting a conceptual framework (Figure 3.1) that visibly demonstrates how the global citizen in higher education can be seen to be influenced by opposing neoliberal and cosmopolitan paradigms.

Chapter Four explains the theory and methodology for the research program. Here my philosophical and theoretical orientation to the research is made explicit. Also, the rationale for the research design and my role and participation in the current research program are established. Criticisms of the theory, methodology and methods, and the steps taken to address the previously identified limitations are discussed. Chapter Four explains how the individual elements of the research build on each other to create an overall theoretical framework to support the research.

The research findings are presented in Chapters Five, Six, Seven, and Eight. The industry key informant study is detailed in Chapters Five, Six, and Seven. Chapter Five focuses on the conceptual nature of the global citizen. In Chapter Six, the informants’ perspectives of the organisational constraints and enablers for educating global citizens are explained. Chapter Seven provides the informants’ views on the philosophical basis of the global citizen, as well as epistemological insights into how students learn as global citizens. In Chapters Five, Six, and Seven, discussion of the industry key informants’ perspectives enhances understanding of the conceptual, practical, organisational, and pedagogical implications of the global citizen in contemporary universities.

Chapter Eight presents the findings from Study Two. The chapter offers a different lens of enquiry from that of Study One by presenting the international mobility students’ perceptions of what it means to become a global citizen. Part One of Study Two
explains the circumstances that facilitate student transformation and that are consistent with becoming a global citizen. Part Two of Study Two captures the common manifestations of students’ experiences of change, facilitated by mobility.

In Chapter Nine, the findings of the two studies are integrated into a cross-case report. Chapter Nine synthesises the multiple interpretations found in Study One and Study Two to provide an in-depth understanding of the research objectives, and discusses how universities can foster the development of all students as global citizens. The concluding chapter, Chapter Ten, comprises an overview of the research findings, contributions of the research, and recommendations for policy, practice, and future research. Table 1.1 provides an overview of the structure of the thesis.

**Table 1.1 Overview of thesis structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>Understanding the macro context of the global citizen in higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>Understanding the global citizen and global citizen learning in higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Theoretical approach</td>
<td>The research program theory and methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Study One Part One</td>
<td>Conceptualising the global citizen in higher education: Industry key informant perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Study One Part Two</td>
<td>Organisational implications for educating global citizens: Industry key informant perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Study One Part Three</td>
<td>Insights to the student global mindset and global citizen learning: Industry key informant perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Study Two</td>
<td>Exploring international mobility students’ personal changes and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Research cross-case analysis</td>
<td>Discussion: Study One and Study Two cross-case analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Summary of findings and implications</td>
<td>Thesis conclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.5 Personal statement

Academic curiosity and personal experience in international higher education stimulated my interest in exploring the meaning of the global citizen in higher education. As Australian Project Leader for an Australian European Industrialised Countries Cooperation Instrument (ICI) Joint Mobility Project, I attended Project Leaders’ Conferences in 2008, 2009 and 2010 in Europe and the USA. At the first European Commission Project Leaders’ Conference (Erasmus, Atlantis and ICI) in 2008, I was amazed at the lack of scholarly inquiry into the personal change students experienced as the result of a mobility experience.

At these conferences, presentations on the ‘good outcomes’ from mobility projects focused on the methodology/operations of projects, rather than on what it meant to students in terms of transformation and change. While this area attracted extensive government investment, the gap in understanding the theoretical complexities of mobility and student transformation was apparent. Furthermore, there appeared to be little research attention on understanding how the theory underpinning student change as result of mobility could influence the learning of non-mobility students.

I was fortunate to have open lines of communication with two Australian and European bureaucrats involved with ICI between 2008 and 2010. These personnel were invaluable ‘sounding boards’ for my developing perspectives, and they were supportive of my research interests. In addition, they assisted me by providing introductions to a number of industry key informants who were interviewed in Study One.

During the conception, planning and conducting of this research program, I have been aware that this is a complex area of research because of the value-laden nature of the topic. I was interested in exploring the philosophical history of the global citizen, its links to cosmopolitanism and how this might inform the future of higher education. In 2008 during my study for the Graduate Certificate in Higher Education, I examined Griffith University’s Academic Plan and Internationalisation Strategy. My physiotherapy and public health background, experience as an academic manager, and my intellectual curiosity ignited my interest in the disjunction between policy aims for the global citizen, and the reality of realising these aims. My position is neither religious nor atheist. A humanist perspective informs it. As a pragmatic person, I appreciate the neoliberal rationale for a corporate university, but also, as an optimist, I have a keen interest in reinvigorating the intellectual potential of a humanist approach to education.
Throughout the research process, I have taken seriously the responsibility of wearing the two hats of pragmatism and optimism. Wearing one hat, I strive to be objective and value-free, while the other hat tempers subjectivity and reflection on our social reality. Overall, I have attempted to critically and reflectively balance my role as a participant in the interpretive research process with academic integrity.

1.6 Summary: Chapter One

Chapter One introduced the research program. A brief literature background was provided to justify the research problem. The aims, objectives and research design and scope were explained, and the structure of the thesis was described. The next chapter introduces the macro variables influencing the global citizen in higher education.
2.0 The macro context of the global citizen

2.1 Introduction to literature review

The literature review is presented in Chapters Two and Three. This comprehensive coverage of the extant literature explains the underpinning conceptual, theoretical and practical issues that are important to understanding the global citizen in contemporary universities. The global citizen has become fashionable again (Carter, 2001), and no more so than in the higher education sector. The concept is widely conceptualised in the literature through an economic (neoliberal), political (radical) or social (moral and transformative) lens (Vertovec & Cohen, 2002). However it is rare for universities to identify their underpinning conceptualisation of the global citizen, a moral and transformative cosmopolitan conceptualisation fits well with the espoused social values seen in university policy statements (Kumar, 2010).

Moral and transformative cosmopolitanism provides students with a way to understand the interactions between humanity, society and the environment. Through this lens students are able to think reflexively and relationally about the impacts of globalisation from the political, economic, social, technical, environmental, and cultural aspects. This lens provides a basis from which to foster and facilitate students’ abilities to think in a systemic and adaptive way about the impacts of globalisation. The cosmopolitan way of thinking fosters moral reasoning and social responsibility in students’ mindsets. Leask (2012) developed a conceptual framework for internationalisation of the curriculum (IoC), intended to act as an institutional and curriculum guide for action. While this model aimed at developing all students as critical and reflexive global citizens, Leask identified a research gap for understanding the student mindset in learning. Furthermore, according to de Wit (2013) not only is there pedagogical uncertainty in regard to what a global citizen means, this extends to the university organisational context also.

This literature review highlights the complexity of the macro and microenvironments of the global citizens in higher education. Globalisation, as a key influencing phenomenon in the higher education sector, is brought into focus first in this literature review and is then followed by internationalisation of higher education. In the first section of Chapter Two, the definitions, dimensions, and models of globalisation are discussed specifically in the context of the higher education sector. Neoliberalism, as the dominant political paradigm influencing the form and function of higher education,
then discussed. In the final section of Chapter Two, the impacts of globalisation in respect of internationalisation of higher education are discussed. The forces and impacts of globalisation are unrelenting and over the last thirty years have influenced higher education considerably (Humes, 2008; Peters, Britton, & Blee, 2008; Richardson, 2008; Rizvi, 2011; Scholte, 2005).

The changing global environment suggests that the way that things have always been may never be again. For instance, Chomsky (2006, p. 2) argued, ‘Failed States’ need no longer be the fate of 3rd world countries, a somewhat insightful prediction to the global financial crisis (GFC), and the complexity of current global affairs. In many ways, the rapid evolution of globalisation has outpaced our theory and language to articulate in a common voice, its societal and individual impacts (McGrew, 2000, p. 160; Saito, 2007, p. 261). It is rare, however, for universities to engage in any depth in the discussion of the implications of global complexity and changing student learning needs. This is particularly the case when considering the conceptual, organisational and practical implications for educating global citizens. Chapter Two provides a succinct representation of the influences of globalization and internationalisation on higher education. It reveals how the construct of the global citizen is currently represented in the literature and proposes a balanced and contextually relevant conceptualisation of the global citizen that is consistent with the espoused social responsibility aims of higher education. The next section introduces globalisation.

2.2 Key globalisation issues

2.2.1 Defining globalisation

Globalisation has had far reaching impacts on the early twenty-first century society. While there is no singular agreed definition for globalisation, there have been many attempts at creating meaning for this modern phenomenon. Quite simply, Hudson and Slaughter (2007, p. 1) described globalisation “as a process whereby distant events or influences significantly affect local political and social activity”. This definition, while providing insight, arguably falls short of identifying the broader complexities of globalisation. In the higher education sector, Knight and de Wit’s (1997) definition is frequently used and is described as:

the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, ideas… across borders. Globalisation affects each country in a different way due to a nation’s individual history, traditions, culture and priorities. The impacts of globalisation occur through rapid interactions of markets and technology affecting lives globally” (p. 6).
From a more philosophical perspective, Rizvi and Lingard (2010, p. 31) argued that globalisation is more than a concept describing change; it represents an ideological formation and a social imaginary. Whereas neoliberal ideology promotes growth, economic efficiency, choice, deregulation and privatisation of public institutions, and relegates social welfare as a lesser concern (Peck & Tickle, 2002, p. 394), the social imaginary promotes a collective way of thinking that evolves into a common understanding of global change (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010, p. 34). It allows individuals to imagine their social existence, their place and relationships with others in their own sphere and operates at a deeper level (Taylor, 2004, p. 23).

The collective social imaginary is not fixed in time or space, rather it is in a state of flux and characterised by diffusion of images, ideas and ideologies across communities around the world (Appadurai, 1996). In contrast to the former neoliberal definitions of a fixed reality, the latter description considers globalisation from a more fluid perspective. It allows globalisation to be thought of as an enabling phenomenon representing change and complexity. The social imaginary enables individuals and collectives to imagine and engage with the possibilities that globalisation provides. The complexity of globalisation can be appreciated by considering specific dimensions and models in the context of higher education.

2.2.2 Dimensions of globalisation
Conflicting dimensions characterise globalisation. Appadurai (1996) captured the essence of globalisation by describing global flows, convergences and divergences. The complexity of globalisation can be further contextualised within higher education by insights from Humes (2008), Rizvi and Lingard (2010) and Richardson (2008). First, Humes (2008, p. 42) provides a higher education context for globalisation through five overlapping and interrelated dimensions of globalisation. From a contrasting perspective, Richardson (2008) and Rizvi and Lingard (2011) discuss globalisation through the imaginary. In this way, the fluidity of globalisation is considered through possibilities rather than fixed facts. These perspectives expand our understanding of globalisation in the context of higher education.

First, Hume (2008) described the neoliberal paradigm where the impact of the economic dimension of globalisation is represented by global trade and commerce. In this dimension he acknowledged the merging of national and global identities, yet failed to link the negative consequences to educational needs. In contrast, Richardson (2008) described economic globalisation as a monopolar imaginary where education value
systems are tied to individualism, competiveness and self-reliance. The monopolar imaginary of the economic dimension of globalisation fails to recognise the humanistic basis of society and education.

The next dimension of globalisation is related to supranational political influence. The most cited supranational organisations are the European Union, the OECD, the World Bank, United Nations, International Monetary Fund and NATO (Hudson & Slaughter, 2007, p. 4; Scholte, 2005, p. 138). Humes (2008, pp. 42-44) described the OECD as the most dominant player in higher education through its cross-national agendas for global comparative measurement. Yet in his analysis, Humes (2008) omitted to mention the impact of OECD-led neoliberal policies of commercialisation, managerialism, instrumentalism and human capital theory. These policies frame higher education in terms of skill development, fuel individualism and contribute to the declining emphasis on the ‘public good’ role of the university. The commercialisation of higher education has significantly changed the form and function of the higher education sector (Chomsky, 2006, p. 227; Furedi, 2011, p. 70; Hargreaves & Shirley, 2009, p. xi; Henry et al., 2001, p. 175; Marginson, 1999; Saul, 1997, p. 191). Arguably, the commercial focus on graduate skill development falls short of the espoused aims of universities to educate socially responsible global citizens.

The third dimension, cultural globalisation overlaps considerably with the economic and technological dimensions. Humes (2008, p. 43) described cultural globalisation as the ‘McDonaldisation of society’ and explained the homogenising influence of globalisation across cultural norms and traditions. In particular, the standardisation of values means that morality and behaviour are influenced through media and technological globalisation. Cultural globalisation has been shaped as the modern ‘colonialisation’ of the masses (Spring, 2010, p. 108) by which various societal standards such as religious ideals, law and family values have become standardised into a set of ‘market belief systems’. The market transmits these ‘belief systems’ to the masses. Market and media led value standards have shaped new challenges to universities, as student values can be formed beyond the traditional influence of family and religion. Cultural and technological forms of globalisation are closely intertwined.

Technological globalisation has contributed to the most rapid societal, individual, and educational change. Knowledge generation and transmission, once the exclusive domain of educational institutions, is now accessible to, and generated by, a broader field of actors across the globe through the Internet (Humes, 2008). Appadurai
(2000, p. 53) considered the mass media as the new power in social life. More people across the world are now provided with images of lives and possibilities not previously imaginable. As a consequence of mass media, the imagination has moved beyond the individual to the imagination of collectives (Appadurai, 2000, p. 8). This description has been most powerfully seen through the spread of political unrest in the Middle East and citizen revolt since 2011. Once unimaginable, regime change has been brought about by the ‘imaginings of the collectives’ and facilitated by the rapid communication and sharing of common interests through the Internet and social networking. The significance of media literacy and interconnected thinking in education is a critically important aspect of student learning and students developing frames of reference.

Environmental globalisation, central to the future viability of society and the planet, is greatly influenced by the preceding dimensions of globalisation (Humes, 2008). Richardson (2008) explained the interconnectedness of the global environment and society as an ecological imaginary where everything is connected. Similarly Vester (2007) explained the art of interconnected thinking as a specific mindset. He explained this mindset as ‘systems thinking’ and it is essential for tackling complexity in a global environment. Yet, making the interconnections between the environment and climate change or depletion of natural resources is at odds with multinational economic and political interests. Furthermore, these dimensions are frequently at odds with the sustainability of societies and the global environment in the corporate pursuit of productivity and prosperity (Humes, 2008). Saul (1997, p. 36) described this contemporary paradox. He argued that the ‘corporate elite’ operate for self-interest and leave the collective ignorant of the future consequences. Other authors attribute the power of corporate self-interest as the greatest hurdle of environmental globalisation and an important challenge for educators (Humes, 2008; Richardson, 2008; Scholte, 2005). The conflicting tensions between the dimensions of globalisation necessitate interconnected thinking for problem solving and meaning making across complex constructs.

The conflict between the market and social responsibility are highlighted through the five dimensions of globalisation discussed above. In light of this conflict, Saul (1997, p. 36) called for educators to foster moral reasoning to wake the “unconscious citizens” and create a society that has the capacity to understand the interconnected and conflicting ideologies that control them. Along a similar vein, Hill (1983, p. 211) described environmental inaction as societal apathy. He felt that preserving natural environments is connected to education through virtues and moral
reasoning. Many authors have highlighted the risk of focusing education on material gain to the detriment of promoting liberal values and ethical and moral reasoning (Hill, 1983; Humes, 2008; Saul, 1997; Scholte, 2005). Globalisation is creating a need for learning that engages with broader educational concepts such as a global identity and mindset, and engaging with a collective social imaginary for environmental awareness, and moral reasoning. The impacts of globalisation pose moral and ethical challenges to the individual and the collective. The educational significance of globalisation provides context for the models of globalisation discussed in the next section.

2.2.3 Models of globalisation

The impacts of globalisation can be understood through two models that exemplify the conflicting tensions of globalisation on society and individuals. In contrast to Friedman's (2006) monopolar imaginary of globalisation in his book, 'The World is Flat', these two models explain the inequalities between rich and poor, developed and undeveloped countries. The models outline the social and civil injustices reinforced by the 'dark side' of globalisation (Saul, 1997, p. 36). First, Foucault (1988) described 'globalisation from above' led by neoliberalism, and second, 'globalisation from below', operating at the civic participatory level. These models explain how globalisation creates the unequal distribution of wealth, between the 'haves' and 'have nots'. Kellner (2002) argued that the imposition of 'globalisation from above' with capitalist logic, will ultimately result in widespread resistance and struggle in cultures operating under different paradigms. This has been demonstrated by Jihadist terrorism in the last 15 years. Kellner (2002), however, felt that mobilising society through 'globalisation from below' had the potential to change the structure of society and reinvigorate citizen social responsibility. As such, mobilising citizen participation 'from below' facilitates global alliances and action for social and political justice, environmental protection and more democratic freedom (Moellendorf, 2004). The success of global citizen participatory action is dependent on the mindset and understandings of a collective society committed to public good.

2.2.4 Global civil society

The notion of the global citizen suggests some form of global society. Yet, the emergence or even existence of a global civil society as an outcome of globalisation is a highly contested concept (Carter, 2007; Hudson & Slaughter, 2007; Ibrahim, 2005; Kymlicka & Norman, 1994; Kymlika, 2002). The common feature of a civil society can be understood as the space where collective citizen action occurs. This space is external to the family, government, and market. It is where people associate to advance their collective and
individual interests. The Western notion of civil society allows for plurality of social values and can include transparency, tolerance, non-violence, gender equity, poverty eradication and environmental sustainability (Malena & Heinrich, 2007, p. 338). However, Keane (2003, p. xiii) pointed out that diverse groups such as neoliberals, Islamists and post-Marxists all use civil society to describe their own collective space, and that it is not just a Western concept. The reemergence of interest in the concept of collective space is theorised to have occurred in the wake of recent historical events such as the political, social and economic consequences of the post cold war era, and more recently in the wake of increased levels and impacts of terrorism (Hudson, 2007; Ibrahim, 2005; Kymlicka & Norman, 1994; Kymlika, 2002; Sassoon, 2005; Zolo, 2007). In particular, the imposition of global standards of security in the wake of 9/11 and the impact of the global financial crisis have increased public awareness of the interrelated nature of our global existence (Olssen, 2008). As explained by Saul (1997), the state of public consciousness is highly relevant to the well being of society and the planet.

The socially beneficial model of a global civil society can be conceptualised through the ‘globalisation from below’ discussed previously (Foucault, 1988; Kaldor, 2003; Kellner, 2002; McGrew, 2000; Moellendorf, 2004). These authors contend that this model has the potential to open up new areas of participatory action. Ultimately the success of ‘globalisation from below’ will depend on citizens who are knowledgeable, social and civically minded and capable of critical moral and ethical reasoning. The challenges, however, for a global civil society are great. These include increasing inequalities and the complexity of governance. The challenges of problem solving any workable form of global governance are thought to be insurmountable (Marginson, Murphy, & Peters, 2010, p. 11).

2.2.5 Global governance
It is suggested that a global civil society cannot exist beyond the rhetoric. Soysal (1994), however, clarified a global paradox. He explained that while national citizenship is no longer exclusively applicable in a globalised world, there is no unified form of global governance. According to Soysal, this threatens the legitimacy of post-national citizenship. Similarly, Hudson (2007, p. 199) argued that without ‘institutional architecture’ and significant institutional inventiveness, a global civil society could not exist beyond the nation state. Currently, existing global or supranational institutions such as the World Bank, International Court of Human Rights and OECD, are not sufficient to provide any overarching form of guidance for a truly global civil society (Kymlicka & Norman, 1994; Kymlika, 2002; Soysal, 1994; Zolo, 2007). While there are
those who favour ‘institutional architecture' as a primary requirement for a global civil society, the counter-argument supports effective cosmopolitan public spheres on a local and global scale (Delanty, 2000). For example there are instances of successful transnational communities and organisations powered by participatory citizens, such as Amnesty International and Greenpeace. These organisations promote social, political and environmental causes without any actual form of institutional architecture or mandate for global governance (Hirst & Thompson, 1999; Kaldor, 2003; Lipschutz, 2000; Murphy, 1994). These latter authors also argue that a global civil society based on the principle and moral virtues of cosmopolitanism is possible.

Communication and dialogue are identified as essential elements of global governance. Delanty (2000) argued that not only is intercultural dialogue necessary on a global scale, but national and sub-national public spheres need to be united through interpersonal and public communication on common issues before legal and political forms of a cosmopolitan civil society can be addressed. The success of intercultural dialogue is greatly dependent on an educated citizenry. Delanty’s (2000) theoretical argument is geared towards developing a ‘thick’ (citizenship in action) dialogue rather than ‘thin’ (citizenship as status) dialogue. Here lies a clear delineation that highlights the very understanding of the nature of citizenship. Delanty argued that global civil society occurs when “context-bound cultures encounter each other and undergo transformation as a result” (2000, p. 145). In order for such transformations to occur, the societies and individuals must first understand citizenship beyond national status and be equipped with the moral and ethical values and capabilities that foster responsibilities beyond the national state. These qualities are consistent with the cosmopolitan global citizen. Students as global citizens need to hold the critical, ethical, and moral values and capacities to think about their identity, place and role in a divided society. The conflict between a neoliberal imaginary for education and social responsibility is expanded upon in the next section.

2.3 Neoliberalism and higher education

Globalisation has led to a marked emphasis on and spread of neo-liberal ideologies, influencing government policies and societies towards more market orientated behaviour. Market forces are particularly evident in the Australian higher education context (de Wit 2013; Marginson & Van Der Wende, 2007; Pratt & Poole, 2000). Neoliberal policies have led to competition, growth, economic efficiency, choice, with social welfare relegated as a lesser concern (Peck & Tickte, 2002, p. 394). In the higher education sector, the OECD has led neoliberal influence, contributing to the education
shift from a 'public good' to an individual benefit. According to Henry and colleagues (2001, p. 175), neoliberal influence has impacted on education policy, systems, and actors, leaving them powerless to cultivate alternative frames of reference for education. These authors suggested that with the OECD influencing education policy, more humane visions and versions of education are stifled.

2.3.1 OECD influence

Neoliberalism as a political ideology led by the OECD, impacts greatly on higher education. The OECD functions as a supranational or global intergovernmental institution supporting market liberalism and new managerialism (Currie, 1998; Henry et al., 2001). Currie (1998) argued that the OECD, as a European based organisation, bridges the gap between globalisation and national education policy in the Australian university sector (p. 16). To contextualise the changing higher education sector, Marginson and van der Wende (2007) explained the institutionalizing mechanism of the New Public Management (NPM). Promoted by the OECD, NPM has been the strongest single driver for change in higher education in the last two decades. The undisputed impact of NPM has facilitated external competition, executive-steered internal academic competition, some devolution of administration and generation of finances, cost reduction, entrepreneurial activities, augmented pricing, reliance on industry support, and quality assurance (Blackmore & Smyth, 2003; Marginson & Van Der Wende, 2007; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004).

The influence of the OECD has been comprehensively contextualised in Australia. Henry and colleagues (2001, p. 125) and Bell (1997) looked at the 'mechanisms of persuasion' between the OECD and educational policy directions in Australia. They concluded that the OECD is a significant influencing agent in Australian policy, but that the national politics are still active to a certain extent in guiding international education policy directions. As the primary policy driver, Henry and colleagues (2001, p.p. 30, 175) explained how the OECD promoted and supported a reworked model of human capital theory (Becker, 1964). From this policy stance, education is primarily a driver of the economy and an investment for the individual.

OECD countries have benefited financially from the OECD educational policies, however the social purpose of universities, and values of education declined as a consequence (Henry et al., 2001). In a framework to address neoliberal political influence, Giddens described The Third Way. This was designed as a pathway via which nations and institutions could respond to social democracy issues while maintaining the
loyalties of neoliberalism, domestically and globally. His book described a left of center renewal of social justice and emancipatory politics (p. 145). In a later book, *The Fourth Way: The Inspiring Future for Educational Change*, Hargreaves and Shirley (2009, p. 108) provided an alternative democratic and professional way to organisationally and socially balance neoliberal policies for educational improvement. It promoted a combination of a cohesive top down, bottom out and lateral support framework for educational change. It placed moral purpose high on the agenda, with professionalism, investment, public-private investment, networks, leadership development and the creation and collection of meaningful student data. It placed responsibility on all stakeholders and worked through short term and long-term goals. While the framework was designed for public schools in the United States, arguably this framework has much to offer to contemporary universities. History will record any influence *The Fourth Way* might have regarding a neoliberal grasp on higher education.

### 2.3.2 Globalisation, neoliberalism and internationalisation

The global influence of neoliberalism is closely intertwined with the internationalisation of higher education. Van der Wende (1997, p. 19) described internationalisation of higher education as “a systematic, sustained effort aimed at making higher education more responsive to the requirements and challenges related to the globalisation of societies, economy and labour markets”. More specifically, Knight (2004, p. 11) defined internationalisation as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education”. Internationalisation is a dynamic phenomenon and is constantly evolving (de Wit 2013, p. 44). Globalisation and neoliberalism have been drivers for change and internationalisation has been the response by the higher education sector (Scott, 1998). Scott (1998) described internationalisation in two ways. He first referred to academic imperialism, whereby ideas and knowledge and systems are exported; and he secondly referred to unstructured mobility and exchange. Internationalisation has evolved in discretely different ways globally, but has altered the form and function of higher education. More recent endeavors to improve internationalisation frameworks are discussed in Section 2.5.2. The following section expands on the stimulus for internationalisation.

### 2.3.3 Drivers and rationales for internationalisation of higher education

The economic drivers for international higher education continue to expand. They extend through the liberalising of trade across borders and the increasing relevance of education to national economies with a strong emphasis on market share and
competition (Altbach et al., 2009; de Wit, 2002; Pratt & Poole, 2000). New transformations as “entrepreneurialism and academic capitalism” have emerged (Stromquist, 2007, p. 82). Academic capitalism (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997) aptly describes the market approach to internationalisation observed in the United States, Australia, Canada and the United Kingdom, as universities compete for international funding and students. This description resonates as higher education is the fifth largest service sector in the US and UK, with higher education in Australia described as the third highest GDP earner (ABS, 2009; Digest Global, 2006). Expansion is likely to continue through increasing levels of competition in international education as a result of initiatives by the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) (Grummon, 2010). Internationalisation of higher education is indisputably an increasing economic force in OECD economies.

The economic driver for higher education dominates politically. Yet, there is unlikely to be a single driver for the internationalisation of higher education (Ollikainen, 1996; Teichler, 1999). For instance, Knight (2004) suggested internationalisation is driven by a variety of imperatives which are not mutually exclusive. The four key rationales for internationalisation are identified as political, economic, social-cultural and academic (Callan, 2000; Gacel-Avila, 2005; Knight, 1997, 1999; Van der Wende, 1997, 1998). However, the economic and political rationales dominate the academic and social/cultural rationales because national economies and higher education are directly linked (Knight, 2012) p. 41. The four key rationales can be understood as the following:

- Political (foreign policy, national security, technical assistance, peace and mutual understanding, national identity and regional identity);
- Economic (economic growth and competitiveness, the labour market, national educational demand, and financial incentives for institutions and governments);
- Social/cultural (social and human capital); and
- Academic (providing an international dimension to research and teaching, extension of the academic horizon, institution building, profile-status, enhancement of quality, and international academic standards). (Knight 2004)

In universities internationalisation rationales act as drivers at strategic and operational levels. At the operational level there are four main approaches described in the literature which can be overlapping and interdependent and are described as: activity, ethos, competence and process approaches (de Wit, 2002, p. 116). According to de Wit (2002, p. 223), European and Australian universities, in contrast to the USA,
adopt more of a process approach to the internationalisation of higher education. The ‘process approach’ can be described as the method adopted by a particular institution to integrate an international or intercultural perspective into teaching and learning, research, institutional management and service areas. The various elements involved with the ‘process approach’ include mechanisms, barriers, facilitators and strategies that are focused on internationalisation as the strategy (Knight, 1994), rather than on the systemic elements of the organisation itself. Knight (2012, p. 30) continues to emphasise that internationalisation is fundamentally a process and is evolutionary. The process approach is steered by managerialism and monitored through accountability measures (frequently designed for external monitoring) that rarely engage the organisation and its actors in any meaningful or systemic way. It fails to align the ethos and mission of the organisation with staff development and student outcomes. This is particularly evident in the ‘policy to practice’ nexus for educating global citizens.

2.4 The reality of contemporary universities

In the contemporary university environment, neoliberalism promotes a form of collective social imaginary. Self-interest is paramount and human behaviour is based on economic self-interest in a competitive environment (Rizvi, 2007, p. 397). Neoliberal influence is evident in university leadership through an adopted corporate style and mindset. University leaders have been criticised for becoming a distinct social group interested in power, domination, and enterprise and are guilty of avoiding their social responsibilities (Coady, 2000a; Deem & Brehony, 2005; Langer, 1992; Langtry, 2000; Taylor, 2010). Neoliberal influence in higher education has filtered to all aspects of university life.

Neoliberalism has influenced university culture, fiscal priorities and leadership style. Universities are now responsible to governments more than to their staff and students (Jameson, Strudwick, Bond-Taylor, & Jones, 2012). McPhee (1998, p. 1) called the bureaucratic stranglehold on universities ‘They’. She considered ‘They’ acted as a minatory presence damaging the scholarly community and traditions. Similarly, a number of authors have explained how the bureaucracy fails to understand the fundamental purpose of universities (Brady, 2012; Langer, 1992; Miller, 2000; Molony, 2000). Bureaucratic thinking has been described as nonsensical, short term and convenient. ‘They’ confuse societal good and national interest with performance and accountability (Marceau, 2000). ‘They’ do not consider the university as a bastion of society.
2.4.1 The conflicting priorities

Universities articulate their social responsibility aims in policy documents. Yet, this occurs in the face of conflicting commercial priorities and fierce competition (Altbach et al., 2009, p. xii; Rhoads & Szelenyi, 2011; Scholte, 2005). The United States of America leads the competition and global expansion of higher education but many individual countries compete for international students (Delors, Al Mufti, Amagi, & Carneiro, 2010). The conflicting commercial and social tensions are well exemplified by the dichotomy of ‘Humanism versus the market’. This description represents the reality of ‘tradition’ versus ‘modernity’ and explains the conflicting tensions universities face in a globalised world (Bergan, 2007b). There is a belief that by relativising the forces of a market economy, a balance can be achieved. By balancing competitiveness and efficiency and addressing public and collectivist values, a more ideal situation could be achieved (Bergan, 2007b). Yet the European Union favours employment and productivity outcomes from higher education (Bergan, 2007a). Similarly, in the Australian context, ‘public good’ lags behind in comparison to aims for employment. Competition, economics, benchmarking, graduate satisfaction, destinations and employability statistics drive these aims and are underpinned by a framework that defines and embraces regulatory necessity, risk and proportionality (Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency, 2011). While the creation of the global citizen is frequently stated as a policy aim, the reality has tended to align more with global employment. As pointed out by Marginson and Sawir (2011), universities have a far clearer role to lead society rather than prioritise wealth creation.

Concern for the social responsibility role of universities is not new. Friedman (1962) identified the risk of corporatisation to social responsibility in universities. He asserted that corporate organisations hold a responsibility to shareholders for profit, but universities are responsible to staff, students and society. Similarly, many authors echo the concerns posed by corporatisation and managerialism to the fundamental humanistic purpose of higher education (Coryell, Durodoye, Wright, Pate, & Nguyen, 2010; Harris, 2005; Klein, 2000; Pratt & Poole, 2000). Kreber (2009), Currie (1998) and Delanty (2001) explained that the economic rationales and competition in higher education are threatening the academic environment, where open and frank social criticism and scholarship should be nurtured. As such, higher education is constricted by the market ideology and by material business practices (Currie, 1998). Or equally, it is matching the ‘supply and demand’ of the market (Qiang, 2003). Yet, it has been argued that rather than play the victim, higher education has a responsibility to review its place and position of leadership in a globalised world (Muller, 1995). Furthermore, there are
pragmatic opportunities to make the broader purpose of education more explicit to students by connecting social responsibility to employability (Caruana & Ploner, 2010; McArthur, 2011).

In such a complex area, alternative views to the market ideology are emerging. Bok (2010) argued that universities are placed in an exceptional position by having the mandate and ability to contribute to the success, cohesion and prosperity of society. Universities have a role to support innovative research and develop expert knowledge and highly skilled staff and students. Furthermore, he called for universities to support educating students for societal roles equipped with moral and ethical understanding and ethical conduct. Yet evidence suggests that there is a significant gap in the ‘policy to practice’ nexus regarding educating for the principles of social responsibility and global citizens (Childress, 2010). Labaree (1994) explained the historic responsibilities of universities as being for three discrete, sometimes competing, purposes. He described these as democratic equality, social mobility and social efficiency. Previously these purposes were held in balance to a greater extent than they are now, yet in the twenty-first century social efficiency, as part of the dominant neoliberal imaginary, has become the key purpose for higher education (Richardson, 2008; Rizvi, 2007, p. 398; Scholte, 2005; Taylor, 2011). As a consequence of this paradigm shift, Taylor (2011) described neoliberalism fueled by commercialisation and competition as surreptitiously eroding the ‘public good’ role and responsibility of higher education.

Rhoads & Szelenyi (2011) explained how instrumental indicators designed for accountability are frequently at odds with the ethos and values of higher education. These authors argued that in most cases universities lack the capacity to educate global citizens who are adequately equipped to meet the twenty-first century global challenges. As a consequence of competing tensions, universities face demands of external accountability for outcomes based purely on graduate employment. These forces appear to greatly overshadow institutional ethos and active engagement with social responsibility for student learning and community engagement. Developing global citizens as a feature of a socially responsible university falls behind in importance to meeting market led indicators.

2.4.2 The socially responsible university and education
The social responsibility of the contemporary university is underplayed in scholarly discourse and research. Yet universities hold the transformative power to mediate between technocratic managerialism, the knowledge society and cultural citizenship
There is some renewal in public discourse on the social responsibility role of the university. Rhoads and Szelenyi (2011) argued that universities act as the conscience of society and as such have the responsibility to prepare tomorrow’s leaders. Future global challenges will require leaders and an educated populace to be open, aware of their evolving ‘identity’, critical, confident and to hold informed positions so as to engage in ‘new social imaginings’ and engage meaningfully in their local and global environment. They will be required to be in a position to take socially responsible moral and ethical stances as educated global citizens. While these aspirations are consistent with the aims of internationalisation, they remain however, organisationally rhetorical and poorly conceptualised.

It would be logical to conclude that social responsibility and the global citizen exist as espoused aims in higher education but lack specifications for implementation. As Huismans (2010) suggested, internationalisation has operated as an ‘a-theoretical concept’ in higher education. Similarly it could be concluded that the concept of a global citizen as ‘an outcome’ of internationalisation is also lacking theoretical depth. While the concept is rich in cosmopolitan theory, morality and ethics, the global citizen as a construct is somewhat removed from scholarly engagement at the organisational level. Furthermore, there has been little empirical research into the philosophical, epistemological and ontological basis of the global citizen to inform curricula. It is not surprising that the ‘global citizen’ attracts widespread criticism. From the literature discussed, it would seem logical to conclude that the global citizen exists as a paradox within the conflicting tensions of the 21st century university. The global citizen is an anticipated or assumed outcome of internationalisation. The next section outlines selected features of internationalisation. This background further builds on the contextual setting of the global citizen in the contemporary university.

2.5 Features of internationalisation

This section moves beyond the macro environment of the internationalisation of higher education and narrows the focus of the ‘global citizen’ concept within the contemporary university setting. The review suggests that the predominant focus of internationalisation research has followed the dominant neoliberal lens for internationalisation and has neglected a research focus on the human dimension of student learning. International mobility, internationalisation at home, and the internationalisation of the curriculum as key features of internationalisation are discussed. Attention is focused on the more integrated and comprehensive approaches
to internationalisation emerging in the sector. The first section concludes by identifying
the deficit in understanding how internationalisation shapes graduates as global
citizens.

2.5.1 Internationalisation research
Internationalisation itself has not been subjected to the level of scholarly scrutiny that
one would logically expect in the higher education sector. Research in the area is ranked
a low priority by government, industry and the academy (Knight, 1997). It has been
claimed there is a need to obtain research evidence to find out the ‘who, what and why’
of the internationalisation of higher education (de Wit, 1997). Research in the area has
been described as sporadic, programmatic and coincidental, lacking theory and
methodology (Teichler, 1996). In the main, research has focused on instrumental
indicators, monitoring internationalisation at the institutional, national, and global
levels. Therefore, it is understandable so little is understood about educating global
citizens as an outcome of internationalisation.

In an analysis of internationalisation, De Wit (2002, p. 211) identified studies
that focused on internationalisation strategies (Knight & de Wit, 1995), national policies
(Back, Davis, & Olsen, 1996), links between globalisation and internationalisation (Scott,
1998) and quality assurance (Knight, 1999). OECD has carried out international
research on innovation and research development (Organisation for Cooperation and
Development, 2011). This research has mainly focused on the economic and political
implications of trade, future scenarios, and globalisation. OECD research focuses on
internationalisation through a neoliberal lens (Organisation for Cooperation and
emphasised the importance of higher education in the imaginings of the future and
questioned why there is a lack of scholarly discussion on the human element. Through
the neoliberal lens for internationalisation, students and graduates have been viewed as
human capital rather than humane individuals, global citizens and a societal collective.
There have been few attempts at conceptualising and examining students’ development
as global citizens as an outcome of internationalisation. It is in this research
environment that the global citizen agenda seems to exist at the periphery of
internationalisation research. As the cracks are becoming visible in neoliberalism (Rizvi,
2011, p. 8), and in response to uncertainty and global challenges, new visions, directions
and research for twenty-first century higher education are possible and are discussed in
the next section.
2.5.2 Systematic approaches to internationalisation

Internationalisation has become normalised to a certain extent within higher education and has evolved thematically and regionally (Jones & de Wit, 2012). More recently however, more systematic approaches have emerged. These are comprised of more formalised strategic and comprehensive approaches to internationalisation with more clearly defined rationales, purposes and strategies than have been seen before. These new approaches are referred to as integrated, mainstream, deep, comprehensive or internationalisation at home (Hudzik, 2011; Jones, 2013b; Jones & Brown, 2007; Leask, 2012; Nilsson, 2000; Qiang, 2003). Comprehensive approaches to internationalisation promote an institutional approach and are mainstreamed into policy and strategy. Jones and Brown (2007) for example, provided a comprehensive list of key issues underpinning Leeds Metropolitan University’s internationalisation strategy. This approach has developed into an integrated approach that is underpinned by an holistic evaluation process (Jones, 2013a, p. 178). Hudzik (2011, p. 6), on the other hand, described comprehensive internationalisation as an overarching organisational principle. It infuses all aspects of the university from concept to action. He acknowledged the complexity of internationalisation, with success dependent upon the way institutions undertake the process of managing sequential steps within the overall comprehensive approach (Hudzik, 2013, p. 58).

Newer approaches to internationalisation are not aimed towards ‘one size fits all’ for internationalisation. They are designed as organisational frameworks to bring about systematic change within the institution itself (Morey, 2000). Comprehensive approaches to date are at the early stages of research scrutiny (Jones & Killick, 2013). For many staff and students at the grass roots level, comprehensive internationalisation is not well understood nor is there apparent translation of policy into the actual learning and teaching experience (Barker, Hibbins, & Farrelly, 2012). The student experience of internationalisation on campus is under-researched. Traditionally, mobility has been an assumed good and ‘the way’ to develop global citizens. Yet the mobility research has failed to inform global citizen learning for all students. The traditional form of student exchange was designed to facilitate mutual understanding and world peace. This can be contrasted with the modern university environment where there is emphasis on the drive to attract overseas fee-paying students, particularly in Australia, UK, USA and Canada (Neave, 1992; Van der Wende, 1997, 1998). The following section discusses mobility as an aspect of internationalisation.
2.5.3 Mobility or internationalisation abroad

Frequently the goal of developing global citizens is accounted for by the existence and presence of inbound and outbound international students on university campuses. Yet, it cannot be assumed that students will automatically develop global citizen attributes from either of these strategies (Lewin, 2009). In the Australian context, there is no evidence that the massive expansion of internationalisation has resulted in a broadening of minds (Gallagher, 2011). As such, the gap between the espoused university aims of educating for global citizenship as an anticipated outcome of internationalisation of higher education and the reality has become apparent.

The aims for international mobility or internationalisation abroad (used interchangeably) have undergone a significant paradigmatic shift. Until the 1980s international education and mobility were characterised by cooperation, understanding and development, whereas today mobility is characterised by competition for international students based on economic rationales (Gallagher, 2011; Rizvi, 2011; Stromquist, 2007; Wachter, Olikainen, & Hasewem, 1999). De Wit (2002) described the 1980s as the ‘great leap forward’ in higher education which was evident in the increased mobility of individual students; in international research and development policies; and in mobility as an integrated part of study and a widening in the scope of destinations. In the Australian context, this period is popularly referred to as the shift in emphasis from ‘aid to trade’ (Back et al., 1996).

The positive economic contribution of international education is recognised largely through incoming international students in Australia. It is the third largest export industry behind iron ore and coal (ABS, 2009). Due to the strong contribution to the national GDP, and in light of changes in the commodity market, an increased focus on the quality and sustainability of international education has emerged. For instance in Australia, Tertiary Education Quality Standards Agency (Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency, 2011) monitors the quality of the student experience using individual universities’ student satisfaction surveys. Yet, this form of monitoring offers little insight to our understanding of international learning outcomes. Student satisfaction surveys are not designed to capture in-depth data on the experience of learning. To date there is little research or understanding of the role of internationalisation on the student mindset. In particular, little is understood about the way students learn to become global citizens as an outcome of internationalisation and mobility. This will be expanded on in Section 3.2. In many cases internationalisation abroad (in contrast to ‘at home’), is solely associated with international delivery of education programs, such as:
- International Student Program – in education delivered off-shore
- International Student Mobility – outgoing students on exchange for a range of study options and experiences (e.g. Study Abroad, short-term exchange, internships)
- International Projects – staff projects for teaching and research or customized training offshore for development or commercial purposes.

International student mobility has occurred since the Middle Ages (Scott, 2006), but the international flow of tertiary students has increased by close to 50% between 2004 and 2009. In 2007 there were 3.7 million students studying abroad (Organisation for Cooperation and Development, 2009). This growth reflects shrinking borders, increasing government support for mobility, wealth in the middle classes, particularly in Asian countries, and higher education participation rates in developed countries (Ong, 2006). Other factors include competition in the international education market, globalisation of the employment market, education seen as an individual investment and changing student demographics (Byram & Dervin, 2008). The most common expectation of a mobility experience is that it ‘will be good’ for the student and it is frequently assumed to contribute to developing a broader worldview. However, the literature has shown that more positive student learning experiences occur when the exchange is supplemented by a systematic pre-departure preparation, a supportive exchange, and post-exchange follow-up. Whilst a systematic approach could be considered ‘ideal’, it does not reflect the reality of many exchange programs (Jones, A., 2009).

The mobility experience is not necessarily considered an essential component of the university experience. Yet there is evidence that a mobility experience contributes to graduate employability (Teichler & Janson, 2007) and intercultural capability in the workplace (Molony, Sowter, & Potts, 2011). While the driving force for mobility continues to focus on improving employability, the social responsibility agenda is gaining momentum in many universities (Banks, 2004; Deardorff, 2009; Hudzik, 2011; Lewin, 2009; Savicki & Selby, 2008; Schattle, 2009). Selby (2008, p. 6) argued that mobility provides a transforming experience for students where there is the opportunity to see ones’ self, culture and values in a new way in relation to the host culture. Mobility experiences are claimed: to foster students with broader social sensibilities to transfer and transform attitudes beyond their own imaginings (Skelly, 2008); and to create global citizens (Lou & Bosley, 2008). Whereas the transformative potential of mobility is recognised, it continues to be relegated as an optional extra to the higher education experience. In the main, the employment and human capital focus of
internationalisation continues to be the strongest rationale for international mobility. In recent years, more effort has been made to integrate internationalisation into the reality of the campus and this effort is expanding through the strategy of internationalisation at home discussed in the next section.

2.5.4 Internationalisation at home

Internationalisation at home (IaH) originated in Europe. It was designed to foster a broader institutional focus in internationalisation strategies beyond international mobility and offshore programs (Nilsson, 2000, 2003; Wachter et al., 1999). Building on this approach, the OECD (2008) introduced a comprehensive directive for the development of national policy frameworks for internationalisation. Integral to this directive was the emphasis on more systematic and coordinated approaches to internationalisation by individual universities. This was particularly aimed at improving the internal dimensions of internationalisation, such as developing campus internationalisation and encouraging the mobility of staff and students. From the Australian national perspective, internationalisation at home involves:

- Policy and culture of internationalisation
- Internationalisation of research and research links
- Internationalisation of curriculum and teaching
- Internationalisation of staff
- Internationalisation of student services
- Community outreach. (Universities Australia, 2009)

This list highlights the formal and informal strategies which are designed to integrate internationalisation more strategically and comprehensively into all areas of university function. The systematic implementation is aimed at providing greater exposure to global education approaches for staff and students, and balancing trends of national or ‘parochial’ educational experiences and environments. Through the inclusion of internationalisation at home with the more traditional area of ‘internationalisation abroad’, it was anticipated that a university-wide internationalised culture would develop. This approach would foster broader staff engagement as well as provide a more equitable student experience of global citizenship (Universities Australia, 2009). This wide-sweeping policy initiative aimed across the entire organisation remains underpinned by challenges at many levels.

Frequently, internationalisation at home is conceptualised as a policy and strategy for change and implementation. Yet, Henry and colleagues (2001) thought such
wide sweeping changes couldn't occur merely as a university edict. These authors discussed the need for organisations to conceptualise the desired changes in more depth, and what they might mean across the organisation. Therefore from this perspective, change needed to occur through “the creative utilisation of the imagination of all those who make up a university” (p. 155). Furthermore, these authors (2001, p. 153-155) described internationalisation at home as an organisational learning framework aligned to the social imaginary of globalisation. They explained that learning should be positioned within the global social, political, and economic imaginings and understandings of the organisation and its actors. As such, internationalisation at home is more complex than a policy and strategy for implementation.

There has been little evidence of internationalisation at home and organisational change engaging with the social imaginary of globalisation. Arguably, as internationalisation at home picks up momentum in university environments, it risks facing the same fate as ‘internationalisation abroad’ by perpetuating a belief that it is contributing to an ‘anticipated good’. There will be a need for research into this increasingly important area that involves systemic organisational issues as well as implications for staff and students. Clifford and Montgomery (2011a, p. 13) use the terms ‘internationalisation at home’ and ‘internationalisation of the curriculum’ as interchangeable terms. For the purposes of this review however, the former will be viewed as a systemic approach to internationalisation including policy, research, curriculum, staff, students, and outreach; whereas internationalisation of the curriculum will be discussed in the following section as one of the systemic elements involved with internationalisation at home.

2.5.5 Internationalisation of the curriculum

The internationalisation of higher education and changing graduate needs have seen a broadening of approaches to university curriculum. A fundamental aim of the internationalisation of the curriculum is to stimulate students to think differently and to encourage deep learning experiences that integrate discipline, international and intercultural perspectives and expansion of horizons (Brewer & Leaske, 2012, p. 245). There has been an assumption that students would develop intercultural competence as well as “personal, professional, and citizenship development” (Knight, 2004, p. 22) as a result of internationalisation, however universities have needed to become more responsive than in the past. Internationalisation of the curriculum can be thought of as a systemic feature of internationalisation at home to influence the learning of all students and can be perceived in three complementary ways. The first approach promotes
integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into course content and teaching and learning (Tak-Yuen Chan, 2011). This approach is arguably the most common approach seen in universities to date. Leask (2009, p. 209) expands on this approach by defining internationalisation of the curriculum as:

*the incorporation of an international an intercultural dimension into the content of the curriculum as well as the teaching and learning arrangements and support services of a program of study.*

This holistic approach includes intercultural as well as international dimensions and involves teaching and learning, student outcomes, all curricular activities (formal and informal), and all student support services supporting internationalisation. A third approach infuses internationalisation of the curriculum with the cosmopolitan basis of global citizen learning. This approach recognises and interrogates the curricula significance of globalisation, uncertainty, and change. In contrast to the former two descriptions, it involves engaging students and academics with the social imaginary of globalisation. It focuses on the significance of the students’ mindset in learning and engages them with global complexity (Rizvi, 2007, 2009; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). In a cosmopolitan approach to learning, students as global citizens are encouraged to think reflexively, relationally and critically across broader concepts than just disciplinary boundaries. This mindset is suitable for thinking about innovative solutions in complex situations (Nummela, Saarenketo, & Purolainen, 2004; Nussbaum, 2010; Randolph, 2011) and fosters the ability to deal with ambiguity and complexity (Kymlicka & Norman, 1994, p. 360). In this approach to learning students are engaged with transformation and self-formation (Marginson & Sawir, 2011, p. 147). These latter authors emphasised the need for students to understand the political, economic, cultural, and moral basis of identity and citizenship as essential elements of global education. This approach to learning will be expanded on in Section 3.2.

Not only is internationalisation an approach to learning, it is organisationally positioned within the disciplinary paradigm, curricula, university culture, ethos and organisational context. Furthermore, it is influenced by the macro contexts at the global, national, regional, and local levels. Jones and Killick (2013, p. 14) adopted and completed the first phase of an institution-wide approach to internationalisation of the curriculum, using a curriculum pyramid model of internationalisation of the curriculum (Jones, 2013b) for implementation. Their evaluation of the first phased has highlighted the complexity of curricula initiatives in the absence of systemic staff development,
review and monitoring and attention to the complementary basis of related agendas and disciplinary learning.

Internationalisation of the curriculum has been contextualised in its macro and microenvironments even further. Leask (2012, 2013a) visualised the layers of intricacy for internationalisation of the curriculum through a conceptual framework. The layers of this framework highlighted its underpinning complexity. The layers of context provide insight to the interacting variables at play across programs, disciplines, and universities. Leask (2013a, 2013b) felt that due to interactions across the various contexts at play in the conceptual framework, internationalisation of the curriculum is an ongoing process of change. It should be approached and monitored in a scholarly and reflective way. Future research into internationalisation of the curriculum will expand our understanding of it as an organisational and disciplinary strategy and in terms of the student mindset and the way students learn to become global citizens.

2.6 Summary: Chapter Two

Inherent in globalisation is uncertainty and change. The speed of change in many areas is out pacing our ability to comprehend and articulate in a common voice the complexities, risks, and challenges facing societies and to respond appropriately. Arguably, the global citizen in higher education has emerged as a policy aim, however there is no common voice on what the construct means or how it is to be achieved. In addition, the rates of change and dominant political forces have irrevocably altered the traditional ‘public good’ focus of higher education. The predominant neoliberal paradigm has influenced the sector in such a powerful way that public discourse on the ‘big picture’ is rarely articulated by the academy. This chapter has provided a contextual background for the influence of globalisation and neoliberal influence on higher education policy and practice.

