



Educating global citizens: A good 'idea' or an organisational practice?

Author

Lilley, Kathleen, Barker, Michelle, Harris, Neil

Published

2015

Journal Title

Higher Education Research & Development

Version

Submitted Manuscript (SM)

DOI

[10.1080/07294360.2015.1011089](https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2015.1011089)

Downloaded from

<http://hdl.handle.net/10072/127716>

Griffith Research Online

<https://research-repository.griffith.edu.au>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11 Educating global citizens: A good 'idea' or an organisational practice?
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 **Key words**

21 commercialisation, cosmopolitanism, global citizen, leadership, public good
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Authors**

28 ¹Kathleen Lilley ^a, Michelle Barker ^b & Neil Harris ^c
29
30

31 ^a School of Medicine, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia
32

33 ^b Griffith Business School, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia
34

35 ^c School of Medicine, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

¹ Corresponding author: k.lilley@griffith.edu.au

Abstract

Higher education emphasises training and skills for employment, yet while the ‘idea’ of educating global citizens appears in university discourse, there is limited evidence demonstrating how the ‘idea’ of the global citizen translates into practice. Recent research emphasises a desire for graduates to be local and global citizens with ethical and critical capacities for global workforce preparedness. The purpose of this paper is to explore the university responsibility for translating the ‘idea’ of the ethical thinking global citizen into practice. Semi-structured interviews were undertaken with higher education experts (n=26). The interpretive research is discussed through the themes: ²*Constructing the global citizen, Enacting the global citizen, Legitimizing the global citizen, and The sidelining context*. The paper contributes to higher education discourse on a contested and topical issue.

² *Italics used to distinguish research themes in text*

Educating global citizens: A good 'idea' or an organisational practice?

A dominant neoliberal economic paradigm has steered higher education towards competency training for professional employment, with education considered as students' investment in their future prosperity as productive employees (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). However, there is support to expand the neoliberal focus to include the broader features of cosmopolitan learning (Caruana, 2014; Marginson & Sawir, 2011; Rizvi, 2009). Cosmopolitan learning provides an individual with broader life skills and capacities and the opportunity to develop as global citizens. Universities commonly articulate an aim of educating global citizens in policy documents. Yet, the global citizen 'idea' is rarely explained and has limited evidence in practice (Leask & Bridge 2013).

The global citizen term is contested and eludes precise definition. Schattle's (2008) research suggests that global citizens present in many ways. Avoiding precise definitions, researchers have elected to describe the global citizen through the dimensions of social responsibility, global competence and global civic engagement (Morais & Ogden, 2011; Shattle, 2008), specifically in terms of justice and the environment (Tarrant, 2010), and as an attitude and commitment (Barrie, 2010; Rhoads & Szelenyi, 2011). Global citizen attributes commonly referred to by these researchers include openness, tolerance, respect and responsibility. In higher education, the global citizen has been investigated through a change in attributes as a result of mobility (Morais & Ogden, 2011; Tarrant, 2010). However, the global citizen is rarely explored as a university responsibility.

Translating the notion of 'public good' and ethical values into education is complex. Yet, the International Association of Universities (IAU) (2012) encouraged universities to integrate academic values explicitly into practice and to improve the preparation of students, as national and global citizens, and as productive members of

EDUCATING GLOBAL CITIZENS

4

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

the workforce. However, this is not easily achieved. As explained by Morrow and Torres (2000), the inter-relationships between globalisation, the state, education, and social change have created major challenges for universities. Despite these complexities, Marginson (2011) claims “education needs to re-ground itself in the social” if it is to avoid slipping into irrelevance (p. 431). Furthermore, as noted by Calhoun (2006, p. 37):

“for universities to be effective institutions for public good we need not merely a defence of old habits or an embrace of new trends. We need a stronger analysis of how universities can be public”.

Through case study research, Rhoads and Szelenyi (2011) concluded that advancing global citizenship is central to the public mission of universities. They believed that developing a global citizen disposition through education could foster a student commitment to advancing public good concerns locally and globally. In summary, there appears to be support for educating ethical thinking global citizens as an outcome of higher education. However, the way to achieve this is unclear. The purpose of this research was to explore higher education experts’ perspectives on the university responsibility for educating global citizens.

Literature review

The ‘idea’ of educating global citizens is often articulated through a university’s public mission and internationalisation policies. As constructs, public good and internationalisation are interrelated, frequently contested, and are claimed to be sidelined by neoliberalism and corporate culture (Giroux, 2009). Considerable in-depth empirical research has analysed how universities, operating in ‘quasi-markets’, are constrained by intrinsic factors specific to higher education. One such factor that is commonly identified is the cultural shift from collegiality and democracy to executive

1
2 power (Marginson & Consadine, 2000, Rhoads & Szelenyi, 2011; Slaughter & Rhoads,
3
4 2004).