In summary, the impact of globalisation on higher education is significant and complex. There is an emerging recognition that global challenges require more responsive higher education. The role of the twenty-first century universities has been questioned through their ‘policy to practice’ commitment with regard to their social compact and social responsibility. The review has identified gaps in scholarly understanding at the institutional and organisational levels for shaping students as thinking citizens equipped for future global challenges. Ironically, university research on internationalisation has in the main been designed to meet external stakeholder needs
rather than to expand understanding of the human aspects of internationalisation. To date, there is scant evidence of best practice models for global citizen learning as an integral aspect of internationalisation of the curriculum. Yet, this fundamental level of curricula reform cannot emerge in isolation. There is a need for university ethos, leadership, staff, and student engagement through a level of mutual understanding of purpose and goals, to foster global citizens. As yet, the illusive 'shape' and educational 'fit' of the global citizen in higher education continues to be poorly conceptualised. A better understanding of the philosophical, epistemological and ontological basis of the global citizen and the student mindset is needed to inform pedagogy and is discussed in the next chapter of this review.
3.0 The global citizen and global citizen learning

3.1 Introduction

Chapter Two contextually explained the global citizen in terms of its macro environment. Chapter Three continues to narrow the focus of the ‘global citizen’ concept to the university setting and expands our understanding of what the global citizen means in this context. In this chapter the global citizen is conceptualised in terms of changing notions of citizenship, identity, and belonging and an underpinning cosmopolitan basis. The ‘global citizen’ is explained from this perspective and the concept is afforded more depth and epistemological understanding. Through a moral and transformative cosmopolitan lens, the global citizen can be conceptualised as a multi-faceted construct. The cosmopolitan global citizen is characterised by moral and ethical capacities that foster and facilitate comparative thinking. The learning process occurs as these capacities interact in contextual situations and circumstances. Rhoads and Szelenyi (2011, p. 267) argued that the global citizen should not be thought of as a static identity. It is comprised of ability, disposition and commitment. Chapter Three explains the basis of transformative learning. The chapter concludes by presenting a conceptual framework for understanding the ‘global citizen’ in contemporary higher education, from its macro to microenvironment.

3.2 Conceptualising the global citizen

The ‘global citizen’ in contemporary universities has lacked in-depth discourse and research on its underpinning philosophical basis as well as a theoretical approach to learning. It is often discussed in terms of attributes and dimensions in higher education. Furthermore, there has been little systemic investigation into how the concept can be translated from concept to practice in the university setting. Even though the ‘global citizen’ term is popular and used frequently in university policy documents, it faces scepticism (Green, 2012). Social responsibility aims espoused in university policy documents for the global citizen are consistent with a moral and transformative cosmopolitan underpinning. Educating for global citizenship involves helping learners to develop the capacities that allow them to learn ethically and empathetically (Clifford & Haigh, 2011, p. 113). This type of learning requires students to think differently (Clifford & Montgomery, 2011b, p. 20). The Oxfam (2006) definition for schools, describes the global citizen as a person who:

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

It would be unrealistic to expect students to emerge from university fully developed as global citizens. However, this definition provides the basis for conceptualisation as to what a global citizen could mean in the context of contemporary universities. The next section discusses how the global citizen has been conceptualised and investigated in the higher education sector previously.

3.2.1 Global citizen attributes and terminology
There is an extensive body of literature investigating the individual and composite global citizen attributes. Research associated with global citizen attributes has looked at intercultural competence (Deardorff, 2004), intercultural behaviour assessment (Fantini, 1995; Rubens, 1979), intercultural sensitivity (Bennett, 1993), and cross-cultural capability (Jones, A., 2009). Other related research with a global dimension of higher education has included citizenship; involvement; democracy (Howard & Gilbert, 2008); civic attitudes and skills (Moely, Mercer, Lustre, Miron, & McFarland, 2002); civic measurement models (Flanagan, Syvertsen, & Stout, 2007); cross-cultural adaptability (Kelley & Myers, 1992); global beliefs in a just world (Lipkus, 1991); global competence aptitude (Hunter et al., 2006); global mindedness (Hett, 1993); global proficiency (Braskamp, Merrill, & Braskamp, 2008); global citizenship; global mindedness and world mindedness (Parsons, 2010), global citizenship (Killick, 2012; Tarrant, 2010) as well as the interface of global citizenship, democracy and liberal learning (Cornwell & Stoddard, 1999). This body of research on the global citizen has largely focused on the empirical measurement of individual traits or dimensions associated with the ‘global citizen’. Yet, this research has not expanded our understanding greatly on how to educate all students as global citizens.

The ‘global citizen’ is often criticised as vague or easily confused with similarly related terms. Deardorff (2006) found that stakeholders used terms such as ‘global citizen’ and ‘intercultural competence’ interchangeably. Yet, several authors have taken a more flexible approach to understanding and approaching the global citizen. For
instance in *The Global Perspectives in Higher Education Project* in the UK, Lunn (2008) used the ‘discursive coalition’ to accommodate the overlapping terms of ‘global citizen’, ‘global perspectives’ and ‘cross-cultural capability’. The discursive coalition is explained as “the ensemble of a set of story lines all organised around a similar discourse” (Hajer, 1995, p. 47). Similarly in business, the theory of strategic ambiguity is used. This approach rejects ideological adherence to clarity for overlapping terminology. Strategic ambiguity recognises that explicit communication is a cultural assumption and not a linguistic imperative. Strategic ambiguity allows language to vary on a contested topic (Eisenberg, 2006; Eisenberg et al., 1985). As such, the discursive coalition and strategic ambiguity provide a theoretical basis to enable a more fluid understanding of what constitutes the global citizen in higher education. By being more open to literal assumptions, it is possible to consider a more open meaning for the term, ‘global citizen’. As pointed out by Rhoads and Szelenyi (2011, p. 267), the ‘global citizen’ is not static: it is an ability, a disposition and a commitment.

Barnett (2004) and Barrie (2004) further exemplify the contrast between a static notion of the global citizen and a disposition. From the policy perspective, Barrie conceptualises the global citizen as an overarching graduate attribute, describing it as a stance or attitude towards the world. This attitude is further underpinned by disciplinary clusters of personal attributes, cognitive abilities and skills of application such as: research and inquiry; information literacy; personal and intellectual autonomy; ethical, social and professional understanding and communication (Barrie, 2004, p. 270). This policy approach was designed to enable a disciplinary interpretation to translate the generic attribute in a meaningful way into program curricula.

In contrast, Barnett (2004) argued that learning for an unknown future involves more than knowledge and skills. It requires human qualities and dispositions. He described this disposition as an internalised way in which individuals understand themselves, their identity and ‘being’ in the world (p. 248). He distinguishes between the epistemological aspect of knowing and the ontological aspect of ‘being’. He describes the pedagogical significance of ‘being in an uncertain world’ as being underpinned by dispositions such as carefulness, thoughtfulness, humility, criticality, receptiveness, resilience, courage and stillness. Barnett acknowledges that designing a curriculum to foster these dispositions is not something we readily understand (p. 260). The curricula implications of Barnett and Barrie’s views are expanded on in Chapter Nine. Barnett’s perception of the global citizen is better understood through its cosmopolitan underpinning discussed in Section 3.2.3. From a practical pedagogical perspective, a
great deal of uncertainty surrounds the global citizen, particularly in terms of measuring ‘it’ as a learning outcome and this is discussed in the next section.

3.2.2 The measurement challenge

Attempts to measure global citizen development in higher education have mostly been associated with mobility experiences and quantitative surveys. For instance, Morais and Ogden (2010) identified social responsibility, global competence, and global and civic engagement as the key dimensions of the global citizen. The authors designed an instrument adapted from twelve instruments from other related research. While the authors claim validation of the scale, there is no reported validity relating to the social responsibility, a dimension that sets global citizenship apart from other intercultural competence measurements. Similarly, Parsons (2010) experienced validity problems when attempting to reduce the outcome of internationalisation to individual scales of measurement for attributes associated with global mindedness, global citizenship and world mindedness. While this particular instrument was designed to capture attitudes, skills and behaviours, there was no attempt to account for the affective dimensions of change which Parsons considered an essential area of growth as a result of internationalisation. Finally, Van de Vijer (2009, p. 413) found results from quantitative tests were contextually invalid for testing intercultural competence. These examples demonstrate the challenge in attempting to understand the global citizen through a positivist lens focusing on measuring attributes.

A number of authors have raised strong arguments against using quantitative research for the concept of global citizen. First, Furedi (2011, p. 58) contested the damaging trend of relying on neuroscience to measure human reasoning rather than focusing on moral reasoning. He felt moral reasoning is essential for developing tolerance and is, in most cases amenable to education. He argued that a focus on quantifying attributes, censors the importance and recognition of values and attitudes in education. Second, Savicki (2008, p. 348) and Deardorff (2009, p. 33) described transformation and intercultural competence respectively as processes, not traits, and as such not amenable to instrumental measurement. Last, in terms of learning, Kucakaydin & Cranton (2012) argued that positivism does not recognise mind and reason and their emotional and affective responses during a perspective change. They considered it impossible to capture these intangible variables with numerical data. Becoming a global citizen involves a process where an individual is influenced by a myriad of interacting variables (Schattle, 2008).
The process of becoming a global citizen is complex and ongoing. For instance, in an interview study of general public global citizens, Schattle (2008, p. 46) identified primary concepts of awareness, responsibility and participation. He felt these intertwined aspects are in sum, greater than their individual parts. The secondary concepts he identified were cross-cultural empathy, personal achievement and international mobility. His research showed that the combinations and permeations in participants led to very different outcomes, concluding that global citizens present differently as “strange bedfellows” (Schattle, 2008, p. 65). It could be logical to conclude that there will be no ‘one size fits all’ for the global citizen, which furthers the questioning of the validity of measurement indicators.

From the perspective of intercultural competence, an intertwined component of global citizenship, Deardorff (2006) reached a similar conclusion to Schattle (Schattle, 2008). She attributed the measurement difficulty to the complex interplay of specific components comprising intercultural competence. Her study involved a Delphi survey of internationally renowned scholars and administrators from the USA. A number of findings from the study are extremely relevant to conceptualising the global citizenship. Findings from Deardorff’s (2006) research rejected the benefit of pre and post surveys. It found a broad interpretation of the term was supported and that ‘understanding others’ world views’ received 100% agreement. The most preferred forms of measurement were found to be case studies, interviews and observations; the use of competency-based quantitative instruments was rejected. Interestingly, this cohort of informants, mainly administrators, rejected placing intercultural competence within a theoretical framework. Moving forward from Deardorff’s (2006) research and the literature reviewed, it seems there is a strong case to move beyond a positivist approach to the global citizen. The next section expands our understanding of the global citizen by discussing cosmopolitanism as a philosophical underpinning for the ‘global citizen’ in higher education.

3.2.3 A cosmopolitan underpinning for the global citizen

The global citizen is rarely conceptualised in higher education from a theoretical basis beyond individual graduate attributes statements. Yet, Golmohamad (2008, p. 519) thought that global citizenship could make a valuable contribution to education if underpinned by an ethical and moral framework. From this perspective, the ‘global citizen’ is rich in history and philosophy and is underpinned by cosmopolitan notions of identity and citizenship (Hudson, 2007; Kumar, 2010; Kymlicka & Norman, 1994; Soysal, 1994). The identity and belonging of the cosmopolitan global citizen occurs
across territorial, cultural, religious and ethnic borders, requiring individuals to engage in multiple personal and cultural perspectives (Osler & Starkey, 2006, p. 53). Peters (2008) argued that the basis for renewed interest in citizenship and cosmopolitanism can be attributed to the rise in capitalist world-wide trade and its theoretical reflections, the reality of expanding empires, religious conflicts, terrorism and war, the emergence of human rights and philosophical emphasis on human reason. The literature provides complementary theories of ‘cosmopolitanism’ as the form of citizenship best suited to a globalised world (Carter, 2001; Hudson, 2007; Kymlicka & Norman, 1994; Zolo, 2007). Cosmopolitanism offers a strong philosophical underpinning to conceptualise the global citizen in higher education.

Cosmopolitanism, where ‘cosmos’ is translated as universal and ‘polis’ as person, describes the shift of citizenship from a purely national perspective to a broader concept and can be traced back to Plato and Aristotle in Greek philosophy and the Stoics in early Christianity. However, the actual term ‘cosmopolitanism’ first emerged during the Enlightenment period and was attributed to Erasmus, humanism and the natural doctrine of law. Immanuel Kant in Perceptual Peace in 1795 was the first modern philosopher to advance the Cosmo as the political idea of ‘universal peace’ between peoples and as based on a single moral society. Kant’s philosophy recognised common principles of freedom, equality and autonomy and grounded the concept of legitimacy and law (Anonymous, 2012). The Kantian tradition did not advocate world government. On the contrary, Kantian tradition supported a ‘federation of states’ that provided for a republican civic constitution, free States and the law of world citizens aligned to ‘universal hospitality’. Whilst it was Kant who first described the modern version of cosmopolitanism, it was the declaration of human rights in 1789 which provided the basis for the modern interpretation of moral cosmopolitanism (Peters et al., 2008; Zolo, 2007).

A number of authors extend the theoretical discussion of citizenship beyond the legal right aspect. Cosmopolitan citizenship is associated with civic virtues and identity linked to the increasing cultural pluralism of modern societies (Delanty, 2007; Heater, 2002; Kymlicka & Norman, 1994; Rhoads & Szelenyi, 2011). As a minimum, a cosmopolitan belief means that individuals, rather than the state, are the basic unit of moral concern (Stoker, Mason, & McGrew, 2011, p. 154). These latter authors described cosmopolitans as those whose commitment to distributive justice allows them to act as global citizens aligned with a commitment to the benefit of a humane society (Stoker et al., 2011). Cosmopolitanism however can be viewed through different lens.
A ‘neoliberal approach’ to cosmopolitanism is framed on the dominance of one market, and international trade and fosters global citizens who are successful in a global, capitalist society. This lens is reflected in education that frames the student experience purely in terms of employment (Richardson, 2008; Vertovec & Cohen, 2002). Second is the ‘radical approach’ to cosmopolitanism, which recognises globalisation as a mode of dominant Western imperialism providing the basis for global citizens to oppose the negative forces of globalisation in its promotion of inequality, oppression and poverty. While the intentions of radical global citizens are potentially associated with ‘globalisation from below’, there is the possibility for misdirection. Radical forms can result in extreme forms of activism or terrorism due to narrow perspectives and poor ethical and moral reasoning. The third approach is referred to as ‘transformative cosmopolitanism’, where a global citizen understands the impacts and interconnecting influences of globalisation from the economic, social, technical, environmental and cultural aspects (Richardson, 2008; Sanderson, 2008; Selby, 2008; Vertovec & Cohen, 2002). This latter form of cosmopolitanism fosters reflexive, relational and interconnected thinking and is an appropriate lens for learning in higher education. Yet the basis of cosmopolitanism continues to meet criticism.

Cosmopolitanism has been criticised for appealing to the comfortable upper middle classes. For instance Bowden (2003, p. 360) argued that cosmopolitanism is only attractive to those who take their safe and protected life for granted. He argued that if cosmopolites only see the world through a Western lens, they risk engaging in cultural imperialism at the expense of non-Western values. From another nationalist and monotheistic perspective, Rege (2001) rejected the cosmopolitan as an elite opportunist who has betrayed religion and homeland. Whereas, Hudson (2007) argued that cosmopolitan discourse focuses solely on Eurocentric values. He stated that this form of moral idealism is rhetorical and powerless against any form of successful negotiation in key areas of political, social, economic or religious conflict.

Cosmopolitanism is not necessarily a Eurocentric notion. For instance, Appadurai (2000), Appiah (2006) and Schattle (2008) compared cosmopolitanism and global citizenship to Islam, Hinduism, Sikhism and Buddhism respectively. They mooted the concept that global citizen values might not be completely Eurocentric, suggesting there are core values associated with educated, thinking people. Taking these multiple perspectives into account, moral and transformative cosmopolitanism offers the possibility for all students on international campuses, as individuals and as a collective,
to imagine and construct new non-territorial identities within a moral framework for
global issues (Scholte, 2005, p. 245). Recognising these contrasting views is important
for an understanding of the global citizen in higher education. Twenty-first century
universities are diverse and multicultural spaces where intercultural encounters,
dialogue and understanding could be central to student life.

Conflicting terminology has plagued both the global citizen and the
cosmopolitan. However, Peters et al (2008, p. xi) shed light on terminology discourse by
emphasising the importance of conceptualising the global citizen in a contextual way.
For instance, the student global citizen engages at the local, regional and global levels as
a society reality. However, students' development processes can be thought of as
context dependent within the higher education system broadly and within the individual
university more specifically. The context is then further determined by the interactions
between the individuals, their local communities and during encounters with others.
Both the macro and micro contexts act as explanatory variables for understanding the
construct in higher education. A contextualised understanding of the global citizen in
higher education allows unrelated concepts, theories and discourse to be disregarded.
The next section expands our understanding of the centrality of identity to the global
citizen.

3.2.4 Citizenship and ‘identity’ discourse
Regardless of whether the driving force for educating global citizens is aimed towards
global employment or social responsibility, cosmopolitanism and identity are central to
student self-formation. Rhoads and Szelenyi (2011) explained how rigid notions of
national citizenship are not in step with the realities of a hybridised world. These
authors explain that globalisation has expanded citizenship rights and responsibilities.
As such, globalisation has provided the springboard for individuals to hold multiple
alliances involving rights and responsibilities across transnational spaces and providing
an individual with multiple identities (Rhoads & Szelenyi, 2011; Rizvi, 2005; Scholte,
2005). Yet students are rarely engaged with their evolving identity as part of their
learning experience.

‘Hybridity’ is used to characterise intersecting social and cultural histories and
Rizvi, 2005; Scholte, 2005). Expanding on the notion of plural identity, Rizvi (2009)
claimed that ‘hybridity’ is theoretically an anecdote to cultural essentialism. As such,
hybridity recognises different ways of imagining cultural difference and belonging in
multiple global spaces. Hybridity provides a basis for engagement with the complexity of globalisation and the global flows of ideas, images and cultures. Hybridity explains why the global citizen cannot be thought of as a static state of being. Individuals are constantly transforming as they engage and learn with others in a myriad of ways.

Understanding the nature of our transforming sense of identity and belonging is an essential aspect of the global citizen. A number of authors have discussed the concepts of identity and belonging for the global citizen (Delanty, 2011; Killick, 2012; Rizvi, 2005; Scholte, 2005). Killick (2012) argued that the developing sense of belonging and identity is influenced by intercultural interactions. Expanding on this notion, Delanty (2011) argued that the actual context of each intercultural encounter makes a unique contribution to the individual's experience and a developing cosmopolitan identity. Therefore, each intercultural interaction is context dependent and helps us understand that global citizen learning is intrinsically tied to the individual and their societal intercultural encounters. These theoretical positions expose the complexity of and more relational possibilities for understanding 'graduate identity'. However, the global citizen largely exists in higher education without identity discourse. Engaging staff and students in discourse on identity, belonging, and the social imaginary in global learning does not feature greatly in teaching and learning and is discussed further in the next section.

3.3 Identifying the basis of global citizen learning

There has been little scholarly discourse on the underlying philosophy, epistemology and ontology for educating global citizens in contemporary universities. Kymlica and Norman (1994, p. 336) thought there needed to be more insight and planning for educating global citizens. In particular, they argued that the market economy and capitalism are not the ideal training ground for education. However, conceptualising the global citizen through moral and transformative cosmopolitanism offers insight. The global citizen appears as a university policy response to social responsibility, whilst its conceptualisation and application falls short. Furthermore university claims to educate or prepare global citizens are somewhat silent in regard to the moral and ethical implications for learning. Yet from the literature reviewed, these are clearly inherent in the DNA of the socially responsible global citizen. Much earlier, Kohlberg (1984) discussed the role of morality and ethics in education and highlighted the importance of the university's voice and commitment to values. He argued that the ethos and atmosphere of an institution must be explicitly evident throughout the organisation if
students are to develop a set of defensible moral values. The next section raises the possibilities for linking university values and global citizen learning.

3.3.1 Beyond vocational learning

To many students the 'value' of university is to obtain a degree for employment. Yet an exclusive employment emphasis in higher education is expedient and short sighted, particularly in terms of understanding global challenges. Education solely based on employment fails to recognise the long-term societal benefits possible through decision making underpinned by moral reasoning and ethical practice (Altbach et al., 2009, p. x). Vocational approaches to education limit the level of complex reasoning needed for ethical thinking. Peters (1987) and Tomlinson (1986) argued that a narrow education produces skilled and instrumentally minded people: they are trained to be competent in a set of narrow competencies, can be prone to rigidity and inflexibility, and value 'good' as something residing in future consumption.

In contrast, a broadly 'educated person' is more likely to hold a set of moral and ethical values. Nussbaum (2010), Spitzeck (2011) and Kumar (2010) emphasised how important humanistic education is to the future of democracy and civil society. Two teams of UK academics have used 'global perspectives principles' at Bournemouth University (Bourn, 2011; Bourn et al., 2006) and at Leeds Metropolitan University (Jones & Killick, 2013). These universities demonstrate 'policy to practice' for pedagogy with explicit values. Showing that an integrated approach to values-based education is possible across the entire university.

Conceptualising the global citizen in higher education through moral and transformative cosmopolitanism offers an opportunity to expand the vocational breadth of education. It offers possibilities to foster and facilitate a level of systemic and adaptive thinking. It enables and equips students to deal with their transforming identity during the process of learning in challenging environments. Internationalisation of higher education, migration and travel have challenged the singular notion of students' identities in higher education, their lives and as they embark on their careers. In a contrast to previous material analyses of the global citizen in regard of attributes and dimensions, there has been little evidence investigating how students engage with their moral and ethical reasoning abilities as they learn to become global citizens during higher education. These capacities are discussed in the next section.
3.3.2 The moral and ethical capacities of the global citizen

There has been little research in examining the personal ethical and moral capacities that enable students to engage with global citizen learning. Schattle (2008, p. 164) identified a common sense of moral responsibility towards humanity as core to a group of self-identified general public global citizens. But there is a gap in understanding what this means in regards to students learning to become global citizens. Appadurai (2000, p. 36) and Marginson and Sawir (2011, p. 142) have explained how central the imagination is to engaging and learning in a globalised world. The imagination acts as a mediator of reason and 'sense making' during engagement with others. It is an enabling capacity for individuals to consider difference; it allows the individual to think differently and construct alternative perspectives and possibilities. Taylor (2004, p. 21) attributed the social imaginary as the way to deal with the unstructured, complex, empirical and affective aspects of our existence. The social imaginary provides a way of thinking that promotes a common understanding of differing perspectives. The social imaginary enables the global citizen to imagine different worldviews, other possibilities and perspectives. It fosters the ability to engage in a relational and reflexive way to adapt to changing and complex situations and opens the mind to ambiguity.

Reflexivity, criticality and relationality are important ethical and moral capacities of global citizen learning. Reflexivity describes the way we become aware of our own perspectives, critically question our assumptions, embrace engagement with others and critically explore different contexts in learning. Reflexivity allows us to question our Western assumptions of superiority and be open to other possibilities, perspectives and cultural paradigms in life and learning (Beck, 2000). Relationality, on the other hand, emphasises understanding concepts in relation to each other rather than as separate entities or focusing on purely one concept (Malkki, 2010). Collectively, relationality, reflexivity, criticality and the social imaginary are important capacities for thinking and reasoning. They foster a mindset for coping with global complexity. They allow students to engage with an open mind, and to imagine other possibilities and perspectives across conflicting paradigms. Bennett (2008, pp. 18-21) discusses becoming a 'global soul' in terms of having a mindset (cognitive competencies), skills set (behavioural competencies) and heartset (affective competencies). She emphasises the educational significance of intercultural experiences, and argues that student transformation during mobility is associated with internally processing critical incidents and intercultural experiences.
Education plays a critical role in developing students' imagination and moral and ethical capacities. In order to have the mindset to deal with global complexity, students need to have the ability to inquire, adapt and transfer contextual factors to construct meaning and transfer ideals across alternative paradigms and perspectives (Nussbaum, 2010; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). The latter authors felt that students need to be capable of interrogating given constructs. They should examine the historical contexts in which such ideals were constructed to develop the ability to imagine and think, using their moral capacities. Engaging students in discourse on identity and the social imaginary in global learning holds great potential for developing a reflexive and relational global student mindset.

Scholarly discussion on moral issues associated with the global citizen is frequently vague and implicit. Scott (2004b, p. 439) referred to this gap in higher education as an apparent conspiracy of silence and/or culture of disinterest. Further, de Botton (2012, p. 14) felt that secular society has grown frightened of the word 'morality'. While university programs address moral issues such as ethical practice, the links to concepts of morality, moral reasoning, the moral imaginary, and moral sensitivity are implicit and rarely explained to students in these terms. Moreover, a global mindset is rarely explained to students as essential to their self-formation as cosmopolitan global citizens (Marginson & Sawir, 2011).

### 3.3.3 Conceptualising global citizen learning in higher education

From the literature reviewed, the global citizen is underpinned by the humanistic values of cosmopolitanism, yet the role of values in higher education has been in decline. According to Scott (2004a) and Taylor (2011) the diminished role of values in higher education is a casualty of history, neoliberalism and 'market fundamentalism'. The twenty-first century is underpinned by uncertainty and change, yet the employment focus of higher education more commonly deals with the known and avoids ethical frameworks for learning (Altbach et al., 2009; Rhoads & Szelenyi, 2011). Ironically, it has been argued that education based purely on vocational needs, threatens graduates' capability to deal with uncertainty, social change and workplace complexity in uncertain times (Altbach, et al., 2009; Rhoads & Szelenyi, 2011). The employment focus of education and decline of values have been accompanied by the relativism of values on university campuses.

Universities have been criticised for adopting a relativist approach to values. Furedi (2004, p. 60) explained that multicultural relativism of values in education
emerged in the 1970’s. Yet a relativist stance to values is directly in conflict with the core liberal values of a democratic society. Moreover, Furedi (2011) claimed that the multicultural relativist “turns out to be no less intolerant than a self-conscious proponent of religious dogma” (p. 52). Expanding on this position further, D’Arms (2005) explained that unfettered relativity promotes a world without a locus of concern and as a consequence enters a space where nothing matters. He felt, however, that in diverse environments it should be possible to promote values of common concern. Similarly, Li (2007) thought it is possible to take a culturally relativist stance without abandoning a commitment to common values. These views provide insight for universities focussed on recruiting a culturally diverse international student population. As such, it could be possible to reinvigorate an interest in an ethos for humanistic values in the diverse university learning environment. Yet, exposing students to cross-cultural boundaries is psychologically demanding, and new approaches to learning are necessary to foster students’ intercultural learning and understanding (Caruana, 2012b, p. 4).

In contrast to a singular vocational approach to learning and the relativism of values, there are other models of learning to support the way students can learn as global citizens. Schattle’s (2008, p. 23) research showed that global citizenship is a developmental way of thinking and living. This perspective of learning is consistent with descriptions of intercultural learning described by Marginson and Sawir (2011), cosmopolitan learning (Rizvi, 2009), border pedagogy (Giroux, 1988), dialogic pedagogy (Friere, 1973; Friere & Shor, 1987) and transformative learning (Daloz, 2000). These approaches to learning are ethically engaged and adaptive to new social formations. However, there has been little research in higher education into any of these forms of learning in terms of educating global citizens. ‘Border pedagogy’ engages with sociological perspectives (Giroux, 1988). It allows values, attitudes and beliefs to play a greater role in learning. Giroux argued that border pedagogy advances the transformative aspects of critical learning. This form of learning promotes a global mindset and enables students to interrogate ethics, virtues, self-identity and belonging, to create meaning and context for their learning and experiences (Daloz, 2000; Marginson & Sawir, 2011).

Global citizen learning, informed by these complementary learning approaches, equips students to view the world from a different perspective. They are better positioned to challenge their notions of Western cultural superiority and engage with the viewpoint of others. This form of broader learning engages students with their changing ‘identity’ and ‘belonging’ in a globalised world. Learning in this way allows
students to transform perspectives, as they become global citizens. The disciplinary content of learning is not underplayed (Boni & Taylor, 2011). However, ‘how’ students learn contributes to developing their cosmopolitan abilities (Clifford & Montgomery, 2011, p. 13). A broader approach to disciplinary learning allows students to develop a sense of social and moral responsibility, relationality, reflexivity and adaptability (Bourn, 2011; Caruana & Spurling, 2007; Killick, 2012; Rizvi, 2009; Shiel, 2007). From this approach, students and staff are equipped to engage with ambiguity and complexity (Clifford & Montgomery, 2011a).

In the absence of any detailed explanation of the process of global citizen learning in the context of higher education, it is useful to review intercultural competence models in the first instance. Deardorff (2009) comprehensively summarised the published models of intercultural competence; however, arguably the most appropriate models were provided by Deardorff herself and can be understood through three models (Deardorff, 2004, 2006, 2009). The General Program Logic Model allows for inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes of internationalisation to be identified, positioning the interculturally competent graduate as an outcome of internationalisation. Second, the Pyramid Model of Intercultural Competence, as a developmental model, avoids conceptualising intercultural competence through a lengthy list of attributes. Finally, the Process Model of Intercultural Competence depicts the complexity of ongoing movement between the interpersonal and the contextual variables of intercultural competence. The three models highlight the fluidity of the concept of intercultural competence.

These models expand our understanding of the global citizen. While intercultural competence is an essential component of global citizenship, it does not have a strong social responsibility or social justice framing. In contrast, intercultural dialogue, as defined by the Council of Europe, can be thought of as a further developmental step from intercultural competence towards global citizenship development and is described as:

- the respectful exchange of view between diverse individuals and groups
- openness of mind
- tolerance and respect for others
- reflection on own values
- freedom and ability to express oneself
- willingness and capacity to listen to other views
• contributes to political, social, cultural and economic integration and cohesion of culturally diverse societies
• fosters equality, human dignity and sense of common purpose.

(Bergan, 2005, 2006).

Intercultural dialogue picks up on the moral cosmopolitan engaged nature of the global citizen. It could be interpreted as a more sophisticated or developed stage of intercultural competence and closer in definition and intent to the global citizen. Intercultural dialogue engages in making interconnections between one's own values and other political, social, cultural and economic areas that are consistent with transformative cosmopolitanism.

There has been interest in dialogic teaching and learning practices that are aimed at equipping staff and students for the complexity and uncertainty inherent in a rapidly changing global environment (Sanderson, 2008). However, to date there is little research evidence supporting these new approaches.

### 3.3.4 Engaging academics with global citizen learning

New forms of teaching and learning are highly dependent on academic engagement. Several authors have identified academic development as an essential part of the internationalisation of the curriculum planning (International Association Universities, 2012; Leask, 2013c; Leask & Carroll, 2011; Mak & Barker, 2013; Sanderson, 2008). It requires academic staff to examine their own value stance and curricula epistemology. However, academic engagement has been identified as yet another obstacle to implementation of an internationalisation of the curriculum. More optimistically however, it is early days for best practice examples of internationalisation of the curriculum. Curricula reform will need to be infused into university ethos, culture, and commitment and organisational and staff development. It will require fundamental program and university systematic change.

If intercultural competence, intercultural dialogue and global citizenship were all part of a development continuum, there would be a marked similarity to global citizen development process as description of transformative learning theory – and this will be expanded upon in the following section.
3.4 A theoretical basis for global citizen learning

'The global citizen' is a term commonly used in higher education. In an effort to avoid any further confusion about the concept, this review and research program has adopted the term 'global citizen learning' to describe the process students engage with, as they become global citizens. This review proposes that transformative learning theory provides a theoretical explanation of the moral and ethical shifts in frames of reference that occur as students become global citizens. There are many shared values between this theory and global citizenship, particularly in self-awareness, social justice, responsibility and participatory action. The epistemic cognition aspect of transformative learning theory enables complex interconnecting thinking that emerges late in adolescence and is an appropriate theory to consider for university students (Mezirow, 2000a, p. 5). Transformative learning theory focuses on how we learn to negotiate confronting or unfamiliar situations to evaluate our own and others' purposes, critically evaluate our own and others' values, understand social complexity through strong values of tolerance, social justice and equality. From this description, there is a similarity to the situations that students may be exposed to during a mobility experience. Transformative learning theory focuses on how students learn, but higher education does not engage greatly with this theory.

The basis of transformative learning theory accommodates the situational and circumstantial nature of perspective change that is characteristic of the transformations that occur as a result of mobility experience (Savicki & Selby, 2008). According to Mezirow (2000a), transformative learning theory is only applicable in contextual situations where critical reflection and reason come into play. Mezirow (2000a, p. xii) explained that we must question our underlying assumptions of our historical and biographical 'self' in relation to others (reflexivity and relationality). In this way we develop our frame of reference, our 'habits of mind' (ethical and moral learning capacities) and 'points of view' as we engage with mind and reason.

Our values and sense of self (identity) are anchored in our frame of reference. It is from here that we filter and interpret meanings from situational encounters (Mezirow, 2000a). In this frame of reference, filtering occurs through our sense of identity and the interplay of our moral and ethical capacities (imaginary, reflexivity and relationality). Marginson and Sawir (2011, p. 140) described self-formation in terms consistent with the transformative learning theory. Mezirow's (2000a) theory has faced criticism; however, he has acknowledged that it is a theory in progress that continues to
be expanded (Cranton, Dirkx, Gozawa, Kasl, & Smith, 2006). The next section makes comparisons between transformative learning theory and the way students learn to become global citizens.

3.4.2 Transformative learning theory

In light of the previous discussion, it can be argued that the Western democratic or Eurocentric notion of global citizenship development shows a strong theoretical link to transformative learning theory through the similar underpinnings of informed, free human choice, critical thinking, moral reasoning, social justice, rationality, self-awareness and empathy (Mezirow, 2000a). Yet, the theory is complex and involves a considerable number of theoretical, practical and ethical challenges as a theory in progress. Four different lenses for transformative learning have been described (Dirkx et al., 2006). These include a development approach (Daloz, 2000), an emancipatory approach related to dialogic reasoning (Friere, 1973), an extra rational approach, which includes the emotive and affective elements at the unconscious level (Dirkx et al., 2006), and a rational approach which involves metacognitive practical reasoning directed towards action (Mezirow, 2000a). Critical reflections and perspective changes are formulated by challenging epistemic assumptions. However, the emotionally charged dimension of the imagination also plays a role, often at the unconscious level, as in the extra rational approach (Dirkx et al., 2006). Through this lens, the transforming nature of self and sense of identity occurs at an inner level. Daloz (2000) emphasises that each transformation is contingent on environmental and cultural forces at play in an individual’s life. He recognises four relevant stages of transformation: the presence of the other; reflective discourse; a mentoring community; and opportunities for committed action.

To date, there is scant evidence directly linking the global citizen to any of the transformative learning theory lenses, but there are links to particular attributes of the global citizen. For example, in a small study, Jones (2010) described how two students underwent epochal moments or ‘subjective reframing’ experiences while abroad. This description is consistent with the disorienting dilemma described by Mezirow (1991). Savicki and colleagues (2008) identified the relationship between transformative learning theory and developing intercultural competence as a result of international education. Furthermore, Taylor (1994), in a small interview study of American students (n=12), compared the learning process of intercultural competence in relation to transformative learning theory. He was able to show that the process of becoming interculturally competent involved changes in values, self-confidence and perspective,
leading to a more inclusive and integrative worldview. His study partially supported a rational lens (Dirkx et al., 2006) but Taylor argued that the Mezirow model viewed emotions simply as interpretations of feelings rather than as more complex emotions. Arguably, Taylor was describing the extra rational lens for transformative learning (Dirkz et al., 2006). Becoming a global citizen is often described as a transformative experience but there are few empirical studies that link the process of global citizen learning to the four lenses of transformative learning theory.

### 3.4.5 Transformative learning theory and the global citizen

Global citizenship and transformative learning theory are both linked to the Enlightenment values by shared goals of self-understanding, overcoming communication distortions, and strengthening self-rationality and reason. Transformative learning theory applies in a contextual situation through critical reflection, reason, and from questioning the underlying assumptions of our historical, cultural and biographical ‘self’ and validating our conclusions (Dirkx et al., 2006). From a cognitive perspective, Bruner (1996) explained how we ‘make meaning’ through internal processing which includes shaping inter-subjectivity, relating events and behaviour, constructing meaning from the normative and their deviations, and the ability to mentally make internal propositions by de-contextualising a situation. According to Mezirow (2000a) there is a fifth essential mode to ‘making meaning’ that involves the ability to critically evaluate our own assumptions, and the assumptions and expectations of others in relation to their relevance. This fifth mode is a critical aspect for the global citizen and involves the reflexive mindset.

The cognitive processes involved with ‘making meaning’ were described by Kitchener (1983, p. 220). He explained that human cognitive processing is understood as basic computing and memorising, meta-cognition and epistemic cognition. It is at the level of epistemic cognition that Mezirow described transformative learning as occurring. In a similar way, Kolb (2009, p. 59) identified that while transformative experience such as overseas exchange is not necessarily a positive one, it is important for changing longstanding habits of mind. Malkki (2010) explained that, emotionally, we automatically orientate towards the comfort zone. We feel uncomfortable emotions when our comfort zone is challenged however these “edge emotions” (p. 55) motivate us to restore balance to our equilibrium through a meaning making process. Malkki argued that we transform ourselves into our expectations of self. Along a similar vein, Mezirow (2000b) argued that changing perspectives can be intensely emotional and he linked
this ability to transform and regain equilibrium to emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1996).

The emotional intelligence quotient (EQ) includes the competencies of empathy, self-regulation, social skills, self-control and trustworthiness. It involves knowing and imagining one's emotions, motivating oneself, handling relationships and clear thinking. Mezirow's link to EQ brought into focus the concept of knowing and imagining one's emotions and handling relationships and clear thinking. The preconditions for transformative learning include: maturity, education, safety, health, economic stability and emotional intelligence (Taylor, 2004). These preconditions, however, seem arbitrary, as seemingly, if all were required to be in place at once, potentially few people would ever experience transformative learning. In particular, it would not be realistic to expect these preconditions to be fully developed in graduates. Students have the capacity to develop along the continuum while at university and continue to develop in the future.

Mezirow's (2000a) theory of transformative learning was strongly underpinned by the work of other theorists. He drew on Habermas (1984) with regard to communicative learning which requires first, critical reflection on the appropriateness, coherence, values and moral issues in communication in order to understand the authenticity of what is said, and second, being critically aware of the assumptions of the person who is communicating. Habermas (1970) argued that we make meaning through synthesising multiple perspectives. Mezirow also drew on the concept of "conscientisation" (Friere & Shor, 1987) as the necessary underlying basis for enabling a person to transform one's frame of reference, an important aspect of broadening one's world view. Freire and Shor (1987) thought that dialogic education was the way via which students could engage with the complexity of society. They claimed that through critical dialogue we begin to understand the more tacit components of individuals and society in light of the political and historical contexts. Expanding further, these authors argued that liberal education educates for social transformation. They described critical students as holding "critical curiosity, some political awareness, democratic participation, habits of intellectual scrutiny, interest in social change with realistic goals gained from dialogic discourse" (1987, p. 13).

Moral and transformative cosmopolitanism, as discussed in this chapter, appears to form an appropriate basis on which to conceptualise the global citizen. It is proposed that the moral and social imaginary allows the global citizen to engage in moral
reasoning and in challenging and ambiguous situations. This literature review has highlighted the shortfall in our understanding of what it means to be a global citizen in higher education and how becoming a global citizen should transpire within the existing university organisational structure. While there is a body of theoretical literature in the area of transformative learning and dialogic pedagogy, there is little empirical evidence linking global citizen development to this theory. Prominent authors have linked the global citizen to a moral and ethical framework (Killick, 2012; Montgomery & Clifford, 2012; Sanderson, 2008; Schattle, 2008) however there has been little research into conceptualising the global citizen through this lens. This research gap is the focus of the current research program.

Chapters Two and Chapter Three have provided a scholarly background understanding of the global citizen in the context of contemporary universities and form the basis of a conceptual framework (see Figure 3.1). The conceptual framework visually depicts the conflicting neoliberal and cosmopolitan paradigms that are influential in educating global citizens in the contextual environment of contemporary universities. As explained by Peters (2008, p. xii) the macro and micro contexts of the global citizen act as variables for understanding the construct in universities. The conceptual framework guided the planning and design of this research program. It informs the objective macro and subjective microenvironments influencing the global citizen in universities with each unit depicting the variables of influence.
Figure 3.1 The research conceptual framework

GLOBALISATION
- Objective phenomenon of growth, economic efficiency, deregulation, less concern for social welfare ... OR
- Ideological formation and collective social imaginary enabling individuals and collective to engage with possibilities provided by globalisation

NEOLIBERAL PARADIGM
- OECD supranational influence
- Materialistic paradigm focused on productivity and prosperity
- Self-interest paramount, human behaviour based on economic gain
- Education influenced by human capital theory
- Graduates as global employees

COSMOPOLITAN PARADIGM
- Humanistic paradigm recognising increased cultural pluralism
- Humane responsibility for common good
- Education based on normative liberal values and social responsibility
- Graduates as moral and transformative global citizens

INTERNATIONALISATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION
- Neoliberal response to globalisation
- Strategic organisational imperatives overshadowing humanistic goals
- Generating commerce and competition in sector
- More comprehensive approaches to internationalisation developing in 21st century
- International interest to review core purposes of internationalisation
- Internationalisation of the curriculum and emerging strategic

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF UNIVERSITY
- Claimed to be the key to cohesive society
- International, intercultural and environmental strategies part of university visions
- Role in promoting moral and ethical perspectives in education
- Universities consciences of society to prepare future leaders
- The organisational and educational challenge of developing morally and ethically responsible global citizens

BALANCING CONFLICTING PARADIGMS
Humanism versus the market

WHAT DOES A GLOBAL CITIZEN MEAN IN CONTEMPORARY UNIVERSITIES FROM CONCEPT TO PRACTICE?
3.5 Summary: Chapter Three

Globalisation and its impacts are outpacing institutional responses in meeting the challenges of changing global and local environments. This is particularly so in the case of educating global citizens. Internationalisation of higher education in the early twenty-first century is a construction in progress. Universities are faced with supranational, international and national policy influences. Changing global events, uncertainty, ambiguity and unforeseen challenges will require students to graduate with a degree of knowledge, skills and values which reaches beyond the neoliberal paradigm of human capital theory and education solely for employment. While social responsibility features in university policy, there is a gap in understanding how this is translated into curricula and when, why and how students will develop as global citizens as a result of their experiences at an internationalised university.

From the literature reviewed and analysed in this chapter, a clearer picture for the global citizen positioned within the context of contemporary universities emerged. The changing nature of internationalisation was described. The individual features of internationalisation, which directly intersect with the global citizen, were discussed. The somewhat current disjointed picture of the global citizen was highlighted. Contemporary discourse engaging in the new language of globalisation was introduced. Terms such as 'hybridised identity' and 'social imaginary' were introduced, as were notions of 'relationality', 'criticality', and 'reflexivity'. The new possibilities for conceptualising the global citizen were contrasted with the previous quantitative approaches to research. Previous research had been based on fixed notions of interculturality and failed to recognise that moral reasoning and values are amenable to education. The overlapping notions of moral and transformative cosmopolitanism, transformative mobility experiences, and transformative learning were described. The theory of developing as a global citizen was compared to four lenses of transformative learning theory discussed in the literature. This background of scholarly literature provides an underpinning basis for the current research program. Chapter Four explains the theoretical, methodological and methods of the current research program.
4.0 The research program theory and methodology

4.1 Overview

The purpose of the research program is to conceptualise and contextualise what a global citizen means in contemporary universities from concept to practice. In this way the global citizen can be considered as an individual, and becoming one as a process of learning. Moreover, for the purpose of this research the global citizen is socially embedded within the university, the organisational aspects of the global citizen are investigated and considered in their contextual setting. In this chapter the theory, methodology, and methods used to underpin the current research are explained.

By providing detail on the research elements, the researcher’s philosophical orientation to the research is made explicit to the reader. Also, the rationale for the study design and researcher role and participation in the current study is established. Furthermore, criticisms of the chosen research elements are discussed, as well as the steps that have been taken in this research to address the previously identified limitations. Table 4.1 shows how the individual elements of the research build on each other to create an overall framework to guide the researcher’s thinking and the research process. Each of these design elements is discussed in the following sections.

Table 4.1 Overall research framework (revised Crotty 1998, p. 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE RESEARCH ELEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPISTEMOLOGY AND ONTOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social constructivism, interpretivism, the researcher position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative research, hermeneutic circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study design, semi-structured interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The research program is an overall case study consisting of two distinct embedded qualitative studies. The studies were designed to capture multiple interpretations of the global citizen as a concept, as a process of learning, as well as in terms of the organisational implications for achieving this aim. According to Habermas (1970), meaning is negotiated from multiple perspectives. The research approach captured two different worldviews and evidence to build a comprehensive contextual understanding of research phenomena. Study One of the research program sought the views of international industry key informants on the meaning of the term ‘global citizen’ and the role of the university for educating all students as global citizens. Study One is presented in Chapters Five, Six and Seven.

Study Two of the research obtained details of Australian and European student mobility experiences, focusing specifically on their personal experiences of change that were consistent with becoming a global citizen. Study Two is presented in Chapter Eight. While both studies were designed to produce independent findings, it was anticipated that there would be complementary findings between the two studies to expand the overall meaning of research objectives. These complementary findings are included in a cross-case analysis and are discussed in Chapter Nine. According to Yin (2009) this type of research approach supports the construct, internal and external validity of the research program and promotes research quality. In the next sections the theoretical, and methodological bases of the research are explained.

4.2 Epistemology and ontology

A paradigm is embraced by ethics, epistemology, ontology and methodology (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 183). Ethics refers to a moral stance towards the world and others. Epistemology describes knowing the world, while ontology explains a belief about reality and the meaning of being a ‘human being’. The research paradigm chosen represents the researcher’s worldview. The researcher’s approach is introduced (Figure 4.1), in the framework and its corresponding research elements. The diagram demonstrates the overall theoretical perspective and operative directions taken by the researcher to ‘make meaning’ from the research data and developing concepts. The theoretical perspectives, methodology, and methods chosen, provided a firm foundation to explore and understand how a global citizen is construed in the context of contemporary universities. As such, the framework provided a ‘form of scaffolding’ to address and intellectualise the research questions (Crotty, 1998). The framework enabled the researcher to be unambiguous in intention and systematically explained the
way the research has been executed. Throughout this chapter, each element will be discussed in regard to their strengths and weaknesses, including the steps taken to address criticisms.

4.2.1 Social constructivism
The global citizen is a highly contested concept in the literature. It is increasingly considered as a phenomenon of interest in the internationalisation of higher education (Schattle, 2009). From the academic perspective, the literature is scarce on the philosophical, epistemological, and ontological bases of the ‘global citizen’ in internationalised higher education; for example see Killick (2012), Leask (2013; 2011) and Rizvi (2009). This issue is accentuated by the predominance of internationalisation research that has been undertaken through an ‘a-theoretical’ lens (Huisman, 2010). While it is intuitive to believe an in-depth understanding of the human being aspect of internationalisation would be foremost in academic circles, on investigation, this part of the phenomenon has been viewed in the main through instrumental forms of research (as discussed in the literature review). There is limited qualitative research into the global citizen as a human being and as a socially and organisationally embedded construct in higher education. As a result, there is a gap in understanding how the global citizen is conceptualised epistemologically, ontologically and practically as the human outcome of internationalisation of higher education.

It is within this environment of scarce conceptual theory that the epistemological and ontological premises for the research have been chosen. More specifically, social constructivism has been adopted to construct meaning for ‘what a global citizen’ represents in the higher education sector and through this lens, how the social and shared nature of the phenomenon is co-constructed by the researcher, participants and the ongoing situational analysis. According to Crotty (1998, p. 45), the heart of constructivism lies in “interaction between the subject and object”, yet Gergen (2003) and Vygotsky (1978) emphasized the centrality of the contemporary setting which provides the contextual explanatory meaning of the phenomenon. To capture the complexity of a global citizen as the phenomenon in this research, and in light of these stated theoretical positions, the researcher accepted these dual viewpoints. Hence, understanding and interpreting the multiple interactions occurring during the research, was central to the researcher’s constructivist approach. Interpretations were influenced by the interview findings, the literature, theory and contextual settings, and historical events.
Constructivism has fielded much criticism. Bowers (2005) has been a forceful critic in particular. He argued that educational theorists have been trapped in a Western Enlightenment time warp and have failed to concede the twenty-first century impacts of globalisation, cultures, values, habits of mind and environments in their theory. While Bowers’ argument is strong in regard to the blanket relativism adopted by some proponents of constructivism, his argument is not entirely applicable in this instance. It can be argued that the social constructivist approach adopted in this research has taken into account the complex interactions of individuals, contexts, and cultures within a globalised environment. These aspects have been sensitively, relationally, and reflexively acknowledged and considered by the researcher throughout the research process.

4.2.2 Interpretivism

An interpretive paradigm as a theoretical approach is inherently suited to the complex interactions in this research. This approach enabled this researcher to pursue ‘Verstehen’ as the empathetic understanding of the global citizen, first as a construct and second as a process within the various research contexts (Elwell, 1996). As such, the researcher, who is knowledgeable and experienced in the area, sought to have an in-depth understanding of the research subject. From this perspective, the researcher synthesised how knowledge is created in the context of each research setting with how the global citizen as a concept, and its development process are personally, socially and culturally derived and understood by the participants in the interview studies (Neuman, 2006). This approach is consistent with a constructivist-interpretive paradigm and a relativist ontology (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 24).

As a key player in the research process, this researcher needed to reflect and examine personal points of view at all times during the process of investigating others, while sharing in the social and political commitment expressed by those studied (Neuman, 2006, p. 93). Due to the complexity of the phenomenon, a comprehensive approach was taken by the researcher in considering the supra national, national and university policy contexts, but also bearing in mind the contextual situation of individual interviewees (Neuman, 2006, p. 93). In light of this complexity, the interpretive approach was well suited to addressing the investigation of the complex phenomenon of the global citizen in contemporary universities. The chosen approach supports systematic analyses of large amounts of rich, detailed, qualitative data to create a deeper and richer understanding of how the separate data sources triangulate to create meaning and strengthen the explanatory outcomes of the research (Neuman, 2006, p.
The complexity of the global citizen and global citizen learning process could not be captured through a positivist lens or a single line of inquiry.

### 4.2.3 The researcher position

In the context of this research, interpretivism provided a complementary philosophical stance to social constructivism and catered for the assumptions of the researcher within various contexts to support the logic and function of the research processes (Guba & Lincoln, 2005, p. 66; Schwandt, 2000, p. 125). The risk of researcher subjectivity is a common criticism of research guided by interpretivism. However, Ritsumei and Mack (2010) in defense of interpretivist research, argued that positivist approaches, as in any research, are also subject to any number of variables and biases and cannot be assumed to be entirely objective.

Interpretivist research does not claim to hold the same verification methods and emphasis on causality as positivist approaches, but can address quality in other ways (Yin, 2009). A demonstration of objectivity in interpretivist research is explained in the way the researcher brackets assumptions, is reflexive and sensitive. The researcher must see beyond preconceptions and view the data from a new perspective. Rather than aiming for causality, interpretivist research aims for claims of analysable generalisation (Yin, 2009). Further discussion in regard to processes for objectivity, rigour, and quality are discussed in the following sections.