5
6
7 Other scholars examining the impacts of neoliberal policies on university public
8
9 good have identified sidelining issues such as; citizenship conceptualised as a private
10
11 affair (Giroux, 2009); a reoriented focus of university values from democracy and
12
13 equality to efficiency and accountability (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010); and the imperfect
14
15 correlation between excellence (inherent exclusivity) and access to education (restricted
16
17 admission to raise standards) (Calhoun, 2006). Notwithstanding these constraints,
18
19 Marginson (2011) claimed universities should provide the ‘conditions for learning’ that
20
21 engage faculty and students with common human problems and contribute to social
22
23 tolerance, international understanding, and social collectivity.
24
25

26
27 Universities have responded to global change through the political, economic,
28
29 social and academic rationales of internationalisation of higher education (de Wit, 2002;
30
31 Knight, 1997; 2012). However, the assumption that internationalisation would produce
32
33 an international understanding among graduates is unsubstantiated (Gallagher, 2011;
34
35 Hoareau, Ritzen, & Marconi, 2012). As summarised by Green (2012) and Rhoads and
36
37 Szelenyi (2011), the public purpose of education and the aims for educating global
38
39 citizens have been sidelined by the instrumental and commercial foci of
40
41 internationalisation.
42
43

44
45 The OECD (1996) promoted internationalisation of the curriculum (IoC) as a
46
47 strategy to prepare students for professional and social engagement in a multicultural
48
49 and global minded society. However, Leask (2013) highlighted how little is understood
50
51 about the influence of IoC on educating global citizens. Higher education stakeholder
52
53 groups have articulated their views on the social responsibility of universities in terms
54
55 of the ‘ideal global graduate’. For instance, UNESCO (2009) identified educating
56
57 critical and ethical thinking graduates as core to the university purpose. Similarly, it was
58
59
60

found that employers value communication and analytical thinking capacities in job applicants and recommended greater synthesis between the aims of liberal education and professional education (Georgetown University, 2013; Maguire Associates Inc., 2012). Emerging evidence suggests that universities hold a responsibility to prepare global graduates with values and capacities beyond the training for productive careers.

A number of prominent authors have conceptualised the critical and ethical thinking global citizen through a cosmopolitan lens. However, as highlighted by Marginson and Sawir (2011, p. 62) “cosmopolitanism can follow different paths”. Peters, Britton and Blee (2008) considered that fostering the cosmopolitan global citizen would promote an understanding of complex political, cultural and internationalisation issues. Furthermore, Rhoads and Szelenyi (2011, p. 27) emphasised the global collectivist nature of the global citizen. **Beck (2006), believes that ‘common sense’ cosmopolitanism presupposes certain common moral values are shared by societies. According to Beck the ‘cosmopolitan moment’ occurs from within as a ‘self-reflexive action’, whereas universalism avoids curiosity about difference, and relativity institutionalises thought and action resulting in pre-established ignorance.** In contrast, Pogge (2002) conceptualised cosmopolitanism as a social justice issue. According to Pogge, the responsibility of world citizens is to mitigate between the compromised premise of strong cosmopolitanism (equal treatment of all), and weak cosmopolitanism (equal worth). Instead, Pogge promoted intermediate cosmopolitanism as a duty not to impose unjust social institutions upon our fellow citizens.

Other authors have discussed cosmopolitanism in a less prescriptive way. Appiah (2006) explained cosmopolitanism as a moral ethic that promotes a sense of ‘otherness’ that helps build habits of coexistence. Concurring, Rizvi (2009) discussed the dynamic nature of cosmopolitanism as an instrument of knowing and critical understanding for moral improvement. **Rizvi rejects universalism and fixed notions**

1
2 **of the global citizen, explaining that cosmopolitan learning engages students**
3
4 **ethically. Taylor (2004) explains how the social imaginary allows us to deal with**
5
6 **the unstructured, complex, empirical and affective aspects of our existence. It**
7
8 **fosters the ability to engage internally, and with others in a relational and reflexive**
9
10 **way.** Adding to an epistemology for global citizenship, Vertovec and Cohen (2002)
11
12 described transformative cosmopolitanism as a way of promoting ‘intellectual thinking’,
13
14 and a mindset for understanding the interconnecting influences of globalisation from the
15
16 economic, social, technical, environmental and cultural aspects (Selby, 2008; Vertovec
17
18 & Cohen, 2002). Moral and transformative cosmopolitanism offers a philosophy and
19
20 epistemology for students to engage in ethical interconnected thinking as global
21
22 citizens. However, enacting the cosmopolitan global citizen as a curricular outcome can
23
24 be contingent on the public purpose of the university and its leadership.
25
26
27