### 4.3 Methodology

#### 4.3.1 Qualitative research

Due to the multi-faceted and international, comparative nature of the research, a qualitative style of enquiry was chosen to achieve a greater depth of understanding than would otherwise have been possible. A qualitative enquiry complemented the interpretive paradigm and provided a focus to in-depth understanding and explanation through differing perspectives (Berkowitz, 1996). Choosing a qualitative style of enquiry allowed the researcher, as the central actor in the design process to be interactive with the participants, as well as to accommodate reflexivity and evaluation during the study process. The researcher could consider the study directions and judge the iterative requirements of the research in line with the emergent data analysis (Yin, 2009). A systematic approach to the research process was taken through the hermeneutic circle and is discussed in the next section.
4.3.2 Hermeneutic circle
The Hermeneutic Circle is a strategy to direct the interpretive approach during the research process. Gadamer (1979) and Ricoeur (1981) outlined the strategy. It enables a researcher to be explicit about their position in the research process and it enables meaning to be negotiated between researcher and participants. Furthermore, it recognises contextual ambiguity (Schwandt, 2000). Klein and Meyer (1999) formulated seven principles to address the criticisms of the hermeneutic interpretivist approach. These principles provide transparency to the research process. They provide greater clarity of purpose and promote quality and evaluation of the interpretivist research.

The seven principles provide a scaffold for the hermeneutic circle process and were adopted as the research strategy in this thesis. In general, the interaction and interplay between the hermeneutic principles and the ‘whole’ they represent, contribute to a research story that is plausible and convincing and, as such, results in plausibility and cogency (Klein & Myers, 1999). Rather than a totally new approach, the Klein and Myers principles (Klein & Myers, 1999) appear to systematically draw together a number of processes described by other authors (Crotty, 1998; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Gergen & Gergen, 2003; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Guba & Lincoln, 2005; Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1984; Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Yin, 2009) to provide an explicit and useful framework to guide and evaluate the research process.

Klein and Myers’ seven principles of the Hermeneutic Circle are:
1. The Hermeneutic Circle
2. The Principle of Contextualisation
3. The Principle of Interaction between the Researcher and the Subjects
4. The Principle of Abstraction and Generalisation
5. The Principle of Dialogic Reasoning
6. The Principle of Multiple Interpretations
7. The Principle of Suspicion.

The Hermeneutic Circle describes the first principle and implies that during the research process we come to recognise a ‘whole’ or research outcome through the conscious and often subconscious interplay between our preconceptions and biases, meanings extrapolated from the data and interrelationships and synergy of these component parts. These parts can be historical, personal and data related. Foremost, it was pertinent for this researcher to acknowledge, that she did not enter the field completely free of pre-conceptions, biases or ideas. In conceptualising this research
program, the researcher was influenced by personal curiosity, contextual university experience domestically and internationally, and extensive immersion in the literature. The conceptual framework from the literature review and a theoretical understanding influenced the research design, sampling method and initial data collection. Researcher reflexivity is demonstrated throughout the research process by questioning assumptions, making constant comparisons between the data and exercising suspicion. Pattern matching of concepts, themes and subthemes was ongoing during the analysis as a way of understanding the findings of the individual studies, as well as the overall case. The researcher position is a key feature differentiating this research approach from grounded theory, as described by Glaser and Strauss (1998). The ongoing data analysis in both studies as well as the cross-case analysis recognised the contribution of the individual concepts and themes to the research questions as well as their contribution to the whole. The execution of Principle One is demonstrated in section 1.5 in the Introduction chapter through the extensive detail provided in ‘The personal statement’. Here the researcher is explicit about how she came to recognise the research as a whole by addressing preconceptions, biases and personal involvement in the research.

The second Principle of Contextualisation refers to the transparency, clarity, and explicitness expressed by the researcher during the research process and reporting outcomes. In the research, the investigation of the global citizen is researched within the context of the Australian and European higher education sectors. Contextualisation is reflected in the temporal sequence of interviews and how research questions evolved. The research questions were developed iteratively during the data collection process in line with previous findings and the informants’ areas of expertise. The context of particular issues is accounted for in the analysis, discussion and overall thesis conclusions. Therefore, any pertinent details that impacted on decision making during the research are provided to the reader to facilitate understanding of the progression of ideas, concepts and theories which lead to the provided explanatory outcomes (Klein & Myers, 1999; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The researcher was explicit throughout the research process regarding the development of concepts and ideas. Principle Two is demonstrated throughout the findings chapters and the cross-case analysis by the way the researcher demonstrates the progress of ideas and concepts in the research. The thesis offers clear examples of this through the Tables for themes, sub-themes as well as the conceptual visualisation in Figures 5.1, Figure 7.1, Figure 8.1 and Figure 9.1. These visual representations show that the researcher was explicit about how the concepts and ideas were developing in their individual contexts as well as over the entire research process.
The Interaction between Researcher and Subjects Principle, the third of the seven Hermeneutic Circle Principles, requires the researcher to participate in the situational contexts with participants. As such, this researcher was an active participant in the research. This Principle was operationalised through an audit trail. The audit trail recorded how interpersonal interactions, data collection, and interpretation impacted on each other. The audit trail was kept through a research journal that was coded, analysed and stored in the research NVivo database. In this way interpersonal interaction, impacts and consequences were followed, recorded, and considered throughout the research process. By analysing the research journal the researcher was confident that Principle Three was adhered to during the research process. Principle Three provided a grounded basis for the researcher to believe the student stories and deduce that there was no influence of reporting bias or influence from the power differential between the researcher and students.

Abstraction and generalisation form the basis of the fourth principle and it required this researcher to relate contextual concepts to abstract categories that might have had multiple applications. This principle applied to the iterative research process of data collection, analysis, iterative questions, and further analysis. During the analysis process the formulation and reformulation of abstract categories was extensive. The abstraction and generalisation credibility was achieved by careful recording of the details of the conceptual processes. The development of concepts, themes and subthemes, the generation of theory, the drawing of specific implications have all been clearly explained and well documented in the research findings and therefore a key strength of interpretive case study can be demonstrated (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Stake, 2000; Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Yin, 2009). The iterative nature of the research is the strength of interpretive research. The key result of Principle Four can be appreciated through the reporting of the cross-case analysis in Chapter Nine. Here the developing concepts, themes and subthemes have been analysed and reconstructed to expand on theory and practice. Furthermore, the research outcomes and implication of abstraction and generalisation of data concepts are demonstrated throughout this chapter.

The Principle of Dialogical Reasoning, number five of Klein and Myers’ seven principles of the Hermeneutic Circle, applied to this researcher’s original lens and preconception of the research and to the sensitivity and reflexivity towards the data that emerged throughout the research. The researcher entered the field with knowledge of the political and economic history, university policy statements about educating global
citizens, also with extensive knowledge of the literature. The researcher held assertions on the conceptual, theoretical, and practical aspects of the phenomenon. These are made explicit in the personal statement and literature review. As such, the researcher acknowledged her views, historical assumptions, and theoretical position at the outset of the research. Hermeneutics recognises that the position of the researcher is the starting point of the research, and that once this is declared, it can be suspended as a greater understanding of the phenomenon emerges during the data analysis. However, objectivity can be demonstrated throughout the thesis. The researcher’s objectivity can be assessed by the reader through the presentation of the data throughout the findings chapters. The visual array of findings in the conceptual themes and sub-themes enables the reader to see the authenticity of the research findings and to follow the interpretive process of the research. Furthermore, the contributions of the research reported in Chapter Ten clearly demonstrate that Dialogic Reasoning was exercised throughout the research process.

In order to gain a broad and meaningful understanding of the global citizen and understand its comparative complexity within the Australian and European contexts, the research was investigated from contrasting worldviews. This was in accordance with the sixth of the Klein and Myers principles, that of Multiple Interpretations. Issues such as power, economics, and values were examined from the international, national, organisational and individual perspectives. The researcher considered their influence on the data at all times. By seeking these different perspectives, the researcher was able to address conflicting perspectives, ambiguity in the data and interpret the differences accordingly. This principle complements the final of the Klein and Myers principles, the Principle of Suspicion. The research findings in Chapter Six particularly highlight how the Principle of Multiple Interpretations was analysed in the research. This chapter explains how power and economics influence the higher education sector at the organisational as well as individual levels. In this chapter the values of commercialisation and public good are contrasted, as are the influence of leadership style, academic autonomy and the influence on embedding values in education.

Suspicion of analytical interpretations was applied to ensure that the researcher maintained a critical perspective and took the participants’ views with an element of suspicion. This perspective encouraged the researcher to challenge the participants’ views through the analysis and through constant comparisons between propositions, literature, evolving researcher position, and emerging concepts in the data. The participant pool of industry key informants and mobility students provided two
contrasting interpretations of the global citizen. The process of transformation, the student mindset, and global citizen learning were considered across a diversity of nationalities, demographics, professional and personal experiences and cultures. The multiple perspectives provided a good basis for researcher suspicion, objectivity, and constant comparison throughout the research process. The Principle of Suspicion was exercised extensively throughout the data analysis to ensure that developing concepts were strong. For example, the researcher continually went back to participant transcripts to ensure that quotes used in the themes and sub-themes were not taken out of context. Viewing the research through the lens of interpretive, social constructivism and adopting the Hermeneutic Circle provided a firm epistemological and theoretical basis for interpreting the study finding.

4.3.3 Case study design

A case study design was chosen for the research as an ideal methodology for the 'how' and 'why' explanatory nature of the research questions. Case study design complements the interpretivist approach (Cavaye, 1996). The case study approach enabled a holistic understanding of the research objectives. Yin's (2009) case study design enabled the complexity of the research phenomenon to be investigated within a bounded system. According to Yin (2009, p. 98), case study research is strengthened by: multiple sources of data that converge on the same facts and findings; a case study database; and an explicit chain of evidence.

The overall case (representing the research question) comprises two embedded cases. The first case is an international key informant study and is reported in Chapters Five, Six and Seven. The second case is a mobility student study that is reported in Chapter Eight. These embedded cases have their own questions that do not necessarily result in identical units of analysis. However during the cross-case analysis the reconstruction and synthesis of the two studies' units of analysis offer conceptual insight to the overall case and objectives of the research program. The converging lines of evidence from the two embedded cases contributed to the synthesis of deeper meaning in the cross-case analysis that is presented in Chapter 9. Chapter 9 reports on the overall case. This explanation of case study and embedded case study is consistent with Yin (2009 p. 53-60).

The overall case study examined in depth what a global citizen means from concept to practice in contemporary universities. The multiple units of data for the analysis were stored in the research NVivo 9 database. They were obtained from the
ongoing literature review, semi-structured interviews, field notes, audit trail, personal correspondence with interview participants, and relevant historical events recorded during the research process. These data contributed to converging lines of evidence. The cross-case analysis allowed the researcher to triangulate multiple points of view found in the data. Triangulation is proffered as a means of searching for alternative interpretations (Flick, 2006, p. 115) and/or of strengthening conclusions (Yin, 2009). While Stake (1995) questioned whether ‘constructed reality’ could be triangulated, in the present research triangulation broadened the researcher’s conceptual, practical and theoretical understanding of the research findings, concepts developed and research conclusions made (Neuman, 2006, p 149). The conceptual development reported in Chapter Nine and Chapter Ten would not have occurred in such depth from a single lens of enquiry.

During the ongoing data collection, the interpretive analysis occurred intra-study and between studies, enabling the researcher to consider different perspectives and insights, leading to a richer pool of data and findings. As such, the temporal sequence of interviews and contemporaneous analysis of findings from the studies enabled the researcher to consider similarities and differences in concepts as they emerged. This did not undermine the significance of analysis and findings for each study but opened the possibilities for multi-perspectivity in the research. Relativity is strong in case study design and so the precise role of this researcher has been outlined as part of the Hermeneutic Circle. In this situation, the researcher was explicit about personal participation; her role was portrayed as that of an informed participant but not of expert; and she acted as a critical analyst. The research is specifically aimed towards the higher education sector, and ongoing conceptual interpretations have been described and clearly recorded to result in a story that can be subjected to scholarly scrutiny and challenge (Stake, 1995).

A frequent criticism of case study design is an inability to achieve generalisable research outcomes (Tellis, 1997). This criticism is categorically denied by Yin (2009, p. 38). He argued that a well-structured case study design facilitates the ability of the researcher to look for ‘replication’ of concepts by examining multiple sources of data. Careful analysis of the converging lines of evidence in this research allowed for replication of conceptual findings to be identified and these are discussed in Chapter Nine. The comparison between data sources allowed generalisable conclusions to be made. The current research was guided by Yin’s (2009) guidelines for design structure to ensure that quality is monitored throughout an ongoing structured approach to the
research to counter criticisms of case study research. Furthermore, a structured approach supported quality and rigour throughout the entire research process.

The cross-case analysis of the overall case study provided depth in understanding of 'what a global citizen means from concept to practice in the contemporary university'. The interpretive case study approach was designed to develop a comprehensive, in-depth understanding of the global citizen in higher education from a conceptual, organisational, and pedagogical perspective.

4.3.4 Study protocol and question development

The researcher’s position and development of minor propositions guided the research design and played a central role in the systematic approach taken in this research. Yin (2009) argued that this basis of researcher position leads to sharper and more meaningful interview questions and study protocols. This researcher, mindful of the extant literature, was able to respond through theoretical sampling to the new developing concepts as they occurred during the iterative data collection and analysis. The research design allowed sensitivity and reflexivity to guide question development during the data collection stage to respond to developing concepts (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Yin, 2009). The interpretivist position guided the question development and facilitated scrutiny of data throughout. At the outset, the researcher commenced with a protocol for the study questions based on the conceptual framework, experience, and theoretical propositions. This acted as a guide but not a script. The iterative question development informed the developing themes and sub-themes.

Reflexivity and sensitivity were applied in accordance with participant needs. As the research progressed, iterative questions developed. These facilitated responsive theoretical sampling and allowed collection of other relevant data and further analysis (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). This process is a key feature differentiating the present research from a grounded theory approach, where any researcher speculation is rejected at the outset (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). This researcher had the ability to expand or reject the neoliberal and cosmopolitan perspectives of the conceptual framework during data collection and analysis. As such, a more robust research conclusion was achieved through this comprehensive case study design. The research addressed the known weaknesses of theory and design. The research has been objective and realistic in reaching conclusions, thereby ensuring that findings stand up to scholarly scrutiny.
4.4  Research methods for Study One and Study Two

4.4.1  Semi-structure interviews
Semi-structured interviews provide an opportunity for the researcher to pursue issues of interest with flexibility. They allow contextually based, valid explanations of participants’ perceptions of reality (Minichiello, Aroni, & Hays, 2008). The semi-structured interviews undertaken in this research were specifically chosen to obtain data on the global citizen from two entirely different perspectives. In this way, the cross-case analysis would provide a data source and analysis and interpretation not possible from a singular approach. The industry key informant interviews were designed to provide informed top-down perspectives. In contrast, the student interviews were designed to provide a bottom-up perspective of their mindset for learning during transformation that was consistent with becoming global citizens. Contrasting data were considered and recorded at all times. According to Miles and Huberman (1994), Stake (2000) and Yin (2009) using different sources of information contributes to quality of findings, depth of analysis, and greater understanding of the research phenomenon. By obtaining and analysing different sources of data, triangulation is possible. This either provides confirmation of findings, or a way of detecting inconsistencies in the data (Patton, 2002).

4.4.2  Data management and analysis
All data for this research were kept in one software program. According to Yin (2009, p. 98) case study research is strengthened by a case study database. As stated in section 4.3.3, NVivo 9 stored all data. NVivo facilitated a reflexive way to consider and view the data. The first step was to code data into nodes and sub-nodes. According to Newman (2006), coding reduces data and facilitates a systematic process of analysis, enabling concepts and themes in the data to emerge. The NVivo software enabled the researcher to code data into categories, themes and sub-themes utilizing NVivo’s strength as a research management tool (Beekhuyzen, 2008).

The first step was to import transcripts into source files. All transcripts were read and coded for content. The start list of initial codes was stored in nodes and aligned to the interview questions. These nodes were descriptive and were based on the areas aligned to the research questions in regard to the conceptual, practical and organisational/pedagogical issues related to the global citizen. Any data of interest was coded and either filed in a node describing its relevance or in a miscellaneous node. Also, outliers were coded that related to an aspect the researcher had not considered.
previously. The potential value of an ‘outliers’ node was acknowledged from the outset as a way to view the research from a different perspective (Neuman, 2006). For example ‘The managerial mindset’ exemplar discussed as a theme in Chapter Six evolved from the outlier node. This particular theme provided conceptual insight to the organisational constraints that were imposed through instrumentalism and managerialism. Through a process of comprehensive analysis, the codes were arranged and extensively rearranged into an array of visual representations. This process of analysis was consistent with Miles and Huberman’s (1994) approach to qualitative analysis. The reduction of data took place as an iterative process throughout the whole research process. Once data collection commenced, the data reduction process was ongoing through coding, classifying various forms of data, reviewing field notes, memos, observations and transcripts. The data reduction as a core element of the research continued until the completion of the thesis.

4.4.3 Data analysis and cross-case analysis guidelines
During the data analysis of the individual studies and the cross-case analysis the following the analytical guidelines were used (Miles & Huberman, 1994):

- Developing categories and themes were arranged in different arrays
- A matrix of categories was developed
- Models were created in NVivo as visual aids to examine data
- Tabulations of frequently occurring events were developed
- Tabulations and relationships were analysed
- Data was ordered into temporal schemes
- Pattern matching, explanation building, and a time-series analysis for the embedded studies and cross-case synthesis were examined.

Eventually the key conceptual themes and sub-themes most meaningful to the study objectives were established and they are presented in Chapters Five, Six, Seven and Eight. The cross-case analysis is reported in Chapter Nine through an analysis and synthesis of concepts and themes to reconstruct an expanded understanding of what being and becoming a global citizen means in higher education. The significance of the cross-case analysis is explained in section 1.3.3.

This ordering approach enabled a systematic reduction of data, ease of management and a strengthened analysis. The pattern matching assisted with discovering explanatory pathways for interpreting the data and enabled the themes to develop. While pattern codes started out as hunches, they facilitated coherent
explanations of the meaning in the data (Miles & Huberman, 1984). 'Typologising', or grouping data, assisted with conceptualising comparative situations. These types either highlighted similarity or difference or enabled conceptual ideas to develop from the data sets (Minichiello et al., 2008, p. 274). The cross-case analysis of the overall case reported in Chapter Nine was executed through an analysis and synthesis of data from the two embedded cases. The cross-case analysis involves breaking down concepts, themes and sub-themes from the two cases following Miles and Huberman (1994) analytical guidelines. The synthesis of the cross-case analysis is a process that involves; an analytical reconstruction of these concepts that draw on concepts in the literature, creates a deeper meaning and understanding, expands on literature concepts and expands on theory.

4.5 Research quality criteria

4.5.1 Addressing design limitations

Assuring the quality of case study research can be addressed at all stages of the research process by adopting an iterative approach through the planning, design, preparation, data collection, analysis and dissemination (Yin, 2009, p. 1). While some qualitative researchers depend on ‘trustworthiness’ as a measure of quality and a parallel measure for rigour (Guba & Lincoln, 2005), Yin (2009, p. 40) articulated a different approach. Yin (2009) stated that case study research could adopt specific tactics to cross-reference the research against the four quality tests common to social science methods. These are construct validity, internal validity, external validity, and reliability. Table 4.2 demonstrates how Yin (2009, p. 41) established criteria to judge the quality of case study research design thereby providing the basis to judge the quality of the study as empirical social research. This research followed these tactics.
Table 4.2   Tactics for addressing quality and rigour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Case study tactic</th>
<th>Phase of research in which tactic occurs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construct validity</strong></td>
<td>• Use multiple sources of evidence&lt;br&gt;• Establish chain of evidence&lt;br&gt;• Supervisors review</td>
<td>• Data collection&lt;br&gt;• Data collection&lt;br&gt;• Draft report completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal validity</strong></td>
<td>• Do pattern matching&lt;br&gt;• Do explanation building&lt;br&gt;• Compare to previous theory&lt;br&gt;• Address rival explanations</td>
<td>• Data analysis&lt;br&gt;• Data analysis&lt;br&gt;• Data analysis&lt;br&gt;• Data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External validity</strong></td>
<td>• Use theory and replication logic to consider contrasting worldviews</td>
<td>• Data analysis&lt;br&gt;• Write up and review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability</strong></td>
<td>• Expert witnesses&lt;br&gt;• Known cohort of students in the same mobility program&lt;br&gt;• Use case study protocol&lt;br&gt;• Develop case study database</td>
<td>• Research design&lt;br&gt;• Fieldwork&lt;br&gt;• Research analysis&lt;br&gt;• Comprehensive analytical methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Yin (2009, p. 41)

4.5.2 Rationale for Eurocentric lens

This research was conceived, designed, and developed through a Western democratic lens. While the Eurocentric notion of the global citizen is criticised (Bowden, 2003; Hudson & Slaughter, 2007), there is very little empirical, comparative evidence forthcoming from Eastern or Western scholars on the global citizen in contemporary universities. From a theoretical perspective however, Appiah (2008) and Shattle (2008, p. 102) have highlighted the links between the ethical basis of the global citizen with Christianity, Islam, Judaism, Buddhism and Sikhism. The ethical basis of the global citizen, however, does not sit well with any form of religious fundamentalism (Appiah, 2008, p. 95).
It is not within the scope of this research program to expand on these arguments. This research is intentionally limited to a Eurocentric lens to determine what the global citizen means from a Western perspective. Rather than a limitation, the evidence will provide an empirical base for future research beyond this lens to embrace the broader global cultural, ethnic, and religious traditions of the global citizen. Research into the concept of the global citizen in universities is in its infancy. This research is specifically designed to capture the meaning of the global citizen in context, be it limited in context to OECD countries.

The Eurocentric approach to this research program is supported by three key rationales. First, this position has been adopted due to the similarity and comparability of Australian and European approaches, rationales, strategies and processes of internationalisation of higher education (de Wit, 2002). Second, while the researcher has had experience teaching in Asia, and experience in teaching and mentoring students of non-Western origin in Australia, she has had more experience of working with Western colleagues and contacts. She has also taught and supervised European students. Aside from extensive personal European and American experience and travel, the researcher spent eight months in Europe undertaking academic, administrative, and research activity from 2008-2011. Third, there is a greater availability of scholarly research literature available on the topic of the global citizen in English, than in any other language at the present time. Therefore, because of the similarity between Australian and European approaches to the internationalisation of higher education, the researcher position (Gadamer, 1979; Ricoeur, 1981), and the availability of scholarly literature, the research program is grounded in a strong theoretical and practical basis. It was concluded that due to the lack of conceptual clarity of what constitutes a global citizen in contemporary universities in the literature, a Eurocentric data source was the most logical starting place to explore the meaning and ‘concept to practice’ implications of the global citizen. The findings from this research will inform future research directions moving beyond the Eurocentric focus.

4.5.3 Ethical considerations
The Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee approved the current research program. Participants in the research were considered at minimal risk. There were no aspects of the research that were considered psychologically, physically, or legally dangerous to the participants in any way. The two key ethical considerations in this research were in respect of individual autonomy and consent and safeguards to protect peoples’ identities.
Informant confidentiality in respect of identities and their regional locations was respected and adhered to at all times. A numerical identification process was used to protect participant anonymity and was recorded in the study database. Due to the cross-regional nature of the research comparative differences would be of interest to readers. However, at the same time, the field of experts in the area of international education is relatively small, and the student participants were drawn from the same mobility project. Therefore, to protect confidentiality, identifying information of the research participants has been kept to a minimum. Further information about these ethical procedures is expanded on in pages 79 and 154-155.

Ethical procedures for informed consent were followed at all times. Participants were invited by email to participate in the research. On acceptance, they were provided with a study consent package approved by the Griffith University Ethics Committee. Informants were briefed on the nature of the research, the nature of their involvement, and their rights to withdraw at any time. The consent package provided a detailed explanation of the research and an outline of the areas of research interest and interview protocol. An interview consent form was obtained from all participants prior to the interview commencing (see Appendices).

4.6 Summary: Chapter Four

This chapter has provided detail for the individual research elements, forming a framework that guided the research program. The framework provided an explicit way to monitor quality. The theory, methodology and methods used in the research program have been discussed. Details have been provided on the strengths and weaknesses of the research elements. Furthermore, strategies used to guide the quality and rigour of the research were described. Social constructivism was explained as the epistemological and ontological basis to co-construct meaning between the researcher, participant data, literature, and contextual setting of contemporary universities. Interpretivism was chosen as the ideal theoretical perspective to complement the social constructivist position in the meaning making process of the research. The principles of the Hermeneutic Circle were adopted as a means of guidance to a balanced researcher position and to ensure the quality and rigour of the research process.

The comprehensive approach to the case study design ensured that known weaknesses in case study design were addressed. In this way the construct, internal and
external validity and reliability were enhanced, allowing generalisable conclusions to be drawn from the research findings. Due to the complexity of ‘the global citizen’, the qualitative research paradigm is an ideal way to capture the tacit, intangible, and contextually focused aspects of the research objectives. The overall design of the research framework is well supported by scholarly literature as a means of ensuring quality for the outcomes for this research program.
5.0 Conceptualising the global citizen

5.1 Overview to Study One

The goal of educating global citizens has emerged as a popular response by the higher education sector to the forces of globalisation. However, there is little clarity about what this goal means and how it is to be achieved (Bourn, 2011, p. 563). Rizvi (2009, p. 258) and Marshall (2011, p. 424) called for research on cosmopolitan learning in higher education that was ethically grounded and empirically informed. The university system itself is complex and, consequently, any consideration of teaching and learning cannot be undertaken in isolation. Universities have many traditions, conflicting priorities, and values and are subject to a myriad of external and internal forces. Empirically, there is scant evidence reporting on how the global citizen transpires within the organisational context of twenty-first century universities. Study One addresses this research gap. Industry key informant interviews were undertaken with twenty-six international key informants in the higher education field. The study captures their conceptual and practical views of the global citizen and provides an insight into the role and responsibility of the university for educating global citizens.

The findings and discussion for Study One provide clarity on what a global citizen and global citizen learning mean in the context of contemporary universities and the organisational implications for educating global citizens. Study One findings encompass three distinct categories of data and are presented in Chapters Five, Six and Seven. In Chapter Five, ‘Conceptualising the global citizen’ provides evidence and discussion on what a global citizen means in conceptual and practical terms. In contrast, Chapter Six, ‘Organisational implications for educating global citizens’, explains how informants interpret the conflicting external and internal barriers to translating the policy rhetoric for the global citizen into practice. Chapter Seven, ‘Insight to the student global mindset and global citizen learning’, draws together the conceptual, theoretical, and practical implications for fostering and facilitating global citizen learning.

Each chapter provides in-depth insight and meaning to its corresponding category of data to answer the objectives of the research. These three chapters are structured further into central themes and sub-themes. A detailed discussion follows each theme, highlighting the theoretical richness of the data by interpreting the data within the context of the relevant literature. At the end of these three chapters, a summary reprises the research objectives against the conclusions of Study One.
5.1 shows how Part One, Part Two, and Part Three of Study One have been broken into Chapter Five, Chapter Six, and Chapter Seven.

Figure 5.1 The three categories of data within Study One

These three chapters address the multiple industry key informant interpretations concerning the conceptual, organisational, and pedagogical implications for global citizen learning. Each of these categories is discussed in Chapter Five, Chapter Six, and Chapter Seven. The next section briefly outlines aspects of the research approach that are specific to Study One.

5.2 The research approach

There is a commonality in the interpretive approach taken in this research program for Study One and Study Two. The research elements, methodology, methods, and approach to analysis were described in detail in Chapter Four. Therefore, this methodology section provides specific information in regard to the participants and interviews for Study One only.

5.2.1 The participants

A purposive sample of industry key informants was used in Study One. They were international industry experts selected to provide a diversity of perspectives and opinions on the global citizen in higher education. The majority of the industry key informants were identified by contacts employed in senior positions in the European
Commission for Education and Culture, and Australian Department of Education Workplace Relations (DEEWR). This list was cross-referenced with academics and policy advisors published in the area of international higher education. Three informants were recruited from snowball sampling. All informants were involved in higher education in OECD countries. The limitation of the Eurocentric focus of the research was discussed in Chapter Four. Thirty respondents were invited and the twenty-six who responded agreed to participate in the research. 46% were women. Approximately one third of the informants work across regions and/or do not work in the country of their birth. Broadly speaking informants were from United Kingdom (4), Netherlands (2), Germany (1), Slovakia (1), Australia (1), New Zealand (1), Pakistan (1), Belgium (1), Norway (1) and America (2). Informant roles included Vice-Chancellor, Deputy-Vice Chancellor, Dean, Rector, Vice-President, International Directors, senior academics and policy advisers in globally influential peak international higher education organisations. The informants came from backgrounds in international education, business, economics, humanities and social sciences. The two student representatives included held governance roles in peak international student organisations. These students were recommended as ‘experts’ by a leading EU policy advisor and are referred to as either industry key informants or informants in this thesis.

5.2.2 Interviews
Semi-structured in-depth interviews were carried out with the key informants either at the informant’s place of work or at international higher education conferences and seminars in France, Denmark, Germany, Austria and Australia. Due to time limitations for this expert group, no pilot interviews were carried out. However, iterative questions developed over the data collection period were in line with the emerging analytical concepts. In order to try to avoid unproductive topics and waste the time of this busy group of people, the question style was more directed (Flick, 2006). In this way, the time available was spent pursuing the topic of interest for the informant and the researcher. Interviews lasted between 40-120 minutes and were recorded and transcribed. All interviews were guided by an interview protocol that was modified in line with the informant's particular expertise, responses, and publications (see Appendix). The informants are referred to in the findings numerically and by geographic region of primary citizenship. The next section provides the questions that guided Study One.

5.2.3 Study objectives and questions
The research program aims to develop a deeper understanding of the global citizen from concept to practice in contemporary higher education.
The specific objectives of the overall research program are:

1. To build a conceptual understanding of the global citizen
2. To identify what a global citizen means in practical terms
3. To examine the organisational enablers and constraints to educating global citizens
4. To understand the students’ experience of change associated with an international mobility experience
5. To explore ways universities can foster all students to develop as global citizens.

These questions guided the interview process:

- How do key informants in the field of internationalisation conceptualise the global citizen (or interrelated term) representing the ideal global graduate?
- How would they recognise a global citizen (and or other related term) as a student in a practical way (case study, interview, *curricula vitae*)?
- Do they recognise stages of development and should they be measured?
- How does the mobility experience facilitate change in students (if at all)?
- How can non-mobility students learn to become global citizens?
- What is the role and social responsibility of the university to develop students as global citizens and what are the organisational implications?

The semi-structured nature of the interviews allowed these areas to be explored with the participants. The questions developed iteratively during the data collection process in line with previous findings and the informants’ areas of expertise. The researcher probed informants to ensure that their meaning was taken in the correct context.

### 5.2.4 Limitations of Study One

International higher education is a relatively small field at the expert level. Therefore, there is no information divulged in the findings linking the gender, title, and position of the informants. This step has been taken to protect the anonymity of informants in line with confidentiality requirements of the Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee. Moreover, due to the smaller informant pool available for interviews in the Southern Hemisphere compared to the Northern Hemisphere, New Zealand and Australia have been grouped together to further protect informant confidentiality. This decision was made to avoid a number of errors including reporter bias and researcher error (Neuman, 2006). The Eurocentric bias of the research program is acknowledged (discussed in Chapter Four). Nevertheless, due to the poor conceptualisation of the
global citizen in higher education globally, this research is undertaken as a starting point for future research. The evidence from this research will inform future research exploring East-West comparisons taken in a more global context. The remainder of Chapter Five presents the findings and discussion for the first category, 'Conceptualising the global citizen' in contemporary universities.

### 5.3 Findings: Study One Part One

A summary of the findings for Study One, Part One is presented in Table 5.1. This table presents the themes and sub-themes that come together to explain what a global citizen means conceptually in contemporary universities. Key quotes from the interview data are presented in tables with each theme and sub-theme to demonstrate informants' interpretations of the global citizen. The first theme, *The global citizen as the ideal global graduate* provides explanations of the overlapping terminology used to describe what is 'ideal' in relation to the global citizen and interrelated terms. The second theme, *Global hybrid identity* has problematised the contested construct of citizenship occupied by the global citizen. Through the third theme a more practical picture is developed for the global citizen suggesting that *Recognisable markers* could be considered as broad learning outcomes. In the final theme, *Ethical and moral capacities* of the global citizen are discussed in relation to the findings. A discussion of the themes in context of the extant literature is provided after the findings.
Table 5.1  Findings: Conceptualising the global citizen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEMES</th>
<th>SUB-THEMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The global citizen as the ideal global</td>
<td>Beyond narrow definitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduate</td>
<td>More than a list of attributes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Global hybrid identity</td>
<td>Global versus national citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global versus European citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cosmopolitanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identity and belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Recognisable markers</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Making the interconnections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measurement or markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Moral and ethical capacities</td>
<td>An ethical attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positioning values in higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conspiracy of silence and culture of indifference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4 Theme 1: The global citizen as the ‘ideal global graduate’

The first theme is underpinned by the ‘ideal’ research approach used by Swedberg and Agevall (2005). Asking informants to conceptualise either the global citizen or their preferred interrelated term to describe the ‘ideal global graduate’ enabled a flexible approach to obtaining informant perspectives. Qualitative researchers use ‘ideal types’ to see how well the ‘ideal type’ matches observable phenomena and it is particularly useful for imprecise issues which have been difficult to define. The ‘ideal type’ does not seek to provide an explanation; it identifies what is essential and allows the findings to build on existing theory (Neuman, 2006, p. 55). By encouraging informants to use their own terms to describe the ‘ideal global graduate’, rich data was obtained that enabled the researcher to compare and contrast the meanings of various terms. The first theme has been broken into three sub-themes to show the multi-layered complexity of what a ‘global citizen’ means from the industry key informant perspective. The sub-themes are: Beyond narrow definitions; More than a list of attributes; and Strategic ambiguity. Each of these sub-themes addresses conceptual issues providing greater clarity to what the global citizen means as the ‘ideal global graduate’. Tables 5.2 to 5.4 present the sub-themes and supporting data for Theme 1.

Table 5.2 Theme 1 sub-theme 1 and supporting data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-THEME 1</th>
<th>THEME 1 THE GLOBAL CITIZEN AS THE IDEAL GLOBAL GRADUATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beyond narrow definitions</strong></td>
<td>1.1 As soon as you get these terms, people try to define the difference between ... we're terrible aren't we, as academics... defining in minute detail to me, doesn't necessarily seem to help. (UK 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 But I also think there is a public out there that may have less of a problem with some of the splitting of hairs and actually could live with certain terms that others might not, as long as they really mean something... there is currently no consensus even in the US and maybe there doesn't need to be on intercultural competence. I mean people are using all kinds of terms to mean exactly the same thing. (US 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 It is a term (sic global citizen) which is not saying much... people can reasonably understand what you more or less imply... all interrelated terms have some misunderstanding as well and are too precise or too fake so there's not really one term that everybody would agree upon. (EU 7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beyond narrow definitions

Sub-theme 1 explains how the majority of informants thought it was time to move beyond narrow definitions for conceptualising the global citizen. As such, they acknowledged the futility of further definitional debate about the global citizen and closely interrelated terms. The academic tendency to be overly preoccupied and rigid about definitions was explained in quote 1.1 in Table 5.2. This informant concluded that "defining in minute detail" (UK 13) is unhelpful. Similarly, US 12 commented, "people are using all kinds of terms to mean the same thing".

In contrast to these views however, EU 7 was very critical of the term ‘global citizen’ and preferred to use the term ‘interculturally competent’ to describe the ‘ideal global graduate’. However, EU 7 still described a graduate in a way that sounded like a global citizen. With this said, EU 7 admitted that it was unrealistic to think that there would ever be unanimous agreement on terms. This sub-theme highlights how rigid terminology can be divisive, and it is time to move forward on identifying the way of educating global citizens. Building on this sub-theme, the next sub-theme shows how the global citizen can be conceptualised from several perspectives as is presented in Table 5.3.
Table 5.3  Theme 1 sub-theme 2 and supporting data

| SUB-THEME 2 | THEME 1  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE GLOBAL CITIZEN AS THE IDEAL GLOBAL GRADUATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>More than a list of attributes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 The global citizen is quite a fashionable way of describing an output of the internationalisation of the curriculum process, both the formal and the informal. It can be both an organising principle for input, but it has to be part of a more holistic set of attributes. (AUS/NZ 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 So it’s picking up a particular global zeitgeist at the moment. I do think it’s an enduring concept, but I think for some institutions it’s a label on the shelf and I think a number of institutions are trying to put some depth behind it. (AUS/NZ 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 The idea of a liberal arts education gives people a framework for understanding cohabitation, collectivism, shared responsibility, and respect for the ability of the individual and communities to learn. This might otherwise be described as a model of global citizenship (AUS/NZ 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 We have to get our hands dirty and get into being, not prescriptive, but certainly normative to a degree. I think it probably comes back to liberal virtues…. we should foster those social attributes which go to sociality itself. You know, tolerance, openness, consideration for others, collectivity in certain domains, making institutions work. All that’s legitimate, proper and we (sic universities) should pursue that. (AUS/NZ 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 I need to look across or over the border of my own “culture”... not presuppose that what I think is good is necessarily good for everybody. I should be open –to different approaches – different theories – different perspectives. Take them into account and still have my own but widened by others. So much more concern about environment. Much more concern about peace of course. (EU 20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.2 More than a list of attributes

Sub-theme 2 (Table 5.3) demonstrates the way informants interpreted the ‘global citizen’ in universities beyond a list of attributes. For instance, in quote 1.4, AUS/NZ 5 discussed the contextual complexity of this “fashionable” construct. The informant discussed the global citizen as “an output of IoC process” ... “an organising principle” and “an holistic set of attributes”. Building on this multilevel conception, AUS/NZ 6 in quote 1.6 explained how the principles of a liberal education provide a platform for developing global citizens. Similarly, AUS/NZ 1 in 1.7 associated the ideal global graduate with liberal values. From these perspectives the global citizen can be perceived as an educational driver. It is influential to the underpinning values, context, input and output of learning. Finally in quote 1.8, EU 20 drew these conceptual aspects together and voiced a practical example to provide further contextual understanding. Notably, EU 20 linked global moral values to the concerns for the global environment and peace.
While different informants offered varying levels of conceptual depth to the construct, overall, there was a great deal of similarity in the values, attitude and attributes informants used to describe their picture of the ‘ideal global graduate’ regardless of which particular describing term they preferred to use. The most common way informants described the key characteristics of the global citizen were openness, tolerance, respect, and responsibility for self, others, and the planet. In contrast to literature defining the global citizen strictly through lists of attributes, informants in this research interpreted the global citizen as a broad, multi-layered construct. Sub-theme 3 shown in Table 5.4 further erodes rigid conceptions of the global citizen by emphasising the value of leaving interpretive space for organisational implementation.

Table 5.4  Theme 1 sub-theme 3 and supporting data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-THEME 3</th>
<th>THEME 1 THE GLOBAL CITIZEN AS THE IDEAL GLOBAL GRADUATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic ambiguity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.9  | I think when we get hung up on definitions, it comes from our feelings that there always has to be a concrete knowledge on everything…. my thinking is informed by theory about strategic ambiguity and the importance of letting everybody have interpretive room. So I think that the idea of interpretive space is critical to how I see this agenda.  
(UK 15) |
| 1.10 | It fits in very easily because everybody can have his own notion of what is a global citizen.  
(EU 8) |
| 1.11 | It can mean anything to anyone. You can put into that pod global citizenship whatever you like.  
(UK 21) |
| 1.12 | Sometimes it’s better to keep it more of a loose term …I think the main thing is that what you want happening is actually happening and the terminology that is attached to it is less important.  
(US 12) |
| 1.13 | It is a term (sic global citizen) which is not saying much… people can reasonably understand what you more or less imply… all interrelated terms have some misunderstanding as well and are too precise or too fake so there’s not really one term that everybody would agree upon.  
(EU 7) |

5.4.3 Strategic ambiguity

Strategic ambiguity (Table 5.4), sub-theme 3 is an in vivo term and theoretical perspective provided by UK 15 (in quote, 1.9) to provide a flexible understanding of the global citizen. This informant suggested that providing a degree of interpretive space to the global citizen was a useful approach for breaking through academic resistance and disciplinary silos. Moreover, UK 15 described the global citizen in ontological terms “as a state of ‘being’ that rejects a bind to exact knowledge”. Rather than primarily focusing on
the global citizen as a measureable and tangible outcome, a more open perspective should be possible. Institutions and academics should be provided interpretive space to allow them to adopt ‘the global citizen’ in a way most suited to their needs. Quotes from EU 8, UK 21 and US 12 in Table 5.4 demonstrate this view in the final three quotes of Strategic ambiguity. In summary, this sub-theme showed that the majority of informants acknowledged the importance and need for institutional and academic interpretive space for adopting the global citizen as a learning goal. In this way, academic uptake is more likely to occur.

The three sub-themes in Theme 1 have demonstrated that, despite minor difference in terminology, the majority of informants hold similar views on the global citizen as a way of representing the ‘ideal global graduate’. Only four out of 26 informants preferred to use an alternative term to ‘global citizen’. These terms included ‘intercultural competence’, ‘cross-cultural capability’, ‘global perspectives’, and ‘cosmopolitan’. These four informants however, expressed a similar set of attributes to other participants in terms of values and a commonality of purpose to describe ‘the ideal global graduate’. Moreover, the majority of informants supported interpretive space for the global citizen to suit institutional and academic goals. Building on this theme, the next theme examines the frequently contested notion of citizenship through an identity lens.

5.5 Theme 2: Global hybrid identity

This theme explains the plural sense of identity and belonging associated with the global citizen. It explores and explains the tensions between citizenship interpreted exclusively through national rights and responsibilities or alternatively the notion that individuals hold plural identities and multiple belonging as a result of globalisation. The informant data strongly reflected the latter interpretation, with 24 out of 26 accepting, in-principle, the flexible interpretation of citizenship beyond the nation state. However the findings in this theme demonstrate the layers of complexity involved with problematising citizenship. Therefore, the findings have been grouped into four sub-themes to demonstrate the contrasting and contested layers involved with citizenship.

The sub-themes in Theme 2 are: Global versus national citizenship; European versus Global citizenship; Cosmopolitanism; and Identity and belonging. Table 5.5 and 5.6 provides the quotes supporting the sub-themes for Theme 2 Global hybrid identity.
### Table 5.5  Theme 2 sub-theme 1 and 2 and supporting data

| SUB-THEME 1 and 2 | THEME 2  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A GLOBAL HYBRID IDENTITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 There are those in the US who say it’s a ridiculous concept….they are really defining citizenship in the context of national citizenship…. However there seems to be a growing number of people who are talking about it. (US 12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National versus global citizenship</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 The global – I would almost say human values, the fact that we accept every other human being as a human being is, in my view, on another level than the citizenship element. And I think it is more important now within the national context of nation states and the citizens as such to protect the rights we have ….. right-wing parties start deteriorating the open societies, the democratic societies that we have. (EU 8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Global citizenship and producing in students a global perspective, and getting them to understand that they’re Australia’s future, is very much tied into being a nation which has a global perspective. (AUS/NZ 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>European versus global citizenship</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 There is not a theoretical framework that could combine the notion of citizenship, which is really related to belonging to a set of rules and to a set of duties... And of course you can’t have rights and duties derived from a global something... I have fewer problems with European citizenship because it is related to duties and rights. (EU 8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 We don’t use that term (global citizen) much in Europe, which may well be a mistake …now I don’t see necessarily a contradiction between being European and being global, you need to be both at the same time. So the way I interpret it’s the same thing. (EU 23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.5.1 National versus global citizenship

The first sub-theme represents a common discourse as to whether citizen rights and responsibilities are solely national, or whether globalisation has changed this definition. US 12, who supports the global citizen, explained in quote 2.1 in Table 5.5 “there are those in the US who say it’s a ridiculous concept”. Through a similar national lens, EU 8 in 2.2 considered human rights and global responsibilities were not national citizenship responsibilities. On the other hand, AUS/NZ 2 provided a more balanced view between national and global citizenship. As such, in quote 2.3 a global citizen is described as someone who is “tied to a nation which has a global perspective”. From this perspective the global citizen is not discarding patriotic rights and responsibilities but considers national rights and responsibilities through a global lens. In this way common moral issues such as human rights and the environment are the responsibility of all humans.
5.5.2 European versus global citizenship

This sub-theme highlights the discrete tensions that exist between European and global citizenship. For instance, in quotes 2.4 and 2.5 in Table 5.5 two contrasting views of national, European, and global citizenship are highlighted. EU 8 argued that you could not have “rights and responsibilities to a global something” but accepts European citizenship. Yet EU 23, in stark contrast, considered that it might have been a EU mistake not to emphasise the consistency between European and global citizenship rights and responsibilities by saying, “so the way I interpret it’s the same thing” (EU 23). EU 8’s view is based solely on rules as duties rather than moral values and cosmopolitan responsibility. From the educational perspective however, it is not common for teaching and learning to engage with the morality of cosmopolitanism. The next sub-theme in Table 5.6 highlights reasons for this.

Table 5.6 Theme 2 sub-themes 3 and 4 and supporting data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-THEMES 3 and 4</th>
<th>THEME 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cosmopolitanism and citizenship</strong></td>
<td><strong>A GLOBAL HYBRID IDENTITY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 So you just don’t have citizenship at a global level. Its just nonsense and it’s just a kind of normative idea that sort of helps the good attitudes in some way…. I think the whole dimension that I’d focus on is ‘cosmopolitan’…. it’s a long word which is one of the problems of using it. (AUS/NZ 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 I think the term cosmopolitanism has connotations of dalliance of the elite that is mobile…. There are more perceptual barriers to signing up to cosmopolitanism….it has some of that ideological whiff to it and then I think once you go down that track, it’s much harder to have mainstream sign on. (AUS/NZ 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity and belonging</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 So I’m basically trying to say let’s move away from trying to describe what a citizenship is, to actually develop the kind of citizens in a fairly open-ended way, as a way of getting people to understand how they belong differently. And how we belong is changing as a result of global processes. We continue to belong to ethnic groups…. to linguistic groups, to all of those sorts of things… And we to belong to professional communities too. So it’s possible to be a nursing citizen. (AUS/NZ 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 You don’t educate nurses to be a nurse in the world. You educate them to be nurses under certain conditions. So I think if we drift away in what we want to achieve by international education programs and sort of bring it to the sky, we drift away from the very important and necessary discussion on why do we do this and what should be the outcome of what we do. (EU 8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.5.3 Cosmopolitanism and citizenship

Cosmopolitanism is part of the underpinning conceptual framework for this thesis as discussed in the literature review. Importantly, quotes 2.6 and 2.7 in Table 5.6 explain the difficulty of using cosmopolitanism in higher education. For example AUS/NZ 1 does not like the term 'global citizen' and prefers ‘cosmopolitan’ but points out that it has not taken off in higher education, explaining, “it’s a long word”. Furthermore, AUS/NZ 5 felt that there are elitist connotations associated with cosmopolitanism associated with wealth and the mobile elite in contrast to its underlying philosophy. Rarely do universities associate social responsibility with cosmopolitan dialogue that recognises a common humanity underpinned by shared moral values. Cosmopolitanism is also associated with having a sense of global identity and belonging, explained in the next sub-theme.

5.5.4 Identity and belonging

This sub-theme provides insight to the notion of plural identity and explains the way an individual can have multiple identities and belong to different things in different ways. In quote 2.8 in Table 5.6, AUS/NZ 4 problematises the issue of identity and belonging. This informant suggested that it is time to move beyond debating citizenship theory, emphasising it is more important to understand the changing nature of our plural identity and belonging. For instance, AUS/NZ 4 explained it is possible to have a professional nursing identity together with ethnic, cultural, and national identities. Interestingly, in stark contrast, EU 8 considered “you don’t educate nurses to be a nurse in the world”. From this perspective, nurses only fulfill an employment role, rather than living and learning as a cosmopolitan moral and ethical thinking human being as well. These two divergent perspectives exemplify the contrast between neoliberal and cosmopolitan paradigms for conceptualising the global citizen in contemporary universities and are expanded on in the discussion.

Overall in this theme, only two out of twenty-six informants did not support the notion of global rights and responsibilities. However AUS/NZ 1, as one of these, thought ‘cosmopolitan’ was a preferable term to ‘global citizen’. In summary, the consensus view supported the notion of global citizenship and as explained by AUS/NZ 4 who said let us “understand citizenship in an open-ended way” rather than describe it in a definitive way Study Two strengthens the investigation into the global citizen by providing another perspective to understanding students' Global hybrid identity. The two worldviews from Study One and Two are integrated in Chapter Nine. Another contested area for the global citizen is related to the educational challenge of measuring the global citizen as a learning outcome and is addressed in the next theme.
5.6  Theme 3: Recognisable markers

This theme has probed deeply into what informants would expect to see in a student who is a global citizen. The theme builds conceptually and practically on our understanding of the global citizen. For practical recognition, informants were asked to describe what their 'ideal global graduate' or global citizen might say or do. How might they recognise their 'ideal' global citizen in an interview or in *curricula vitae*? Do they perceive a continuum of development? As the interviews followed a semi-structured process within a limited time period, not all informants contributed in detail to this particular section, so enumeration of responses is less definite than for the previous theme, but the illustrative quotes enable the reader to grasp the emerging concepts. The findings are presented in six sub-themes: *Awareness of others; Mobility; Engagement; Making the interconnections; Language pain tolerance; and Measurement or markers*. Table 5.7 provides the sub-themes and supporting data for sub-themes 1, 2 and 3.
Table 5.7  Theme 3 sub-themes 1, 2 and 3 and supporting data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-THEMES 1, 2 and 3</th>
<th>THEME 3 RECOGNISABLE MARKERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mobility              | 3.1  *I think one of the early markers is the courage to go and spend time overseas, take those risks and be prepared to fail. ... They don't necessarily have to have gone overseas to do that but I think mobility will have assisted. They come back different people.*  
                      | *(AUS/NZ 2)*                 |
|                       | 3.2  *Sometimes mobility experiences actually confirm prejudices rather than challenge them or shift them or expose them. That mobility experiences per se won’t do it.*  
                      | *(AUS/NZ 5)*                 |
| Awareness of self and others | 3.3  *I think the minimum is that they have at least awareness, ideally an understanding of others' perspective.*  
                  | *(US 12)*                    |
|                       | 3.4  *So I think an ideal global citizen would be someone who has that kind of cultural humility and openness and self-awareness and awareness of others.*  
                      | *(AUS/NZ 19)*                |
|                       | 3.5  *Being a global citizen might mean just being aware of the products they're buying or their lifestyle based on this awareness of others’ perspectives or what's happening in other parts of the world.*  
                      | *(US 12)*                    |
| Engagement            | 3.6  *Intercultural competence is part of global citizenship and that global citizenship is more the specific engagement part. The engagement part is mostly how I see it connected between the two.*  
                      | *(US 12)*                    |
|                       | 3.7  *I look for evidence of volunteering, social enterprise engagement. I think that is a mark of maturity and being other-centred rather than highly narcissistic and self-centred.*  
                      | *(AUS/NZ 5)*                 |

5.6.1 Mobility
International mobility is accepted as a way of opening students to broader perspectives as noted in the literature review, but it is not an unconditional marker. In the first quote 3.1 in Table 5.7, AUS/NZ 2 felt *Mobility* can be thought of as a marker of courage in the way it shows how a student is prepared to leave the comfort zone and also in the way it has transformative benefits. However AUS/NZ 2 thought, "they don't necessarily have to have gone overseas" to become a global citizen. Along a similar vein, AUS/NZ 5 in quote 3.2, thought many variables influence student transformation and mobility *per se* is not a panacea for transforming students' global citizen mindset. Mobility can also have negative consequences as well and “confirm prejudices” (AUS/NZ 5). As such, student transformation is closely associated with the contextual situations and circumstances they are exposed to. Chapter Eight further explains the contribution of the circumstances and situations that are involved with student interpersonal encounters,
the ensuing interpersonal exchange, and the relationships that influence global citizen development. Another early marker of the interpersonal change can be recognised as an increased *Awareness of self and others*. This is expanded on in the next sub-theme.

### 5.6.2 Awareness of self and others

Awareness of self and others is associated with the global citizen and is highlighted by AUS/NZ 19 and US 12 in quotes 3.3 and 3.4 of Table 5.7. Both of these informants recognised that awareness of others infers a sense of humility in the developing global citizen. Students’ ability to imagine what it is like to be the ‘other’ shows they have personal awareness and insight as well. In the final quote 3.5, US 12 indicated that a student might demonstrate their global citizen development simply by being an aware consumer, by being aware of “what’s happening in other parts of the world” (US 12). In this way students are making the interconnections between consumer items, and global context and are acting on this knowledge. Consumer awareness can be thought of as a marker for considering the implications of consumption in a global context. Moreover, different levels of engagement were seen as important developmental markers for the global citizen and are discussed further in the next sub-theme.

### 5.6.3 Engagement

This sub-theme explains the significance of *Engagement* as a feature of the global citizen and acts as a differentiating marker between intercultural competence and the global citizen. In quote 3.6 of Table 5.7, US 12 explained the overlap between intercultural competence and global citizenship. The global citizen engages. AUS/NZ 5 further expanded on this view in quote 3.7, by explaining that engaging in extra-curricular alone is not evidence of social sensibility. The global citizen engages in a meaningful way. AUS/NZ 5 felt that a *curriculum vitae* is often useful but not a foolproof way to see what students have engaged in beyond their basic degree. Global citizens demonstrate maturity, initiative, commitment, and agency by volunteering and engaging in extra-curricula activities. US 12 qualified this opinion further in the next sub-theme. The global citizen engages for a moral purpose. They are starting to consider alternative possibilities and perspectives and make the interconnections between increasingly complex concepts and contexts.
### Table 5.8  Theme 3 sub-themes 4 and 5 and supporting data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-THEMES 4 and 5</th>
<th>THEME 3 RECOGNISABLE MARKERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making the interconnections</td>
<td>3.8  <em>I don’t see global citizenship as political engagement … and it’s not, they go out and do a service. It’s that they’re able to make the interconnections between the local and the global.</em>  &lt;br&gt; (US 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.9  <em>You need to be aware that there’s much more than just you in the world … but that everything is very much connected to social and international … well, the interdisciplinarity that everybody is talking about now.</em>  &lt;br&gt; (EU 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.10  <em>We’re less good at educating intellectuals. I mean people who can take their subject specific competence and be able to see what is my field, what is a transferable contribution to the whole. You cannot solve challenges like the climate change or social cohesion without this.</em>  &lt;br&gt; (EU 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.11  <em>So to me cosmopolitan is not some abstract notion out there. Cosmopolitan simply highlights that the moral universe of connectivities which affect the way in which we define how we belong.</em>  &lt;br&gt; (AUS/NZ 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language pain tolerance</td>
<td>3.13  <em>We are all exposed to bad English all the time. I’ve said the best preparation for an international career is a sort of language pain tolerance.</em>  &lt;br&gt; (EU 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.14  <em>I became friends with so many people whose English wasn’t clear. And their English capability was not an issue. This could be a lesion for domestic students. They get very frustrated and impatient if English is not good enough. They will get used to it if they take the time.</em>  &lt;br&gt; (AUS 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.15  <em>And then I started to talk to academics and researchers whose English wasn’t very good. And I sat there thinking: These people are kicking my butt when it comes to intelligence and knowledge. Who cares if my English is better than theirs? They’re still more accomplished. They’re more experienced. And I learnt to respect that a lot more as well.</em>  &lt;br&gt; (AUS 26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.6.4 Making the interconnections
The fourth sub-theme, *Making the interconnections* is a significant marker of recognition for the global citizen. In quote 3.8, of Table 5.8, US 12 explained that “it’s not they go out and do a service”, they demonstrate a deeper level of thinking as an outcome of this experience. In this way, students are starting to make interconnections and think about local and global constructs. EU 25 in quote 3.9 thought it was important that students realise “everything is very much connected to social and international”. In a similar vein EU 23 in 3.10 described *Making the interconnections* as a marker for intellectual thinking. This informant argued that complex global challenges such as climate change and social cohesion could not be solved without this type of thinking and moral
reasoning. In quote 3.11, AUS/NZ 4 explained the cosmopolitan underpinning of the global citizen. It brings together our identity and belonging in “the moral universe of connectivities” that bind us together in our common humanity. AUS/NZ 6 considered that all students emerging from university should be engaged with a sense of global interconnectivity. Not only should they be aware of the global, they should be able to access knowledge that will provide them with a relational understanding. The cosmopolitan global citizen is capable of making moral and intellectual interconnections.

5.6.5 Language pain tolerance

The title of “Language pain tolerance” is an *in-vivo* term from EU 17. In quote 3.13. (Table 5.8) this informant felt that a personal level of tolerance to bad English was an important marker for a global citizen. AUS 26, who was a student key informant, confirmed this view in quotes 3.14 and 3.15. This student talked about the way domestic Australian students were impatient with bad English. This student spoke of a personal realisation about becoming accustomed to bad English. In fact students “will get used to it if they take the time” (AUS 26). This student was able to challenge personal assumptions of superiority linked to English skill. In fact, this student realised that poor English is not relevant to who people are, or what they know. Giving people with bad English more time and understanding, can lead to mutual learning and personal growth.

Table 5.9 Theme 3 sub-theme 6 and supporting data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-THEME 6</th>
<th>THEME 3 RECOGNISABLE MARKERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Markers or measurement?</td>
<td><strong>3.16</strong> With the whole idea of global citizen, it’s a bit like in physics…. There’s no absolute frame of reference and there’s no natural frame for looking at these sorts of things…There are certain things just aren’t measureable and ethics is one. We all want to behave ethically. Well, what’s the performance indicator on that and the answer is, there isn’t one. It’s important but it’s not measureable. (AUS/NZ 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.17</strong> I’m not interested in measuring what the students come out with. If I produce a student – if as a result of this, they take responsibility for their own actions and are happy to live with their consequences and I tried to provide them some things that I think would help make the world a better place, then I’m satisfied. Choices after that are up to them. (UK 15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6.6 Markers or measurement

One of the conceptual and practical challenges in universities has been to associate the global citizen with measurable learning outcomes. This sub-theme explored the logic of
this goal. For instance, quote 3.16 of Table 5.9 from AUS/NZ 19 highlighted how the ethical capacities of the global citizen do not sit easily within a measurable frame of reference. The previous four sub-themes suggested that while there may be ways to recognise markers for the global citizen, the construct is largely resistant to numerical performance measures. In quote 3.17, UK 15 felt that rather than focusing on a way to specifically measure the immeasurable, the right teaching and learning environment is more important for educating global citizens. How students behave is up to them. The goal for educating global citizens is to teach students how to think, not what to think.

The six sub-themes for Recognisable markers offer practical insight to conceptualising the global citizen. The findings show that students can demonstrate global citizen markers along an inexact continuum of development at varying rates and in a very imprecise way. These markers are underpinned by a multitude of associated attributes that could be difficult to elicit and recognise individually. In the ideal situation, students will emerge from university with an awareness of self and others. As students become aware of themselves and others, they develop a sense of cultural humility. Markers that informants considered important to look at in students were: initiative, responsibility, and maturity. The key features of the global citizen are that students demonstrate some form of engagement beyond individual interests and they make local and global interconnections in their thinking. Students should have Language pain tolerance and be open to others whose language skills are not at their level. While informants offered a number of ways of recognising the global citizen, they acknowledged the impracticality of focusing on quantitative measurement of global citizen attributes. The next section builds on the previous three themes by identifying The moral and ethical capacities that provide students with the ability of 'how to think' as a global citizen.

5.7 Theme 4: The moral ethical and capacities

This theme represents both the moral and ethical capacities of the individual as well as the university and is significant to conceptualising the global citizen. They are introduced in this theme and are further expanded on in Chapters Seven, Eight and Nine. The moral and ethical capacities of the global citizen have been paid 'lip service' in universities and have received very little serious attention in practice. This theme focuses on the tacit values and capacities that are important to developing the social responsibility of global citizens.
Moral and ethical values were not specifically identified in the initial interview questions; however, as a couple of early informants were focused on intercultural competence as a measurable learning outcome for the 'ideal global graduate', the role of values in education was probed with these early informants to gauge their response. Interestingly, as it transpired, all informants in the study supported the role of values in education. The collective informants' responses reinforced that there is a lack of university and program engagement with values as part of critical thinking and ethical and moral reasoning in universities. The organisational perspective of values is discussed in more detail in Chapter Six; however all informants conceded that linking global citizen values to higher education is difficult. Some of the challenging issues informants identified were: a lack of public and academic understanding of what a global citizen means; leadership oversight; academic aversion to ideological links; unrealistic goals; and unrealistic expectations for global citizen outcomes. The moral and ethical capacities are discussed through the following three sub-themes: An ethical attitude; Positioning values in higher education; Conspiracy of silence and culture of disinterest. Supporting data for each of the sub-themes are presented as Tables 5.10 and 5.11 and are described in the following sections.
Table 5.10  Theme 4 sub-themes 1 and 2 and supporting data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-THEMES 1 and 2</th>
<th>THEME 4 THE MORAL AND ETHICAL CAPACITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>An ethical attitude</strong></td>
<td>4.1 Right, it’s openness, tolerance, it’s acceptance of difference. Well at a very advanced stage it’s probably commitment. Essentially aren’t we talking of an attitude, of Europe, the world, a commitment rather than some sort of technical efficiency. (EU 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 It is very clear with the present financial crisis, that if we are not preparing students in a society that has become much more money and products driven, then students are unprepared to deal with the challenges. They don’t get the kind of baggage we got from our generation where we were much more, religious and values based. (EU 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 And to talk about intangible goals (sic global citizen), well, in the meantime very important values and norms and rules and regulations and laws that we have, come under pressure I find that very dangerous. (EU 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positioning values in higher education</strong></td>
<td>4.4 What accounts for the kinds of behaviours that we’ve seen post GFC. I think that’s very good, going back to the role of values in education and certainly more – not what to think, but how to think about these things. (AUS/NZ 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5 That’s one kind of secular dilemma of the modern university in the West and to some extent in the East. But I think it is proper domain for universities and if we don’t do it systematically, we can’t expect those sorts of values to be fostered in families and this is what’s different from the East. (AUS/NZ 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.6 So that is probably the most interesting challenge of education beyond the discipline and knowledge areas. That’s the set of values. But I think you have to be careful imposing one idea of what a good citizen is. (EU 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.7 They’re sort of generic values, they reflect global challenge values around sustainability... the role and place of commitment to Indigenous education... And some of these get to be fairly intangible... I’m one who does believe in universality rather than the cultural relativism of those values. The rights of women and girls and approaches to gender, which I think should be enshrined in the Australian legislative framework, into our cultural values. (AUS/NZ 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.8 I like the term global citizen, but I find it very difficult to develop pedagogical strategies to make it a learning outcome with students’ (EU 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.9 I link a lot of the values and attitudes employability. And my argument is that developing the global perspective enhances the transferable skills of employability because young people will have a greater understanding of who they are, self-identity, self-confidence, self-esteem, communication skills and all those things. (UK 15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.7.1 An ethical attitude

The greater majority of informants identified *An ethical attitude* as the underpinning quality of the global citizen and is explained in the first quote (Table 5.10). First, EU 17 thought that simplifying general understanding of the global citizen would be helpful to academic uptake and public recognition. EU 17 described the global citizen as “a commitment rather than some sort of technical efficiency”. The global citizen has a commitment to public good and *An ethical attitude*.

Quote 4.2 from EU 7 is interesting. This informant thought the ‘global citizen’ term was too imprecise and preferred ‘intercultural competence’ to describe the ideal global graduate, yet EU 7 admitted that the transmission of values are absent in modern secular society and higher education. EU 7 highlighted that without *An ethical attitude* “students are unprepared to deal with the challenges”. From a contrasting perspective, in quote 4.3 EU 8 thought that it is dangerous to consider trying to foster intangible values in education when other national rules and regulations were being eroded. It appears that EU 8 was suggesting global citizen values are inconsistent with national values and responsibilities. Potentially, this quote highlights the contrast between a neoliberal and cosmopolitan paradigm in education, where intellectual thought and reasoning in education are too abstract to pursue. Otherwise, the majority of informants acknowledged that the global citizen involves *An ethical attitude* linked to ethical and moral reasoning, but that integrating values into education is challenging and this is expanded on in the next sub-theme.

5.7.2 Positioning values in higher education

Informants felt that there was a role for integrating ethical and moral values into higher education. Many acknowledged that students needed a moral compass to be able to navigate their lives in an era of global uncertainty and complexity. In the past, for many, an individual’s moral capacity was fostered through family, community, and religion; however secular society and the media have eroded this norm. For instance, AUS/NZ 5 in quote 4.4 in Table 5.10 commented on the consequences of amoral behaviour in the financial sector, that precipitated the GFC and felt education has a role in contributing to moral learning.

Education has a role in teaching students “not what to think, but how to think” (AUS/NZ 5). Similarly, in quote 4.5, AUS/NZ 1 asserted that universities have a role to fill the societal moral and ethical void that has become the “secular dilemma of the modern university”. Yet, EU 11 in quote 4.6 echoed the uncertainty felt by several informants in identifying core values or what constitutes “what a good citizen is”.
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Nevertheless, AUS/NZ 5 in quote 4.7 identified the generic cosmopolitan values identified by the majority of informants. These represent the human and environmental values of cosmopolitanism. The quotes 4.8 and 4.9 from EU 8 and UK 15 encapsulate two contrasting academic perspectives to learning. EU 8 liked the term ‘global citizen’, as it cannot be directly measured. However UK 15 considered that the cosmopolitan aspects of learning provide a way of producing more capable employees. They are given the opportunity to develop “self-identity, confidence, self-esteem, and communication skills”. However many informants felt that there was a degree of academic discomfort in respect of embedding values in learning. AUS/NZ 1 highlighted that academics have and a tendency to avoid articulating an ethical position. This has been described as a conspiracy of silence and a culture of disinterest by Scott (2004a) and is explained in the next sub-theme.

Table 5.11 Theme 4 sub-theme 3 and supporting data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-THEME 3</th>
<th>THEME 4 THE MORAL AND ETHICAL CAPACITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conspiracy of silence or culture of disinterest</td>
<td>4.8 This is where the academy hasn’t necessarily been helpful because it’s gone into a cultural relativism which actually then comes right up against the universality of some of our core values. (AUS/NZ 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.9 One of the first comments when the global citizen program went through the committee structure was, “This is about values and we don’t do values”. (UK 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.10 We’re a bit unpretentious about our values. ... I guess in universities, you do take for granted certain things, like tolerance and fairness. (AUS/NZ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.11 When you are dealing with a value position of some kind, you’re either abstaining from an issue, which you should be active on, or you’re taking a position in disguise, which is mostly the case. (AUS/NZ 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.12 Australian, domestic students, they’re not told that when you go to a university, that’s going to be a trial run for being a part of this world. You’re not going meet so many different people from different cultures with different personalities, and you will learn so much about things around the world. You’re told you just go in there, get your degree, get some work experience. We just need to market it better. (AUS 26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.7.3 ‘Conspiracy of silence and culture of neglect’

The title of this sub-theme is drawn from the work of Scott (2004) who discussed the way values were neglected in universities. Scott argued that universities for some time have been subordinated by external political and market forces. The data in Study One exemplified Scott’s view and is expanded on. In the first quote in Table 5.11, AUS/NZ 5 lamented on the unthinking adoption of the relativism of values in universities.
individually and collectively. This is also demonstrated in quote 4.9 from UK 15. This informant explained how a senior executive member of the university, when realising that the context of the Global Citizen program marked for approval was based on values, commented, "We don't do values". Whereas no other informant was quite so explicit about the university stance or lack of, on values, several informants admitted that university executive attention was usually focused elsewhere.

The organisational context of values-based education is further discussed in Chapter Six. The impact of relativism on academic reasoning is exemplified in quote 4.10 when AUS/NZ 3, as a senior executive, admitted, unpretentiously, to taking values for granted. Moreover, AUS/NZ 1 in the quote 4.11 provided evidence of the way relativism has filtered into academic behaviour. This informant explained how academics avoid taking a value stance in public life. AUS/NZ 1 felt that frequently academics abstain from public comment or camouflage their actual value position, so as to appear politically correct in a public forum. From the student perspective, AUS 26, a student informant, provided a different perspective. He/she explained that students are not aware that going to university "is a trial run for being part of this world" (AUS 26). Improving the integration of domestic and international students is an unresolved challenge in universities yet, AUS 26 has captured an excellent insight to this disconnection. Little has been done to promote and explain to students the connection between the values that underpin democratic society and the purpose of engaging in and learning from cultural others. Students are not made aware of the mutual benefit of learning with and from international students during their university experience. Students are unaware of the cosmopolitan and intellectual purpose of broadening their social and educational spheres.

In contrast to accepting the absence of values-based learning, the greater majority of informants were sympathetic to change. They supported the liberal values associated with the global citizen but felt there was little explicit articulation or support for these values in the university sector. Whereas universities extol the benefits of their multicultural campuses, little has been done to explore or position values in higher education in multicultural campuses beyond rhetoric. The value stance of global citizens is not just a technical efficiency; it involves a moral, intellectual, emotional, and rational way of thinking. This paradigm shift in education involves a different way of thinking from the norm that is expanded on in Chapters Seven, Eight and Nine.
5.8 Discussion: Study One-Part One

In Chapter Five, the global citizen has been conceptualised through four key themes. Each of these themes and their corresponding sub-themes come together to provide a rich and detailed conceptualisation of the global citizen and are now discussed in relation to the extant literature.

5.8.1 The global citizen as the ideal global graduate

The first theme explored the ways that informants described the global citizen. The methodology called the ‘ideal research approach” was used to provide a directed interview focus for the busy informants and to avoid any unnecessary discussion away from the purpose of the research question. By allowing informants to identify with either the global citizen or their idea of the ‘ideal global graduate’, the researcher was able to see how closely the ideal type matched the global citizen (Swedberg & Agevall, 2005). In this way, the data analysis focused on essential information provided by informants. This approach facilitated an easier pathway for collecting data on a complex phenomenon.

The findings showed that ‘the global citizen’ can be understood as an interchangeable concept with other similarly interrelated terms such as ‘intercultural competence’, ‘cosmopolitan’, ‘cross-cultural capacities’ and ‘global perspectives’. Beyond attributes, ‘the global citizen’ is strongly associated with liberal values and a framework for ethical and moral understanding. Overall, informants were interested in moving beyond the “lip service” paid to ‘the global citizen’. The majority advocated for leaving room for the way individuals and organisations interpreted ‘the global citizen’. As such, there are several theoretical perspectives to support the current research findings that exact knowledge is not always essential for conceptualising a concept (Eisenberg, 2006; Eisenberg et al., 1985; Lunn, 2008). These perspectives have been described as ‘strategic ambiguity’ and as a ‘discursive coalition’.

The theory of strategic ambiguity allows for the level of interpretive space many informants felt was important for institutional uptake. For instance, UK 15 explained the theory of strategic ambiguity as a way to revise “feelings that there needs to be exact knowledge on everything”. The theory of strategic ambiguity (Eisenberg et al., 1985, p. 3) is used in business organisations and rejects ideological adherence to rigidity of definition. It recognises that explicit communication is a cultural assumption, and not an essential to practice. Several informants confirmed the unhelpful academic tendency to focus on the precise terminology for the global citizen. Informants thought it was
important to convey the meaning and aims for the ‘ideal global graduate’ to staff, students, and the public in contrast to defending various definitions and terms. The theory of strategic ambiguity allows the global citizen to be thought of as the outcome for the ‘ideal global graduate’, but choice of qualifying term can vary.

A similar strategy to strategic ambiguity has been adopted in education previously. Lunn (2008) used the ‘discursive coalition’ strategy in the UK Project. She chose to use the term ‘global perspectives’, to encompass the global citizen and interrelated terms. The ‘discursive coalition’ represents a set of words with similar meaning and avoids a single correct or authoritative definition. The theory of strategic ambiguity and the discursive coalition both recognise how the majority of informants in this study could acknowledge the overlapping nature of ‘the global citizen’, ‘cosmopolitan’, ‘intercultural competence’, ‘cross-cultural capability’, and ‘global perspectives’ to describe the ‘ideal global graduate’. In contrast to these terms however, ‘the global citizen’ underpinned by ‘cosmopolitanism’ has a strong philosophical, ontological and epistemological basis that is expanded on in Chapter Seven.

In contrast to a list of attributes, the informants provided a multi-layered picture of the global citizen. For instance, the global citizen was identified as an organising principle, an input to curriculum, and output of internationalisation as well as an holistic set of attributes. Attributes informants spoke of included: open, tolerant, respect and responsibility (self/others), cultural humility, empathy, courage, aware (self/others), curious, and adaptable. These attributes are common to literature-based conceptualization of intercultural competence (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009, p. 36). The overlapping nature of attributes associated with intercultural competence and the global citizen is strong, however the data raised some pragmatic markers to demonstrate that the global citizen is a cognitive developmental step beyond intercultural competence. This is discussed further in Chapters Seven, Eight and Nine. The attributes, not associated with intercultural competence by Spitzberg and Changnon (2009), but which were apparent in this study are: engagement (others/community/volunteering), planetary awareness, sustainability, courage, initiative, self-motivated, making interconnections of knowledgeable and concern for world peace.

Intelectually, the global citizen has the ability to make moral, ethical, and intellectual interconnections across local and global contexts. Overall the combined list of holistic attributes found in the current research is somewhat consistent with previous studies investigating the global citizen (Hunter, 2004; Killick, 2012; Morais & Ogden,
Furthermore, informants’ descriptions of the global citizen were consistent with Schattle’s (2008) primary concepts of awareness, responsibility, and engagement; and with Schattle’s secondary concepts (cross-cultural empathy, personal achievement and mobility). However the contribution of the present research has captured the complexity of the global citizen beyond these descriptions.

In the current research, *The moral and ethical capacities* were identified as central to the global citizen. Awareness of self and others was raised as an important marker of the global citizen but it also infers a moral and ethical sense of empathy and cultural humility. Empathy is associated with having awareness of ‘others’ or imagining what it is like to be the existential ‘other’ (Selby, 2008, p. 6). Moreover, Hill (1983) argued that a moral imagination is essential for developing empathy, cultural humility, and insight into our own fallibility. Cultural humility as a capacity enables the individual to reflexively question social and cultural prejudices (p. 211). Hill explained how the moral imaginary gives us the insight to engage with other perspectives. The relevance of the imaginary and reflexivity to the global citizen mindset is discussed in more detail in Chapter Seven, Eight and Nine. Another feature of the global citizen was identified through a student’s sense of identity.

### 5.8.2 Global hybrid identity

A global hybrid identity describes the plurality of the global citizen, a notion that was supported by the majority of informants. The question of European citizenship arose; however it was argued that the human principles of European citizenship and global citizenship are one and the same. Schattle (2008, p. 2) argued that the global citizen is rarely considered exclusively through national citizenship or world government. Similarly, Golmohamad (2008, p. 520) claimed that the increasing focus on the global citizen in education should be promoting local to global imaginings. Only one informant preferred ‘cosmopolitan’ to represent the ‘ideal global graduate’; the term is rarely heard in universities. This is interesting as cosmopolitan theory provides a basis for national and global issues to be mediated and resolved by those who are able to see and consider beyond their national boundaries, or otherwise the global citizen (Carter, 2001). Education rarely engages with the concepts of citizenship, identity, and belonging.

Several informants raised the notion of multiple belongings and implications of common values in multiracial and multiethnic societies. The modern notion of citizenship beyond the nation state has been precipitated by the impacts of globalisation. As such, there is a growing body of literature discussing the concept of
'hybridity', as a way to represent the existence and intersecting nature of multiple social and cultural belongings. Furthermore, hybridity is described as a way to engage with global complexity (Luke & Luke, 2000; Marginson et al., 2010; Rhoads & Szelenyi, 2011; Rizvi, 2005, 2011; Scholte, 2005). In education, hybridity provides a way for students to engage with the complexity of globalisation and the global flow of ideas, media, and cultures across global boundaries. Students’ sense of identity greatly influences the way they engage and think in relation to their local and global spaces. Students need a reflexive and open way of thinking in order to deal with their hybrid existence. Yet, mainstream education rarely engages students at this level of thinking. Osler & Starkey (2006) suggest that new forms of global belonging challenge teaching and learning, particularly in accommodating cultural and personal perspectives.

5.8.3 Recognising the global citizen

The evidence in this theme builds on the developing conceptual and practical framework for the global citizen. It may appear to the reader that there is an overlap between the holistic attributes previously discussed and the markers discussed in this theme. There is a difference. Informants identified the markers in this theme as a way of recognising the global citizen. Interestingly, they felt they would recognise the global citizen if they saw ‘it’. Informants discussed broad markers for ‘the global citizen’ and supported the notion that precise measurement is not the goal for ‘the global citizen’. In contrast, facilitating and fostering the opportunity to develop these markers is a more significant priority for teaching and learning.

Informants offered what they considered to be recognisable markers in students acting as global citizens. Many of these markers are consistent with other research on the global citizen (Killick, 2012; Schattle, 2008). While tolerance is widely accepted as an inherent aspect of the global citizen, language pain tolerance provides an easily recognisable marker. Both EU 9 and AUS 26 presented very good evidence to suggest that raising awareness of Language pain tolerance to students could in itself be not only valuable to individuals, but to the student collective in the classroom situation. Furthermore, it could provide one of the many missing links to more effectively engage domestic and international students.

Potentially, there were three levels of recognisable markers described by informants. The first level could be considered as more discrete markers such as cultural humility, awareness of others, and being ‘other centred’; whilst the second range of markers were potentially easier to recognise than the former level. These were described as the ability to self-organise, show courage and initiative and language pain
tolerance, take risks and be prepared to fail, demonstrate ethical behaviour and be responsible for their own actions. The final group of markers described by informants was more action-associated such as: volunteering, social enterprise engagement and mobility. The overarching feature of these recognisable markers is that the global citizen is thinking differently. The student will be broadening perspectives, will question assumptions, and will be demonstrating the ability to make interconnections across local and global contexts. As such, considering the global citizen through broad markers offers practical insight to teaching and learning and will be discussed further in Chapter Seven and Chapter Nine. The markers offer a broader scope for learning outcomes in contrast to imposing exact indicators of measurement for individual attributes.

It was strongly agreed that there are no precise frames of reference for measuring 'the global citizen' and that student development occurs along an imprecise continuum of development. Acknowledging that global citizen development is an imprecise process significantly diffuses discourse on associating the concept with rigid measurable learning outcomes. The global citizen can be thought of as a disposition and this is expanded on in the next section.

5.8.4 The moral and ethical capacities
This theme focused on the more difficult to capture values and capacities that informants linked to the global citizen. Informants supported the role of values-based education. This finding raised the serious question of: How does this actually happen? One 'policy to practice' assumption of developing global citizens in universities is evidenced by the 50% increase of international flow of tertiary students between 2004-2009 (Organisation for Cooperation and Development, 2009). This assumption is based on claims that international mobility transforms student imaginings, fosters social responsibility (Skelly, 2008), and thereby creates global citizens (Lou & Bosley, 2008). In reality however, only a minority of students experience international mobility during their studies. Furthermore, developing socially and morally responsible global citizens at 'Home' is not well-understood or entrenched in teaching and learning. Rizvi (2005) criticised international education for its neoliberal imaginary where benefits are perceived from an individual and economic perspective. He contrasted this lens with a cosmopolitan approach to teaching and learning that emphasises global interconnectivity and criticality for moral improvement (Rizvi, 2009, p. 263). However it is possible for both cosmopolitanism and the global citizen to be viewed through a neoliberal lens. For instance, neoliberal imaginary for international education is consistent with corporate cosmopolitanism (Appiah, 2008). Through this lens, relativism is embraced, moral and social values are neglected, and the focus for
education is vocational. This lens is consistent with the way EU 8 considered that nurses were educated for a specific task and did not require education involving global thinking. The majority of informants acknowledged that in the current universities environment values are frequently silent, implicit or avoided in universities. Furthermore, universities have retreated into cultural relativism. Yet, many informants considered reaching agreement on shared values could be possible in higher education without being prescriptive and this is discussed further in Chapter Seven.

EU 17 highlighted the difference between a vocational approach to the global citizen and a cosmopolitan one by describing the global citizen “as an attitude and commitment rather than some sort of technical efficiency”. This quote can be contrasted with attributes promoted in neoliberal skills-based and specialised education, where competence and efficiency are paramount (Furedi, 2011, p. 70; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010, p. 78; Saul, 1997, p. 191). Informants attributed the lack of emphasis on social responsibility to blanket relativism, lack of university ‘voice’ and pre-existing curricula demands. Many informants raised recent global crises and expressed concern for graduates’ intellectual and moral capacities to grasp the significance of social responsibility and their ability to deal with complex and ambiguous global issues. It was acknowledged that bulging curricula frequently picked up on global perspectives, but rarely in the context of ethical and moral reasoning and social responsibility. Giroux (2006) and Bourn (2011, p. 565) argued that education purely focused on employability, threatens graduates’ capability to deal with social change and workplace complexity in uncertain times.

The limitations of vocational approaches to education have been recognised. Vocational approaches to learning have been associated with producing graduates with narrow, rigid and inflexible tendencies (Peters, 1987, p. 244). These tendencies are the antithesis of the global citizen and are incompatible with solving complex global problems, as explained by EU 23. Problems such as climate change and social cohesion cannot be solved without intellectual thinking. In contrast to a narrowly educated individual, the cosmopolitan version of an ‘educated person’ holds a set of moral and ethical values (Peters, 1987, p. 263; Tomlinson & Quinton, 1986, p. 3). These values are consistent with ‘The moral and ethical capacities identified in this research. Similarly, Saul (1997) was critical of the global neoliberal influence and felt that narrow education has resulted in developing an unthinking generation. He argued that an ‘educated thinking person’ instinctively understands the relationship between “what you know” and “what you do” (Saul, 1997, p. 5). These positions were echoed in the data, where it was recognised that subject specialists were replacing intellectuals in higher education.
An intellectual needs to be able to consider complexity by transferring competencies, thinking in an interdisciplinary way, or making interconnections using ethical and moral values, capacities and reasoning.

Several informants discussed how universities have embraced cultural relativism in contrast to explicitly articulating core values. Furedi (2004, p. 62) discussed this paradigmatic shift in the basis of knowledge. He argued that the New Left was suspicious of cosmopolitanism and intellectual knowledge and promoted a “philistine attitude to knowledge”. He argued that the New Left mistakenly associated cosmopolitanism with capitalism and attributed the growth of specialisation in education as perpetuating a culture that avoids promoting discourse on the 'big picture' (p. 70). A relativist approach to education has resulted in few opportunities where students are able to problematise conflicting or shared cultures and values. Scott (2004a) considered the lack of interest in values by universities is due to subordination to external political and market forces.

The findings strongly associated the informants’ view of the global citizen with liberal and moral values or viewed the global citizen as a moral and transformative cosmopolitan. While there are few practice models that explicitly link the global citizen to cosmopolitanism in universities, the findings are consistent with this lens. The findings describe a global citizen as a student who shows concern, responsibility and respect for issues that impact on global society. The findings also support the transformative perspective of cosmopolitanism in the way students make interconnections between the impacts of globalisation from the political, economic, and social, technical, environmental and cultural perspectives (Stokes, Pitty, & Smith, 2008; Vertovec & Cohen, 2002). Through a moral and transformative cosmopolitan lens, students developing as global citizens have the potential to develop as socially responsible citizens equipped to deal with complex global challenges.

Professional disciplines frequently have an ethics course; however, the focus in these is often on professional standards rather than on developing students’ sense of social responsibility. Sherblom (2012, p. 118) described the process for developing as a moral and socially responsible person. He suggested, “moral sensitivity develops as a consequence of complex interactions occurring within an individual’s moral capacities”. He described these capacities as: moral reasoning, self-awareness, empathy, perspective taking, questioning socio-cultural assumptions, life experiences, chosen values, and self-identity. Sherblom (2012) argued that each moral engagement facilitates a unique and dynamic interaction of these capacities in contributing to the process of moral
development (p. 128). These interactions are consistent with the process of developing as a moral and transformative cosmopolitan and will be discussed further in Chapter Seven. Importantly, Sherblom's perspective highlights how important it is for students to be engaged with their identities and values during the process of moral development and global citizen learning.

The moral and ethical capacities of the global citizen pose a challenge to operationalising the policy rhetoric of the global citizen, yet embody the core values of a liberal society. These capacities bring to focus the conflict between a neoliberal approach to education that is focused on skills, employability, and productivity and a cosmopolitan paradigm with its focus on common humanity and social responsibility. These capacities lie at the core of what it means to be a global citizen and add an important aspect to conceptualising the global citizen. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to address the purported failure of multiculturalism and the impacts of cultural relativism on democratic society, but a recent Grattan Report (Norton, 2012) found a surprising lack of support for democracy by Australian youth. Several reasons for this have been reported, but one has been attributed to cultural relativism where civic and liberal values have disappeared from societal and educational focus (Hare & Trounsen, 2012). The moral capacities of the global citizen are resistant to expedient forms of measurement and represent the great organisational challenge of turning the policy rhetoric of the global citizen to a reality. Currently, education is solely conceptualised as a measurable competency rather than as intellectual development in moral and ethical terms as well. For instance, morality is rarely articulated in either policy or educational practice and brings into focus the educational divide between the neoliberal and cosmopolitan paradigms in education.

5.9 Summary: Chapter Five

This chapter has explained the structure for Study One and how the study is presented in three categories of data in Chapters Five, Six, and Seven. The related findings for the first category were analysed using four themes: The global citizen as the ideal global graduate, Hybrid global identity, Recognising the global citizen, and The moral and ethical capacities. Each theme built progressively to explicate what the global citizen means in the context of contemporary universities. The analysis and discussion in this chapter offer the reader an in-depth conceptual understanding of 'the global citizen' within contemporary universities. However, the global citizen is also socially situated within the university and the higher education sector more broadly. In Chapter Six, the second
category of data is explored through the organisational implications for educating global citizens.
6.0 Organisational implications for educating global citizens

In the twenty-first century, universities are under pressure from conflicting priorities in a highly competitive, globalised world. This chapter discusses organisational implications that are directly related to the university role and responsibility for educating global citizens in a highly competitive world. Developing global citizens does not occur in a vacuum. The global citizen is contextually positioned within the university political, economic, social, and organisational environment. Previous research into the global citizen has tended to concentrate on the individual as the unit of analysis, and focused less on the organisational context of the construct. In response, the current research addressed this gap by capturing industry key informant perceptions of the organisational constraints and enablers that influence universities’ ability to translate the global citizen from concept to practice.

6.1 Background

The traditional aspect of ‘public good’ is invariably overtaken by economic priorities in the reality of the university business environment (Altbach et al., 2009, p. xii). As an inherent component of internationalisation and social responsibility, it is common for university mission statements and policies to claim they educate global citizens; however, there is scant evidence showing how the policy aim is embedded into universities’ organisational processes and practices. The reality of economic viability and other competitive forces frequently directs the attention of university leadership away from the concerns of those at the ‘coal face’ of learning and teaching (Skelton, 2012). Managerialism and internationalisation are integral aspects of the modern university; however these processes do not necessarily facilitate achievement (Leask, 2009) of the ‘public good’ aspect of the socially responsible university.

Strategies designed to meet universities’ social responsibility include ‘internationalisation of the curriculum’ (Jones & Brown, 2007; Leask, 2013c) and ‘internationalisation at home’ (Nilsson, 2000). Usually these strategies have aims associated with educating global citizens. While there are excellent examples of strategies (in the formal and informal curricula) introduced by individual universities to promote global citizen education (see for example Jones and Killick (2013) and Leask (2009), as yet there is little empirical evidence to support their effectiveness and sustainability over time. Nor is there a body of evidence demonstrating how these strategies are systemically embedded into universities. Leask (2012) has developed a
comprehensive guide for action to embed IoC into universities; however, it is too early to assess any longitudinal data that evaluates the effectiveness of this framework.

Study One findings presented in this chapter are not intended as a solution to this problem, but as a way to gain further insight into organisational implications for developing socially responsible global citizens as an integral aspect of IoC. Industry key informants were asked for their views on the role and responsibility of the university to educate socially responsible global citizens. Furthermore, informants were encouraged to discuss issues they considered essential for improving the policy- to-practice nexus for educating global citizens, and to discuss their views on values-based education from the organisational perspective.

6.2 Findings: Study One- Part Two

This section explains the findings through four themes that coalesce to provide insight into the role and responsibility of the university to educate socially responsible global citizens as part of the university notion of ‘public good’. The first theme, *Commercialisation versus public good*, relates to the influence of New Public Management (NPM) (Marginson and Van der Wende 2007). Interestingly, the second theme, *The managerial mindset*, addresses an exemplar provided by a single informant (AUS/NZ 19) who articulated clearly the implications of commercialisation and managerialism on university leadership. More specifically, the respondent reflected on the frustration and disempowered position of an executive team dealing with *The managerial mindset*. The rationale for including this outlier as a theme in the findings is explained in Section 6.4. The third theme, *Leadership reflections*, expands on several important leadership concerns; while the fourth related theme, *Academic considerations*, addresses informants’ perceptions of organisational issues impacting on academic staff in particular. The four themes and sub-themes reported in this chapter are shown in Table 6.1.
### Table 6.1  Chapter Six themes and sub-themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME</th>
<th>SUB-THEME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Commercialisation versus public good</td>
<td>1.1 Competitive agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Financial constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Embedding values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The managerial mindset</td>
<td>2.1 Measuring performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Reinforcing the managerial mindset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leadership reflections</td>
<td>3.1 Leadership potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Corporate leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Thought leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Academic considerations</td>
<td>4.1 Integrating values-based education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Academic attitudes to teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Cosmopolitan role model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.3 Theme 1: Commercialisation versus public good

The commercialisation of higher education has overshadowed the notion of universities contributing to the public good of society. The next section introduces the first theme and conveys the ways informants reflect on commercialisation and how it has influenced the underlying principles of the university to the detriment of public good. The three sub-themes that underpin Theme 1 are: Competitive agenda; Financial constraints; and Embedding values. (see Table 6.2).
Table 6.2  Theme 1 sub-themes 1, 2 and 3 and supporting data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-THEMES 1, 2 and 3</th>
<th>THEME 1 COMMERCIALISATION VERSUS PUBLIC GOOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitive agenda</td>
<td>1.1 Universities contribute to global education ... as part of globalisation we’re also competing. So notion of universities contributing to common good is a contradiction, where universities are acting like a business. (UK 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Values come in all the time. It’s sometimes the counterargument to the competitive discourse. There’s very much a competitiveness agenda in Europe that’s driven by the European Union. But it’s also driven at national level by the notion that higher education needs to stimulate growth and that graduates need to be trained to be employable and need to be relevant with respect of economic growth of Europe and of its member states. (EU 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial constraints</td>
<td>1.3 The fact that you’re a prisoner in a financial crisis is not going to make this any easier. (EU 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 At the executive, we never talk about things like these (sic values). We talk occasionally about we’ve got to educate students and not train them. But we’re busy working out with our international numbers dropping and our domestic down, who’s going to pay for the buildings. (AUS/NZ 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedding values</td>
<td>1.5 I think there should be much more debate about the public good that isn’t just short term, both for the individual and for society (AUS/NZ 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6 I think today very often universities are so busy with dealing with their own business it’s hard for them to play that active stakeholder role. (UK 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.7 Don’t forget we’re trying to educate global citizens. And it’s not that the two are incompatible (competition and values). It’s that sometimes the link is lost. (EU 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.8 The strength of American universities is that they are socially embedded and you have to demonstrate how you are linked to the universities’ mission of social embeddedness. US hiring policies ask how you are going to serve the community. This is taken very seriously in appointments and levels for promotion. We don’t take it that seriously in Australia (AUS/NZ 4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.1  Sub-theme 1: The competitive agenda

The first sub-theme presents informants’ views on the way in which universities operate under a corporate model characterised by commercial and competitive interests while at the same time espousing policies of social responsibility. Informant UK 15 cogently explained: “...notions of universities contributing to common good is a contradiction where universities are acting like a business”. Similarly, in quote 1.2 in Table 6.2, EU 9 commented on how the European Union and its member states place a heavy emphasis on education for employment and productivity. Along a similar vein, all informants from Australia and New Zealand were acutely aware of the way fierce competition for students internationally and domestically has shifted universities’ focus away from
social responsibility in their countries. Overall, there was general consensus that commercialisation priorities take precedence over support for the values that underpin the ‘public good’ role of the university.

6.3.2 Sub-theme 2: Financial constraints

The second sub-theme explains in part why the ‘public good’ role of the university seems to be overshadowed. Informants discussed the consequence of declining external funding on universities. Interestingly, in quote 1.3, EU 23 commented on Australian higher education, arguing it is imprisoned by these financial constraints, particularly in regard to progressing the global citizen agenda. AUS/NZ 24 provided an insight from the ‘coal face’ about the challenges faced by university leadership. Quote 1.4 (Table 6.2) points to the executives’ awareness of the tension between providing a university education and a more vocationally-oriented training program. However, prioritising budgetary considerations such as “who’s going to pay for the buildings” (AUS/NZ 24) takes precedence over concerns about the nature of the education provided to students.

6.3.3 Sub-theme 3: Embedding values

The third sub-theme speaks to the challenges and tensions of embedding values in the 21st century university. In quote 1.5 (Table 6.2), AUS/NZ 5 suggested there should be more public debate on global citizen values, whereas UK 21 (quote 1.6) highlighted how the corporate pressures of running the university as a business conflict with acting as a socially responsible corporate entity. EU 9 exemplified the sub-theme in quote 1.7 which argued that while competition and global citizen values “are not incompatible”, there is no current mechanism to link the two.

In the final quote, AUS/NZ 4 opines on how American universities explicitly and systemically embed values throughout the organisation. According to this informant, US academics need to demonstrate their contribution to the university social mission and to the community in order to succeed in recruitment and career advancement. It seems that human resource management strategies are used to help ensure ‘the public good’ role of the university is prioritised. The next section expands on an informant’s view of ramifications caused by universities’ dependence on external funding.
6.4 Theme 2: The managerial mindset

The managerial mindset is an in-vivo term used by one informant (AUS/NZ 19) to describe the mindset of external funding bodies towards universities. The managerial mindset is used in this chapter as a theoretical representation of bureaucratic thinking. Boisot and MacMillan (2004) described the managerial mindset as an embedded managerial epistemology that “seeks evidence to justify its actions” (p. 513). This description resonates with the message conveyed by AUS/NZ 19 in this theme. Boisot and MacMillan explain that different mindsets are comprised of combinations of ‘belief’, ‘truth’ and ‘justification’ (p. 507). The theme highlights how the external funding bodies and the university operate under different mindsets. Their mindsets comprise different combinations of belief, truth and justification.

This outlier in the findings has been included as a theme. The reason for doing this was to contribute to the completeness of the dataset through the presentation and explanation of a dissimilar case that will help to build an explanation (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 269). This theme builds further on the internal ramifications of commercialisation and the influence of external funding bodies on leadership and university processes. Other informants did not express this informant’s perspective and there are several plausible reasons to explain this. Notably, the interview was one of the longer ones (100 minutes), and undertaken in the latter stages of data collection. Moreover, being a member of an executive team, the informant was more interested in the organisational aspect of the research questions and was experienced and knowledgeable about the relationship between the university and external funding bodies. Table 6.3 presents the sub-themes and quotes for Theme 2, The managerial mindset.
### Table 6.3 Theme 2 sub-themes and supporting data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-THEMES 1 and 2</th>
<th>THEME 2 THE MANAGERIAL MINDSET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measuring performance</td>
<td>2.1 <em>We all want to behave ethically. Well, what’s the performance indicator on that and the answer is, there isn’t one. But that’s unacceptable to the managerial mindset, which can only see in that sort of thing.</em> <em>(AUS/NZ 19)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 <em>They’ve said they are going to measure teaching quality and hand out money accordingly, and They’ve tried it in the past and They usually come down to student satisfaction surveys… when they fail They say, “Okay, we must redouble our efforts”, rather than revisit our premises.</em> <em>(AUS/NZ 19)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational reinforcement</td>
<td>2.3 <em>The money side of international education dominates so much. It’s not just the pragmatic fact that we need the money, it’s also built into management performance indicators, all these sorts of things. And so all the incentives are structured around that as well. We sort of reinforce it all.</em> <em>(AUS/NZ 19)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 <em>Well, because the managerial mindset assumes that the sector is talking from self-interest. Therefore, if you say, Well, no, we shouldn’t have performance based funding on this…. it must be because of university self-interest. And so that voice can be discarded.</em> <em>(AUS/NZ 19)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6.4.1 Sub-theme 1: Measuring performance

The first sub-theme reports how measuring university performance is a central concern of *The managerial mindset*, yet the reporting indicators set by external funding bodies are not viewed by the university sector as useful. In quote 2.1 in Table 6.3, AUS/NZ 19 used a complex construct such as ethical behavior as a practical example. ‘They’ (*The managerial mindset*) think it is unacceptable not to be able to reduce ethical behavior to a performance indicator. Quote 2.1 highlighted the different belief systems that underpin *The managerial mindset* and universities. AUS/NZ 19 further explained the differing worldviews between the sectors. Quote 2.2 referred to repeated attempts by *The managerial mindset* to measure teaching quality. In this situation AUS/NZ 19 pointed out that when student satisfaction surveys fail to produce meaningful data on teaching quality, the *Managerial mindset* thinks universities should “redouble our efforts”. *The Managerial mindset* is working on their ‘belief’ that this form of measurement is effective rather than engaging in a shared understanding of the ‘truth’ of the situation.

#### 6.4.2 Sub-theme 2: Organisational reinforcement

In the second sub-theme (Table 6.3) AUS/NZ 19 explained how *Organisational reinforcement* of *The managerial mindset* occurs internally. University leaders in their attempts to meet demanding external performance indicators actually reinforce. The
managerial mindset in their university. In quote 2.3, AUS/NZ 19 explained that because universities are so dependent on external funding, they are left with little choice but to devise internal incentives for staff to provide data to meet externally imposed performance indicators. As explained by AUS/NZ 19 "We sort of reinforce it all". AUS/NZ 19 was asked if Universities Australia or individual universities had tried to redress the nature of illogical benchmarks with external funding bodies. AUS/NZ 19 explained in quote 2.4 that any attempt by universities to challenge external measurement requirements was misinterpreted by The managerial mindset as "...university self-interest. And that voice can be discarded". This exemplar from AUS/NZ 19 provided another insight into the external constraints influencing the twenty-first century university, resulting from the neoliberal model of commercialisation.

The next theme presents informants' perspectives about the role of university leadership in supporting the education of global citizens.

### 6.5 Theme 3: Leadership reflections

Many informants identified leadership as a potential enabler for embedding the global citizen in higher education, however many expressed their concerns. The responses are grouped into three sub-themes: Leadership potential; Corporate leadership; and Thought leadership (see Tables 6.4).
Table 6.4  Theme 3 sub-themes 1,2 and 3 and supporting data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-THEMES 1,2 and 3</th>
<th>THEME 3: LEADERSHIP REFLECTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.1</strong> We don’t walk the talk really. In our university I’ve analysed – we say the word ‘international’ 63 times in all of our strategic planning and mission statement and so forth. But then I don’t see evidence of that right through the university. <em>(AUS/NZ 17)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.2</strong> Organisational leadership can drive those fruitful conversations about social embeddedness of values without determining any preconceived outcomes. <em>(AUS/NZ 4)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporate leadership</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.3</strong> The role of the university should be to create citizens who have a set of values which would necessarily make them global citizens. Senior management at this university just does not get it. They’re bound up with their own power and status. <em>(AUS/NZ 6)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.4</strong> I think most leadership is very much oriented towards their own institution to the next year, to the budget, to the number of students, to that sort of thing. And show very little long-term notions on why we have universities. <em>(EU 8)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thought leadership</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.5</strong> We need more ‘thought leadership’ on it (sic values) to encourage public debate. And I think that’s part of the role of Vice Chancellors. They’re not just CEO managers. They are thought leaders. <em>(AUS/NZ 5)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.6</strong> I think this is where the academy hasn’t necessarily been helpful because it’s gone into cultural relativism which actually then comes right up against the universality of some of our core values. <em>(AUS/NZ 5)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.7</strong> So the first things universities have got to do are educate and not train. But you go talk to the Minister or something about global citizens. They are not interested. But you talk about making engineers to go and go in our mines and they’re right on board with you. <em>(AUS/NZ 24)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5.1 Sub-theme 1: Leadership potential

The first theme presents two contrasting perspectives. Leadership holds the potential to drive a social responsibility agenda throughout the university and this potential was identified by a number of informants. Yet, informants frequently expressed the opinion that leaders failed to “walk the talk” (AUS/NZ 17) or offered “lip service” (EU 8) to educating global citizens. Quotes 3.1 and 3.2 in Table 6.4, demonstrate first, “lip service” paid to social responsibility and second, Leadership potential. In the first quote AUS/NZ 17 referred to an organisational analysis showing limited evidence of implementation of an international perspective throughout the university. In contrast, in the second quote, AUS/NZ 4 highlighted how “organisational leadership can drive those fruitful conversations about social embeddedness of values without determining any
preconceived outcomes”. Despite the potential of leadership, the model of leadership informants discussed was more aligned to Corporate Leadership.

6.5.2 Sub-theme 2: Corporate leadership

The second sub-theme represents informants’ views on the corporate style of university leadership. This theme is closely linked to Theme 1, Commercialisation versus public good but explains how commercialisation has impacted on university leadership style to the detriment of public good. In Quote 3.3 (Table 6.4), AUS/NZ 6 explained that the role of the university is to create students as global citizens with a value system, yet considered that leadership did not take this responsibility seriously. This informant blamed this situation on the self-interested power status of senior management. Along a similar vein, EU 8 explained that leadership attention is directed towards business management and was not engaging with the need for the intellectual importance of higher education.

6.5.3 Sub-theme 3: Thought leadership

The next sub-theme, Thought leadership (Table 6.4), provides a contrasting aspect of university leadership. AUS/NZ 5 expressed an opinion that the responsibility of Vice-Chancellors is to be “thought leaders”. This informant considered that university leaders have a responsibility for driving public debate on values and “they're not just CEOs” (AUS/NZ 5). University leaders are responsible also to students, staff and society. Furthermore, this informant highlighted how the academy (the university collective) failed to drive public discourse on the core values of society as they “have gone into cultural relativism”. The final quote from AUS/NZ 24 in this sub-theme is provided to demonstrate the organisational constraint Thought leadership faces from The managerial mindset. For instance, a government minister is more attracted to the benefits of the mining industry than to discussion of notions of the global citizen and public good.

These three sub-themes have highlighted the potential of leaders to embed social responsibility into organisational strategy and act as ‘thought leaders’, rather than just CEOs. The next theme, Academic considerations, builds further on the responsibility of academic staff to educate socially responsible global citizens.

6.6 Theme 4: Academic considerations

Several informants discussed Academic considerations in respect of educating global citizens. These findings are grouped into three sub-themes: Integrating values-based
education; Academic attitudes to teaching and learning; and Cosmopolitan role model and are shown in Tables 6.5 and Table 6.6.

### Table 6.5  Theme 4 sub-themes 1 and 2 and supporting data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-THEMES 1 and 2</th>
<th>THEME 4 ACADEMIC CONSIDERATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrating values-based education</td>
<td>4.1 I link a lot of the values and attitudes to employability and no university is going to turn down anything that’s to do with employability. And my argument is that developing the global perspective enhances the transferable skills of employability. (UK 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 But if you tighten things down, the more you get a faction that will seek to misinterpret, divert. So it’s how you can maintain this – you need some tightness and structure, but some looseness for this to evolve. I found that logical incrementalism helps. (UK 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 But doing these things top down is very difficult because there’s all these layers in between where messages get garbled, wires get crossed and you end up with a very different message down at the other end. They’re loosely connected organisations, universities. (AUS/NZ 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4 There’ll be a generational change of these things coming through. But it’s not to say that the new generation have necessarily whole of university perspectives on these things... You have to have a mix in your staff to provide broader experiences, imbue it through the people that are hired. (AUS 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic attitudes to teaching and learning</td>
<td>4.5 But my experience has been most academics are very keen to broaden things. They’re not the ones who are narrowing the curriculum. They’re not the ones who want to drill it down to just the practical basics. (AUS 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.6 Many higher education teachers do define their role quite narrowly. My role is to reach mathematics, my role is to teach history and my role is to teach a foreign language or to study those. (EU 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.7 The role of education is to continually open students up to alternatives, do what we can to make them more open minded. Their attitudes and values are frameworks which are laid down through different points in their history, our role is to give them new experiences to inform those frameworks so they can move on. I like to provide things in the extra-curricular sphere so people who want to go further can engage. But it’s their choice. (UK 15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6.6.1 Sub-theme 1: Integrating values-based education

Integrating values into education is highly dependent on the capacities of engaged, informed and supported academics. This sub-theme describes ways informants thought academics could be engaged with values-based education. In the first quote (Table 6.5), UK 15 found that by linking values and attitudes to enhanced employability skills, global perspectives became more meaningful to academics. Quotes 4.2 and 4.3 highlights the
level of awareness and sensitivity necessary for implementing values across the organisation. While academics can be resistant to top-down approaches to curricula, without a level of consistency across the organisation, the underlying messages can be misrepresented. UK 15 discussed a solution to this problem by working through ‘logical incrementalism’. This is a form of delegated leadership. Through ‘logical incrementalism’ a delegated leader consults with academics seeking their input but spreads the core messages as well. This promotes a sense of academic engagement and ownership of an issue while the core principles are maintained. These two insights from UK 15 suggest that organisational processes can fail without adequate organisational input, academic support, and development to ensure the message is followed through in a consistent manner. It is important to ensure there is a shared understanding of the purpose for Integrating values-based education into curricula by all actors. In the last quote AUS/NZ 3 discussed how important academic staff were to imbuing values, and felt that there would be distinct generational differences in the way global citizen values would be interpreted by academic staff. This informant felt that younger academics would be more open to global citizen values. AUS/NZ 3 was the only informant who discussed age as a factor in this regard.

6.6.2 Sub-theme 2: Academic attitudes to teaching and learning

In the second sub-theme two different academic philosophical approaches to teaching and learning are presented. In the first quote (Table 6.5) AUS/NZ 19 felt that overall, academics would be receptive to broadening education to integrate global citizen values into curricula. Yet in the second quote, EU 23 considered that many academics defined their roles narrowly. These two quotes highlight the difference between a cosmopolitan and neoliberal approach to teaching and learning. The former embraces education as an intellectual experience, which is in contrast to the latter neoliberal approach that focuses on delivering professional training to students. In quote 4.7, UK 17 introduced a cosmopolitan approach to education by discussing attitudes and values as the way to broaden students’ mindsets. According to UK 15, the role of teaching is to inform students’ ethical frameworks for understanding. Importantly, UK 15 highlighted the fact, that how much students choose to engage is up to them. The notion of the successful academic acting as a Cosmopolitan role model is expanded on in the next sub-theme (Table 6.6).
### 6.6.3 Sub-theme 3: Cosmopolitan role model

The *Cosmopolitan role model* sub-theme represents the influential academic who inspires and motivates students to be open-minded. These academics influence students’ values and morals and value frameworks during their education. EU 9 (quote 4.8) in Table 6.6 highlighted how important it is for academics to be supported organisationally by a globally thinking university. AUS/NZ 4 and EU 11 (quotes 4.9 and 4.10) both highlighted an important point raised previously, that the behaviour and attitudes of academics can be inspirational and motivational to students. Their daily practices inform students’ frames of reference. Through example, the *Cosmopolitan role model* can convey to students how to think, not what to think. They can demonstrate the knowledge, virtues and skills they aspire to for their students. The final quote from AUS/NZ 6 provides an exemplar of the *Cosmopolitan role model*. The role model is passionate about their content area, makes explicit the interconnections of knowledge across contexts, and translates theory into practice. In this way, the *Cosmopolitan role model* makes learning inspirational, contemporary, and meaningful to students.

The informants’ perspectives presented in this chapter suggest that university leadership does not always “walk the talk” (AUS/NZ 17) for translating internationalisation and social responsibility into organisational processes that support academics to educate global citizens. This is particularly the case if the university is not thinking globally and when anticipated teaching outcomes are not underpinned by the
explicit "difference between training and education" (AUS/NZ 24). American Association of Colleges and Universities (2012) discussed the importance of educating students for global complexity and uncertainty through a liberal education. A liberal education is described as:

*A philosophy of education that empowers individuals with broad knowledge and transferable skills, and a stronger sense of values, ethics, and civic engagement... A liberal education characterised by challenging encounters with important issues, and more a way of studying than a specific course or field of study* (American Association of Colleges and Universities, 2012, p. 9)

This definition is consistent with the *Moral and ethical values and capacities* of the global citizen identified in Theme 4 in Chapter Five, and with 'global citizen learning as a process' which is explained further in Chapters Seven, Eight and Nine. Without a cosmopolitan "Thought leadership" and a commitment to social responsibility for educating global citizens, the broader purposes of education may not be on academics and students' horizons. Therefore, the ability of academic staff to foster and develop social responsibility and global citizens is severely handicapped from several perspectives. The discussion draws together the four themes in the context of scholarly literature to provide insight into the organisational implications for educating global citizens.

6.7 **Discussion: Study One- Part Two**

Study One- Part Two explored the informants' perceptions of the role and responsibility of the university to educate socially responsible global citizens. The following sections discuss the context of these themes in relation to the literature.

6.7.1 **Commercialisation versus public good**

This theme highlights the contradictory position of the 21st century university. The first and second sub-themes, *Competitive agenda* and *Financial constraints*, describe how the social and academic rationales for higher education are dominated by the economic rationale, promoting competition in the global market (de Wit, 2002; Knight, 1997). Kreber (2009, p. 5) suggested that the predominant economic rationale posed a risk to the fundamental purpose of higher education, and how it could be defined in the future. Similarly, Klein (2000, p. 109) argued that universities were no longer recognised as institutions where societal values are respected, fostered and articulated; rather, universities act as corporate businesses in a competitive global market. Yet, uncertainty in regard to current and future public funding is unsettling the sector, bringing financial constrictions to the fore (Universities Australia, 2013). In this uncertain political and
financial environment, commercial priorities take precedence over public good and organisational support for social responsibility, and educating global citizens (Nussbaum, 2010, p. 7).

The commercialisation of higher education and the corporatisation of internal structures have changed the form and function of universities. The change to a corporate internal function was highlighted in the sub-theme *Organisational reinforcement*. This sub-theme explained how university leadership reinforces *The managerial mindset*, by providing internal incentives to capture the data needed for external performance indicators. Harris (2005) thought the changes of internal governance of universities, and external accountability were responsible for precipitating the shift away from traditional university values and public good. Adding further depth to this view, Friedman (1962) explained the difference between the values of a corporation and a university. Whereas the social responsibility of a corporate organisation is to make as much money as possible for stakeholders, universities hold the responsibility to uphold values of benefit to the whole of society. Within the higher education sector, the social, cultural and academic rationales for higher education (Knight, 1997) have been overtaken by commercialisation. As such, in many countries, internationalisation of higher education is an increasingly important contributor to national GDP.

The conflicting tensions caused by *Commercialisation versus public good* are an international phenomenon. The competitive market for international students is expanding in OECD countries. The United States of America (USA) is leading the push for recruitment of international students with the United Kingdom, Canada and Australia also acting as major players (Delors et al., 2010). While internationalisation has been responsible for major changes to the university with claims of broadening students’ outlooks (Murphy, 2007), there is little evidence to support these claims (Gallagher, 2011). More research has been recommended to identify both how internationalisation as an overarching strategy (Qiang, 2003, p. 250) and how internationalisation of the curriculum (Leask, 2012), influence students’ global abilities and mindsets.

The third sub-theme, *Embedding values*, introduces the more optimistic, cosmopolitan and public good feature to this theme. Informants in this research felt that the values of the global citizen and the commercialisation agenda should not be thought of as incompatible, however the links between commercially driven education and values is not currently being explored. Delors et al (2010) advocated linking university processes that addressed societal values as well as prepared graduates for employment.
This view is consistent with the way AUS/NZ 4 discussed the American model of social embeddedness across the organisation. Moreover, synchronising internationalisation and pragmatic employment aims with ethical and philosophical frameworks as described by UK 15, is thought to make good business sense (Caruana, 2010a; McArthur, 2011). At the present time the internal pressures of commercialisation, competition and financial constraints contribute to organisational barriers to *Embedding values*.

The commercialisation of higher education is a twenty-first century reality. Nonetheless, the evidence in this theme supports a call to explore the complementary nature of commercialisation and public good. Some pockets of the literature support this opinion, with prominent authors advocating that universities hold a responsibility to revitalise and promote the public good role of the university (Delanty, 2001; Harris, 2005; McArthur, 2011; Nussbaum, 2010; Rhoads & Szelenyi, 2011). Seemingly, without collective academic agency, universities face a future of status-quo or, alternatively, of further erosion of public purpose, as ongoing financial crises impact on the sector and society (Saul, 1997). In the Australian context, Universities Australia in 2013 took the unprecedented move of broadcasting a national television advertisement in response to recent $3.8b government funding cuts (Trounsen/Australian). This action by Universities Australia precipitated an overwhelming public response by survey against university funding cuts. It appears that there is public support for an adequate funding base to support the quality of Australian universities.

The integration of findings and the literature in this theme suggests there is academic interest in moving beyond the status quo of accepting the predominance of the economic rationale to the detriment of the notion of public good and embedding values into education. Building on the first theme, the second theme offers an organisational insight to the internal ramifications of commercialisation. Theme 2 provides an explanation of the way *The managerial mindset* impacts on internal processes of a university.

### 6.7.2 The managerial mindset

This theme developed from an outlier in the dataset. The reason this outlier has been included as a theme was explained in Section 6.4. The theme provides a snapshot of the conflict at play between the diverse ‘theoretical mindsets’ of external funding bodies and universities. In the past, academics operated with autonomy and some control in the university organisation whereas now, universities are responsible to governments to a greater extent than to their students, community of scholars and to society more broadly (Jameson et al., 2012). In this situation, universities have been blamed for
subordinating their values to external funding bodes (Scott, 2004a). This theme provides an inside view of what appears to be involved with this situation of alleged 'subordination'. The theme describes how external funding bodies influence university business and provides an insight to the internal ramifications of this externally controlled situation.

The underlying epistemology of the managerial mindset could explain why value conflicts exist between universities and external funding bodies. Boiset and MacMillan (2004) contend that different mindsets are comprised of different combinations of ‘belief’, ‘truth’ and ‘justification’ (p. 507). These authors argue that *The managerial mindset* is object oriented and needs evidence to justify its actions. Extrapolating from Boiset and MacMillan’s theory, *The managerial mindset* in the university situation, with its instrumental orientation, seeks evidence from performance indicators to justify funding provided to universities. *The managerial mindset* believes this form of instrumental measurement provides evidential truth (p. 513). In contrast, the university mindset views and values research differently. As such, the mindset of external funding bodies and the university are underpinned by differing views in regard to the way belief, truth and evidence are comprised and balanced. According to Peters (1981, p. 78) rational thinking is underpinned by caring about the truth and potentially the conflicting mindsets between these two sectors become more apparent.

There appears to be a mismatch of understanding between *The managerial mindset* and the university sector about the purpose of a university education. Expanding on this scenario, Kreber (2009) asserted that the fundamental purpose of the university risks being defined by an economic mindset. Moreover, the conflict of mindsets has been identified previously in terms of impacting on academic autonomy and public good. McPhee (1998, p.1) thought ‘They’ (external funding bodies) were steering educational directions. In her terms, ‘They’ act as a minatory presence in university life, damaging academic citizenship. She argued that ‘They’ dominated academic discussion, controlled academic life, and were damaging collegiality and the scholarly community. She thought ‘They’ have failed to recognise the purpose of universities for supporting public good.

*The managerial mindset*, or the ‘They’ in this research, applied primarily to external funding bodies. Yet, as explained in the sub-theme *Organisational reinforcement*, university leadership reinforced *The managerial mindset* by internally devising incentive based-processes and indicators that are specifically designed to meet external performance requirements. In this way leadership appears to be supporting the
corporate model of *The managerial mindset* and academic capitalism (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). The legitimising of external performance indicators through internal university incentives has been identified previously. Brady (2012, p. 347), argued that this behaviour reinforces rather than challenges the underlying ethos of neoliberal thinking by external agencies.

A number of academics have discussed the organisational challenges imposed by external funding bodies. For instance, Miller (2000, p. 111) felt that governments have an oversimplified view of university purpose, and this view is reflected in benchmarks set to measure university performance. He argued that government lacks an in-depth appreciation of the social responsibility of the university as well as the concept of long-term societal benefit. Along a similar vein, Moloney (2000, p. 76) asserted that government equates national interest with university accountability rather than with any intellectual, moral or societal dimension. Other descriptions of *The managerial mindset* have been nonsensical, convenient, and short-term (Marceau, 2000, p. 230). The frustration echoed in this theme builds on the previous theme of *Commercialisation versus public good*. *The managerial mindset* demonstrates how the pressure of external accountability dominates internal executive attention and perpetuates corporate processes internally. Currently, goals are set for universities not by them, and in this respect Delanty (2001, p. 158) argued that universities need to recover their “cosmopolitan project” (p. 158) to contribute to a global society. This notion is expanded on in the next theme. *Leadership reflections* provide further insight to the conflict at play between the cosmopolitan and neoliberal paradigms in higher education.

### 6.7.3 Leadership reflections

The three sub-themes in this theme were identified as *Leadership potential*, *Corporate leadership* and *Thought leadership*. This theme builds on the previous two themes by providing more depth to the way university business is, and could be orchestrated by university leaders individually and collectively, through the academy of scholars and peak organisations. The first sub-theme contrasted leadership failing “to walk the talk” with the potential for leadership to embed social responsibility across the organisation. Taylor (2010, pp. 97, 106) stressed that managerialism fosters leadership oversight of fundamental university values. This view was supported in the findings. The consequence of leaders disengaged from social responsibility by the influence of corporate leadership was explained in the second sub-theme. Coady (2000b, xi) alleged that government and corporate leadership were eroding the fabric of universities. He felt universities have been reduced to a branch of the public service, producing students as products for a competitive market. In contrast to the clear demarcation between the
institutions in the past, the differences are becoming more ambiguous (Deem & Brehony, 2005; Harris, 2005). Furthermore, Langtry (2000, p. 93) explained the internal flow-on budgetary effect of Corporate leadership. Leaders can allow enterprise to take precedence over academic and social priorities through funding distributions between faculties and departments. Furthermore, Deem and Brehony (2005, p. 231) identified university leaders as an 'entity' of their own. They claimed that senior academic managers operate as a distinct social group with an interest in power and domination. In a similar vein, Langer (1992, p. 53) argued that corporate leadership is occupied with outputs, leading to mindless and unthinking behaviour in organisations. The findings in the current research and the literature suggest that Corporate leadership acts as a constraint to public good and support for educating global citizens.

In contrast, the final sub-theme suggested that universities need Thought leadership not just Corporate leadership. As such, university "thought leaders" (AUS/NZ 5) could be stimulating scholarly debate on ways to balance the neoliberal and cosmopolitan purposes of the university. "Thought leaders" would not cloak their values in cultural relativism, discussed previously in Chapter Five and expanded on in Chapter Seven. Along a similar vein, Hunter (2013, p. 71) stated that imaginative university leadership has the capacity to drive its own future. In this respect, Lawler (2005) described an existentialist element in leadership. He argued that the predominant model of corporate leadership, researched and developed through a positivist paradigm, lacks a philosophical basis where responsibility, values and morality are inherent. He claimed an existential aspect of leadership supports and recognises the holistic nature of reflection and reflexivity during values based decision-making. The findings and the literature suggest that universities are not solely commercial corporations, nor are Vice-chancellors purely CEOs. Prominent authors urge the academy to have an explicit voice for public good (Austin, 2012, p. 57; Harris, 2005; Molony, 2000, p. 83).

This theme highlights an apparent shortage of Thought leadership internally and in the public sphere. In contrast to these views from the coalface, Delanty (2001) offers insight into, and a more optimistic direction for, the future of universities. As a social theorist, he calls for reinvigorating the “cosmopolitan project of universities” (p. 158). He argued that the 21st century university should be recognised as a key communicative institution in society, particularly as the state retreats from social responsibility and cultural direction (p. 155). Delanty described universities as important sites for interconnectivity between transnational information technology and cultural citizenship. He claimed that academic freedom should not be forgone and universities should reclaim their position and voice in the public sphere (p. 6, 11, 150).
Yet, social theorists have been criticised for expounding their views on the university. In particular Barnett (2013, p. 7) was critical about abstract views of social theorists, rather than offering specific proposals for action to support their views. Nevertheless, Barnett acknowledged there is a dearth of imaginative ideas in the public domain that is publicly engaging university leaders to seek a way forward in this respect. By integrating the findings in this research and the literature discussed, it is proposed that cosmopolitan Thought leadership could be capable of balancing the dual responsibilities of commercialisation and public good. University leadership that reinvigorates the cosmopolitan project of the university as suggested by Delanty (2001), yet is able to balance the commercial constraints, holds the potential to be influential on the public good role of universities.

The next theme continues to build on the organisational elements that are systemically involved with educating socially responsible global citizens under the notion of public good. The final theme introduces the central role of academics and their cosmopolitan potential.

### 6.7.4 Academic considerations

This theme highlights the importance of academic staff for educating global citizens. The theme is explained in terms of Integrating values-based education, The attitude of academic staff and the Cosmopolitan role model. In the first sub-theme, Integrating values-based education was unanimously supported by informants as an integrated aspect of disciplinary learning, but implementation across the organisation was seen as a challenge. Leask (2013b, p. 13) has stated that intercultural learning needs to be integrated across the culture of the university. However as described in this theme, on one hand imposing a prescriptive approach to global citizen learning could lead to academic resistance, yet on the other hand, allowing too much organisational flexibility could contribute to misdirection of the original intended purpose.

UK 15, discussed logical incrementalism as a useful organisational approach to spread a shared message across an organisation. The approach allows a delegated leader to gather ideas while engaging with academic staff to spread ‘the message’, using connections and networking. In contrast to an ineffective outcome from ‘disjointed incrementalism’ (Banathy, 1988), delegated leadership using logical incrementalism to network with staff has the potential to manage the risks of organisational “tightness” (UK 15) and “looseness” (AUS/NZ 19) within the organisational system. It has the potential to engage staff in a meaningful way for Integrating values-based education. In
this way, integrating a shared understanding of global citizen learning could be adopted as a mainstream strategy as part of IoC across the organisation.

Clearly, recognising global citizen values as mainstream to learning will not be without its detractors. To many, integrating values across the curriculum is associated with a liberal education (Schneider, 2004). Yet, this research has identified values-based education with the global citizen as well as with a mainstream university policy aim. Peters (1981) thought moral education is indistinguishable from liberal education (p. 81). He claimed that being educated must be associated with specific values in contrast to skills training (Peters, 1987). He argued that moral education is underpinned by virtues such as empathy, compassion and tolerance and we acquire these virtues by habit (1981, p. 94). Peters claimed that such virtues could not be taught directly. A grasp of moral principles is needed but they develop through environmental stimulation (1981, p. 102). Furthermore, he points out that ethical understanding does not result from knowledge in a specialised area. Understanding needs depth and breadth, different ways of interpreting things, and systematic conceptual schemes for ethical thinking (1987, p. 240). Further to this insight for instance, Tomlinson and Quinton (1986) felt empathy can only be encouraged through imaginative insight which is gained through engaging with others. Chapter Seven will expand on the imaginary and reflexive and relational engagement with others in terms of global citizen learning.

While liberal education programs have existed as discrete programs, educating all students as global citizens through a moral and ethical framework lacks a body of organisational evidence. However, Coryell and colleagues (2010, p. 16) identified a set of evidence-based organisational issues for embedding social responsibility that promotes a sense of academic purpose. First, these authors felt that sensitive dialogue and engagement between faculty, administration and academic staff is necessary to provide a conduit for change. Second, a contextually grounded and shared vision needs to be understood by all actors. Coryell and colleagues highlighted that systematic change within the organisation is time-consuming and does not occur easily. They concluded this approach could occur in an institution through a shared vision that is contextually grounded, and understood by all actors, as well as having clearly identified learning expectations. These guidelines complement the findings in this theme.

Nevertheless, Coryell and colleagues’ organisational practices do not emphasize the importance of any specific academic qualities. The involvement of academic staff with internationalisation of the curricula is an under researched area. In particular, there is little known about the ‘ideal’ set of teachers’ knowledge and skills (Harman,
Sanderson (2011) and Childress (2010) thought it cannot be assumed that academic staff have the right knowledge skills and values to promote a cosmopolitan outlook in students. Campbell (2007) claimed that bringing together academic staff and students for discussion using an action research approach, offered a greater potential for success than imposing ‘top down’ directives. This approach is consistent with logical incrementalism discussed previously (Banathy, 1988). Similarly, Caruana (2010) stated that development was more likely to be incremental and ‘diffusionist’ with activity and ownership from a ‘middle out’ approach. She felt that cross-faculty dialogue was best suited to expanding staff and student horizons, consistent with cosmopolitan learning. Intuitively these organisational strategies are important for systemic change.

The present research makes a contribution to knowledge by identifying qualities of the Cosmopolitan role model. These qualities are identified in both Chapters Six and Eight, from the industry key informant perspective and the student perspective. In both studies, the Cosmopolitan role model is inspirational, brings in the affective side of learning where emotion, passion, awareness, empathy and the moral imagination emerge during interactions with students; the teacher makes interconnections between contexts and applies learning in a trans-disciplinary way to open student minds to alternative possibilities. Students are engaged in their learning in a globally connected way that is meaningful to them; this approach challenges them and takes them out of their comfort zone of learning. The academic uses role modeling, theory, experience and context to transform students. Similarly, Durodoye, Wright, Pate and Nguyen (2010) found the success of international learning was dependent on the emotion and passion of academic staff. The Cosmopolitan role model needs access to professional development that exposes him/her to the theory and practice of global citizen learning, and needs to be supported within the organisational infrastructure. The theory and practice of global citizen learning is expanded on in Chapters Seven, Eight and Nine.

There is a distinct role for academics to take ownership of their cosmopolitan development. Taylor (1999) argued that academics need to become “players rather than pawns” (p. 7) in the process of university change. By recognising and accepting that change in itself is the new university tradition, academics can move beyond the sense of grief and disillusionment commonly felt by those disempowered in the sector. However, he claimed that academics need institutional support for self-interested and self-managed career trajectories that accommodate both institutional social responsibility, and individual values. Sense-making within the change process needs to be made central to the academic identity, where self-interested activism becomes a positive force for
academics to collectively engage with colleagues in support of shared values and purposes (p. 157). A model of organisational social embeddedness underpinned by incentives and a career trajectory, as described by AUS/NZ 4, is consistent with Taylor's approach. From an organisationally supported position, academics are empowered and better positioned to engage in academic work that accommodates their personal values as well as more committed to socially responsible teaching, learning and community engagement (p. 158). This model uses human resource management processes to support and develop Cosmopolitan role models in the organisational context.

Passion, global experience, real world interconnections, and engagement are shown in this theme as important markers for the academic acting as a Cosmopolitan role model. Global citizen learning is about opening students' and teachers' minds to alternatives through a learning environment that allows them to think differently and to move along a continuum of global citizen learning. The significance of thinking differently to the concept of global citizen learning is expanded on in Chapters Seven, Eight and Nine. Academic staff need support to be adequately equipped in order to foster and facilitate this learning environment for students. Students also have a responsibility to engage; there is only so much that the university can do. This significant point is rarely explained to students.

The broader aspects of learning need to be made explicit to students in the context of their future lives and careers. This point is expanded on in Chapter Eight. The role of the cosmopolitan academic staff in educating global citizens is paramount. The findings suggest that universities need to systematically engage and support academic staff and students within the university ethos of global citizen learning. An ethos that is socially as well as organisationally embedded holds the potential to create a situation where academics are central to the purpose of the university and students are engaged with global citizen learning in a meaningful way.

6.8 **Summary: Chapter Six**

Chapter Six has captured the informants' perceptions of the role and responsibility of the university to educate socially responsible global citizens. The informant findings were discussed through four themes: Commercialisation versus public good, The Managerial mindset, Leadership reflections and Academic considerations. In the first theme the conflict between the commercialised university environment and the more traditional university role as bastion of society, supporting public good was highlighted. The competition for international students was discussed in terms of global and
domestic markets. While university policies espoused their social responsibility, informants felt there was little compelling evidence for the exercise of this across the sector.

The managerial mindset was explained as a theoretical description of bureaucratic government thinking. It was seen as a significant impediment to a university operating as a commercial entity as well as a social institution. Leadership was seen as holding significant potential for embedding social values across the organisation. Yet, in reality, leadership was perceived as operating primarily under the influence of managerialism and a CEO model of corporate leadership rather than making a contribution as ‘thought leader’. An alternative model of cosmopolitan Thought leadership was proposed as having the potential of balancing the conflicting tensions between commercialisation and public good.

In contrast to the constraints, a significant enabler for educating global citizens was associated with the Cosmopolitan role model. This type of academic was seen as a way to first embody the values and virtues of the global citizen and then integrate these into teaching by example. The cosmopolitan role model is inspirational and motivational and is capable of influencing the global citizen mindset. The Cosmopolitan role model exhibits passion, emotion and commitment to their work and students. This role model makes the interconnections of real world examples to student learning, so that learning is rooted in practice. However, no matter how committed academics are, they are highly dependent on organisational support and development. For the public good role of the university to survive and flourish, it is suggested that cosmopolitan Thought leadership is needed from university and collectively from the academy to balance the impacts of commercialisation and public good. The next chapter builds on Chapters Five and Six by exploring the pedagogical implications for educating global citizens.
7.0 Insights to the student global mindset and learning

7.1 Introduction

Chapters Five and Six reported informants’ perspectives of the conceptual and organisational basis of the global citizen. In contrast, Chapter Seven provides insight into the way students learn as global citizens. In Part Three, informants were encouraged to discuss how students who do not experience a mobility experience could be educated as global citizens. Some participants offered philosophical, epistemological, and practical insights into how higher education could be broadened beyond vocational learning. Analyses of these responses expand our understanding of the way students learn to become global citizens. This process of development is referred to in this research as global citizen learning. The chapter concludes by proposing that the student global mindset and global citizen learning provide the ‘conceptual glue’ linking the global citizen to teaching and learning. In this way, the global citizen is provided greater conceptual and practical meaning.

7.2 Background

Educating global citizens is a common aim of universities, yet there is scant evidence as to the way that students learn to become global citizens. Scholarly evidence from study abroad research provides strong support for global citizen development (Hanson, 2010; Killick, 2012). In the main, a great deal of this literature has been conceptualised and measured through a positivist paradigm (Morais & Ogden, 2010; Tarrant, 2010; Wynveen et al., 2012). Study abroad research has not greatly informed internationalisation of the curriculum as a way to broaden student global learning and understanding. Instead, a great deal of focus has been on measuring attributes or competencies. Overall, there has been little interpretive research investigating the ethical capacities that allow students to think like global citizens. In particular, there is little research on global citizen learning from an epistemological basis. According to Barnett (1997, p. 1), all universities aim to educate critical thinkers, however he considers that this concept needs to be expanded. Critical persons need to be critical thinkers, but also critical self-reflectors and critical in action. In this way they can be ‘critical beings’. Critical, ethical, and moral capacities are central to moral and transformative cosmopolitanism. These capacities foster students’ ability to transform perspectives, beliefs, and attitudes. Rizvi (2009, p. 258) and Marshall (2011, p. 424) have both called for research on cosmopolitan learning which is ethically grounded and empirically informed. As yet, this research is scarce. The findings and discussion in this chapter provide insight into this research gap.
Table 7.1 shows the two themes and five sub-themes that emerged from Study One Part Three to inform the process of global citizen learning and a deeper understanding of the student global mindset.

Table 7.1 Insights into the student mindset and global citizen learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME</th>
<th>SUB-THEME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The basis of global citizen learning</td>
<td>1. The foundational concept of cosmopolitanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Beyond vocational learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Terminology for global citizen learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Shared values of higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The mindset for global citizen learning</td>
<td>1. The critical moral and ethical capacities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Thinking differently</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3 Findings: Study One – Part Three

The findings in this chapter expand our understanding of the theory and practice of educating global citizens in higher education. The first theme, The basis of global citizen learning explains the cosmopolitan underpinning of global citizen learning and highlights its associated values and terminology for learning. The second theme, The mindset for global citizen learning is explained as the way students engage with their epistemic virtues (their thinking capacities). The critical and ethical capacities discussed in this chapter are the ‘tools’ that students use for interconnected moral and ethical thinking. These ‘tools’ work together in various ways and ‘fuel’ the student global mindset. The two themes in Chapter Seven provide insight and new knowledge on the pedagogical implications for educating global citizens.

7.4 Theme 1: The basis of global citizen learning

The findings in the first theme explain the philosophical and epistemological foundations of global citizen learning. There was a great deal of consensus in the way
Informants described the underpinning cosmopolitan values of the global citizen in Chapters Five and Six. The first sub-theme shown in Table 7.2 demonstrates the link between these values and a cosmopolitan approach to learning.

**Table 7.2** Theme 1 and supporting data for sub-theme 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-THEME 1</th>
<th>THEME 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The foundational concept of cosmopolitanism</td>
<td>1.1 <em>There is not a theoretical framework that could combine the notion of global citizenship... you can’t have rights and duties derived from a global something.</em> (EU 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 <em>We have to get our hands dirty and get into being, not prescriptive, but certainly normative to a degree. I think it probably comes back to liberal values... we should foster those social attributes which go to sociality itself. You know, tolerance, openness, consideration for others, collectivity in certain domains, making institutions work.</em> (AUS/NZ 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 <em>I think this is where the academy hasn’t necessarily been helpful because it’s gone into a cultural relativism which actually then comes right up against the universality of some of our core values.</em> (AUS/NZ 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 <em>I don’t have any kind of abstract universal view of cosmopolitanism. I’m not that kind of cosmopolitan thinker. I’m sort of saying, keep the possibilities of cosmopolitanism open, and there should be pedagogic possibilities of cosmopolitanism. So it’s the possibilities you’re highlighting.</em> (AUS/NZ 4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7.4.1 The foundational concept of cosmopolitanism**

The findings of Study One support the cosmopolitan basis of the global citizen, with only one informant rejecting a global citizen framework for learning. EU 8’s position is made clear in quote 1.1 in Table 7.2. This quote raises the contested territory of citizenship. This informant's perception was in stark contrast with that of the rest of the informants. Despite the intangibility of some aspects of the global citizen, the remainder of informants felt there was a need to infuse cosmopolitan values into twenty-first century frameworks for learning. For example, quote 1.2 (AUS/NZ 1) represents a consensus position of global citizen values identified in the findings of Study One. The dearth of explicit emphasis on values in education is then explained in quote 1.3 (AUS/NZ 5). This informant blames the academy for adopting relativism of values and argued that this conflicts with some of our universal core values. In contrast to accepting the status quo, quote 1.4 provides insight to moving forward in terms of global citizen learning. AUS/NZ 4 argues that cosmopolitanism should underpin university values. Furthermore, this informant felt that cosmopolitanism could be linked more directly to globally responsive
pedagogy. Therefore, using cosmopolitanism as an underpinning concept provides an explicit way of integrating the liberal values of the global citizen into learning. This pedagogical possibility is further explained in the next sub-theme shown with supporting data in Table 7.3.

Table 7.3 Theme 1 and supporting data for sub-theme 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-THEME 2</th>
<th>THEME 1 THE BASIS OF GLOBAL CITIZEN LEARNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beyond vocational learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 It gets a lot of lip service (sic global citizen values). There is a tremendous amount of consensus but very little attention, perhaps, to conceptual specifications as to how it is implemented and carried out. (EU 9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 I don’t think this is the taught curriculum but there is a general conversion of the social sensibility, the planetary sensibility, the cultural sensibility. But I don’t know that we could draw a straight line from what we do and what they are. (AUS/NZ 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 I think there’s that big conflict in higher education in general, between that whole transmission of professional knowledge and the idea about not just putting things into minds, but opening them up, which is surely the real purpose of higher education (AUS/NZ 19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 This is something you can’t teach people. You have to make them understand or to make them realise that they will learn, rather than saying you have to behave like this from now on. I think that’s important. (EU 25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 So ethics is certainly a very important point but how do you include that. That is much more in the liberal arts division and most the bachelor programs for Europe are not focused on that. So we still have the assumption that something you have learned in your primary and secondary education has values and now you have to be much more skill oriented which you can question if that’s still true. (EU 7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Now people are picking up their ideas and values from media and from peer groups and from families. And it’s in that context that I think the university might have to step in as a more objective and more public body devoted to the conditions that enable you to be public and objective. (AUS/NZ 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.4.2 Beyond vocational learning

Higher education has increasingly become focused on professional training to the detriment of values-based education consistent with educating global citizens. This sub-theme provides evidence for broadening the learning experience of students beyond vocational training. The first two quotes in Table 7.3 demonstrate the uncertainty many informants felt about turning the policy aim of the global citizen into an approach to learning. EU 8 explained there is strong support for the values of the global citizen, but little attention to “conceptual specifications as to how it is implemented”. AUS/NZ 5
quote 2.2) admitted that social responsibility aims consistent with the global citizen are on the policy table, yet there is no “straight line” from policy to teaching and learning. In the quote 2.3, AUS/NZ 19 explained how the drive for professional knowledge has narrowed the focus of education rather than broadened the learning experience, as one would expect of a university education. In quote 2.4, EU 25 captured the conundrum of broadening learning. Broader learning needs a different approach as there are “some things you can’t teach people” (EU 25), highlighting the need for alternative approaches to pedagogy. EU 7 (quote 2.5) now questions the assumption in higher education that an individual’s values system has been developed prior to attending university.

In the final quote, AUS/NZ 1 explains the influence of media and peers on student values. Therefore drawing on these findings, it suggests that universities have a role to provide the “conditions” of education that promote liberal values and objective thinking. Most informants felt that higher education has a responsibility to function as a public body devoted to the transmission of values and objective thought. As quoted previously by AUS/NZ 3, “we have become unpretentious about values and take things such as tolerance for granted”. The consensus position of informants in this research supported an explicit pedagogical approach to learning that strikes balance between vocational oriented learning and global citizen learning. The next sub-theme (supporting data shown in Table 7.4) explains the importance of understanding the terminology for global citizen learning.

**Table 7.4** Theme 1 and supporting data for sub-theme 3

| SUB-THEME 3 | THEME 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terminology for global citizen learning</td>
<td><strong>3.1</strong> <em>When we talk about larger external things (globalisation) we need to find language to do that. I think it means we draw from some of the sensibilities of the humanities as well as the social sciences, when we create a social science of globalisation</em> (AUS/NZ 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.2</strong> <em>I’d focus on ‘cosmopolitan’. I mean, it’s a long word, of course, which is one of the problems about using it. But it’s that relational cosmopolitism, that capacity to enter into the imaginative world of the other. It seems to me to be the central principle that you’re trying to get through, which is quite hard. It’s quite a jump. I think a lot of people find it hard.</em> (AUS/NZ 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.3</strong> <em>Epistemic virtues are those virtues that help us to think morally and productively about that extended notion of our belonging, not from the local sense but cosmopolitan one.</em> (AUS/NZ 4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.4.3 Terminology for global citizen learning

This sub-theme discusses terms that are important to understanding the process of global citizen learning. As highlighted in Chapters Five and Six, cosmopolitan thinking involves a paradigm shift for many people. This sub-theme suggests that it also requires an open attitude towards new terminology. Global citizen learning involves terms that may be unfamiliar, but are essential components of learning. In the quote 3.1 in Table 7.4, AUS/NZ 1 explains that the complexity of globalisation has preempted the need for “a social science of globalisation”. The cosmopolitan terms that emerged in the findings included hybridity, epistemic virtues, social imaginary, reflexivity and relationality. For instance, in quote 3.2, “relational cosmopolitanism” (AUS/NZ 1) is explained, as the way we imagine what it is like to be the ‘other’. This capacity triggers the personal awareness, sensitivity and empathy of the global citizen. In quote 3.3, AUS/NZ 4 described the capacities of global citizen learning as the “epistemic virtues”. These virtues allow students to engage in moral reasoning, and interconnected, and comparative thinking. Many or some of these terms will be unfamiliar, yet they capture the essence of thinking differently as a global citizen and are expanded on in the next theme. The cosmopolitan basis of global citizen learning is further described in the next sub-theme (shown with supporting data in Table 7.5) as the Shared values of higher education.

Table 7.5 Theme 1 and supporting data for sub-theme 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-THEME 4</th>
<th>THEME 1 THE BASIS OF GLOBAL CITIZEN LEARNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared values of higher education</td>
<td>4.1 So it's a question of having it as a sort of mandatory thread, cross-disciplinary values. So, yes, I think coming to a consensus around common values might not be so hard if the IUA took it up or someone took it up. I think that could be done. It would then be more a question of pushing for concrete take-up, if you will. (EU 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2. It's a subtle problem but it clearly, yes, obviously there's much scope to develop shared values and to find shared values and to develop them as well, new ones. One of the major shared values is a commitment to the global community, both itself and its freedoms. (AUS/NZ 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.4.4 Shared values of higher education

This sub-theme provides evidence for making the Shared values of higher education more explicit in the sector. The findings in Chapters Five, Six and Seven have consistently supported the liberal cosmopolitan values that underpin the global citizen. The majority of informants felt that ‘somehow’ they should be integrated into teaching.
The fourth sub-theme now suggests that it should be possible for universities to be more explicit, by committing to the cosmopolitan values that underpin our shared global existence. Quotes 4.1 and 4.2 in Table 7.5 and previous findings demonstrate that there is potential for universities to commit to the values that bond a common global humanity.

These four sub-themes expand our understanding of *The basis of global citizen learning*. First, cosmopolitanism can be thought of as a foundational concept for learning. It is underpinned by the liberal values the majority of informants identified with the global citizen. At the same time, the absence of explicit values in higher education was blamed on the relativism of values. This in itself could explain why there has been so little organisational support to date for effectively translating the global citizen from policy to practice. Furthermore, unfamiliar terminology challenges the synthesis of global citizen learning with vocational approaches. The final quote optimistically claims that it should be possible for universities to commit to values that underpin our shared global existence. The next theme introduces and brings together the critical, moral, and ethical capacities needed for global citizen learning. These capacities are explained as the conduit that enables a different way of thinking or a global citizen mindset.

### 7.5 Theme 2: The mindset for global citizen learning

IoC is designed to broaden students' mindsets for comparative global thinking yet to date there is little known about how this happens in students. This theme expands our understanding of this problem. The theme provides a snapshot of what is involved with the student global 'mindset for thinking' during the process of global citizen learning. The first sub-theme and supporting data are shown in Table 7.6 and are expanded on in the next section.
Table 7.6 Theme 2 and supporting data for sub-theme 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-THEME 1</th>
<th>THEME 2 THE MINDSET FOR GLOBAL CITIZEN THINKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The critical and ethical capacities</td>
<td>2.1 <em>What is more important? Is that the attitude dimension or actually the content and skills dimension? I’m a little bit traditional in the sense that I say we as higher education institutions should focus on content and skills and making the students able to change this attitude or not, we have nothing at all in the attitude dimension.</em> (EU 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 <em>The traditional definition of learning outcomes is what you know, what you understand and what you’re able to do and I will increasingly add attitudes to that. Not only what you’re able to do but what you’re willing to do.</em> (EU 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 <em>Graduates should be competent as, persons of the world rather than just persons of a locality or a nation, then that involves acknowledging that you’re talking about transforming their outlooks and them transforming outlooks of others... I think the key is whether they’ve undergone the imaginative challenge of working across culture and entering into another culture.</em> (AUS/NZ 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 <em>So the epistemic virtues that I talk about are relationality, reflexivity, and imagination. Those are the kind of virtues that become important once you accept the premise of the changing nature of our notions of belonging and how we belong.</em> (AUS/NZ 4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.5.1 The critical and ethical capacities

The critical and ethical capacities are explained in this sub-theme as the ‘tools’ of the student global mindset. These ‘tools’ activate and act as the ‘fuel’ for the students’ way of thinking, (their global mindset), as they develop their global knowledge and understanding. The four quotes in this sub-theme represent a spectrum of informant perspectives, suggesting the need for more reflexive approaches to learning. In the first quote in Table 7.6, EU 7 questions a personal assumption, recognising that there may be a need for higher education to take responsibility for developing student attitudes as well as knowledge and skills. This quote confirms previous informant data in Chapter Six on the role of universities for integrating values into teaching and learning approaches. EU 23 further explains the nature of changing learning needs in quote 2.2. This informant felt that learning outcomes should include ethical attitudes as well as competencies. These two quotes highlight how learning in an increasingly interconnected world involves critical and ethical capacities to broaden students’ thinking, beliefs and attitudes as well as employment competencies.
In quote 2.3 (Table 7.6), AUS/NZ 1 explains the ‘what’ and ‘why’ of this changing context of student learning. Students are intricately woven into a diverse local and global tapestry of identity, connectivities, and transformation. Moreover, AUS/NZ 1 highlights how important the cosmopolitan imaginary is for students to be able to see the world through the eyes and minds of others. By imagining what it is to be the ‘other’ we understand their perspective better. Through encounters, dialogue and a shared understanding, we have both the capacity to transform the outlooks of others or be transformed by others. In quote 2.4, AUS/NZ 4 describes these learning capacities as the “epistemic virtues”. In an attempt to simplify the terminology, the epistemic virtues are referred to in this research as the critical and ethical capacities that allow students to think differently. AUS/NZ 4 identified reflexivity, relationality and the social imaginary as the capacities students need for thinking differently. These terms were discussed in Chapter Three. These capacities enable students to engage with the hybridity of their changing identity and sense of belonging. They ‘tool and fuel’ a global mindset to deal with complexity and ambiguity. These capacities are further expanded in Theme 2 in the context of the developing student global mindset. They are further expanded in Chapter Eight in the context of the mobility students’ experience of change.

There was a distinct difference in the philosophy of learning between several European and Australian informants. Several European informants felt that there is very little understood in regard to student ethical attitudes. In contrast, several Australian informants were more expansive about the potential of pedagogy to foster students’ ability to think differently and change attitudes and perspectives. This interpretation is provided with caution. It is possible this observation is an artifact of unintended bias in participant selection, emphasis on questions and/or interpretive error in analysis by the interviewer. However on the basis of the available findings, The Critical and ethical capacities of the global citizen identified in the findings describe the way students think differently and transform perspectives, attitudes, attributes and behaviours. This process of learning is expanded on in the next sub-theme, Thinking differently. Table 7.7 provides the supporting data for sub-theme 2.
Thinking differently

Thinking differently is an underpinning recognisable marker for the global citizen and explains a function of the student global mindset. Informants described Thinking differently in several ways. For example in quote 2.1 in Table 7.7, AUS/NZ 5 explained that global citizens have the “habits of mind” for life as a way of reflecting and thinking critically about what they know and what they can do. Along a similar vein, AUS/NZ 1 (quote 2.2) described Thinking differently as relational cosmopolitanism and explained this as entering the imaginative world of the other; or imagining what something is like from their perspective. AUS/NZ 1 acknowledged this is a difficult concept to convey. However this research explains global citizen learning as a process that is underpinned by The critical and ethical capacities. Therefore, considering the capacities in this way provides a ‘toolbox’ for academics and students to engage with global citizen learning.

Quotes 2.3 and 2.4 from AUS/NZ 19 associated global citizen learning with the basics of sociology. Thinking differently from this informant’s perspective is having the “ways of thought” and “basics of knowing”. The “ways of thought” can be thought of as The critical and ethical capacities that contribute to students’ “basics of knowing” and their developing epistemic beliefs. This sociological perspective is also linked to the

Table 7.7  Theme 2 and supporting data for sub-theme 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-THEME 2</th>
<th>THE MINDSET FOR GLOBAL CITIZEN THINKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thinking differently</td>
<td>2.1 I think that the 'habits of mind', whether that is interpreted as critical thinking, reflection, openness, resilience and having that as a habit of mind for life and as an integrated part of what our graduates know and can do. (AUS/NZ 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 But it’s that relational cosmopolitism, that capacity to enter into the imaginative world of the other. It seems to me to be the central principle that you’re trying to get through, which is quite hard. (AUS/NZ 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 I think it’s more about having ‘ways of thought’ that people ought to have and that ideally, if we get back to the fundamental issue, what’s a global citizen from an education point of view? It ought to be somebody who is open and understand the way cultures play out around the globe. (AUS/NZ 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 It’s often about the very’ basics of knowing’ that cultures differ and it’s about the social construction of these sorts of things. And it’s almost one of the basics – it’s Sociology 101 in some respects, but it’s not the kind of things that you encounter in engineering curricula or in business. (AUS/NZ 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 I think that everybody needs to be taught systems thinking. I don’t mean systems theory. They just need to be taught the connectivity between one thing and another… So we change the way people think, which of course is at the heart of sustainability. (AUS/NZ 6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.5.2 Thinking differently
Thinking differently is an underpinning recognisable marker for the global citizen and explains a function of the student global mindset. Informants described Thinking differently in several ways. For example in quote 2.1 in Table 7.7, AUS/NZ 5 explained that global citizens have the “habits of mind” for life as a way of reflecting and thinking critically about what they know and what they can do. Along a similar vein, AUS/NZ 1 (quote 2.2) described Thinking differently as relational cosmopolitanism and explained this as entering the imaginative world of the other; or imagining what something is like from their perspective. AUS/NZ 1 acknowledged this is a difficult concept to convey. However this research explains global citizen learning as a process that is underpinned by The critical and ethical capacities. Therefore, considering the capacities in this way provides a ‘toolbox’ for academics and students to engage with global citizen learning.

Quotes 2.3 and 2.4 from AUS/NZ 19 associated global citizen learning with the basics of sociology. Thinking differently from this informant’s perspective is having the “ways of thought” and “basics of knowing”. The “ways of thought” can be thought of as The critical and ethical capacities that contribute to students’ “basics of knowing” and their developing epistemic beliefs. This sociological perspective is also linked to the
social imaginary. This informant’s view reinforces how the complexity of globalisation and a hybridised society have precipitated a need for more adaptive, interdisciplinary “ways of thought” in learning approaches for all students. Along a similar vein, quote 2.5 from AUS/NZ 6 Thinking differently was equated with “systems thinking”. Using sustainability as an example, students need to be able to expand their thinking to recognise the interconnections between knowledge, concepts, and constructs. They need to think broadly, imaginatively and differently. Not all students will have the opportunity to travel, study sociology, theory of education, systems thinking or the humanities; however different ways of thinking could be fostered within all disciplinary learning.

Overall, the findings in this theme demonstrate that Thinking differently as a global citizen involves “ways of thought”, “ways of knowing” and “habits of mind” and “systems thinking” that enable students to think imaginatively, critically, relationally and reflexively about knowledge in different situational contexts. Clearly, the aim for educating global citizens is to foster a student global mindset that allows perspectives to broaden. For example, EU 25 in the previous theme explained how learning to be a global citizen needs a different approach to teaching and learning as “it can’t be taught” as a technical skill. However Thinking differently occurs by fostering students’ critical and ethical capacities.

As part of a global citizen mindset, students must understand the nature of their transforming identity, hybridity, and self-formation as they engage with complexity. Students engaging in global citizen learning are in a process of ongoing self-formation. It could be possible to embed global citizen learning into IoC across university programs. While disciplinary learning is specifically focused on workplace competencies, it is likely that all disciplinary paradigms have underlying theories and concepts that can be addressed in learning through the global citizen mindset. The findings are now integrated with the extant literature in the next section to provide further theoretical depth to the pedagogical implications for educating global citizens.

7.6 Discussion

The findings in this chapter provide insight into the process of global citizen learning and the student mindset. The predominant emphasis in education for skill development and employment outcomes (i.e. vocational learning) has overshadowed more challenging approaches to learning. A broader approach identified by informants in the current research is consistent with a cosmopolitan approach to global citizen learning.
Twenty-five informants were in favour of an education consistent with the shared values of cosmopolitanism. The reporting of the findings here, as well as in Chapters Five and Six, align with moral and transformative cosmopolitanism described by Vertovec and Cohen (2002), discussed in Chapter Three. Yet many informants voiced a degree of uncertainty in the way universities could achieve this outcome.

The vocational emphasis of contemporary higher education learning environments has been blamed for narrowing graduate cognitive capabilities towards more inflexible and simplistic thinking (Furedi, 2009; Kholberg, 1984). Moreover, it has been claimed that when faced with uncertainty and a lack of understanding, people tend to revert to tradition, rather than transformational thinking (Mezirow, 2000b, p. 3). As such, an exclusive neoliberal lens for education, focused solely on skill development, is incompatible with the educational needs of the twenty-first century. As confirmed by informants in the findings, universities have adopted the relativism of values. One informant explained the link between relativism and the absence of moral reasoning and ethics in teaching and learning.

AUS/NZ 5 stated that the lack of emphasis on moral values was due to the academy’s penchant for cultural relativism. Several authors have commented on the risks of relativism of values. Furedi (2009) argued that relativism in education emerged as the New Left mistakenly associated cosmopolitanism with capitalism. Yet a relativist stance to values conflicts with the core liberal values of a democratic society, as indicated by AUS/NZ 5. Moreover D’Arms (2005) felt that unfettered relativity promotes a world without a locus of concern, and as a consequence enters a space where nothing matters. More specifically, Scott (2004a, p. 439) attested to this opinion, in respect of higher education’s attitude to values, calling it a “conspiracy of silence and culture of disinterest”. Informants in Chapters Six and Seven echoed this sentiment.

EU 8 and AUS/NZ 1 commented on the possibility of identifying the shared values of higher education. Yet there has been little scholarly debate on balancing the relativism of values in higher education. D’Arms (2005) and Li (2007) both suggested ways to progress this issue. First, D’Arms thought that when aiming to promote values in a diverse environment, it should be possible to differentiate between issues of common moral concern (core liberal values), and those that are legitimate to vary in a relative way (accommodating other values). Along a similar vein, Li (2007) asserted the possibility of taking a culturally relativist stance without abandoning a commitment to liberal values. These views could provide a guide for universities striving to recruit culturally diverse international students. The findings of this research study suggested
that it should be possible to integrate values into disciplinary learning in higher education.

The concept of embedding cosmopolitan values and fostering global citizen learning in university education needs to be supported and articulated throughout the entire organisational environment. The role of university leadership in this endeavour was discussed in Chapter Six. Much earlier, Kohlberg (1984) confirmed the importance of leadership. He argued that morality should be institutionally explicit in higher education if students are to develop a set of defensible moral values. De Botton (2012, p. 12) highlighted one of the impediments to this goal by highlighting that secular society avoided discussing morality, as it confused morality with prudishness. In contrast, advocates such as Kidder (2001) claimed that creating a values-based culture is the principal task of education in the early 21st century. Furthermore, Kidder claimed that engaging in values-based education represents the best risk-management policy for the 21st century. Yet, as identified in Chapter Six, university leaders do not necessarily 'walk the talk' in relation to their espoused aims for social responsibility.

An explicit commitment from leadership to infuse values across the organisation offers a way to broaden students' expectations of learning beyond vocational goals. Values could be used as a stimulus for shared learning and understanding in the multicultural classroom and campus, in contrast to oversight or avoidance of value discourses. Education underpinned by cosmopolitanism holds potential for developing the values and attitudes consistent with the global citizen. The findings in this chapter suggest that fostering students' critical and ethical capacities facilitates a global mindset suitable for global citizen learning.

The cosmopolitan foundation of global citizen learning requires an understanding of the *Terminology for global citizen learning*. A shared understanding of cosmopolitan values and terminology was identified in the findings as important for institutional, academic and student engagement with global citizen learning. *The critical and ethical capacities* for global citizen learning were described in the findings as the social imaginary, reflexivity, relationality or collectively as epistemic virtues (defined previously). These capacities can be fostered through reflection on challenging intercultural encounters, dialogue, and relationships with others. In this context, the moral and ethical capacities of the global citizen represent the 'tools and fuel' of the global citizen mindset. These capacities foster self-development and can contribute to the transformation of others. While personal transformation has been recognised as a benefit of student mobility programs, learning environments can be designed 'at home'
through different learning activities to engage all students to develop their critical and ethical capacities.

Global citizen learning can be thought of as a shared process that occurs when individuals engage with their critical and ethical capacities (social imaginary, reflexivity, and relationality) during encounters with others. The transformation potential of engaging with cultural others was highlighted by AUS/NZ. He/she discussed the important role of the imaginary in self-transformation and the possibility of transforming others. Similarly, Delanty (2011) explained how cosmopolitan transformation occurs during relational encounters with others. He argued that transformation is contingent on the specific context of an interpersonal encounter and the intervening dialogue that occurs. By engaging with our own critical and ethical capacities and **Thinking differently** we are able to incorporate the perspectives of others into our own worldview. This process of thinking and learning has the potential to transform perspectives, beliefs, and opinions. Self-formation occurs in response to this reflexive and relational learning experience (Marginson & Sawir, 2011). Furthermore, self-formation expands an individual's understanding of a plural sense of identity and belonging. While university campuses provide opportunities for students to engage in relational encounters, unless students have a global mindset they do not have the thinking capacities to engage effectively in these encounters.

‘Hybridity’ is an important aspect of global citizen learning because it describes the plural sense of our identity and belonging. Students’ ‘hybridity’ represents their intersecting social and cultural histories and the social existence of their multiple belongings (Luke & Luke, 2000; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; Scholte, 2005, p. 262). Students are influenced by the impacts of globalisation and the ongoing dynamic, global flow of ideas and cultures in their learning and social environments. Understanding their ‘social changing self’ enables students to open their minds and consider possibilities beyond ‘the way it has always been’. They are able to think more critically and consider alternative perspectives and possibilities. Our hybrid identity is continually in a process of self-formation and is an important aspect of learning. For instance, Marginson and Sawir (2011) argued that all transitions in learning involve degrees of self-formation.

The foundational aspects of the global citizen comprise the individual attributes and recognizable markers identified in Chapter Five. Chapter Seven has expanded the meaning of the global citizen in higher education to incorporate the process for global citizen learning. Learning occurs relationally in terms of contextual interpersonal
encounters, dialogue, and relationships. Student transformation occurs as a result of the dynamic interaction of identity, sensitivity, cultural humility, tolerance, awareness, empathy, respect, responsibility, and agency. The critical and ethical capacities of the global citizen include the social imaginary, reflexivity, relationality, and criticality. The global citizen thinks differently. IoC is the organisational strategy most suitable for transmitting global citizen learning principles, tools and practice into teaching and learning and will be expanded on in Chapter Nine.

### 7.7 Summary: Chapter Seven

This chapter suggests that the tensions of vocational and liberal learning can be balanced by fostering the critical and ethical capacities and a global citizen mindset to think differently. Industry key informants reported their desire for universities to move beyond paying ‘lip service’ to the values of the global citizen but were cognisant of the challenges of integrating values into teaching and learning. The global citizen described in the findings is consistent with a moral and transformative cosmopolitan paradigm. As such, the paradigm provides a strong philosophical, epistemological and ontological basis to translate the global citizen into teaching and learning. In this way students are better equipped to deal with a globally complex and ambiguous existence.

Chapters Five, Six, and Seven have addressed the research questions for Objectives One and Two of this research program. These findings have expanded our understanding of what a global citizen and global citizen learning mean from the key informant perspective. While these findings are valuable, there is still a gap in understanding how the theoretical, practical, and epistemological lenses reported from this study compare with the student-lived experience of becoming a global citizen. In contrast to numerous quantitative studies, limited qualitative research has investigated the way in which students become global citizens, for instance see Jones (2009), Killick (2012) and Schattle (2008). It is widely acknowledged that a mobility experience can transform students’ beliefs and perspectives (Morais & Ogden, 2010; Savicki & Selby, 2008; Selby, 2008) but the way in which this occurs is uncertain. Study Two of this research program provides a different perspective to previous research. Chapter Eight reports how students described change as a result of the mobility experience, and the reasons students thought they had changed.

Figure 7.1 provides a visual representation of how the findings in Study One and have come together to expand our understanding of what it means to be a global citizen and how this construction of the global citizen contributes to the student global mindset.
The conceptualisation of what it means to be and become a global citizen is expanded further in Chapters Eight and Nine.
Figure 7.1  Conceptualising the global citizen

THE GLOBAL CITIZEN

'MEAL GLOBAL GRADUATE'

THE STUDENT GLOBAL MINDSET

- More than a list of attributes
- Beyond narrow definitions
- Strategic ambiguity
- Hybrid identity
- An attitude
- Thinking differently
- Moral and ethical capacities
- Moral and transformative cosmopolitanism
- Broad markers of recognition
8.0 Exploring mobility and student change

8.1 Overview: Study Two

Prominent authors in international education have identified knowledge gaps in our understanding of the global citizen in respect of mobility, the student mindset in learning, and IoC. First, according to Savicki and Selby (2008), little is known about what happens to students during their transformational experiences abroad and how this may inform IoC. Second, Leask (2012) explained that little is understood about the impact of IoC on the student mindset. Moreover, it is considered that there is a lack of evidence on the effectiveness of IoC for student learning (Jones, 2013c). On the other hand, Killick (2012) highlighted the need to consider the student as a global citizen beyond mobility, suggesting that becoming a global citizen could be thought of as an extension of becoming a local citizen, and not exclusively in the context of travel. Moreover, students can be psychologically challenged when crossing cultural boundaries. Caruana (2012b, p. 4) suggested that new approaches to learning are necessary to foster students’ intercultural learning understanding.

Collectively, these authors highlight the need for a more in-depth understanding of the global citizen in contemporary higher education. In particular, there is a need to understand the student mindset as they learn to become local and global citizens, and in the context of IoC. Therefore, the focus of Study Two was to explore the student experience of change facilitated by mobility, to expand our understanding of the process of change that is consistent with learning to become a global citizen.

8.1.1 Study aims and questions

The overall research aim is to develop a deeper understanding of the global citizen from concept to practice.

The specific research program objectives are:

1. To build a conceptual understanding of the global citizen
2. To identify what a global citizen means in practical terms
3. To examine the organisational enablers and constraints to educating global citizens
4. To understand the students’ experience of change associated with an international mobility experience
5. To explore ways universities can foster all students to develop as global citizens.
These objectives were contextualised in Study Two:

- To understand the factors common to mobility that facilitate change for students
- To identify the shared manifestations of student change
- To identify how the student experience of change expands our understanding of the
global citizen and the student global mindset for learning in higher education.

The semi-structured interviews were guided by the following:

- What have students learnt as a result of the mobility experience?
- What are the ‘key changes’ in regard to self-awareness, awareness of others, culture
and society they have experienced (if any)?
- Can students identify any particular perspective/s that changed after the mobility
experience?
  o Why do they think this occurred?
  o In what way has this impacted on them (for instance on their lives, career goals, and
relationships)?
- Can students explain what may have facilitated or caused the changes they
experienced?
- How do students think universities could influence students who do not travel to
broaden their perspectives and think differently?

Part One of Study Two focuses on the reasons why students changed. These
findings construct an understanding of the facilitators of change, the student mindset
during change, and the process of becoming a global citizen. Part Two of Study Two
focuses on the ways students manifest change, to provide insight into what a global
citizen means in practical terms. The findings from Study Two stand alone as evidence of
the student experience of becoming a global citizen and provide a contrasting source of
evidence to the key informant findings in Study One to consider from another
worldview. The following section outlines the research approach for Study Two.

8.2 The research approach

The overarching research approach, methodology, methods and process of analysis used
in Study Two are consistent with those of Study One and have been discussed previously
in Chapter Four. In contrast to Study One, Study Two sought to obtain detailed and rich
data from Australian and European mobility students as another source of evidence to
meet the aim and objectives of the research. The converging lines of evidence between
the two studies strengthen the authenticity of the research findings (Yin, 2009). The two sources of data provide a wide scope for interpretation of common and contrasting issues and support the quality and rigour of the research program (Yin, 2009). The following sections provide information on the participants in Study Two.

8.2.1 Participants

Participants in Study Two were public health students from an Australian-European funded mobility project. Purposive sampling was a preferable choice of sampling, as the researcher considered the mobility students would provide relevant in-depth data to inform the research objectives (Oliver, 2006). Mobility students were specifically chosen for this study as it has been argued that mobility experiences accelerate participant transformation (Savicki & Selby, 2008). Hence, researching with this sub-population rather than a broader cross section of students including non-mobile students was considered most appropriate to address the stated research objectives for study two and the broader research program. There was a degree of procedural uniformity of the mobility experience for the participants through the overarching funding and administrative arrangements for the mobility project. Participants were recipients of a mobility scholarship (AUS$10,000). The researcher was Australian Coordinator of the Mobility Project and there were 40 Australian and 40 European students in the participant pool. The two key informant students from Study One (not from the Mobility Project), EU 25 and EU 26, also provided insight to two themes in Study Two. Their quotes (as mobility students) have been included in this chapter, as their evidence enriched the data set.

The chosen participants were students who responded to an email interview request from the researcher and with whom face-to-face interviews were possible. Students were involved with either Bachelor or Masters programs. The age of the participants ranged from 18-45 years and they had undertaken either a six or twelve month mobility program. The researcher had been involved with teaching and/or administration in the project, had visited the four European universities and was known to all participants. This level of familiarity enabled ease with email correspondence, arranging interviews and opening the interview dialogue. There was a level of trust established with the students prior to and during interviews. This situation was conducive to rapport and a productive interpersonal climate for the researcher to obtain the students' views and perceptions of personal experiences (Minichiello et al., 2008). All interviews were carried out in a relaxed and informal manner in settings selected by the students.
Due to the interviewer’s involvement with the Project, the risk of students providing unrepresentative responses to interview questions was considered on several levels. Neuman’s (2006) advice for avoiding interviewer bias was adhered to during all interviews. For instance, steps were taken to avoid errors by students. First, as a principle of the Hermeneutic Circle, the Interaction Between Researcher and Participant was considered at all times (Klein & Myers, 1999). The researcher, as a participant in the interpretive research process, was working on a reflexive, sensitive and responsive level when interacting with the students, but still fully aware of the unavoidable power differential between the researcher and students. Several steps were taken to minimize the influence of social desirability bias in students’ responses (Polit & Beck, 2004, p. 732). The relationship of the current research and the researcher’s role was made clear to all students at the outset. The students were reassured that the research and researcher had no direct connection to students’ academic program or university. Next, it was explained to students that there was no right or wrong answer to the interview questions. The purpose of the research was to hear ‘their story’ and learn from their experiences of change. Reflexive probes were used when the researcher considered the student’s response needed clarifying or confirming. The researcher tried at all times to avoid influencing the students’ responses. Furthermore, a full and detailed explanation was provided to students on confidentiality to ensure that they understood that there would be no personal identifying data.

8.2.2 Interviews
Semi-structured in-depth interviews were an ideal form of data collection to inform the research objectives of the research program. It was important to draw from mobility students’ knowledge, interpretations and perceptions of their experiences of change. In this way a more in-depth understanding of the conceptual and contextual relevance of students’ personal change and development (the phenomenon of interest) could be obtained. This level of social reality cannot be elicited from quantitative methods (Minichiello et al., 2008). Two pilot interviews were carried out to test the suitability of the interview questions (Neuman, 2006). These participants were asked if there were any other issues of importance to their experience that they would like to offer. For instance, in the pilot study, participants commented that the majority of students would not necessarily know what ‘global citizen’ meant. Similarly, Bourne (2010, p. 24) found in a small video chat room study (n=30) that students were ambivalent about their own identity and were dubious about the term ‘global citizen’. Therefore, it was made clear to students that the interviews were specifically focused on their experiences of change occurring as the result of mobility. They were not asked to think about themselves as global citizens.
All first round interviews were conducted face-to-face in a time period as close to the completion of the mobility experience as possible. There were twenty-one students interviewed (EU= 12, AUS= 9). Interviews were between 45-60 minutes in duration. The interviews were carried out during field trips to three European countries and two Australian states. An Australian Endeavour Postgraduate Fellowship Award supported the field trips for interviews. A second round of interviews was conducted with students (15-45 minutes). These interviews were carried out approximately six to twelve months following the mobility experience with seven European and four Australian students. These interviews sought to revisit data on issues students considered significant to personal change from the first interview. Recall bias was not considered as a limitation to the slight variance to the timing of interviews due to the self-reported significance of issues discussed (Minichiello et al., 2008). The second round of interviews was less structured (n=11, EU= 7, AUS= 4) than the first. Four of these interviews were carried out by Skype. Students were reminded of the key aspect/s of change from their previous interview and were asked to reflect on how/why or if at all they had changed since their last interview. All interviews were recorded and transcribed.

Iterative question development occurred over the data collection period to pursue emerging areas of interest. For instance, students who admitted to mixing little with intercultural others were still keen to discuss how interpersonal relationships with co-nationals were influential to their personal growth and development. This aspect was reflexively explored and contributed to the Interpersonal encounters and Interpersonal relationship themes. Key issues were probed with students during the first and second round of interviews. Over the entire research process the researcher attempted to avoid eliciting purely, “yes” and “no” answers. However, where this occurred and students either failed to expand, or wandered from the question, the short answers were used during the analysis to support the relevance of other more detailed answers. Limitations of Study Two are discussed in the next section.

8.3 Limitations of Study Two

Confidentiality is not usually addressed as a limitation. The next section explains why confidentiality was an ethical issue for the reporting of detailed information about mobility.
8.3.1 Confidentiality

The expert field of industry key informants in international higher education is quite small in comparison to other fields. Moreover, due to the small cohort of students (10 students) from each of the eight participating universities in the AUS-EU Joint Mobility Project, caution necessitated avoidance of comparisons of the student data in terms of length of sojourn, Bachelor or Master Program, age, gender, or European country of origin (or Australian state), to protect student confidentiality and concerns of reporting and omission bias (Neuman, 2006). Therefore, the researcher was limited at times to either expanding interview questions or including some of the detailed comments provided by students during the interviews. In this way, student confidentiality was assured in accordance with Griffith University ethical requirements. Where age or regional comparisons have been made in the findings, they are of a general nature and do not conflict with confidentiality.

The student quotes are referred to by Roman numerals (i-xxi) and a suffix is used for European (EU) or Australian (AUS). This differentiates student data from informant referencing used in Study One. The next section describes another limitation of the study.

8.3.2 “Like”: The curse of Generation Y conversation

All 21 students provided considerable evidence of developing global citizen attributes, cosmopolitan values and behaviours which they related to their mobility experience. However, the overuse of the word “like” by many of the students created a challenge in reporting the data effectively. It was at times difficult for the researcher to effectively demonstrate the evidence in a way that could be easily understood by the reader. Some European students struggled with their English and embraced ‘like’ as a key word in conversation. Yet, Australian students’ threads of conversation were equally difficult to follow at times due to over use of the word ‘like’. Peters (2010), a lexicographer, claimed, “all the citations and study in the world can’t dispute the reality that saying “like” too much makes people sound like morons”. While a harsh statement, the overuse of the word ‘like’ acted as a severe limitation in providing succinct examples of evidence suitable for readable quotes in a research thesis.

Quotes that have been included are still at times difficult to decipher. For example the student responsible for the following quote had a truly transformative experience and has completely changed his/her personal, career and life goals. However, the written transcript is difficult to follow and has not been included in the findings. In such cases, the researcher would give probes to confirm that she understood what the student was saying. While the particularly poor quotes have not been included in the overall findings, these answers were used to confirm the significance of other
more detailed findings during the analysis. The following quote is provided as an example:

It's just all this experience like with the other students – it's – as I told you it's like open more mind... Is like I become even more, more like – I was friendly person like but I mean I become more friendly and like also – I'm stuck for words – it's like you're not alone. In my country we say just Indians or Africans or something and now they are for me – like they are so nice people.

Nevertheless, the research provides a solid cross sample of the findings from as many participants as possible however some students appear more frequently. The next section provides a summary of the findings for Study Two.

8.4 Overview of Study Two

Study Two is explained through three main groupings of data. These three categories provide considerable insight for understanding the student experience of change occurring as the result of mobility. The categories of data relate to: facilitators of student change (Part One), a mindset for change (Part Two) and the manifestations of change (Part Three). Figure 8.1 explains how the three parts of Study Two come together to describe the experience of mobility and student change.

Figure 8.1 The three categories of data for Study Two

Next, Table 8.1 presents the themes and sub-themes for Part One, Part Two and Part Three of Study Two.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Sub-theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part One</strong></td>
<td><strong>Facilitators of change</strong></td>
<td><strong>1. Out of the comfort zone</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Culture shock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legitimising change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The positive aspect of culture shock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nudging the comfort zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2. Interpersonal encounters</strong></td>
<td>Influenced by encounters with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-realisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Passively engaging domestic and international students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3. Interpersonal relationships</strong></td>
<td>Learning about relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Different friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4. Cosmopolitan role model</strong></td>
<td>Personal experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comparative learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Role model influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Motivational and inspirational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part Two</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mindset for change</strong></td>
<td><strong>1. Thinking differently</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Questioning assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thinking comparatively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledging fault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part Three</strong></td>
<td><strong>Manifestations of change</strong></td>
<td><strong>1. Broadening perspectives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seeing the world differently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thinking comparatively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2. Accelerated maturity</strong></td>
<td>Coping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soul searching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3. Cosmopolitan hospitality</strong></td>
<td>Other focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Empathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Willing and welcoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4. Widening horizons</strong></td>
<td>Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Study and career goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.5 Findings: Part One- Facilitators of student change

All students underwent significant personal growth and transformation as the result of their mobility experience. They demonstrated attributes and dimensions consistent with previous research on the global citizen (Killick, 2012; Morais & Ogden, 2010; Schatte, 2008). In contrast to previous research, the analysis of Study Two findings has conceptualised the student experience of mobility in terms of the facilitators of change, the mindset for change and the manifestations of change. These three categories of data come together to provide new insight to the process of global citizen learning. Study Two has gained insight to the student mindset during change and the process of global citizen learning. In this way, Study Two presents a picture of students’ change within their social reality (Minichiello et al., 2008). This process is further explained through the cross-case analysis in Chapter Nine.

In Part One of Study Two, the facilitators of change are explained through the themes Out of the comfort zone, Interpersonal encounters, Learning through interpersonal relationships, Thinking differently and the Cosmopolitan role model. Then again in Study Two, the manifestations of change are explained by the four themes: Broadening perspectives, Cosmopolitan hospitality, Accelerated maturity and Widening horizons. Each theme and sub-theme is provided in table form for ease of reference to the supporting data and is briefly described, then followed by a broader discussion of Study Two. The key analytical concepts of Study Two are integrated with Study One in Chapter Nine. In this way the complementary findings of both studies are synthesised to provide an in-depth understanding of what a global citizen and the process of global citizen learning means in contemporary higher education. The sub-themes and supporting data for Theme 1 are shown in Table 8.2.
Table 8.2  Theme 1 sub-themes 1, 2 and 3 and supporting data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-THEMES</th>
<th>THEME 1</th>
<th>OUT OF THE COMFORT ZONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUB-THEME 1</td>
<td>1.1 When I arrived in Australia I was kind of in a state of shock. Because I realised that I’m the oldest student at the university and also in the students’ accommodation. And then I think you have certain thoughts or imaginations about how your dream is or looks like. But it was not – it was different. So this was really hard. It felt like a shock.</td>
<td>(EU vi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture shock</td>
<td>1.2 So I was really sick and homesick. I didn’t have a phone then so I couldn’t really call home. There was no Internet connection at the dorms. We were in the middle of nowhere. No one spoke English. No one was smiling at us and I didn’t know any of these people. I cried and cried and just watched crap TV for probably two days.</td>
<td>(AUS xxi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Arriving was probably the worst experience of my life, absolutely, that was horrible. I was ready to pack up and leave the minute I got there.</td>
<td>(AUS xv)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB-THEME 2</td>
<td>1.4 I think being overseas, you’re allowed to change into the person you’d like to be. Unless you’re actually put in that situation yourself… it just changes everything.</td>
<td>(AUS xv)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimising change</td>
<td>1.5 We don’t talk to strangers. We don’t let anybody hit on us. And over there it was just everybody was talking to everybody. When I was asking who it was, “I don’t know.” And I was, “Okay.” And it was kind of different to me. That’s one example. But I liked it. It was a totally new world for me.</td>
<td>(EU v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB-THEME 3</td>
<td>1.6 Making the global citizen more concrete? Well, culture shock. But it doesn’t have to be a shock because that’s negative. I think cultural – yes, it has to be – find a positive word for culture shock. That’s what you need, actually.</td>
<td>(EU 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The positive aspect of culture shock</td>
<td>1.7 If there’s someone there babying you through the process then what are you going to get out of it. There won’t be any self-reflection, there won’t be any self-realisations because people are taking you through the process and I think that exchange is good because you’re getting out of your comfort zone.</td>
<td>(AUS xx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 It was a negative experience but it was more…in a negative situation you constantly have to be like, what do I stand for, what do I want to believe, who do I want to be as a person…there is a choice to grow more in negative situations.</td>
<td>(AUS xiv)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.5.1 Theme 1: Out of the comfort zone

Being *Out of the comfort zone* describes the central facilitator of change described by students. Not only were students separated from friends and family, they needed to cope independently in all aspects of their lives. Students felt these coping experiences allowed them to grow personally and intellectually. Being *Out of the comfort zone* challenged them greatly. For instance, many students felt isolated without Internet access. For some, this took some weeks to organise. They also needed to think beyond themselves to consider others in share housing and travel. Many students had never lived away from home. They needed to deal with unfamiliar situations, cultures, encounters, and relationships.

Theme 1 is explained through four sub-themes: *Culture shock*, *Legitimising change*; The positive aspect of culture shock; and Nudging the comfort zone at home. However, as exemplified in quote 1.1 (EU vi), *Culture shock* was not just an artifact of age or immaturity of students; all students were challenged. Quotes 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 (Table 8.2) from EU vi, AUS xxi, AUS xv provide contrast between students from the oldest and youngest age brackets respectively (40-45 and 20-25 years). These quotes show that regardless of age, maturity, region of origin, and gender, it is very hard to prepare for the unknown and know intuitively how to regain the loss of personal balance. All students experienced varying degrees of shock as they transitioned from their safe home environment to a foreign one.

In the sub-theme *Culture Shock* (Table 8.2), EU vi, AUS xxi and AUS xv (in quotes 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3) explained how they felt when they were out of their comfort zone. EU vi, an older student, explained how you have “imaginations about how your dream is or looks like... but it was not”... “It felt like a shock”. Similarly, AUS xv described shock as “probably the worst experience of my life”. Students experienced varying levels of emotional stress, homesickness, and loneliness during this time.

The sub-theme *Legitimising change* (Table 8.2) starts to explain why being *Out of the comfort zone* is such a transformative experience. In the previous sub-theme, AUS xv described culture shock as “the worst experience”. Yet the student felt that being *Out of the comfort zone* legitimises change and created a situation where “you’re allowed to change into the person you’d like to be” (AUS xv). In a different context, EU v explained how dealing with a completely different culture of gender distance and formality was a new but welcome experience, “But I liked it. It was a totally new world for me” (EU v). This student’s eye opening experience made it legitimate to *Think differently* about previous assumptions and cultural norms.
The relevance of the third sub-theme, *The positive aspect of culture shock* (Table 8.2), came directly from the student stories. They felt that universities could capitalise on this aspect better in terms of designing learning for students who do not travel. As explained by EU 25, “find a positive word for culture shock”. All students recognised how much they learnt from coping with being out of their comfort zone. Quotes 1.7 and 1.8 from AUS xx and xiv highlighted how self-reflection and self-realisation (facilitated by these disorienting experiences) came together as part of their self-formation in the global citizen learning process. These students explained how being thrown into emotionally charged situations and dealing with adversity facilitated an internal struggle for reflecting on self-identity and self-worth. Negative situations provided “a choice to grow” (AUS xiv). All students acknowledged the positive aspect of culture shock.

**Table 8.3** Theme 1 sub-theme 4 and supporting data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-THEME 4</th>
<th>THEME 1 OUT OF THE COMFORT ZONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nudging the comfort zone at home</td>
<td>1.9 <em>We always declare that internationalisation at home is not working at the moment because people stay in their comfort zone. If you don’t change the social environment that people are living in, they will not look for or they will not take up the different factors which are playing.</em> (EU 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.10 <em>But the general thing is you don’t really have to turn everything upside down and throw a student in the middle of nowhere, just to learn respect for a different culture or for a different religion.</em> (EU 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.11 <em>Getting the hang of life in another place gives you the self-confidence of being able to travel wherever you want, and finding a way to survive and adapting to different situations. When you know the basics of getting around, then you’ll start learning more and being able to bond and socialise with people from the local population.</em> (EU 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.12 <em>Yeah there are a lot of people I know that don’t like being out of their comfort zone and I think that’s a bigger thing. I don’t think it’s not that they’re not interested, they don’t go exploring beyond. … You just learn to adapt like to me, this is my double home theory – to me they’re not used to adapting to a different social status, they’ve never been taught to push their comfort zone, it’s like you haven’t given yourself a chance to break away and be independent.</em> (AUS xvii)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth sub-theme, *Nudging the comfort zone at home* (Table 8.3), offered insight to the student mindset and possibilities for IoC and IaH. In quote 1.9, EU 25, explained that “Internationalisation at Home is not working” yet. The student explained that “if you don’t change the social environment”, you can’t look for, or see the different
ways of the world. EU 26 in quote 1.10 thought that it would be possible to create situations for domestic students in that "you don't really have to turn everything upside down and throw a student in the middle of nowhere, just to learn respect". The possibility of Nudging the comfort zone at home was further explained in quote 1.12 by AUS xvii. In Australia, this student had moved from a rural primary school to a regional high school and then to a capital city university. The student had already been taken out of the comfort zone in without traveling overseas.

Students don't need to have left the country to change, however they do need to move away from their safe and known social environments to face challenges. AUS xvii described this as the "double home theory", if you don't push the comfort zone "you have never given yourself a chance to break away and be independent" (AUS xvii). As explained by EU 25, “getting the hang of life in another place gives you the confidence to travel wherever you want”. Students need to realise how important and beneficial it is to nudge their zone of comfort and "learn to adapt" (AUS xvii). Students felt this learning changed them exponentially. They explained how confidence is built from each challenging situation, and that in turn, builds more confidence and self-esteem. These ‘maturing’ situations helped students to think differently and see the world through different eyes.

When students were asked about how were they able to move on from their state of shock, many students spoke about how they were influenced by meeting different people. Students described how interpersonal encounters and exchange with others provided a foil for them to regain their momentum and move on to a more comfortable space. This is expanded on in the next theme. Table 8.4 provides the sub-themes and supporting data for Theme 2.

8.5.2 Theme 2: Interpersonal encounters

This theme explains how students' Interpersonal encounters facilitated change in students and is described through three sub-themes Influenced by encounters with others and Self-realisation and Passively engaging domestic and international students, shown in Table 8.4.
Influenced by encounters with other

2.1 I was ready to pack up and leave save for meeting three amazing Australians who I’m still really close with now.  
(AUS xv)

2.2 A new friend said, “It’s not the end of the bloody world you know”. But I did need someone to tell me that eventually and I figured out okay this is the shit pile (sic), just chill a bit, you know it’s going to get better.  
(AUS xvi)

2.3 I can remember I was so amazed about this girl. She was maybe 20 and she was actually listening to this old lady for 30 minutes while she was telling her a lot of weird stuff. It was so clear they didn’t know each other. And then they disappeared in each direction. I loved it. I love it still. So that’s something I have tried to bring home, that’s one of the things that has changed in me.  
(EU xii)

Self-realisation

2.4 The realisation through meeting new friends. A big slap in the face from them really... They were just like you’re in a whole another country. You’re meeting new people, you get to do new exciting things. It’s going to be tough but your family is only a phone call away.  
(AUS xv)

2.5 So I had the possibility to communicate with people and I felt that my isolation started to shrink. So I knew you had to be active and you have to get out of the shock situation somehow and when I realised this is the reality. Now you have to deal with the reality.  
(EU vi)

Passively engaging domestic students with international students

2.6 If you get a student who’s got bad English, get that student to speak up a lot during presentations, get that student to answer questions. After awhile the students will get used to bad English. Passive engagement can be practised in classrooms.  
(AUS 26)

2.7 If I was a teacher and I was talking to a Chinese student, I would just have a normal conversation with them and while other people are not actively engaging in that conversation, they are passively listening, and that’s a good way to get things started.  
(AUS 26)

The first sub-theme, Influenced by encounters with others, shows that interacting with others in varying ways influenced students greatly and helped them recover from culture shock and think differently. Some spoke of reflecting on what was said to them by others. In quote 2.1 (Table 8.4), AUS xv “was ready to pack up and leave save for meeting three amazing Australians”. Similarly, in quote 2.2 by AUS xvi, the experience of an encounter and exchange with another influenced the student’s mindset. The student explained that this ‘tough love’ approach by a new friend helped him/her regain momentum. AUS xvi expanded on the benefit of the blunt words from the new friends, “I did need someone to tell me that”. Several students spoke about how others’ opinions had jolted them out a state of self-centredness. These new friends taught them to view
their situation from a different perspective. Students relied on the advice of others to adapt to a new life and their surroundings. They underwent a personal transformation. Students were able to think about themselves and their situation differently.

From a contrasting perspective, quote 2.3 captured how a European student (EU xii) was influenced by the lack of formality in Australian society and the impact this might have on others. This student was influenced personally by an indirect encounter and was able to make interconnections in regard to this incident. The student was thinking comparatively about the way Australians are prepared to chat to strangers in contrast to Europeans and the potential benefits this can bring. EU xii and many European students wanted to continue to engage more openly with others when they returned home, despite the European norm of social distance.

The second sub-theme, Self Realisation (Table 8.4), explains another way students thought they overcame their culture shock. In quote 2.4 AUS xv described it as “realisation through meeting new friends”. Whereas EU vi claimed “my isolation started to shrink”. The encounters with others allowed students to think differently about their situations and they were able to recover from their shock. They were influenced by others and were able to see their situation from a different perspective.

The third sub-theme, Passively engaging domestic students with international students (Table 8.4), sheds a completely different perspective on Interpersonal encounters. In quotes 2.6 and 2.7, AUS 26 described how hesitant Australian domestic students are to engage with international students. AUS 26 considered that “passive engagement can be practiced in the classroom... they are passively listening, and that’s a good way to get things started”. As such, the student felt that during Interpersonal encounters between teachers and international students, domestic students would be passively engaging and this could provide a starting point for future conversations with the international student. In this way the teacher’s Interpersonal encounter becomes the ‘ice-breaker’ for domestic students for future engagement with international students.

8.5.3 Theme 3: Interpersonal relationships

Expanding on the previous theme, this theme explains how the majority of students felt they had learned new things as they built deeper Interpersonal relationships with others. The theme is explained through two sub-themes: Learning about relationships, and Different friends (shown in Table 8.5). Nearly half of the mobility students said they mixed very little with domestic students during their stay. Yet, for some students, learning about Interpersonal relationships occurred as a result of mixing with co-
nationals. All students discussed situations resulting in a deeper understanding of *Interpersonal relationships*. They had learned to deal with conflict more easily and confidently. They understood more about the nuances and layers of interpersonal relationships. Several European students concluded that becoming less formal in encounters and relationships made all interpersonal encounters easier and often more rewarding than they would be otherwise.

Table 8.5 Theme 3 sub-themes and supporting data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-THEME</th>
<th>THEME 3 INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-THEME 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Learning about relationships</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.1            | *So I think learning when to speak and when not – when it’s going to make a difference and when it’s not going to make a difference – so I think that taught me a lot. Yeah I’m probably more willing to confront situations, because by the end my housemate and I had a really good relationship because we confronted so much.*
| (AUS xviii)    |                                   |
| 3.2            | *Yeah my experience is that you can get closer relationships to other people if you are not so formal so that’s really good.*
| (EU vii)       |                                   |
| 3.3            | *When you stay at a campus with the same people it becomes a long-term experience. You learn there are different layers of people for a person, and you might just reach the first layer when you see people short term. But you reach so many other layers when you stay there for a longer period of time.*
| (EU viii)      |                                   |
| **SUB-THEME 2** | **Different friends**              |
| 3.4            | *I met the group of very young Korean English teachers. They were at least in their 30s. So they were really nice and respectful. And so we started to meet regularly and so this was really great.*
| (EU vi)        |                                   |
| 3.5            | *I think if she and I had met in our Australian lives, we wouldn’t be friends because we are so different. So I think it’s such a blessing we ended up there together because now I can’t imagine my life without her.*
| (AUS xxi)      |                                   |
| 3.6            | *I never became friends with people who had bad English. I realised that the perception I had was wrong. And just with other people, like, I became friends.*
| (AUS xxii)     |                                   |

In quote 3.1 (Table 8.5), AUS xviii experienced a lesser degree of culture shock in the host city than others, yet felt very challenged by an *Interpersonal relationship* with another Australian in a share house situation. The student admitted to learning so much from this difficult experience. On the other hand, in quote 3.2 EU vii, explained “you can get closer relationships with people if you are not so formal. This student found this was extremely important to overcoming culture shock and felt more settled and happy in Australia by mixing with culturally diverse younger friends. In the final quote, EU viii
described the layers of relationships, which is a clever way of describing how friendships become closer and more complex over time.

The second sub-theme, *Different friends* (Table 8.5), explains how AUS xxi and AUS xxii developed friendships with different types of people. They admitted that they would not have considered friendships with such different people at home. Students felt being away from home facilitated situations and experiences that led to new insights and new ways of thinking with and about other people. Reasons students attributed to this personal development were lack of their own support group, the support of new friends, or conflict with new housemates (same nationality or ‘other’). Several students claimed that you were not able to escape, ignore, or bury interpersonal conflict or react as you might at home. Students developed the confidence to deal with interpersonal encounters and relationships they would have found difficult in the past. From this level of newfound confidence, students had a more open mindset to meeting and mixing with different types of people beyond their usual group. Interpersonal encounters and trusting relationships with new, old, and different friends broadened the students’ mindsets for thinking differently.

### 8.5.4 Theme 4: The cosmopolitan role model

The link between academic influence and student change was not included in the scope of the interview questions, yet was offered as a reason for change by four students. Theme 5, *The cosmopolitan role model*, represents the story told by these students. The students spoke about how a teacher changed their perspectives on a number of levels. When the students were asked to explain what it was about the teacher that influenced them, they described the academic’s personal qualities, teaching style, and global experiences. The teaching style shifted them from their usual comfort zone of learning (the four were usually fairly disengaged) and changed them considerably. The academic fostered and facilitated learning, was motivational, and an inspiration to these students. Table 8.6 provides the sub-themes and supporting data for Theme 4.
Table 8.6  Theme 4 sub themes and supporting data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-THemes</th>
<th>THE COSMOPOLITAN ROLE MODEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal experience</td>
<td>5.1 It was from his experience in travel. All the time he taught us how to do something, not what to do, how to have more courage to do something ....the first class in my life that I was preparing for... he did influence me and I was excited. (EU iv)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative learning</td>
<td>5.2 He influenced me. He did a huge impact. We were learning about global health and it made me to look deeper into these areas and what I would like to do in this world.... Like we were participating 100% in his lectures. (EU i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role model influence</td>
<td>5.3 But that teacher's lectures made me think that I could do something for others, like in the future. (EU ix)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational and inspirational</td>
<td>5.4 We didn't miss any of his lectures, we went to all of them and it was really good...He was telling us all the time that we can make a difference, we can go to poorer countries and work there and everything like that. I'm not very keen on that like right now but maybe later. (EU ii)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, these four quotes demonstrate how the motivational and inspirational teacher changed these students' perspectives across personal and professional spheres. Due to the influence of this teacher, these students' application to this particular teacher’s course had changed dramatically. One reason for this was, “His experience in travel” (EU iv). The teacher’s personal experience and teaching style made the internationalised curriculum and comparative learning more meaningful to students. This teacher combined real world examples to motivate and influence the students. The teacher had made these students think more deeply and contextually about, not just the course content, but also future possibilities in their lives. The enthusiasm generated by the cosmopolitan role model influenced students’ course attendance, engagement, and learning. They adopted a global mindset. They expressed awareness of others, societies, and places beyond their previous imaginings. This exemplar illustrates the significance of academic influence on students’ thinking and behaviours. These students’ were becoming global citizens through this teacher’s influence.
8.6 Findings Part Two - Mindset for change

In Study Two Part Two the students’ stories provided considerable insight into their mindset for change in the ways in which they were Thinking differently as they experienced personal change. Thinking differently can be thought of as both a facilitator and a manifestation of student change and is conceptualised as the central feature of global citizen learning. The theme of Thinking differently is explained through three sub-themes: Questioning assumptions, Thinking comparatively, and Acknowledging fault. To a certain extent, the way students are thinking differently is referred to in many themes. However, Part Two of Study Two provides a more explicit focus on the student mindset during their process of learning. Table 8.7 provides the sub-themes and supporting data for Thinking differently.
### Table 8.7 Mindset Theme 1 sub-themes and supporting data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-THEMES</th>
<th>THEME 1 THINKING DIFFERENTLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-THEME 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questioning assumptions</strong></td>
<td>4.1 I am quite patriotic about Australia and I didn’t actually realise it till I was away and if anyone said anything bad about Australia I was always trying to defend it ....I think we need to be critical of our own country too, we should be critical but you don’t see that whilst you’re here. (AUS xiv)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 It’s hard to get my head around their way of doing things. I’ve been brought up in we only pay this much tax and if it goes higher we’re going to complain and why should these people get these benefits when they don’t do any work, blah, blah, blah. So it was nice to see that it works, it does work and they do make sacrifices for that. (AUS xx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 If there’s someone there babying you through the process then what are you going to get out of it. There won’t be any self-reflection, there won’t be any self-realisations because people are taking you through the process and I think that exchange is good because you’re getting out of your comfort zone. (AUS xx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-THEME 2</strong></td>
<td>4.4 It made me think how critical I was on Australians about Aboriginals. ...I could see we have the same with Greenland (Inuit). Sometimes you need to be taken out of your own daily life and your views you have on other people and then when you see it from the other side. That really gives you a lot. And it’s easy to judge others but then sometimes when you see yourself from that side you’re exactly the same. (EU xii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thinking comparatively</strong></td>
<td>4.5 Like I think it’s opened my eyes more to the whole political system so that’s given me more knowledge than what I would have had if I was at home. (AUS xviii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.6 I got this perspective that the world actually isn’t that big. Even though you go to the other side of the world, yes, it’s the same qualities in people and it’s nice to actually experience that, well, there isn’t any difference between the human being. (EU x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-THEME 3</strong></td>
<td>4.7 I never thought about it (sic internationals), it’s so stupid. I never thought about it from their perspective. I think I guess I just thought they’re here, they’re obviously capable so why aren’t they making more of an effort. But now that I’ve gone through it, they were making an effort. (AUS xx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acknowledging fault</strong></td>
<td>4.8 I was very narrow-minded, you know, I had no idea what was out there and I was content with my life so that was enough. I just haven’t experienced anything. I can’t believe it and even issues everywhere, around the world and things that were happening in Europe and I just had no idea until I got over there. (AUS xv)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.6.1 Theme 1: Thinking differently

In the first sub-theme, Questioning assumptions (Table 8.7), quote 4.1 shows how AUS xiv had reflected on unquestioned pride in everything Australian. The student was not discarding national identity, but had started to look more critically at Australians and Australian culture. The student was listening to the perspective of others and thinking about their views from a more objective viewpoint. By thinking like this, students were starting to compare their beliefs and assumptions to those of others. By questioning personal assumptions, students were able to think in a reflexive and relational way.

In quote 4.2 (Table 8.7) AUS xx talked about the taxation scale in the host country in relation to that of Australia. AUS xx was able to question his/her family norm of criticising governments that supported higher taxation. The student was impressed by the different political system in the host country. It appeared that the whole of society benefited in a country with a higher taxation scale. In quote 4.3, AUS xx explained that coping with being out of the comfort zone fostered reflective and critical self-thought and self-realisations. This student was asked if the home university should have provided more support before leaving Australia to assist in minimising the culture shock. Quote 4.3 reinforced what many students felt: you need to be taken out of your comfort zone to be able to see and think about things differently.

In sub-theme 2, Thinking comparatively (Table 8.7), several students were able to compare the treatment of minority groups between their own and host countries. For instance, in quote 4.4, EU xii explained how he/she was critical of Australia’s treatment of its Indigenous peoples until reflecting on the way Inuit were treated in Greenland. This student realised that “when you see it from the other side, you’re exactly the same”. By questioning assumptions and thinking comparatively, students were broadening perspectives. They were thinking relationally. What students thought and believed was no longer what it had seemed previously. In quote 5.4 (xviii) explained how he/she had started to think comparatively about politics. In quote 4.6 EU x explained that he/she had travelled to the other side of the world to realise “there isn’t any difference in being a human being”. The student had only considered ‘others’ in terms of difference, rather than what people have in common as human beings. These students were able to question prior assumptions, to think differently, and to develop new perspectives.

The next sub-theme, Acknowledging fault (Table 8.7), describes the way students had started to think about their own fallibility. For instance in quote 4.7, AUS xx mentioned the plight of international students and admitted, “I never thought about it from their perspective”. In quote 4.8, AUS xv admitted to being “very
narrow-minded”. Both of these students acknowledged their faults and were humbled by the learning experience.

By *Thinking differently* students were able to imagine and consider other perspectives and possibilities in many different contexts. They engaged with their self-identity, assumptions, and beliefs. They thought comparatively about the treatment of minority groups, political difference, and the common humanity we all share. By thinking differently, students were starting to make interconnections across complex social, cultural, economic, and political contexts.

8.7 Findings: Part Three – Manifestation of change

In this part of Study Two, the lens is placed over how student change can inform what ‘a global citizen’ means in practical terms. These findings have been categorized to create a more in-depth and meaningful picture of the student developing as a global citizen. How can we recognise global citizens? What do they look like or what do they do? In contrast to focusing on the individual attributes, this section demonstrates the way students manifested their changes. The findings in this theme are: *Broadening perspectives*, *Accelerated maturity*, *Cosmopolitan hospitality*, and *Widening horizons*. These themes expand our conceptual and practical understanding of what happens to students, as they become global citizens.

8.7.1 Theme 1: Broadening perspectives

All participants felt they had *Broadening perspectives* that were demonstrated in a number of ways. All students related opening their eyes and minds to themselves and others; they were thinking differently and considering other perspectives and possibilities. One student thought that going on exchange would help him/her “see over the plate”, however after the exchange, the student realised that there are “many plates” (EU i). Theme 1 is explained through two sub-themes: *Seeing the world differently* and *Considering other perspectives*. Table 8.8 provides the sub-themes and supporting data for Theme 1.
### Table 8.8 Manifestations Theme 1 sub-themes and supporting data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-THEMES</th>
<th>THEME 1 BROADENING PERSPECTIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-THEME 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Seeing the world differently</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Now perspectives on family and friends and uni and life, the world and everything had completely changed. Now like I want to challenge myself and I want to try different things and fail or have a go. (AUS xv)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Yeah I’d say, the way I’d viewed the world. Again it’s given me a wider scope – it’s a bigger world out there than I expected. (AUS xvi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 I think it opened my mind. Like, I lived with a guy from Malaysia, which before wouldn’t be a country that I have thought about. You get another view on a lot of countries, to hear about them from someone inside. (EU viii)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 I think that you have to have an interest in it (broader perspectives) for it to be interesting. I think you have to want to achieve something in your life, concern about your career. Which means you need to broaden your views. I think promoting it to students will do it. (EU iii)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 They’re not told that when you go to a university, that’s going to be a trial run for being a part of this world. You’re not going to go in there, meet so many different people from different cultures with different personalities, and you will learn so much about things around the world. You’re told you just go in there, get your degree, get some work experience. You’re told you just go in there, get your degree, get some work experience. (AUS 26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-THEME 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Considering other possibilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 I’ve been thinking about why we do some things and especially with politics, it seems bit of mess to me. Yeah it’s just made me think about that sort of thing a bit more and our relationship with other countries and things like that. (AUS xiv)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 A really simple thing can become funny to talk about because they are so different. It doesn’t sound a big thing but I think it is. I got really the idea that it doesn’t have to be as it is in my life. There’s a lot of other ways you can have Christmas at or you can do your summer holiday. There are many ways of doing things. Even though I have travelled before, from my exchange trip I really think that I learned that there are so many other ways to do things. (EU viii)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the first sub-theme, *Seeing the world differently* (Table 8.8), seven quotes demonstrate ways that the students broadened their perspectives. As shown in quotes 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3, AUS xv, AUS xvi and EU viii explained that their perspectives on all aspects of life had changed as they started to see the world differently. Mobility had provided the opportunities to engage in new encounters, new experiences, different ways of thinking, and new ways of seeing the world. From a slightly different perspective, EU iii in quote 1.4 talked about how to expand outlooks of students who do not travel, by suggesting that universities should promote the benefit of having broader perspectives to all students. It should be made more explicit to all students that broadening perspectives leads to an improved understanding of their own study
program and career prospects. Universities do not explain to students that their mindset and horizons will expand by engaging with different others while engaging in challenging learning activities. As explained by AUS 26 in quote 1.5, students aren’t told that going to university will be a “trial run for being a part of this world ... you’re told go in there, get your degree, get some work experience...universities could market it better”.

In the second sub-theme (Table 8.8), students explained how they had started to Consider other possibilities. For instance, in quote 1.6, AUS xiv was thinking about politics more critically than previously. In quote 1.7, EU viii highlighted how an epiphany in thinking occurred over a simple comparison. This student explained, “there are so many other ways to do things”. Overall in the findings, students felt they had broadened their perspectives in regard to societal, cultural, religious, and political differences. Their perspectives were also broadened by exposure to other international students. As a result of experiences and encounters, students had opened their eyes and were Seeing the world differently and Considering other perspectives. Students realised that difference does not necessarily equate with right or wrong or black and white.

8.7.2 Theme 2: Accelerated maturity

Many students expressed change in terms of improved maturity through a greater sense of independence, self-reliance, confidence, coping capability, and sense of achievement. They related a sense of heightened sensitivity towards others and personal esteem by being able to cope with and adapt to a foreign environment. The theme is explained through three sub-themes: Coping, Soul searching, and Capable. The sub-themes and supporting data are shown in Table 8.8.
Table 8.9  Theme 2 sub-themes and supporting data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-THemes</th>
<th>THEME 2 ACCELERATED MATURITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUB-THEME 1</td>
<td>Coping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 The first step is already a very mature one, taking the plane. The big jump is jumping (EU 25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 I think, in terms of growth, going on exchange accelerates it. I think I would have eventually maybe got to these stages in my life but I think going on exchange and being thrown into these circumstances, it just forces you to grow up that much more. (AUS xvi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 … saving yourself, find a bakery, find a school. Get the hang of life in another place. Because that gives you the self-confidence of being able to travel wherever you want and finding a way to survive and adapt. When you know the basics of getting around, then you’ll start learning more and being able to bond and socialise with people from the local population. Yes, then the maturity goes faster. (EU 25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB-THEME 2</td>
<td>Soul searching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Like personally I’ve changed heaps…. Just growing up and like it sounds so cliché the whole soul searching and whatever overseas but you really do, like discover so many things, you learn so much. (AUS xv)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 It’s more like self-discovery things. I’ve never been critical of myself until – I had a lot of time and I wasn’t working and so I’d spend a lot of time just thinking and I would, yeah think about opening up to other people (AUS xiv)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB-THEME 3</td>
<td>Capable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 I was always so fully confident about myself. So I was living on my own before I went to Australia. I saw that wasn’t the hardest thing but to integrate into another society and the culture that made me more mature than I was before (EU i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 So it was very easy just to settle in here and I think after two weeks I felt comfortable and I got to know my housemates. It has to do with my exchange I think. Yeah. I grew up a lot in this half year so yeah I’m more self-assured and I’m more organised and I have more confidence in my abilities. (EU vii)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The link between ‘impact of student mobility’ and ‘accelerated maturity’ is exemplified in the first three quotes. In quote 2.1 (Table 8.9), EU 25 explained how taking the opportunity to go on exchange was the first mature step. However, as explained in quote 2.2 from AUS xvi, once away, the experiences facilitated a sense of accelerated maturity. EU 25 further explained the maturing experience in quote 2.3. The coping experiences provided incremental steps of confidence building and maturity. Through their Soul searching, AUS xv and AUS xiv engaged with their own identity and self-formation. The accelerated maturity that students experienced was certainly more marked in younger students in terms of independence. As shown in the last two quotes from 2.6 and 2.7 in the sub-theme, Capable, EU i “felt more mature than before” and EU vii “grew up a lot in this half year”. Overall, the challenge of being out of the comfort zone facilitated Accelerated maturity in all students.
8.7.3 Theme 3: Cosmopolitan hospitality

This theme explains the way students developed empathy, humility, patience, caring, and a willingness to help others as a result of their mobility. The theme is explained through *Other focused*, *Empathetic* and *Willing and welcoming*. Students had experienced being the cultural ‘other’. They were prepared to act on greater awareness of others, showing a heightened sense of social sensibility, respect, and responsibility towards others. Peters and Tukeo (2010) referred to this transformation in relation to mobility as ‘cosmopolitan hospitality’. They used it to explain the relevance of opening up to others. Cosmopolitan hospitality explains a marked change in students. Table 8.10 provides the sub-themes and supporting data for Theme 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-THEMES</th>
<th>THEME 3 COSMOPOLITAN HOSPITALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUB-THEME 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other focused</td>
<td>3.1  <em>Unless you’re actually put in that situation yourself it just changes everything. Like, you know you just have more time for people. Like the amount of people that I’ve helped now.</em>  (AUS xv)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2  <em>I think my ability to be more patient grew. I became a lot more patient and willing to listen. Whereas, I usually probably wouldn’t be as willing to listen to someone like that before.</em>  (AUS xviii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB-THEME 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathetic</td>
<td>3.3  <em>I met some African migrants in Australia and it gave me an insight why they left their country and the situation they had to face in their country. I hadn’t really thought about it. I think that for example, that migrants should have, especially those who cannot live in their country anymore because of political issues or religious issues, should have the chance to live somewhere else and not just be sent back.</em>  (EU vi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4  <em>I’m more empathetic towards international students now as well. Like I never wanted to work with them in group assignments or anything because it’s hard to communicate with the English barrier and you end up doing most of the work but now it’s like no, you’re able to produce that and it’s your second language that’s amazing.</em>  (AUS xx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB-THEME 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing and welcoming</td>
<td>3.5  <em>Everyone I encountered was always so welcoming… everyone was really friendly and then that kind of rubbed off on me, so willing to do more for other people in general but definitely international students.</em>  (AUS xvi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6  <em>And I don’t think that you need to know people before you have this welcoming or hospitality. It’s for everyone. Well, that’s how I saw it, yes.</em>  (EU xii)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theme 3, sub-theme 1, *Other focused* (Table 8.9), quotes 3.1 and 3.2 from AUS xv and AUS xviii explain how the mobility experience changed their perspectives. For example AUS xv said, “the amount of people I have helped now”. In quote 3.3, EU vi was influenced by meeting African migrants and felt more *Empathetic* towards the plight of migrants and refugees and thought they should not be “just sent back” (EU vii). Similarly in quote 3.4, AUS xx spoke about having more empathy for international students. Now, from personal experience, AUS xx had started thinking about international students relationally. From a slightly different perspective according to AUS xvi and EU xii (quotes 3.5 and 3.6), they had become more *Willing and welcoming*. AUS xvi thought it
was the kindness of others that made him/her more hospitable to others, particularly international students at home. Again in the final quote, EU xi, a European student, challenged European formality in regard to being hospitable to others. As part of student change or resulting from the sum of these changes, students recalibrated their lives.

8.7.4 Theme 4: Widening horizons

Students provided considerable insight to their changing mindset in Theme 4, *Widening horizons* (Tables 8.10 and 8.11) in the way there were recalibrating their future lives and careers. Students described enhanced motivation for study; reflected on career direction; heightened interest in global issues; related to their study; and were more open to discovering other cultures and countries. Because of these new imaginings for their futures, several students broke off long-term relationships when they returned home. Their goals and future expectations had changed. Several students put marriage and family on the back burner with the aim of pursuing further study or travel. While many of the students were high achievers, even those students who had started out as somewhat indifferent in their study, admitted to being more committed to their study program during and/or after the exchange. Several students were pursuing the possibility of doing a PhD. The change was most evident in students’ interest in global and comparative political, social, and cultural issues. All students were motivated to travel and experience more of the world and its cultures. For instance in in Table 8.10, AUS xv exemplifies a new mindset and imaginings for the future. This example has been included to show how significant being *Out of the comfort zone* can be in transforming a student. This student is *Widening horizons* by recalibrating his/her life, study and career aspirations and directions.
### Table 8.11 Exemplar AUS xv supporting data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME 4 AN EXEMPLAR WIDENING HORIZONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(AUS xv)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(AUS xv)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(AUS xv)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In quotes 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 (Table 8.10) AUS xv referred to new goals and motivation to study. He/she demonstrated how mobility contributed to a sense of cosmopolitan hospitality and willingness to help others. This behaviour can be contrasted with "before the exchange I didn't do anything". In quote 4.3 the student explained a new understanding of education as being beyond a credential and an individual achievement. Now the student had started thinking about education in terms of a career and making a difference. This student in fact changed degree programs to enter a caring profession with the aim of working in remote Indigenous communities in Australia and then overseas. In the final quote, the student talked about future goals and expanded horizons. AUS xv experienced a dramatic transformation in becoming a global citizen. Table 8.11 provides two further findings and sub-themes to expand on the way that students were *Widening their horizons*. 
### Table 8.12  Theme 4 sub-themes and supporting data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-THEMES</th>
<th>THEME 4</th>
<th>WIDENING HORIZONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-THEME 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>4.4  About my relationship... but now I want to do something else like ... I feel bad that I was not doing some of these things before and now I want like to take every opportunity I can get – like try to go to get some PhD opportunities.</td>
<td>(EU iv)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5  The only thing that’s changed in a bad way, I would say, is the importance of a relationship, so partnership. I quit my relationship a few months ago. And because my focus was on my studies and my plan to go overseas again. So I had the taste of being free and going everywhere, so I decided going overseas again is easier when you’re single or you have a partner who is going with you.</td>
<td>(EU i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-THEME 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study and career goals</td>
<td>4.6  The key thing about the exchange, for me is, it’s not so hard. If you really want something, everything’s possible.</td>
<td>(EU iii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.7  I want to have so much more ambition now, so much more keenness about what I’m doing and I will get out there...I was a lot more excited about my future then, about the possibilities of this degree and where it could take me especially in terms of travelling.</td>
<td>First interview (AUS xvi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.8  I am more thinking about doing honours and then a PhD. Definitely still a career in international health and working to those same sorts of organisations which I probably mentioned earlier, like WHO and that. But that route seems to be getting a bit difficult so I might have to get some higher education.</td>
<td>Second interview (AUS xvi)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the second part of this theme, two sub-themes, Relationships and Study and Career goals, are presented in Table 8.11. In quotes 4.4 and 4.5, EU iv and EU i discuss how they ended existing long-term relationships. Their future expectations had changed. They were now thinking about further travel and study opportunities, “now I want to do something else” (EU iv). Their expanded horizons were not consistent with their relationships at home. In quote 4.6, EU iii realised that if you put in the effort, you are rewarded. This student also ended a long-term relationship and is now pursuing a PhD. Similarly, the final two quotes from AUS xvi showed how the mobility experience led to significant life and career changes for this student. The second quote (quote 4.8) showed that after six months, the student’s goal to pursue an international career was realistically grounded in the next steps to achieve the recalibrated career.

Many students expressed several of these expanded horizons. As a result of the mobility experience, students were keen to travel and see more of the world. They were becoming involved with their university community and volunteering. Some students
were more interested in Asia because of developing interpersonal relationships with Asian students, whereas other students were more confident and open minded about tackling new adventures and challenges either through travel or future careers. These goals, expectations, and future imaginings were things many of the students had not contemplated previously.

8.8 The second round of student interviews

A second round of interviews was carried out to determine if any of these changes had continued or changed when students had resumed their previous lives at home. The evidence from the first round of interviews strongly supported that the proposition of change was directly attributable to mobility rather than normal maturation. However, following eleven second-round interviews, the researcher determined that the additional data collected did not add greatly to the evidence already in-hand. Therefore, these interviews were discontinued. The evidence from the second round of interviews showed that students continued to emphasise the value of the mobility experience to their way of thinking, perspectives and changed behaviours and life and career expectations. While students' sense of Accelerated maturity had plateaued once they resumed their normal lives, they were still more open to learning opportunities, challenges and people and places than prior to their mobility. They were continuing to think differently about personal, societal, and political issues through relational, reflexive, and imaginative thinking. All students were aware of how their mobility had set them apart from their peers who had not travelled in regards to their Broadening perspectives and different world views and ambitions. Students reinforced how important it is for universities to promote the benefits of ‘nudge the comfort’ and ‘embracing broader learning experiences’ to all students.

8.9 Discussion: Study Two

The purpose of Study Two was to expand our understanding of the student experience of change that is consistent with becoming a global citizen. Study Two examined the way mobility facilitated change in students, as well as the different ways students manifested their change. Furthermore, Study Two considered whether the student stories could inform Internationalisation of the Curriculum (IoC), to influence global citizen learning for all students. Student insights to influencing learning experience for all students are raised in this chapter, but are expanded on with the informants' perspectives in Chapter Nine.

In the findings, students described being Out of the comfort zone as the central
facilitator for change. The unhappiness, loneliness, difficulties with language barriers and shock described by students were consistent with Pedersen’s (1995) ‘culture shock’ and Bennett’s (1998) ‘transition shock’. In hindsight however, students in the current research overwhelmingly acknowledged the benefits of dealing with negative situations. A recent Australian report recommended that international students would benefit from more pre-mobility preparation (Gothard, Downie, & Gray, 2012), yet students in this study valued the learning they gained from being Out of the comfort zone to the extent that AUS xx questioned what would be gained from being out of the comfort zone “if someone was babying you through it”. This finding suggests that there needs to be a considered balance between mobility preparation and ensuring that students endure the transformative experiences that result from being Out of the comfort zone.

Students in this research felt being Out of the comfort zone facilitated situations and circumstances that allowed them to question their assumptions and think differently. Killick (2012) described in his mobility study how moving beyond the comfort zone provided students with a legitimate ticket to change. Legitimising change was exemplified by AUS xix, who thought, "being away lets you change into the person you want to be". This student’s rationale could be explained by an ability to utilise “edge emotions” (Malkki, 2010). Edge emotions restore balance when our comfort zone is challenged. Students felt that the benefits of being Out of the comfort zone were more appreciated when they were able to move forward and learn from their challenging experiences. Jones (2010, p. 93) similarly found in a short term volunteering project that students placed more value on what was to be gained personally from helping others than on focusing on being Out of the comfort zone. The research findings suggest that students value the positive benefits of challenging learning experiences, yet education is frequently designed not to emotionally challenge students.

The way students recovered their momentum from this disorienting experience was explored. In this respect, many students thought that meeting new and different people contributed to overcoming their challenge and regaining emotional balance. It was through these encounters, exchanges, and relationships with others, that students were able to adapt to their foreign environment and open their eyes to see their situation differently. The value of cosmopolitan encounters and dialogue has been discussed previously in the literature review (Carter, 2001; Delanty, 2006, 2011; Peters et al., 2008; Peters & Tukoe, 2010). Students valued the advice and support from new friends.

The transition from interpersonal encounter to interpersonal relationship is an
important developmental step for becoming a global citizen and has been discussed by other authors. Bennett, Volet and Fozar (2013) explained the unique nature of an interpersonal relationship and the significance of learning from an intercultural other. Moreover, learning through interpersonal interaction and from this type of situation is closely associated with a cosmopolitan paradigm for learning (Appiah, 2006, 2008; Marginson & Sawir, 2011; Rizvi, 2009). Expanding on the relevance of the situational context, Delanty (2011) explained the importance and relevance of the specific context or ‘logic’ of interpersonal encounters and exchange of dialogue. It is the outcome of these particular situations and circumstances that contribute to cosmopolitan learning.

Correspondingly, Baumgartner (2002) and Carter (2002) explained how social interaction and dialogue with trusted others promotes validation of new or shared perspectives. It is the mutual learning and respect that results from these situations and circumstances that contributes to the developing interpersonal relationship.

The support and encounters with new friends and co-nationals reported in this research allowed students to open their eyes and see the world differently. Savicki and colleagues (2008) and Killick (2012) also identified the importance of co-nationals to coping and adjustment during a mobility experience. In this study, students thought that universities should position culture shock in a positive light and nudge the comfort zone for all students. In support of this notion, Jones (2010, p. 86) found that students in a short-term volunteering project enjoyed the risk of being out of the comfort zone. Building on this in terms of learning, Thom (2010, p. 156) felt that when tolerance is institutionally embedded, and when students are properly supported to think and act out of their comfort zone, transformation in learning is possible during IoC. While there is a lack of research focusing on domestic students and transformation occurring as a result of IoC (Sawir, 2013), taking students out of the comfort zone in learning needs to be institutionally supported and may need to be balanced with other organisational processes, such as student satisfaction surveys, for example.

In this research students overwhelmingly thought that challenging situations accelerated their maturity, made them more receptive to different people and opened their eyes and minds to think differently. Several students suggested that the broader benefits of university education beyond a degree should be marketed and promoted to students better. Students have no idea about having a global understanding or mindset for thinking differently. They have no idea about the potential of their university experience and that engaging with cultural others could expand their preparation for their global existence. A recent project developed an interaction for learning framework to improve engagement between international and domestic students (Arkoudis et al,
The framework includes six dimensions: planning interaction; creating environments for interaction; supporting interaction; engaging with subject knowledge; developing reflexive processes; fostering communities of learners. The authors of this project acknowledged the obstacles to successfully implementing this framework from the perspective of both academics and students.

Engaging international and domestic students effectively in the classroom is an ongoing challenge. AUS 26 offered insight by suggesting that domestic students could be passively engaged by following dialogue between an international student and an academic. AUS 26 suggested that passive engagement could provide an entry point for domestic students to future encounters with the international student. This rationale seems valid. Clifford (2010, p. 172) found that even when domestic students were keen to mix with international students, they felt they didn't have anything in common. Arkoudis and colleagues placed 'finding common ground' as a central concept for their interaction-learning framework. But the success of this particular framework could be undermined by a lack of understanding in regard to the mindset of domestic students, and their willingness to engage with cultural others. Students in the present research attributed being *Out of the comfort zone* to precipitation of their openness and willingness to engage with cultural others. These students thought that this experience allowed them to start Thinking differently. Without the appropriate facilitating situations and learning experiences, aims for global citizen learning may be limited.

The students in this research provided considerable insight to their mindset for change in the ways they were Thinking differently. As a result of their experiences students were thinking relationally, reflexively, embracing engagement, and critically exploring their assumptions and were engaging in the social imaginary in different contexts. Students were making the interconnections of knowledge and perspectives across complex constructs that they had not considered prior to their mobility. By thinking in this way students engaged in a cosmopolitan basis for learning (Thom, 2010, p. 156). Study Two has contextualised the learners’ perspectives and captured why they think they have changed. In this way, the student stories provided evidence of the direct link between the students’ experience of becoming a global citizen and a cosmopolitan paradigm for learning as discussed in Chapter Seven (Appiah, 2006; Back et al., 1996; Delanty, 2011; Marginson & Sawir, 2011; Rizvi, 2009).

The student stories provided insight into their different ways of thinking during the process of global citizen learning. The conceptual and pedagogical importance of moral and ethical capabilities to student transformation will be expanded on further.
when student findings are integrated with the key informant findings in Chapter Nine. 

As consistent with Bennett’s (2008) description of the ‘global soul’, these students developed their global ‘mindset, skillset and heartset’ from their mobility experience. This research however has expanded on Bennett’s work by identifying the moral and ethical capacities that fuel students’ global mindset for Thinking differently as global citizens.

While not a focus of the research questions, the theme of The cosmopolitan role model makes a valuable contribution to the overall understanding of the global citizen and informs IoC. This theme demonstrates the value of the ‘engaged cosmopolitan academic’. Yet, Barker, Hibbens and Farellly (2012) identified the sense of uncertainty experienced by many academics in terms of engaging with internationalisation. In contrast, the Cosmopolitan role model influenced the students’ ability to engage with the ‘bigger picture’ of the world, and see their study and future through a different lens. Sanderson’s (2011) approach for the ‘ideal teacher’ encourages teachers to explore their own cosmopolitan knowledge, outlooks and experiences, and incorporate these in their disciplinary areas. Furthermore, the influence of the Cosmopolitan role model was identified by several key informants and was discussed in Chapter Six. Clearly, the success of educating all students as global citizens involves cohesive organisational support and will be expanded on in Chapter Nine.

In Part Three of Study Two, the focus was on the way students manifested change. These manifestations of change are described as Broadening perspectives, Accelerated maturity, Cosmopolitan hospitality and Widening horizons. Foremost in the findings, all students had Broadening perspectives and this appeared to be the central manifestation of change. Many students spoke about either how naïve they were prior to the mobility experience or how their eyes had been opened. They acknowledged their limited prior awareness and knowledge. They recognised personal faults, accepted their fallibility, and were humbled by the experience. The association between personal fallibility and cultural and intellectual humility has been discussed previously (Hill, 1983). Many students realised that difference does not necessarily equate with right or wrong or black and white. A number of students described how they realised the ‘greyness of things’ for the first time. In contrast to a focus on individual attributes in previous research on the global citizen, the students’ stories in this research have provided evidence-based markers to complement those of the key informants in Study One and will be integrated in Chapter Nine.
All students spoke about their sense of personal growth and the accelerated maturity they experienced as a result of their mobility. While this was to be expected for the younger students who were experiencing a sense of autonomy and independence for the first time, older students also described how they felt more mature. The second round of interviews however confirmed that the accelerated maturity had slowed down or ceased once students had resumed their previous lives. This heightened sense of self made students feel more adaptable, flexible, and resilient. Kinnear (2009) also identified resilience and independence in learning was present in culturally diverse and international students. Moreover, the students' descriptions in the theme **Accelerated maturity** resonated with the way Taylor (1994) Mezirow (2000b) and Dirks, Mezirow and Cranton (2006) and Barnett (2004) described transformative learning. These authors linked transformation with enhanced autonomy, self-directedness, assertiveness, self-confidence, and heightened self-esteem. As a consequence of their accelerated maturity, students had started thinking differently and had started considering cosmopolitan possibilities. The process of global citizen learning, as explained through the students' stories, is consistent with the epistemology and ontology of cosmopolitanism and transformative learning theory and Barnett's learning for uncertainty (expanded on in Chapter Nine).

The personal expansion of thought beyond self-interest to awareness of others was described as cosmopolitan hospitality and explained the way students discussed their empathy, cultural humility, and willingness to help others. Peters and Tukeo (2010) considered cosmopolitan hospitality as a way of understanding how mobility influences students to open up to others. This model draws on Kantian cosmopolitanism and was first described by Derrida (2001, p. 16) who linked friendship to forgiveness and hospitality. The students in this research related their cosmopolitan hospitality through their changed attitudes towards others and their actions of reciprocity, forgiveness (language tolerance), and kindness. For many this way of thinking and behaving had not occurred to them previously. European students were able to change a cultural norm by showing hospitality towards strangers. The students’ cosmopolitan hospitality demonstrated an agency-oriented outcome of their mindset change, particularly in their new attitudes towards international students at their home university.

As a result of the mobility experience, students had significantly changed their personal goals and life expectations through **Widened horizons**. This was shown through changes to partner relationships, career directions, and motivation for their current programs of study. Several students decided to undergo either further coursework or
enter research programs. This theme highlights a significant gap in our current approach to teaching and learning research. Perrone and Vickers (2003) explained that universities tend to focus on student completions and destinations rather than on the future goals and expectations of graduates. These authors argued that little research attention has been paid to the student mindset as they transition to their careers. They claimed that universities have a responsibility to encourage students to take a greater responsibility for their own expectations of their beginning career and future directions. University should be more than a degree mill. Furthermore, Cope and Kalantzis (2000) argued that disciplinary learning frequently overlooked the importance of developing cosmopolitan behaviours in students and argued that multiple sites of learning are important to broaden students’ mindsets and foster more responsible behaviours before graduation. Montgomery and colleagues (2012) supported this view and reported significant benefit from the informal curriculum. The work of these authors suggests that students need to be engaged with their study program, their future lives, and their careers with a global mindset. Clearly, educating all students as global citizens is of significance to universities with a strong focus on internationalisation and social responsibility. The insights from Study Two show that a global citizen mindset helps students to think about themselves and their future goals and expectations more broadly. The challenge for universities is to create a global citizen learning environment for all students. This challenge will be discussed in Chapter 9.

Figure 8.1 conceptualises the student experience of global citizen learning in a process model. The two-sided arrows between the facilitators of change, the core uniting concept of Thinking differently and the manifestations of change represents the feedback loops and ongoing process of global citizen learning. Being and becoming a global citizen is a dynamic transformative process that occurs over time and develops in an imprecise way in response to the particular facilitating situations and circumstances that occur when Out of the comfort zone. The social imaginary, reflexivity, relationality and criticality are moral and ethical capacities that ‘tool and fuel’ the student global mindset in the process of global citizen learning.
Figure 8.1  Conceptualising the student experience of global citizen learning
8.10 Summary: Study Two

Study Two expands on our conceptual and practical understanding of the change and transformation that students experience as the result of a mobility experience. Students see themselves, others, and the world differently. They are better able to make interconnections of knowledge across complex constructs that had not occurred to them previously. They recognised their personal fallibility and had developed intellectual and cultural humility. The students were thinking differently. They had started to question their own assumptions and were Broadening perspectives. Their imagination had opened to consider new perspectives and possibilities. In particular, all students expressed how empathetic they were towards the plight of international students and had, or would, act on this. Students were engaged in their critical and ethical capacities.

Students felt more mature and better equipped to deal with the nuances and conflict that interpersonal relationships may bring. They valued dialogue with others beyond their inner circle, learnt from new friends, and valued developing new perspectives and different ways of seeing the world. They developed a greater sense of autonomy, self-directedness, assertiveness, self-confidence, and heightened self-esteem. They engaged in social interactions that promoted and validated new and shared perspectives. Finally, all students had recalibrated their future lives and careers. Overall, students had transformed their learning paradigm considerably, becoming more studious with an invigorated sense of direction, optimism, and enthusiasm. Study Two describes how students developed a new mindset for life and learning. They had taken a considerable number of steps along a continuum of development to become global citizens. The cumulative 'student stories' in this chapter explains the epistemological and ontological shift in the student mindset during the process of global citizen learning.
Chapter Nine integrates knowledge gained from Study One and Study Two. The research sought to address the continuing confusion of what a global citizen and the process of becoming one means in contemporary universities. Study One and Study Two individually and collectively expand our understanding of the global citizen and global citizen learning. In contrast to previous research that has focused on attribute development and mobility (Morais & Ogden, 2010; Williams, 2005), and on values, beliefs, and attitudes (Tarrant, 2010; Wynveen et al., 2012), the present research has taken a more comprehensive approach. This approach was taken by expanding on previous Delphi studies on intercultural competence (Deardorff, 2006), and global competency (Hunter et al., 2006). Also, previous research examining the transformational benefit of mobility for facilitating shifts in students’ frames of reference have been expanded (Bennett, 2008; Byram & Dervin, 2008; Killick, 2012; Schattle, 2008; Selby, 2008). The research has expanded the understanding of the student mindset during the process of change, consistent with global citizen learning, an identified research gap (Savicki & Selby, 2008, p. 346).

The conceptual, practical, organisational and theoretical basis of the global citizen in contemporary universities was explored in the research. As such, the lens of enquiry for the present research was not limited solely to a mobility experience or a key informant perspective. The global citizen was viewed as a concept, a process for learning in the context of a mobility experience, as well as what this means for students who do not travel. In this way a more comprehensive model for understanding has emerged for the global citizen as a concept and a process for learning.

According to Habermas (1970) synthesising different perspectives contributes to meaning making. Multi-perspectivity was adopted in this research. The thesis analysed two distinct datasets to extend our understanding of the philosophical, epistemological and ontological foundations of the global citizen, and to provide a clearer understanding of the role and responsibility of the university to educate socially responsible global citizens. The multiple perspectives of industry key informants and students provide converging evidence (Yin, 2009) and are synthesised in this chapter. The cross-case analysis of the overall case was executed through an analysis and synthesis of data from the two embedded cases. The cross-case analysis involves breaking down concepts, themes and sub-themes from the two cases, following Miles
and Huberman (1994) analytical guidelines. The synthesis of the cross-case analysis involves: an analytical reconstruction of these concepts that draw on concepts in the literature, creates a deeper meaning and understanding expands on literature concepts and expands on theory.

The research program aimed to develop a deeper understanding of what the concept of the global citizen means and how it is operationalised in contemporary universities. The research examined the perspectives of two stakeholders.

The objectives of the research programs were to:
1. Build a conceptual understanding of the global citizen;
2. Identify what a global citizen means in practical terms;
3. Examine the organisational enablers and constraints to educating global citizens;
4. Understand students’ experience of change associated with an international mobility experience; and
5. Explore how universities can foster the development of all students as global citizens.

The purpose of the cross-case analysis reported in this Chapter is:

- To synthesise the conceptual, practical, pedagogical and organisational implications of student and industry key informant perspectives to offer insight for improving the link between concept to practice, and educating global citizens in higher education

The findings for Study One and Study Two have been discussed in Chapters Five, Six, Seven and Eight. Chapter Nine specifically focuses on understanding the multiple interpretations of the global citizen to expand our understanding of the research objectives. The conceptual, practical, organisational, and pedagogical understanding for the global citizen expands our understanding of what ‘a global citizen’ and ‘global citizen learning’ mean in contemporary universities. The cross-case analysis provides more depth to understanding what being and becoming a global citizen means. The limitations of this multi-level approach are acknowledged and discussed in Chapter Ten. The next section analyses a context-specific conceptualisation of the global citizen in contemporary universities.

9.2 The conceptual basis of the global citizen

An expanded conceptual and practical understanding of the global citizen in higher education is a key contribution of this research. The synthesis of the combined findings
provides a basis to translate the informants’ perceptions of the global citizen as the ‘ideal global graduate’ into a practical understanding of students becoming global citizens. In this respect, the abstract notions of moral and transformative cosmopolitanism linked to informants’ perceptions of the global citizen, have been materially exemplified through the students’ findings. The student findings complement the industry key informant perspectives by providing examples and insights into what students think, say and do, as they develop as global citizens. The students personify the self-transforming cosmopolitan, at the ‘sense making interface’ of their local, global, and social reality. Through their stories, the students embodied and explained what it means to become a global citizen, and what it means to be in the process of becoming one.

The current research has approached ‘understanding the global citizen’ from concept to process, as well as outcome. These three aspects of the global citizen are intricately interwoven informing what being and becoming a global citizen means contextually in contemporary universities. Both studies highlighted the fact that the core feature of the global citizen is their mindset for thinking differently. The global citizen mindset equips students with a disposition that allows them to think, learn, and transform their attitudes and perspectives along a continuum of development.

The synthesis of data confirmed the humanistic disposition of the global citizen and its moral and transformative cosmopolitan underpinnings (Kumar, 2010; Lilley et al., 2014; Sanderson, 2011; Scholte, 2005; Vertovec & Cohen, 2002). For instance, the quote below exemplifies how student EU x recognised the cosmopolitan and ontological basis of ‘being’ a human being:

I got this perspective that the world actually isn’t that big. Even though you go to the other side of the world, yes, it’s the same qualities in people and it’s nice to actually experience that, well, there isn’t any difference between the human being. (EU x)

The combined findings confirm the moral and transformative cosmopolitan underpinning of the global citizen. This philosophy also offers an appropriate epistemological basis to understand the concept in the context of higher education. Furthermore, the students’ stories not only explained the epistemological basis of their mindset for ‘knowing’, but also showed (via the above quote) that a global mindset involves an ontological shift, of ‘being’ a global citizen. As explained in the sub-theme reported in Chapter Five, More than a list of attributes, the global citizen “is more than a technical efficiency, it is an attitude” (EU 7). The following sections explain, through the central research themes and their sub-themes, how the global citizen is constructed. A
composite understanding of the global citizen reveals the concept as an attitude and disposition that develops in response to particular, facilitating situations and circumstances.

9.2.1 A multi-layered concept

A major conceptual obstacle for the global citizen has been associated with either definitional rigidity or it has been criticised for being too vague. The definitional overlap with terms related to the global citizen was addressed in the Chapter Five theme, *The global citizen as the 'ideal global graduate'*, and its associated sub-themes of *Beyond narrow definitions, More than a list of attributes and Strategic ambiguity*. The ‘ideal research approach’ (Swedberg & Agevall, 2005) discussed previously, allowed all informants’ views to be compared, regardless of their preferred term for the ‘ideal global graduate’. This convergence of meaning has been previously explained through the theory of strategic ambiguity (Eisenberg et al., 1985, p. 3) and the ‘discursive coalition’ (Lunn, 2008). Both of these theoretical positions avoid a single authoritative definition for a construct that is contextually positioned within a complex environment. The global citizen can be thought of as a broad term and is explained through the theme of the ‘ideal global graduate’. There is little to be gained through further definitional debate. Understanding the student global mindset and process of becoming a global citizen is more significant for translating policy to practice in contemporary universities.

It is further proposed in this thesis that the ‘intention of the global citizen’ is another way of conceptualising the ‘global citizen’. Bauman (1987, p. 2) described the ‘intention of being an intellectual’, as it is impossible to be definitive about such a complex construct. He was concerned about the truth of being ‘an intellectual’, not the definition. The results from the present research support and build on Bauman’s proposition about the truth of ‘being’. The current research proposes that understanding the depth about ‘being’ and ‘becoming’ a global citizen, may be more important than focusing on terminology, narrow definitions, lists of attributes or quantitative measurement. This is evident in the first informant theme, *The global citizen as the ideal global graduate*. The priority for universities should be ‘acknowledging and accommodating the multi-layered nature of the global citizen’, along with a focus on how ‘the global citizen’ can be more effectively translated from policy to practice within existing organisational constraints.

The research has made a contribution to knowledge by making the global citizen less abstract. By explaining that the global citizen can be thought of as the “ideal global graduate” this concept enables ‘the global citizen’ to be accepted and understood more
broadly. Yet, as shown in the themes described in Chapter Seven, *The basis of global citizen learning* and *The mindset for global citizen learning*, a broad interpretation is meaningless unless the ‘ideal global graduate’ and ‘global citizen’ are underpinned by cosmopolitanism and have a humanistic disposition and mindset. As explained in Chapters Five and Seven, a moral and transformative cosmopolitan underpinning for the global citizen recognises the centrality of the critical, ethical, and moral capacities. Cosmopolitanism affords the global citizen an epistemological basis for thinking and understanding the world differently. As such, the global citizen operates within an ethical framework for understanding. This is expanded on throughout this chapter.

To some, the definition of citizenship is an obstacle for adopting the term ‘global citizen’ in higher education. In Chapter Five, citizenship was problematised in terms of identity and belonging. The next section explains why the integrated findings support the notion of the global citizen in higher education as having a hybrid identity.

### 9.2.2 Identity and responsibility beyond national ties

In the Chapter Five theme of *Global hybrid identity*, the majority of informants supported the plural nature of the global citizen, consistent with its cosmopolitan underpinnings. A plurality of identity and belonging has been described previously as ‘hybridity’ (Luke & Luke, 2000; Scholte, 2005). The consensus view recognised the global citizen, as a person who showed respect and responsibility towards a common humanity beyond national boundaries. Delanty (2006) explained that a mind shift towards broader notions of citizenship is internally translated and mediated in a transformative way. Delanty’s theory has been applied in the current research and explains how students developed a plural understanding of their identity and responsibility beyond national ties. Students started to understand their identity as persons in a “bigger world” (AUS xvi). As explained through the themes and sub-themes in Chapters Seven and Eight respectively, global citizens are *Thinking differently*.

A key contribution of this research is an expanded understanding of the student mindset, as students become global citizens. Both studies identified a theme and sub-theme demonstrating how the global citizen is *Thinking differently*. This global mindset enables an ongoing process of internal transformations of perspectives and outlooks to occur. For instance, one student explained how he/she was able to reflect on unquestioned notions of patriotism and realised it was all right to be critical of one’s own culture and country (AUS xiv). The mindset for *Thinking differently* identified in both studies of this research captured Delanty’s (2006) theory and mediating mechanism of identity and citizenship transformation. The mediating mechanism of
Thinking differently was further explained by students in the theme of Broadening perspectives and the sub-themes of Seeing the world differently and Considering other possibilities. These sub-themes explained how students were able to engage with their changing notions of identity and responsibility beyond a national identity. The student stories of Seeing the world differently and Considering other possibilities expand our understanding of how students learn to engage with their hybrid identity as they become global citizens.

Barnett (2004, p. 248) offered a theoretical insight to the students’ changing identity. He explained that we understand our identity (or lack of it) as an ontological disposition of ‘being’ and as a way of recognising self in an uncertain world. The student stories explained through the themes and sub-themes in Chapter Eight described the student’s progress of ‘being’ and ‘becoming’ a global citizen. This research has made a contribution to knowledge by expanding our understanding of what a global citizen means conceptually. As stated earlier, ‘the global citizen’ is a multi-layered concept. Students as global citizens understand and are able to engage with their hybrid identity and recognise their connections to a global world. They think differently and see the world differently. They have the disposition of a cosmopolitan ‘human being’. The next theme explains the pragmatic aspects of the global citizen.

9.3 The practical basis of the global citizen

The research makes a contribution to knowledge by expanding our understanding of what a global citizen means in practical terms. Previous research attempting to measure attributes faced challenges with contextual validity (Morais & Ogden, 2010; Parsons, 2010). In contrast to focusing on measurement, this research sought to identity recognisable markers for the global citizen that might assist academic staff to understand the disposition, mindset and possibilities of the global citizen.

The theme Recognisable markers in Chapter Five explained how industry key informants would recognise a student as a global citizen through an interview, case study or curricula vitae. In Chapter Eight, markers were identified in the way that students manifested change associated with their mobility experience. Taken together, the findings contribute to an ‘identikit’ of recognisable markers of the global citizen in higher education. The broad markers (summarised in 9.3.1) comprise multiple underlying attributes, but the construction of attributes may vary between students. As such, the markers offer a pragmatic and realistic way for recognising students developing as global citizens.
9.3.1 An identikit of markers

The current research suggests that the global citizen could be identified through markers in an identikit. As Shattle (2008, p. 65) explains, global citizens are "strange bedfellows". This research suggests the global citizen may wear many guises. The identikit term represents the variability of global citizen presentation. The idea of being definitive about the picture of the global citizen is as complex as constructing a human face from a one-dimensional identikit creation. As explained in Chapter Five sub-theme Markers or measurement, students can demonstrate global citizen markers along an inexact continuum of development at varying rates and in an imprecise way. The recognisable markers for the global citizen are underpinned by associated attributes that may be difficult to recognise individually. This could explain why previous quantitative research has faced challenges with contextual validity. In Study One, informants described markers for the global citizen through the sub-themes of Mobility; Awareness of self and others; Engagement; Making the interconnections; and Language pain tolerance. The themes associated with manifestations of change described by the students were reported in Chapter Eight.

A disorienting experience such as international mobility accelerates global citizen development, but the findings suggested that mobility is not a panacea for change. Moreover, it was suggested in the sub-theme Nudging the comfort zone (sub-theme Chapter Eight) that change can occur simply by expanding one's sphere of interest, beyond your local peers in your social environment. Collectively, the Recognisable markers for the global citizen identified from this research provide insight into what the global citizen means in practical terms. The markers can be thought of as contributing to the 'identikit' for the global citizen. They are by no means conclusive, nor are they claimed to be. Rather they are offered as a guide to identify the global citizen disposition.

The themes associated with the manifestations of change described by students are reported in Chapter Eight. Specifically, the theme of Broadening perspectives is a central marker for the global citizen. Also, all students described situations where they were demonstrating Cosmopolitan hospitality (Derrida, 2001; Peters & Tukeo, 2010) in their attitudes and willingness to help others. They were thinking beyond themselves and their immediate circle. They felt more independent, confident, capable, and mature than prior to the mobility experience. They understood that their Accelerated maturity had occurred as a result of dealing with challenging situations. They were able to rationalise how the unsettling experience of being Out of the comfort zone contributed to
very significant personal growth and change. Furthermore, they were expanding horizons in the way they were *Widening horizons*.

The engagement marker highlighted the way students were able to show agency by acting on a moral stance, even if just in choice of consumer items. The combined findings show that commitment and agency, along with engagement with different others locally and globally, are markers of the global citizens. These markers will be explained in relation to pedagogical implications for educating global citizens, further in this chapter. There has been much criticism of the intangible nature of the global citizen, yet the combined findings provide insight into making the global citizen ‘real’ in practical terms. The identikit is presented in Table 9.1. The markers for a global citizen ‘Identikit’. The 'Identikit' of markers is at an early stage of research sophistication. It is not possible at this stage to make assumptions about the markers, for instance, assume any relationship to particular graduate attributes. It is unlikely that the markers are mutually exclusive or interchangeable.
Table 9.1  The markers for a global citizen ‘identikit’

| BROAD MARKERS FOR THE GLOBAL CITIZEN: |
| A COSMOPOLITAN DISPOSITION |

- Prepared to leave comfort zone
  - Shows courage to go on a mobility experience
  - Prepared to mix beyond social peers
  - Confronts challenging situations
  - Readiness to engage and work with different ‘others’
  - Engages in challenging learning situations
- Thinking differently
  - Uses moral and ethical reasoning in problem solving
  - Shows awareness of self and others
  - Makes the interconnections of knowledge across complex local global constructs
  - Recognises a common humanity and environmental sustainability
- Engages beyond immediate circle of peers, family and friends
  - Willingness to engage with social and cultural others
  - Shows patience and willingness to understand different accents and limited language skills
  - Volunteering, service, community participation
  - Cosmopolitan hospitality
  - Acts on consumer awareness
- Shows a mature attitude and initiative
- Considers self, life, others and career, and the world beyond narrow expectations.

As highlighted in Chapter Six, the global citizen is socially embedded in the complex organisational environment of the contemporary 21st century university. The importance of university support for educating global citizens is expanded on in the next section.

9.4  University support for global citizen learning

The present research makes a contribution to our understanding of the global citizen in higher education by identifying organisational constraints and enablers that either
hinder or assist in translating the global citizen from policy to practice. Increasingly universities articulate their commitment to educating global citizens, yet there is little empirical evidence of the organisational support needed to meet this aim. The findings from Study One and Study Two suggest that global citizen learning is consistent with the aims of a liberal education. Yet, it is rare for universities to adopt a mainstream approach for liberal learning or global citizen learning. Schneider (2004) referred to this organisational situation as a “voluntary conspiracy of silence” (p. 10) in universities. She claimed there is public unawareness of the purpose of liberal education. Yet she also emphasised there is public support for the analytical judgement, social responsibility, civic engagement and economic opportunity that a liberal education offers. This research suggests that this situation also applies to global citizen learning in universities and in the public eye. The central themes in Chapter Six highlighted how the neoliberal policy influences have altered the form and function of the twenty-first century university. These influences constrain the education of students as global citizens.

The first theme in Chapter Six, Commercialisation versus public good, explained the contradictory tensions and reasons as to why social responsibility and public good are not priorities of the commercialised university. Yet, in Chapter Eight, students identified that they are not encouraged to Nudge their comfort zone (Theme 1, Sub-theme 4) in learning. These students highly valued the learning that occurred as a result of their challenging experiences from being Out of their comfort zone. They had not understood the benefits of being environmentally challenged and engaged in intercultural and interpersonal encounters with others. They emphasised that a university education is not marketed to students as a broader intellectual experience that could develop their capacity to expand their personal horizons, and that could enable them to become more socially responsible. Students understood a university education as being geared to getting a degree. Policy rhetoric of educating global citizens did not enter the student sphere of thinking or in their expectations of learning. In this respect Schneider (2004) p. 10) considered universities should promote and synthesise socially responsibility and globally connected educational experiences with vocational training for all students to broaden their horizons.

The organisational constraints were further discussed in Chapter Six through Theme 2, The managerial mindset, and its sub-themes of Measuring performance and Reinforcing the managerial mindset. This theme and sub-themes highlighted how external measurement indicators imposed by external funding bodies created a situation internally where organisational incentives for staff were not necessarily designed to support quality teaching. The incentives were instrumental in meeting
external reporting requirements. For instance, teaching designed to score well on student satisfaction surveys might not necessarily take students beyond their comfort zones in learning. The findings from the two studies highlighted the organisational mismatch between current teaching and learning practice and the learning environment that students need to learn as global citizens.

Through Chapter Six themes, Leadership tensions and Academic considerations, it was explained how the neoliberal model of the corporate university has impacted on leadership style and has positioned vocational learning outcomes as the priority. This situation has imposed contradictory pressures on leadership. In contrast to the leadership style explained though the sub-theme Corporate leadership, a more cosmopolitan style of leadership was suggested in the sub-theme Thought leadership. This sub-theme echoes and speaks to Delanty’s (2001, p. 158) call for universities to reinvigorate the “cosmopolitan project central to its identity from the beginning”. He highlighted the important role universities have in balancing relativism and instrumentalism in the twenty-first century. According to Delanty, universities are important zones of interconnectivity for opposing technical and cultural domains, and he argued that cosmopolitanism is central to balancing these tensions. In a similar vein, other prominent authors and peak bodies have reflected on the needs of the twenty-first century university. They have reiterated a need to reinvigorate a humanistic purpose in higher education. (American Association of Colleges and Universities, 2012; Delors et al., 2010; McArthur, 2011; Nussbaum, 2010).

The integrated findings in this research suggested that Thought leadership could mediate in the internal university environment to support the effective translation of ‘policy to practice’ for social responsibility aims and global citizen learning. Thought leaders have the ability to balance the conflicting tensions of commercialisation and public good. Thought leaders would: recognise the constraints at play; mediate in challenges with external funding bodies and their internal staff relationships; and influence organisational processes. Furthermore, thought leaders will need to facilitate organisational processes to reframe student expectations of learning beyond current expectations. As explained in Section 9.5, student engagement and expectations for learning are also important in the overall systemic organisational approach to educating socially responsible global citizens.

More integrative organisational approaches to internationalisation strategies are emerging in the literature. According to Hudzik (2013, p. 58) there is a cultural shift under way in higher education that will require faculty, staff and students to think and behave within a twenty-first century frame of reference. He highlighted the need for the
macro level of the organisation to support international programs throughout the university. Hunter (2013, p. 61) also identified the importance of leadership. She acknowledged that not only are leaders needed to support effective governance structures, but they also need the visionary capacity to engage as agents of their own change as well. Both Hudzik and Hunter have identified the need for leaders to be systemically involved during the ‘policy to practice’ process of enacting social responsibility in the contemporary university. Further contributing to the discussion of the systemic nature of social responsibility, Leask (2013b) situated the internationalisation of the curriculum within the complexity of the organisational environment and disciplinary learning contexts. Furthermore, she identified the need to assist academic staff in understanding how different contexts influence their understanding of internationalisation of the curriculum (p. 102). The findings also support Corryell and colleagues (2010) evidence-based organisational issues for embedding social responsibility across the university. Educating global citizens requires dialogue and engagement between all actors through a contextually grounded vision. Successfully educating global citizens within the university will require a systemically embedded approach across multiple levels of influence.

9.4.1 The social responsibility of the university

In spite of more inclusive and integrative models of internationalisation emerging, as yet few universities systemically embed global citizen learning throughout the university. Yet, most universities espouse a commitment to some form of social responsibility and operationalise these aims in different ways. Frequently universities promote their social causes, for example through International Women’s Day or Naidoc Week, or through sustainability and Indigenous strategies. This can occur outside the overall educational experience of students. As pointed out in the Chapter Six sub-theme, *Integrating values-based education*, “universities are loose organisations” (AUS/NZ 19). There is potential for even the most committed university to fall short on making its social responsibility aims “mean something” (US 12) in terms of educating global citizens, if value laden strategies are not well integrated into student learning.

In Chapter Six sub-themes, *Integrating values-based education* and *Thought leadership*, the absence of an explicit voice to identify and support values in universities was discussed both at the individual leader perspective as well as at the level of the academy. As commented on by AUS/NZ 5 in Chapter Six, “the academy has retreated into cultural relativism”. Building on Delanty’s (2001) perspective on relativism and instrumentalism in universities, McArthur (2011) challenged universities on their fundamental responsibility to address their internal and external value conflicts. The
'value-neutral zone' created by the relativism of values in higher education was raised in Chapter Six and Chapter Seven. Providing further insight to values, Appiah (2006) argued that relativism was adopted in the belief it would result in tolerance, however relativism in fact extinguished cosmopolitan engagement and dialogue about a shared world:

*If we cannot learn from one another what it is right to think and feel and do, then conversation between us will be pointless. Relativism of that sort isn’t a way to encourage conversation, it’s just a reason to fall silent.* (Appiah, 2006, p. 31)

Chapter Five sub-theme, *Conspiracy of silence and culture of disinterest*, spoke to Appiah’s perspective. For example, the culture of neglect was exemplified by the way AUS/NZ 3 said, “we have become unpretentious about values and take things such as tolerance for granted” (AUS/NZ 3). Also this culture was reiterated in the way UK 15 described a university leader comment about a proposed global citizen program, “this is about values and we don’t do values”. Providing further insight to the *Conspiracy of silence and culture of disinterest*, AUS/NZ 1 explained how academics’ values camouflage their value stance, or alternatively, as explained by McArthur (2011), it is hidden behind ambiguous language.

On the basis of the findings in this research, without individual and collective university responsibility and agency, the silence of values will continue to pervade university culture. Without thought leaders and organisational support, the aim for educating all students as global citizens will remain rhetorical.

### 9.4.2 Supportive processes for policy to practice

A body of work discusses comprehensive integration of internationalisation across the university infrastructure (Caruana & Ploner, 2010; Childress, 2007; Hudzik, 2011; Jones, 2013b; Leask, 2012). To date however, there is little evidence to support the effectiveness of these integrated organisational approaches for educating students as global citizens. The current research makes a contribution to the organisational implications for educating global citizens by providing several evidence-based insights for educating global citizens as part of an overall organisational approach.

First, in Chapter Six, the sub-theme *Thought leadership* suggested that university leaders also need a global citizen disposition. They need to articulate and act on an explicit value stance towards socially responsible education. For implementing and monitoring values across the organisation, thought leaders would need to oversee human resource management strategies in organisational planning and support processes. Thought leaders are capable of supporting embedded values as well as
corporate responsibility. In this way leaders could be in a better position to ‘walk the talk’. For instance, a globally thinking university needs academics that are supported in thinking and acting globally. Otherwise, global citizen learning will not reach students. As discussed in the Chapter Six sub-theme, Integrating values-based teaching, socially embedded academics hold great potential for acting as Cosmopolitan role models (Chapter Six sub-theme and Chapter Eight theme). On the other hand, Sawir (2013, p. 1) found that academics who actively engaged with international students could be inspiring in the way they teach. EU 11, as a leader, represented both a Thought leadership role as well as a Cosmopolitan role model through his/her relationships with both students and staff by saying:

Lots of things you can’t teach directly. You can at best be a role model. And also in your own handling and style of management, as a team, demonstrate the values that you aspire them to have. (EU 11)

The findings suggest that thought leaders and organisationally supported cosmopolitan role models are important drivers for educating socially responsible global citizens.

In Study Two, students thought universities should market the broader purposes of a university education beyond a degree. Becoming a global citizen is possible at home. You don’t need to go overseas to have an international experience. Through Study Two themes, Thinking differently, and the sub-themes, Questioning assumptions, Thinking comparatively and Acknowledging fault, the students’ stories explained how their eyes were opened and they started to think critically, morally and ethically. Students felt that it would be possible for universities to improve learning experiences for all students by providing different learning experiences and encouraging them to move beyond their safe social environments. In this way, all students could have the opportunity to learn as global citizens. However, this type of learning needs to be marketed to students to change their expectations of the university experience. The next section expands on the possibilities for global citizen learning for all students.

9.5 The pedagogical possibilities for educating global citizens

The present research has considered the global citizen from concept to practice. The limitations to such a broad lens of enquiry meant the pedagogical possibilities for IoC were not examined in depth. Yet the integrated findings offer insight to the theory and practice of global citizen learning. The integrated findings connected the abstract notions of cosmopolitan learning discussed by informants and the literature to the real-world experiences of students. The pedagogical possibilities are discussed in terms of
creating a shared understanding of global citizen learning for academics and students, and how this might inform integrative approaches to IoC. The next section expands our understanding of what global citizen learning means in higher education.

9.5.1 The cosmopolitan basis of global citizen learning

The cosmopolitan basis of global citizen learning was explained in Chapter Seven, identifying a gap in current learning and teaching practice. This research makes a contribution to knowledge by demonstrating an evidence-based association between informants and students’ findings and moral and transformative cosmopolitanism. For instance from Study One sub-theme 2, Thinking differently, AUS/NZ 19 admitted that it was not usual for disciplinary learning to engage students with the social construction of knowledge, or “ways of thought” or “ways of knowing” to broaden their perspectives. Yet this informant explained “the real purpose of higher education is not just putting things into minds, but opening them up” (AUS/NZ 19). The cosmopolitan basis of learning is about opening minds and is underpinned by the abstract “epistemic virtues” (AUS/NZ 4) of the global citizen. The sub-theme of Thinking differently explained how these capacities transformed student perspectives and outlooks on life. They were able to see the world relationally through the eyes of others.

The epistemology for Thinking differently as a global citizen, was also described by informants in Chapter Seven as: “basics of knowing” (AUS/NZ 19); “habits of mind” (AUS/NZ 5); “systems thinking” (AUS/NZ 6); “the interdisciplinarity”(EU 25); “transferring of competences” (EU 23) and “entering into the imaginative world of the other” (AUS/NZ 1). However, Study Two provided examples offering practical insight to the ways students started to think differently. The collective student stories helped us understand the mindset changes that students undergo during the process of global citizen learning. For instance in Chapter Eight, the central facilitating theme for change was explained through Out of the comfort zone. Being Out of the comfort zone created a situation where students were Thinking differently (Part Two/theme 1) about themselves and others and the bigger world. For instance the following quote in this theme shows how EU xii had time to critically reflect on personal assumptions. The student was thinking relationally and reflexively:

*It made me think how critical I was on Australians about Aboriginals...then I could see we have the same with Greenland (Inuit). Sometimes you need to be taken out of your own daily life and your views you have on other people and then when you see it from the other side. That really gives you a lot. And it's easy to judge others but then sometimes when you see yourself from that side you're exactly the same. (EU xii)*

203
This student explains a situation where he/she was developing a global mindset using the moral and ethical capacities. The student and was showing fallibility and cultural humility. He/she had critically questioned assumptions (reflexivity) and could imagine and consider another perspective (social imaginary and relationality), had acknowledged fault and was Thinking differently.

Becoming a global citizen was explained through the facilitating themes in Chapter Eight (Out of the comfort zone, Interpersonal encounters and Interpersonal relationships, and Cosmopolitan role model) and in supporting sub-themes. These challenging situations contributed to student transformation and self-formation as a global citizen. These sub-themes are discussed in the next section to provide more insight to the global citizen mindset.

9.5.2 The capacities of the global citizen mindset

Thinking differently (sub-theme Study One and theme Study Two) as a global citizen is a core concept that links Study One and Study Two. The capacities for the global citizen mindset for Thinking differently were described by informants and exemplified by student stories. These capacities were explained by informants and by the literature as reflexivity (Beck, 1994), relationality (Marginson & Sawir, 2011), criticality (Rizvi, 2009) and the social imaginary (Appadurai, 1996). While these terms may be unfamiliar to many and are not considered mainstream within disciplinary learning, the student stories demonstrated how central these capacities were to changing their perspectives, disposition and attitudes. These capacities were the ‘tools’ students used to think differently as global citizens. These ‘tools’ worked interactively to ‘fuel’ a global citizen mindset.

The student stories helped to translate the “epistemic virtues” described by AUS/NZ 4 (Chapter seven, theme one, sub-theme 3) into concrete tools for learning as global citizens. The learning process was described through the Chapter Eight theme, Thinking differently, and the sub-themes of Questioning assumptions, Thinking comparatively and Acknowledging fault. These sub-themes explained how students were thinking critically, reflexively and relationally. Through their encounters and relationships with others, they engaged in the social imaginary and saw the world through the eyes of others. From the lived experience, being Out of the comfort zone was the central reason students started to change and to think and learn differently. Yet, the facilitators of change are intricately interwoven with the manifestations of change as described in Chapter Eight. These manifestations are the learning outcomes that are aimed for in university graduate statements. Yet, as this research shows, if the
facilitating situations and circumstances are not provided to students, the aim of mainstream global citizen learning is restricted.

The student stories also offered insight to the process theory for global citizen learning. By examining the sub-themes from the student stories (Self-realisation, Learning about relationships, Soul searching, Coping, Capable, Other focused, Empathetic and Thinking differently), comparisons with the four lenses of transformative learning theory could be made (Daloz, 2000; Dirkz et al., 2006; Friere, 1973; Mezirow, 2000a) as a way of explaining the theoretical basis of global citizen learning. This is expanded on in the next section.

9.5.3 Global citizen learning and transformative learning theory
The research expanded our understanding of the theoretical basis of global citizen learning. Not only does the research support a moral and transformative cosmopolitan philosophy, epistemology and ontology (Sanderson, 2011; Vertovec & Cohen, 2002), the student and informant sub-themes resonate well with transformative learning theory. For instance, when emotionally challenged in different situations, students started to engage with different others. They started to question their assumptions (reflexivity), they began thinking comparatively (relationally) and made interconnections across contextual issues from the political, economic, social, technical, environmental and cultural aspects.

The global citizen mindset for making interconnections across complex constructs and contexts locally and globally as described by informants and students was consistent with ‘epistemic cognition’, described in transformative learning theory (Mezirow, 2000a). It was explained through the theme and sub-themes of Awareness of others and Thinking differently. Students were able to appreciate and acknowledge their faults, naivety and personal fallibility. They could see things from the perspective of others. They were empathetic towards the plight of others, and willing to help (Cosmopolitan hospitality). In this way they demonstrated their cultural, moral and intellectual humility (Hill, 1983). As an integral part of the ongoing process of global citizen learning, students engaged in a mindset that fostered their moral reasoning and social responsibility.

The process of global citizen learning described in this research and transformative learning theory share similar underpinnings of informed, free human choice, critical thinking, moral reasoning, self-awareness and empathy (Mezirow, 2000a). Transformative learning can be viewed through four different lenses (Dirkx et
These were explained previously in the literature review as: Daloz’s (1999) developmental approach; Freire’s (1972) emancipatory approach related to dialogic reasoning; Mezirow’s (1991) rational approach involving metacognitive practical reasoning directed towards action; and Dirkx’s extrarational approach which is associated with emotional circumstances for learning. The students in this research engaged and transformed in a way that was consistent with these four lenses of transformative learning theory. Student learning occurred along a developmental continuum (developmental approach), and students engaged and learned from different others (dialogic reasoning/emancipatory approach). They made the interconnections of knowledge by thinking reflexively, relationally, critically and imaginatively to change behaviours and perspectives (rational approach), and their ways of Thinking differently were facilitated by being Out of their comfort zone in challenging situations (extrarational approach).

The integrated findings of Study One and Study Two strongly suggest that the moral and transformative cosmopolitan basis of global citizen learning is consistent with the four lenses of transformative learning theory. These theoretical lenses explain how students learn to negotiate confronting or unfamiliar situations, to critically evaluate their own and others’ purposes and values, and understand social complexity through values of tolerance, social justice and equality (Mezirow, 2000a). The student global mindset and global citizen learning provide the ‘conceptual glue’ linking the global citizen to teaching and learning. In this way, the global citizen is provided greater conceptual and practical meaning and is expanded in section 9.5.9.

9.5.4 Broadening disciplinary approaches

As discussed in the literature review and Chapters Five, Six and Seven, neoliberal influence on higher education in the late twentieth century and early twenty-first century has led to an increased focus on vocational learning. Several informants expressed this as a major conflict to the intellectual purpose of higher education. For example, EU 23 explained (Chapter Five, theme 3):

*We’re very good at educating highly competent, highly specialised subject specialists. We’re less good at educating intellectuals. I mean people who can take their subject specific competence and be able to see what is my field, what is a transferable contribution to the whole. You cannot solve challenges like the climate change or social cohesion without this. (EU 23)*

The student stories explained how their mobility challenged them to think and reason in an intellectual way as global citizens. From the students’ stories it appears that these
circumstances facilitated and fostered values-based interconnected thinking and learning.

For one or more of the reasons previously discussed in this thesis, there has been a decline in the emphasis given to ethical frameworks for learning. However, global citizen learning could become mainstream if it were considered “a cross-disciplinary thread” in education as suggested by EU 9 (Chapter seven, theme 1, sub-theme 4). The themes of Integrating values-based teaching, Broadening vocational learning, Thought leaders, and Cosmopolitan role model identified the constraints to educating global citizens. Constraints to educating global citizens were reported more frequently in this research than the enablers.

In recognition to the constraints for educating global citizen and highlighting a way to move forward in higher education, Nahas (2012) identified the role of the international academe by saying:

The academic family is in the best position to create a common approach to the values that unite us in total respect of the human being and the ethics that govern the relations between societies and institutions. (Nahas, 2012, p. 24)

Building on the role and responsibility of the university, Green (2012, p. 97) called for a review of internationalisation where student learning for global citizenship was the central concern rather than the counting of university inputs or activities. As explained by EU 9 (Chapter Seven sub-theme/Broadening vocational learning), there is a consensus on global citizen values but “the specifications for how it is implemented and carried out” are lacking. This research suggests that all actors in contemporary universities need a shared understanding of the purpose and processes involved with global citizen learning.

9.5.5 Reframing global citizen learning

The disorienting impact of the mobility experience cannot be understated, yet this experience is not, and may never be, available to the majority of students. While IoC and Internationalisation at Home (IaH) are designed to broaden the learning experience for all students, the success of these strategies is only starting to emerge in the literature (Hanson, 2010; Jones & Killick, 2013; Leask, 2009; Marginson & Sawir, 2011; Sawir, 2013). The present research has identified several issues to consider. In particular, the student stories offered insight to improving learning opportunities for the non-mobile population of students. Moreover, many students thought universities could do more to raise students’ awareness of broader learning experiences in a number of respects.
The student sub-themes of *Culture shock*, *The positive aspect of culture shock*, *Legitimising change* and *Nudging the comfort zone* highlighted central challenges for IoC and IaH. First, students felt that 'culture shock' needed to be reframed as a positive experience to all students as a way to learn, transform and grow. As explained by AUS xvii in *Nudging the comfort zone*, you cannot change unless “you have given yourself a chance to break away and be independent”. The notion of maturity and learning is rarely explained to students, yet as explained by Marginson and Sawir (2011), every transition in learning results in self-formation. Second, while changing the social environment is essential for challenging students' equilibrium, it need not be as dramatic as going to the other side of the world. Students need to realise that their sense of confidence, independence, maturity and potential for global citizen learning is contingent on undertaking more challenging learning such as volunteering (Caruana, 2012a; Jones, 2010), service learning (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Kezar & Rhoads, 2001), and engaging with diverse 'others' socially and academically on campus. Caruana (2012b) developed a model for student learning in multicultural community environments utilising a ‘cosmopolitan local’ construct to enhance community learning, intercultural understanding and cross-cultural capability. Yet, globally adaptive approaches to teaching and learning are often considered as extra curricula and have been explored little in mainstream learning.

As explained through the Chapter Eight themes *Interpersonal relationships* and *Interpersonal encounters* and sub-theme *Different friends*, students need to understand that by engaging with ‘different others’, such as international students and broadening their friendships, their minds will open to see and *Think differently*. This is an essential part of becoming a global citizen and needs to be reframed in a meaningful way to students. However, while the benefit of domestic and international students interacting effectively has been identified, many domestic students continue to avoid working with internationals on group assignments (Leask, 2009; Marginson & Sawir, 2011; Sawir, 2013).

Students need to understand the relevance of engaging with their ethical and moral capacities during interpersonal encounters with diverse others. They need to understand that it is possible to be critical of your own beliefs without discarding self-identity, patriotism, culture or religion. In this sense, students learn to accept that their self-identity will evolve and change as part of their intellectual global citizen learning experience. As explained through the manifestation themes, self-formation as a global citizen occurred in response to mobility students dealing with the challenges of being *Out of the comfort zone*. In contrast, how often do universities and academics provide
opportunities for non-mobile students to step *Out of the comfort zone?* Organisationally there are bridges to cross for integrating global citizen learning into IoC. However, thought leaders could advocate for and reinvigorate an intellectual interest in the cosmopolitan basis of learning. For this to be successful, academics and students’ expectations of learning may need to be challenged.

### 9.5.6 Changing student expectations of learning

The task of changing student expectations in learning has not been explored in the context of mainstream global citizen learning. Yet, as explained in the sub-theme *Nudging the comfort zone:*

> You don’t really have to turn everything upside down and throw a student in the middle of nowhere, just to learn respect for a different culture or for a different religion. (AUS 26)

The multicultural university has the potential to nudge the comfort zone of all students. However, as pointed out by Sawir (2013, p. 1), domestic students remain ignorant of their changing cultural environment. Many domestic students would consider they were informed, worldly and independent, yet remain unaware that they are not. As explained through the theme *Out of their comfort zone,* students in this research had no idea how unworldly, naïve and dependent they were until they travelled abroad. They conveyed that while it is normal for many students to hesitate in moving beyond the comfort zone, all should be made aware that “you haven't given yourself a chance to break away and be independent” (AUS xiv, *Nudging the comfort zone*) if you do not.

In support of reframing the purpose of learning to students, McArthur (2011) argued universities should explain more explicitly to students that their education develops broader human and social traits that prepare them to be good citizens. He argued that students have a right to perceive themselves as more than a valuable commodity to national productivity. They need to understand why broader aspects of learning benefit them personally as citizens, in their lives and careers, and collectively for the public good.

*Language pain tolerance* (sub-theme Chapter Five) and *Passive engagement* (sub-theme Chapter Eight) in the classroom are conceptually related sub-themes and offer useful perspectives for IoC. The former can be thought of as a marker of the global citizen, while the latter can be thought of as an indirect teaching approach to foster *Language pain tolerance* in the classroom. EU 17 described *Language pain tolerance*
(sub-theme Chapter Five) as “the best preparation for an international career” (EU 17). This in itself could be reframed in student terms. For instance, *Language pain tolerance* could be promoted to students as a desirable attribute for employment and a recognisable marker of the global citizen. In contrast to students’ avoidance of interpersonal dialogue in difficult language situations, students could be challenged (nudge your comfort zone) to use these situations to improve their ability to listen and and learn from student with different accents and language proficiency.

*Passive engagement* can be understood as a facilitating circumstance for *Language pain tolerance*. If teachers engaged more with international students or students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds in the classroom, domestic students could learn from the interchange while observing the teacher engage with the cultural ‘others’. They would learn more about the student and become accustomed to different accents. *Passive engagement*, therefore, could provide an ‘icebreaker’ via which domestic students could engage with students from diverse cultural backgrounds. They would have an entry point for future conversation with these students. Potentially, there could be a number of ways to obtain greater student engagement, through modelling the benefits of engagement with different others as part of global citizen learning. These student insights highlighted the benefit of engaging students in future research on global citizen learning.

9.5.7 **The cosmopolitan role model**

The *Cosmopolitan role model* was identified as a sub-theme with informants in Chapter Six and it was also identified as an important facilitating theme in Chapter Eight. Both studies highlighted the potential of the *Cosmopolitan role model* for influencing, motivating, and inspiring students to start to think differently as global citizens. As EU 25 highlighted “there are some things you just can’t teach people” (Chapter Seven, theme 1, sub-theme 2). Yet the integrated findings in this research demonstrated how the *Cosmopolitan role model* can stimulate students to think differently.

An example of the *Cosmopolitan role model* was provided in Chapter Six, theme 4. AUS/NZ 6 related consistent student feedback about why their classroom learning experience with him/her had such a dramatic effect on opening their eyes and minds to think differently. This quote is further expanded below. AUS/NZ 6 picks up on three themes from student feedback in respect of his/her teaching approach. These themes suggest the style of teaching is impassioned, it encourages interconnected thinking across disciplinary areas, and learning is linked to real world situations and practice.
The three themes of feedback given to AUS/NZ 6:

...you seem to be passionate about this.”

... you make connections between things that nobody normally does and you're trans-disciplinary. So you’ll make a connection between economics and ecology or between ecology and town planning and town planning and complexity theory or whatever.”

... you’ve managed to root whatever it is you do in practice. So it isn’t just theory. You’ve told us that actually it’s happened somewhere or other and this is how it is – and this is what's been learnt. And you’ve told us that it’s a journey and that it’s a learning experience. This isn’t finite”.

The student feedback given to AUS/NZ 6 (Study One) is consistent with the way students’ described an influential teacher in the Cosmopolitan role model in Chapter Eight (Study Two). The combined findings from Study One and Study Two provide evidence to link the emotional or extra-rational (Dirkz et al., 2006) and rational, ‘epistemic cognition’ (Mezirow, 2000a) aspects of transformative learning theory to global citizen learning. AUS/NZ 6 as a Cosmopolitan role model provided students with the facilitating circumstances for global citizen learning. The cosmopolitan role model nudged students’ comfort zone in learning. They learned to think differently and make interconnections of knowledge content across different contexts.

According to Sanderson (2011) there is a lack of research on the qualities of the ‘ideal academic’ role model in international learning. He explained that the ‘ideal academic’ demonstrates a commitment to a cosmopolitan outlook and acts as a catalyst in the university, as well as influencing students. On the other hand, Sawir (2013) explained how international students have the capacity to inspire academic teaching. Along a similar line, Lysaker and Furness (2012) discussed how academics can engage in relational-orientated dialogic pedagogy. Their approach enables teachers to engage in personal and professional transformation through moral reasoning. Furthermore, Lysaker and Furness (2012) and Sanderson (2011) are supportive of the transformative cosmopolitan basis of global citizen learning. But the transitioning process for academics in broadening their approaches to teaching is unclear. Mak and Barker (2013) have tailored an intercultural program (EXCELL) for health and business academics to build their intercultural understanding. Leask (2012) has developed IoC in Action to expand academics’ ability to conceptualise an internationalised curriculum. However, to date there is little research examining the cosmopolitan mindset of academics and their potential to influence students.
As a final theoretical insight into the disciplinary context of global citizen learning, Barnett (2004, p. 255) distinguished between educational development and educational transformation. He considered that student transformation occurred by transitioning through four quadrants (zones) of pedagogical practice. These quadrants are: zone 1: disciplinary initiation (knowledge field as given); zone 2: disciplinary wonder (knowledge field uncertain and subject to change); zone 3: generic skills (fixed ontologies for an unknown world); and zone 4: human being as such (open ontologies for an unknown world). From the student stories cited in this thesis, their transformational experiences occurred primarily in Barnett’s final quadrant, zone 4 of learning. Being out of their comfort zone facilitated their learning.

Barnett explained that this learning is disturbing and high-risk to one’s knowing and understanding and sense of being (ontology). He emphasised that learning in this quadrant required student-led tasks that challenged and confronted certainty and engaged the imagination. The qualities he identified for learning for an uncertain future included the qualities of carefulness, thoughtfulness, humility, criticality, receptiveness, resilience, courage and stillness. He considered that learning in an uncertain world couldn’t be understood simply through knowledge and skills, but through an enacting of pedagogy for human ‘being’. He also emphasised the importance of reciprocity between teacher and students, as uncertainty requires relatively open relationships between the two. Barnett’s position can be considered consistent and complementary to the cosmopolitan basis of global citizen learning and the cosmopolitan role model described in this thesis.

Reflection on the two studies suggests that by engaging academics in the theory and process of global citizen learning and transformative learning theory through professional development activities, academics as well as students have the potential to engage in personal and professional transformation. On the basis of the findings presented in this thesis, the synthesis of global citizen learning and IoC will be a complex undertaking on many levels. In-depth analysis of the complexity of this organisational approach is beyond the scope of the current thesis. Nevertheless, suggestions are made in the next section related to pedagogical possibilities.

9.5.8 Integrating global citizen learning and IoC
There remains much to be resolved about global citizen learning. As such, it is impossible to be definitive at this stage about how best to synthesise it as a mainstream learning approach within IoC. Nevertheless, this section integrates what has been learnt from the current research as pedagogical possibilities for IoC in the future. The complexity of the
global citizen learning environment was identified by Leask (2011), who suggested that in reality, IoC is subject to a great deal of “Wishing and Hoping”, rather than concrete evidence. In a similar vein, Caruana (2010) concluded that the values and attitudes of staff and students towards intercultural issues in higher education have changed little over the last two decades, despite the impacts of globalisation. The pedagogical possibilities for integrating the values and capacities of the global citizen into IoC are constrained: by the corporate leadership; by academic resistance; by student expectations of learning; as well as by the current level of pedagogical uncertainty for moving forward.

From a more positive and pragmatic perspective, in Chapter Six, the themes of Integrating values-based education and Beyond vocational learning provide ways of linking global citizen values to learning as a way of enhancing employability. In a similar vein, Caruana (2010a) and McArthur (2011) both flagged the need to connect the broader aspects of education to pragmatic employment aims. For example, Caruana (2010) found that synchronising internationalisation with ethical and philosophical frameworks made ‘good business sense’. Further, Kidder (2005) claimed that engaging in values-based education represents the best risk-management policy for the twenty-first century. In contrast to a remote philosophical concept, he described moral courage (moral reasoning and moral action) as a practical necessity of modern life. As such, drawing on these three authors’ perspectives, global citizen learning can be thought of as the uniting concept for integrating values into vocational learning. Yet global citizen learning needs to be reframed in terms that are appealing to students, academics, and institutional leadership.

The three distinct steps of Leask’s (2011, p. 647) IoC intervention could assist with integrating global citizen learning with IoC. She suggested that by (1) aligning the informal and formal curriculum, (2) focusing on pedagogical approaches to task design, and (3) adopting new approaches to staff professional development, a more comprehensive ‘policy to practice’ outcome for internationalisation of the curriculum is possible. The evidence from the current research supports these suggested steps. It is proposed that global citizen learning, as described in this research, could be integrated as a complementary theoretical lens and practical strategy to this intervention. However, global citizen learning would engage with pedagogy more aligned to Barnett’s zone 4 pedagogical practice where learning is geared for uncertainty and challenge.

An integrated approach for global citizen learning would involve nudging students’ comfort zones and engaging them in learning activities with different others. Students would need to have their equilibrium disturbed to allow them to open their
minds, to considering people and situations from ‘the other side’ (relationality) and thinking differently. Clearly, there is much work to be done on researching and refining an effective framework for integrating global citizen learning and IoC. Nevertheless, expanding on Leask’s (2011) three points, and incorporating the learning from this research, a systemic approach to embedding the global citizen in curricula can be developed. Global citizen learning synthesised into mainstream learning approaches offers potential for future research.

9.5.9 Conceptualising global citizen learning

The synthesised findings from Study One and Study Two provide grounded-constructed ‘sense making’ for what it means to be and become a global citizen during the process of global citizen learning. Figure 9.1 provides a visual representation of the student experience and mindset for global citizen learning. The model demonstrates how the process of global citizen learning can be conceptualised as a whole. The model demonstrates the cell of global citizen learning. It represents the unified way that the facilitators and manifestations of change feed into and are fed by the nucleus of Thinking differently. The nucleus of Thinking differently forms the basis of the student global mindset.

The ethical and moral capacities of the student mindset (social imaginary, reflexivity, relationality and criticality) provide the ‘tools and fuel’ for Thinking differently. The ongoing activity that is facilitated in challenging situations and circumstances from being Out the comfort zone nurtures the ongoing process of global citizen learning. The student global mindset is the generating centre of global citizen learning.
Figure 9.1  Conceptualising global citizen learning
9.6 Unanticipated findings

There were unanticipated findings in both the informant and student data that influenced the researcher’s thinking and interpretive position. Furthermore, explanations are given as to why they were not expected. In an attempt to explain the unanticipated findings during the data collection and analysis, the researcher reflected on these findings through several different lenses. First, the Principles of the Hermeneutic Circle (Klein & Myers, 1999) discussed in Chapter Four were considered at all times during the research process to ensure the analysis was balanced between the evidence, the literature, contrasting theories and researcher interpretation. Therefore, the researcher at all times attempted to: exercise suspicion (Klein & Myers, 1999); be reflexive and sensitive; be an objective researcher; and be a careful interpreter of the findings. The unanticipated findings were several.

The researcher did not expect the combined evidence to so strongly support a moral and transformative cosmopolitan paradigm, philosophically, epistemologically, and ontologically. Equally, the researcher was working on a hunch that transformative learning theory was involved with student transformation that is consistent with becoming a global citizen as a result of mobility. Yet, the researcher did not expect to find the association of moral and transformative cosmopolitanism and transformative learning theory to be so closely intertwined, or be such an effective theoretical basis for drawing the evidence from Study One and Study Two together. While intuitively it is rational, there does not appear to be empirical evidence to support this association from other researchers in the past. Furthermore, the cosmopolitan nature of interpersonal encounters, dialogue, and relationships has not previously been widely reported with respect to mobility and global citizen development in higher education. This finding could possibly be due to the a-theoretical approaches and predominance of quantitative research on student mobility and change.

The researcher did not expect such strong informant support for values-based learning in higher education. An understanding of the predominant commercial environment in higher education and emphasis on employability and skill development underpinned this expectation. From another perspective, in the planning stage, the researcher had personal correspondence with a prominent author on global citizenship. This author warned against discussing values in a thesis. The author considered this approach would prove disappointing in contemporary universities. Therefore, values were not specifically addressed in the research protocol at the outset. Nevertheless, during the first two interviews, the researcher felt there was a need to have a clearer
understanding between intercultural competence and the global citizen. Once values were raised with informants in the early interviews, the value-based findings continued to emerge as presented in this thesis.

Furthermore, the degree of humanistic learning described in the student stories was unanticipated. This can be explained by the researcher’s assumption that a number of students would persist with their individual worldview. From this assumption, the researcher expected to hear some elements of ethnocentrism from students. The absence of such findings could be explained by the power differential between participants and researcher, discussed in Chapter Four. However, the researcher believes the student stories. The students appeared and sounded authentic during their interviews and other personal communication. They all showed they were developing as moral and transformative global citizens. As explained through the continuum of development, students demonstrated their development at different stages along the continuum, but there were no examples of ethnocentrism. In particular, even students who mixed very little with the domestic students in their host university described changes.

Finally, it is still possible that an unanticipated bias in participant selection may have occurred, despite the care in participant selection, participant diversity of nationality, background, age and experience. Potentially, these questions can only be considered with more certainty in the future with further comparable research. The quality and rigour of the present interpretive research has been underpinned by Yin’s (2006) case study design and the Principles of the Hermeneutic Circle (Klein & Myers, 1999). The research has attempted to adopt and practise the processes and practice of these recommended strategies to support quality and avoid unintended bias.
9.7 Chapter Nine summary

Chapter Nine reported on the combined learning gained from this thesis. The cross-case analysis synthesised the conceptual, practical, organisational and pedagogical concepts of the research to answer the research objectives. The research has expanded on the scholarly understanding of what a global citizen means and how the concept can be more effectively translated from concept to practice in contemporary universities. Conceptually, ‘the global citizen’ was explained as a multi-layered construct. It represents the ‘ideal global graduate’. The concept is also consistent with other interrelated terms if their conceptualisation is also underpinned by moral and transformative cosmopolitanism. The global citizen is more than a technical efficiency. The global citizen is characterised by a global hybrid identity and recognises the significance of global interconnectivities and responsibilities. The global citizen was explained in practical terms. An identikit of recognisable markers was proposed as a way for students and academics to understand what a ‘global citizen disposition’ means.

From the organisational perspective, the contradictory forces of commercialisation and public good were explained and balancing solutions to this conflict were proposed. Thought leaders were described as a mediating stimulus in the contemporary university to advocate, support, and action a systemic approach for educating all students as global citizens. The challenges of integrating global citizen learning into IoC were discussed. The challenge of the work ahead is acknowledged but suggestions to moving forward were made by synthesising the learning from this thesis with current frameworks identified from the literature.

The basics of global citizen learning were explained, as were the capacities for the global citizen mindset. The success of integrating global citizen learning into mainstream approaches for IoC will be dependent on reframing both the vocational approaches to learning and academics and students’ expectations of learning. The cosmopolitan role model was explained as a central systemic feature of global citizen learning. Thought leaders, cosmopolitan role models, and supportive organisational processes will be essential to integrating the global citizen and IoC within the contemporary university. The next chapter provides the conclusions of this thesis, the contributions to knowledge, and the utility of the research findings in terms of application. The limitations of the research and recommendations for future research are also provided.
10.0 Thesis conclusion

10.1 Overview

Educating global citizens is a common aim of universities, yet its popularity has greatly outpaced empirical research on what this means from concept to practice. Conceptually, there is a great deal of uncertainty in regard to what being and becoming a global citizen means, and there is little organisational evidence showing how the concept is implemented in practice. The student mindset for change, and thinking and learning as a global citizen is poorly understood. While mobility is acknowledged as providing transformational experiences, research on mobility has provided limited insight into how all students can be transformed as global citizens (Killick, 2012; Savicki & Selby, 2008). In summary, educating global citizens in the context of contemporary universities remains an unresolved challenge.

In previous research, the global citizen has not been problematised as a theoretically grounded, and a socially and organisationally embedded phenomenon. Nor has previous research examined the global citizen from multiple perspectives within the context of contemporary universities. The present research explored the global citizen as an individual construct, an organisational aim, and a process for learning that is intricately woven into, and contingent upon, the university ethos, organisational culture, and teaching and learning environment. The findings highlighted the organisational mismatch between current teaching and learning practice and the learning environment that students need to learn as global citizens. The multiple perspectives explored in this research collectively contribute to new knowledge about this inherently complex organisational and educational challenge.

10.2 Purpose and structure of the thesis

The research program aimed to develop a deeper understanding of the concept of the global citizen, and how it is operationalised into practice in contemporary universities.

The thesis was presented in ten chapters. Chapter One introduced the overall research program. The literature review was presented in Chapters Two and Three. Chapter Two positioned the global citizen as an organisational aim of universities within the macro environment of globalisation, and internationalisation of education. Chapter Three examined how the global citizen has been explored as an individual construct, and process for learning. The global citizen is positioned between the opposing neoliberal and cosmopolitan paradigms influencing higher education.
Chapter Four explained the theory and methodology underpinning the research approach. A qualitative interpretive approach was used to address the objectives of the research program. Semi-structured interviews obtained multiple interpretations of the global citizen from two sources. In this way, industry key informant views of the global citizen could be considered in relation to the student experience of change attributed to their mobility experience. These two sources of evidence were purposively chosen to negotiate meaning through multiple perspectives (Habermas, 1970).

The research findings are presented in Chapters Five to Eight. Chapters Five, Six and Seven present the analysis of the data from industry key informant interviews. The findings in Chapter Eight explored students’ experiences and their mindset for change that occurred as a result of their mobility experience. The cross-case analysis from Study One and Study Two is presented in Chapter Nine.

10.3 Key findings and contributions

The research program has developed a deeper understanding of the concept of the global citizen, and how it is operationalised in contemporary universities. The research makes a contribution to knowledge by synthesising grounded evidence from two principal sources. The integrated analysis of industry key informants, and international mobility student experience of change, informs what being and becoming a global citizen means in contemporary universities. The research contributions have been achieved by addressing the stated research objectives. The following sections explain the findings and contributions of the research relevant to the five objectives.

Objective 1: To build a conceptual understanding of the global citizen

The research findings have problematised the ambiguity surrounding the concept of the global citizen, and have sharpened the conceptual meaning. The research identified that the global citizen and interrelated terms similarly describe the ‘ideal global graduate’. The theory and sub-theme of Strategic ambiguity, discussed in Chapter Five, caters for a similarity in meaning, and provides a basis for conceptualising the global citizen Beyond narrow definitions. The ‘global citizen’ is More than a list of attributes; it is conceptualised as a disposition, and a multi-layered concept. It portrays an individual who is developing a global hybrid identity, and is underpinned by the central liberal values described as openness, tolerance, responsibility and respect for self, others and the planet. The ‘intention of the global citizen’ (Bauman, 1987), and ‘discursive coalition’
(Lunn, 2008) were explained as theoretical concepts that further diminish the ambiguity in meaning between the global citizen and related terms.

The global citizen is a theoretically grounded phenomenon, involving a development process, referred to in this research as global citizen learning. The research makes a contribution by explaining global citizen learning through the themes, *The basis of global citizen learning*, as well as *The mindset for global citizen learning*. The global citizen is underpinned philosophically, epistemologically and ontologically by moral and transformative cosmopolitanism. The theoretical process of global citizen learning was explained through the four lenses of transformative learning theory: developmental, extra rational, rational and dialogic lenses (Daloz, 2000; Dirkx et al., 2006; Friere, 1973; Mezirow, 2000a). Being and becoming a global citizen is also consistent with the ontological basis of Barnett’s (2004) Zone 4 of learning. This type of learning occurs beyond knowledge and competencies. It is disturbing and high-risk to one’s knowing and understanding and sense of being (ontology). It requires student-led tasks that challenge and confront certainty and engage the imagination. It occurs reciprocally between teacher and students, as uncertainty requires relatively open relationships between the two. The present research makes a significant contribution to identifying a conceptual and theoretical framework for the global citizen in contemporary universities. The models for global citizen learning were presented in Figures 8.1 and 9.1.

**Objective 2: To identify what a global citizen means in practical terms**

The research has met the objective of what the global citizen means in practical terms by identifying a set of broad markers, clustered together as an ‘Identikit’ for the global citizen. The ‘Identikit’ makes a contribution to knowledge by providing a practical tool that exemplifies the global citizen as a concept that is *More than a list of attributes*, and *Beyond narrow definitions*. The central markers illustrate that the global citizen is prepared to move beyond their comfort zone, engages beyond family and peers, and is *Thinking differently*. The global citizen presents a mature outlook, and considers their life beyond narrow expectations. The global citizen ‘Identikit’ (presented in Table 9.1) offers not only a tool of recognition for academic staff, but it also provides a cogent way of introducing students to the practical basis of becoming a global citizen.

**Objective 3: To examine the organisational enablers and constraints to educating global citizens**

My contribution to organisational knowledge is through informing university change processes at three levels: top-down, middle-out, and bottom-up. The research identified
enablers and constraints for educating global citizens at each of these levels. Thought leadership is an important top-down enabler for embedding the global citizen as part of universities’ social responsibility strategies. Thought leaders will have the ability to balance the constraining influence of commercialisation with public good. Thought leaders are essential for mediating between vocational educational demands, and the university's compact to educating for social responsibility.

A top-down organisational approach will be needed to integrate cosmopolitan values into practice, and embed social responsibility across the entire organisation. Furthermore, organisationally, global citizen learning needs to be marketed to students in meaningful terms, to expand and reframe their expectations of learning.

Constraints were identified at the level of academic staff. The middle-out process of delegated leadership for transmitting the global citizen message by academics as organisational enablers was associated with the theory of logical incrementalism. Importantly, the middle-out process for developing academics as the Cosmopolitan role model, was identified as an enabler for inspiring and motivating students to learn as global citizens.

The significant contribution of students’ stories to achieving the five objectives of this research exemplifies how essential student input is for providing insight into bottom-up management processes within the social and organisational context of contemporary universities. For instance, students identified the significance of the Cosmopolitan role model and the importance of Nudging the comfort zone for all students in learning. Passive engagement and Language pain tolerance were supported by students, as indirect ways of engaging domestic and international students in the classroom.

Objective 4: To understand the students’ experience of change associated with an international mobility experience

The student experience of transformation associated with a mobility experience has been attributed to their development as a 'global soul', with a 'mindset, heartset and skillset' (Bennett, 2008). The present research makes a contribution to knowledge by drawing on the integrated findings to provide theoretical and practical insight to Bennett's 'global soul'. The facilitating circumstances of change described by students are explained through the themes: Out of the comfort zone; Interpersonal encounters; Interpersonal relationships, and Cosmopolitan role model. The manifestations of student
change were described as: *Broadening perspectives; Cosmopolitan hospitality; Accelerated maturity, and Widening horizons.*

The integrated findings explain how the global citizen ‘mindset’ develops as students begin to *Think differently* using their *Critical and ethical capacities* (social imaginary, reflexivity, relationality and criticality). Students develop a ‘heartset’ during the process of global citizen learning as they experience *Self-realisation* and are *Acknowledging fault*. They become sensitive to the plight of others during the process of global citizen learning and develop *Cosmopolitan hospitality* (*Empathetic, Willing and welcoming, Other focused*). The global citizen ‘skillset’ for engaging with diverse others (*Interpersonal encounters and Interpersonal relationships*) develops along a continuum of development as a consequence of facilitating circumstances. The mindset, heartset and skillset of the global citizen are intricately interwoven into the process of global citizen learning. *Thinking differently* was described as the generator of the student mindset.

**Objective 5:**  
To explore how universities can foster all students to develop as global citizens

Educating all students as global citizens is an organisational challenge. This research makes a contribution to knowledge by identifying ways of approaching global citizen learning that have potential for uptake, in both the formal and informal curriculum. This research explored how universities can foster global citizen learning. Mainstream uptake in higher education however, will only be possible through an institution-wide approach. Constraints were identified as *Corporate leadership, Academic resistance*, and student expectations of learning, as well as pedagogical uncertainty. Student expectations of their university experience and learning will need to be reframed. Students will need to acknowledge and accept the challenges of global citizen learning in the formal and informal curriculum, as explained in *Nudging the comfort zone* through *Intercultural encounters*, and developing *Interpersonal relationships* with diverse others. The research proposes that global citizen learning could be synthesised with organisational strategies for IoC as suggested by Leask (2011). The themes *Beyond vocational learning* and *Integrating values-based education* make a contribution to knowledge by suggesting ways of integrating global citizen learning with vocational learning.
10.4 Future research directions

Future research is needed to test the strength of the present research findings. Global citizen learning identified in this research has the potential to be synthesised into IoC and the informal curricula through an holistic approach involving organisational change management (top, middle and bottom). Organisational support from Thought leadership will be needed for Cosmopolitan role models, staff development, and engaging students with the benefits of global citizen learning. The following sections outline future research recommendations.

10.4.1 Testing the 'Identikit' of recognisable markers

The 'Identikit' of markers should be tested for relevance to academic staff and students. The following research questions could be explored through classroom-based action research, survey research, qualitative semi-structured interviews, or focus groups.

For instance:

- Does the 'Identikit' make the global citizen more accessible for academics in terms of designing learning activities?
- Does the 'Identikit' make the concept of becoming a global citizen more meaningful to students?

The 'Identikit' could be used as an instrument to measure potential changes pre- and post-mobility experiences.

Greater understanding is needed for teaching and learning to identify appropriate strategies to challenge students in their learning and social environments. The 'Identikit' could be used with non-mobile students to measure change in response to challenging learning activities (that include: Nudging the comfort zone, Interpersonal encounters and Interpersonal relationships with others).

10.4.2 Case study research

Further case study research is needed to strengthen the results of the current research. Future research could test for replication of the findings in different cohorts of industry key informants and mobility students. This research could be undertaken, not only through a Eurocentric lens, or across other OECD countries, but also in other global domains – namely Asia, Africa, and the Americas.

For instance:

- Is there any consistency in the values associated with the ‘ideal global graduate’ (global citizen or related terms) across these regions?
• Do moral and transformative cosmopolitanism, transformative learning theory and Zone 4 learning translate across these domains?
• Do the organisational constraints and enablers for educating global citizens from the present research resonate across regions?

Answers to these questions would expand understanding of what being and becoming a global citizen means in contemporary universities.

10.4.3 Disciplinary comparative research
It is recommended that comparative research based on the present methodology be undertaken in other disciplines, to test the strength of findings beyond public health mobility students.

Research on non-mobile students could be undertaken in a range of disciplines. It is proposed that exploring students’ lived experiences and their insight into the following questions would assist in designing global citizen learning activities in the future.
• Are students aware that their future in a globalised society will require an expanded global mindset for different ways of thinking and seeing the world?
• Would students be prepared to engage in global citizen learning activities that take them out of their comfort zone personally, socially, environmentally, as well as in terms of learning?
• Does emphasising employment opportunities associated with being a global citizen provide a useful ‘hook’ to increase student engagement with global citizen learning?

Future research in disciplinary groups could explore how the learning tools of the global citizen mindset (reflexivity, relationality, criticality and the social imaginary) could be integrated into specific course materials.

10.4.4 Organisational research
Future organisational research could be undertaken across multiple levels: university leadership (top-down), academic staff (middle-out), and students (bottom-up). For instance, the attitudes of university leaders to the moral and transformative cosmopolitan underpinnings of Thought leadership could be explored. Social marketing as a change strategy could be developed throughout the organisation to promote global citizen learning to students to expand their expectations of learning.

Academic staff resistance to engaging with global citizen learning needs to be understood in greater depth. Future research could centre on reasons for academic staff
resistance to any curricula change that focused on developing global citizen learning. In this way, appropriate strategies could be adopted to reduce resistance, and improve academic capacity. The receptiveness of academic staff towards the personal and professional aim of becoming a *Cosmopolitan role model* could be explored. New approaches for academic professional development, consistent with global citizen learning and the *Cosmopolitan role model*, need to be developed and evaluated. While not specifically addressed in the research program (an acknowledged limitation of the research), the role of administrative staff constitutes an integral role in the translation of the global citizen from concept to practice. Administrative staff also need to be engaged in the university ethos of social responsibility and understand the aims, challenging nature and anticipated learning outcomes of global citizen learning. They also need to be engaged with research planning and development. Appropriate professional development could be designed and evaluated to promote the role of administrative staff in this regard.

Future research could be directed toward identifying the organisational constraints in taking students *Out of the comfort zone* in learning. For instance, students who are unprepared in their expectations of learning may experience adverse reactions to being taken out of their comfort zone. As such, risks may need to be considered in this respect. For instance, underlying psychological conditions such as anxiety and depression or cultural norms could exacerbate these risks. Furthermore, reasons for student resistance to being taken *Out of the comfort zone* in learning need to be understood in more depth so as to inform curriculum development. For instance, what are the barriers and enablers for students’ participation in service learning programs or volunteerism programs? As shown in this research, students have the capacity to contribute to the scholarly understanding of learning in terms of curriculum development, as well as organisational change processes.

### 10.5 Limitations of the current research

The Eurocentric focus of the research could be considered contrary to the notion of a global citizen. Yet, at this stage of conceptual understanding, it was deemed important to develop an in-depth understanding of the global citizen from a single perspective – in this case a Eurocentric perspective. The present research has provided a baseline understanding of the research objectives. Future research should expand on this research by testing the findings and exploring the concept of the global citizen across cultural and regional divides.
Concentration on mobility students from a single discipline is acknowledged as a limitation of the study. Moreover, it is possible that the informants chosen in the present research may be more predisposed to a cosmopolitan worldview than others might be. For example, the lack of industry key informants from scientific backgrounds is an acknowledged limitation of the research (due to confidentiality, Chapter Five only provided a broad disciplinary background for the informants). Furthermore, the changes experienced by public health students may not have occurred in students studying solely through a scientific paradigm. Future research could be extended to explore the perspectives of industry informants and students from a wider range of disciplines.

Pre-mobility interviews with students may have strengthened the research findings. On the other hand, drawing students’ attention to the significance of being Out of the comfort zone, and the expectation of personal change and development, could have influenced the authenticity of the research findings, and introduced a level of reporting bias.

As discussed in Chapter Eight, respecting student confidentiality limited the ability to report on individual student differences in respect of the findings (for example: difference in length of sojourn, age differences, Bachelor or Masters study program, gender, European country of origin and Australian state of origin). Moreover, the students’ overuse of the word ‘like’ limited the use of some of the student quotes.

The lack of focus on the role of administrative staff is an acknowledged limitation of the research, particularly in terms of mobility students. In terms of being Out of the comfort zone, frequently, administrative staff are the first point and sometimes a consistent point of contact with mobility students during their sojourn. Future research should be inclusive of all university actors involved with translating the concept of the global citizen into practice.

10.6 Researcher’s concluding comment

The present research diminishes the ambiguity of what being and becoming a global citizen means in the context of higher education. The global citizen in higher education is a moral and ethically thinking human being. Through this conceptual lens, educating global citizens in contemporary higher education is a complex process, and an evolving challenge. There is much to learn about the most appropriate ways to educate students as global citizens within the formal and informal curricula. The potential for mutual
learning between thought leaders, academics, administrative staff and students provides an exciting backdrop for future scholarly discourse and research. There is a great need for further multi-faceted research to resolve the organisational and pedagogical constraints, and strengthen the enablers for educating global citizens identified in this research.

University graduates increasingly are faced with complexity, uncertainty and unprecedented challenges in their personal and professional lives. Their ability to flourish and prosper demands vocational expertise, and a global mindset, heartset and skillset. Contemporary universities have the potential to develop global citizens as humane intellectuals and leaders, as well as subject specialists in their vocational fields. University graduates are future societal leaders and citizens emerging onto a global stage. The findings of this research suggest that being and becoming a global citizen is significant to all university actors. The conceptual, practical, organisational and pedagogical implications of this research offer significant insight to ways of educating all students as global citizens of the future.
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Industry key informant interviews
Participant information sheet

Who is conducting the research?
- Kathleen Litley, School of Public Health, Griffith University, Ph. 37353241, k.litley@griffith.edu.au
- Professor Michelle Barker, GHE, Griffith University, Ph 37355030 m.barker@griffith.edu.au
- Dr Neil Harris, School of Public Health, Griffith University, Ph. 3382 1043, n.harris@griffith.edu.au

Thesis title:
A systemic approach to embedding the global citizen in higher education: An Australian and European case study.

Research questions:
What is a global citizen and how is it implemented from policy to practice?
How and why do students develop global citizen attributes?

Overview of the key informant interviews
As a key informant in higher education, you are aware of the changing graduate profile as a result of the internationalisation process. While the literature shows there is some consistency between Australia and Europe in regard to the process of internationalisation (de Wit, 2002), there is little conceptual and practical clarity in regard comparative terminology or what the 'ideal global graduate' looks like, 'says' or 'does' or how it is implemented from policy to practice. I am hoping to draw on your knowledge and experience to gain a greater conceptual and practical in sight on the issue.

Discuss participation and informed consent
As part of my PhD research I would like to undertake semi-structured interviews (40-50 minute duration) with interested international key informants. The questions will be provided prior to the interview. All participants will have protected anonymity in the study. Their personal identifying details will be transferred to de-identified/re-identified coding in a process known only to the research team. The interviews will be audio recorded for transcription purposes only and this will not result in any identifying information being made known to anyone outside the research team. The audio tapes will be destroyed once transcribed.

Confidentiality
To ensure your confidentiality, the researcher will manage the data collected throughout the research in locked storage. Your interview materials will have no personal identifying descriptors. The results of the research will summarised and will be used in the researcher's PhD thesis in the future.

Questions/further information and feedback on the project
For additional information about the project, contact Kathleen Litley, School of Public Health, Griffith Graduate Centre, PO Box 3370, South Brisbane, QLD 4101, Australia, email: k.litley@griffith.edu.au, ph. +61737353241. A summary report will be compiled using information from the interviews and made available to each participant to view on request. A summary report of this project on completion will be provided to interview participants on completion of the research.

The ethical conduct of this research
Griffith University conducts research in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans. If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you should contact the Manager, Research Ethics on 3735 5565 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.

Privacy statement
There will be no sensitive personal information recorded in the proposed interviews. The information collected is confidential and will not be disclosed to third parties without your consent, except to meet government, legal or other regulatory authority requirements. A de-identified copy of this data will be used as a case study in the lead researcher's PhD thesis in the future. However, your anonymity will at all times be safeguarded. For further information consult the University’s Privacy Plan at www.griffith.edu.au/ua/aa/vcpp or telephone +617 3735 5565.
Industry key informant interview

Participant Consent Form

Consent to participate

I confirm that I have read the information sheet and in particular have noted that:

- Participation in this project includes participating a semi-structured interview.
- I believe I understand the purpose, extent and possible effects of my involvement in this research project.
- I understand that my interview will be audio-taped; and
- I understand that only the research team will have access to this tape; and
- I understand that the MP3 recording will be erased following transcription.
- I understand that my anonymity will be protected through a coding process known only to the researchers.
- I have had an opportunity to ask questions and I am satisfied with the answers I have received.
- I understand there will be no direct benefit to me from my participation.
- I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time, without comment or penalty.
- I understand that completing and submitting this consent form signifies my consent.
- I understand that I can contact the manager, Research Ethics on +61 7 3735 5665 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au, if I have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the project.
- I voluntarily consent to participate in this research project.

Consent to participate in this research is indicated by the return of this signed consent form.

(Signature)

(Print name)

(Date)
Questions:

There are five sections to the interview; these questions will be modified in response to interview participant area of knowledge, interest and or expertise. Should these questions not be relevant to a particular participant alternative views will be sought on more general questions on internationalisation of higher education in respect to policy and practice.

1. *Clarifying terminology:* Interview participants will be asked how they interpret and conceptualise global citizenship and or interrelated terms in the context of higher education.

2. *Role of the university:* Participants will be asked to discuss the role of universities in promoting a values-based agenda and how or should policy be best translated from policy to practice.

3. *Recognising global citizenship:* Participants will be asked to describe how they would recognise a student who has impressed them with features of global, international or intercultural competence or global citizenship and why this is the case.

4. *University student mobility:* Participants will be asked about the benefits of international mobility and their view on a good practice example.

5. *No mobility:* Participants will be asked to describe a good practice example of how to achieve global citizenship or international perspectives in graduates without a mobility experience.

Broad area questions:

- As a concept
- Is it an intellectual and cognitive construct or has the higher education policy and outcomes agenda (TESSA or AUQA) capitulated the global citizen into an objective fact
- Can an objective fact be measured or should it stay as an intellectual and intangible aspect of the holistic set of attributes.
- How is it recognised
- What is the role and responsibility of the university
- Should universities be more explicit
- Can internationalisation of the curriculum change perspectives and attitudes
Public health mobility student interviews

Participant information sheet

Who is conducting the research?

- Kathleen Lilley, School of Public Health, Griffith University, Ph. 37353241, k.lilley@griffith.edu.au
- Professor Michelle Barker, GIHE, Griffith University, Ph.
- Dr Neil Harris, School of Public Health, Griffith University, Ph. 3382 1043, n.harris@griffith.edu.au

Overall research question: What is global citizenship mean and how does it develop as a result of internationalisation of higher education?

Overview of the exchange student interviews
As a returning exchange student in the AUS-EU project you have been exposed to life in another culture and society for 6 or 12 months. As a result of the exchange you may have experienced changes in perspective or your world view that might not have occurred without the exchange. The researcher is interested in hearing from you about any particular situations that led to a change in perspective and why you think this might have happened.

Discuss participation and informed consent
The researcher would like to undertake semi-structured interviews (30-45 minute duration) with interested international exchange students after the completion of their exchange and 6-months following. The questions will be provided prior to the interview. All participants will have protected anonymity in the study. Your personal identifying details will be transferred to de-identified/re-identified coding in a process known only to the research team. The interviews will be audio recorded for transcription purposes only and this will not result in any identifying information being made known to anyone outside the research team. The audiotapes will be destroyed once transcribed.

Confidentiality
To ensure your confidentiality, the researcher will manage the data collected throughout the research in locked storage. Your interview materials will have no personal identifying descriptors. The results of the research will summarised and provided to the funding bodies of the exchange process as part of the evaluation requirements. It is possible that the research may be included in the principal researchers PhD thesis in the future.

Questions/further information and feedback on the project
For additional information about the project, contact Kathleen Lilley, School of Public Health, Griffith University, email: k.lilley@griffith.edu.au, ph. 37353241. A summary report will be compiled using information from the interviews and made available to each participant to view on request. A summary report of this project on completion will be provided to interview participants on completion of the project.

The ethical conduct of this research
Griffith University conducts research in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans. If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you should contact the Manager, Research Ethics on 3735 5585 or research.ethics@griffith.edu.au.

Privacy statement
There will be no sensitive personal information recorded in the proposed interviews. The information collected is confidential and will not be disclosed to third parties without your consent, except to meet government, legal or other regulatory authority requirements. A de-identified copy of this data may be used as a case study in the lead researcher’s PhD thesis in the future. However, your anonymity will at all times be safeguarded. For further information consult the University’s Privacy Plan at www.griffith.edu.au/ua/aa/vcpp or telephone (07) 3735 5585.
Participant Consent Form

Consent to participate

I confirm that I have read the information sheet and in particular have noted that:

- Participation in this project includes participating a semi-structured interview early in my exchange and if I am willing will be repeated at the end of my exchange experience
- I will be provided with the questions before the interview
- I believe I understand the purpose, extent and possible effects of my involvement in this research project
- I understand that my interview will be audio-taped; and
- I understand that only the research team will have access to this tape; and
- I understand that the audiotape will be erased following transcription
- I understand that my anonymity will be protected through a coding process known only to the researchers
- I have had an opportunity to ask questions and I am satisfied with the answers I have received
- I understand there will be no direct benefit to me from my participation
- I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time, without comment or penalty
- I understand that completing and submitting this consent form signifies my consent
- I understand that I can contact the manager, Research Ethics on 3735 5585 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au, if I have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the project.
- I voluntarily consent to participate in this research project.

Consent to participate in this research is indicated by the return of this signed consent form.

____________________________
(Print name) 

____________________________
(Signature)

____________________________
(Date)
Interview area of interest

SECTION 1 – Self awareness and awareness of others
In this section I would like you to discuss any changes you may have experienced personally, in your own self awareness and awareness of other people, culture and societies during and since your exchange experience.

SECTION 2– Exciting, stressful or ambiguous situations?
Can you describe a particularly exciting/stressful or ambiguous situation that occurred because of a misunderstanding in language or a different cultural interpretation of the situation?

SECTION 3– Self-identity
Have you thought about your national identity since on exchange?
Have there been any social or political concepts that you understand differently as a result of your exchange? (democracy, citizenship, rights, minority groups, disadvantage, religious belief, social cohesion).

SECTION 4- Internationalisation at home
How can universities provide students who do not travel with learning experiences to broaden their outlooks?
What could be done differently?