28
29 In summary, the contemporary university could be considered paradoxically
30
31 positioned between corporate responsibilities, a mission of public good and the ‘idea’ of
32
33 educating global citizens. The purpose of this study was to explore expert higher
34
35 education perspectives on the university responsibility for translating the concept of the
36
37 ethical thinking global citizen into a curricular outcome.
38
39

40 **Methodology and Methods**

41
42 An interpretive, hermeneutic approach was taken in this qualitative research
43
44 (Elwell, 1996). The conceptual framework of the research was guided by the
45
46 juxtaposition between the university operating as a ‘quasi-market’ institution, and the
47
48 public purpose of education. Given the degree of ambiguity and uncertainty about the
49
50 global citizen term, we adapted the qualitative research technique of matching the “ideal
51
52 type” to observable phenomena and explained to participants that the global citizen
53
54 represented the ‘ideal global graduate’ (Neuman, 2006; Swedberg & Agevall, 2005).
55
56

57
58 The following questions guided the semi-structured interviews:
59
60

EDUCATING GLOBAL CITIZENS

8

- What does the global citizen or ‘ideal global graduate’ mean to you?
- Do universities have a responsibility to educate ethical thinking global citizens (representing the “ideal global graduate”)?
- What are the implications and obstacles?
- Is there a role for values-based education?

A purposive sample of Australian and European Union (including United Kingdom) higher education experts (n=26) was chosen. According to de Wit (2002), European and Australian universities have a similar educational approach to internationalisation of the curriculum and this provided a degree of institutional commonality for participants to respond to the research questions. Twenty-five participants either worked in the European Union or Australia/New Zealand, the twenty-sixth in America. **Defining participant identity was complex. For instance, a group of Australian/New Zealand participants originally came from India, Pakistan and England. Participants working in Europe were from Scotland, United States of America (USA), Belgium, Germany, Norway, Netherlands and Slovakia. One participant worked in USA but was involved with higher education in Europe and Australia.**

All participants were employed in universities, peak higher education non-government organisations (NGO), or key intergovernmental organisations (IGO) involved with higher education policy and funding in the European Union. University Executive (UE) positions included Dean, Deputy-Vice Chancellor, Rector, Vice-Chancellor and Vice-President. University Academic (UA) participants were professors. **Non-government organisation (NGO) and Intergovernmental organisation (IGO) participant descriptions included Education Department Head, Executive Director, Director, Deputy-Director, Senior Policy Advisor, and International Education Consultant.** Expert status of participants was gauged by scholarly

1
2 publications, reputation and experience. Two postgraduate students involved with
3
4 international postgraduate student organisations were included. Gender was balanced
5
6 and there was ethnic diversity among participants. The Eurocentric bias of the sample is
7
8 acknowledged and is not claimed to be representative of the higher education sector.
9
10 Nevertheless, due to the limited institutional evidence about the global citizen, this
11
12 research was undertaken as a starting point for future national and cross regional
13
14 research.
15
16

17
18 Data were analysed by identifying descriptive and conceptual themes and sub-
19
20 themes (Miles & Huberman, 1984). In accordance with the principles of the
21
22 hermeneutic circle (Klein & Myers, 1999), the researcher engaged in dialogic
23
24 reasoning, was sensitive to multiple interpretations and exercised suspicion of biases,
25
26 and distortion of participant data. Data analysis involved devising multiple ways of
27
28 viewing the data, such as developing matrices of categories, tabulation of frequently
29
30 occurring events, tabulation and relationship comparisons, ordering into temporal
31
32 schemes, modelling, pattern matching and explanation building. Abstraction of the
33
34 findings was done contextually in respect of the participant worldviews and
35
36 experiences, and in relation to theory and the literature. The developing concepts,
37
38 themes and sub-themes were subject to cycles of revision. The multiple interpretations
39
40 were considered through their individual parts and their contribution to the whole. The
41
42 research protocol was revised in line with the emerging data. An audit trail was
43
44 maintained during the research process, and the research database was managed in
45
46 NVivo 9. The comprehensive and systematic approach taken during the data analysis
47
48 provided a scaffold to support the trustworthiness of the findings (Miles & Huberman,
49
50 1984). Ethical approval was obtained from an Australian university.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 Findings

59
60

EDUCATING GLOBAL CITIZENS

10

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The findings offer insight to the global citizen as a curricular outcome and as a university responsibility. The findings are discussed through the themes; *Constructing the global citizen*, *Enacting the global citizen*, *Legitimizing the global citizen*, and *Sidelining the global citizen*. These themes present an interpretive representation of participants' perspectives. The participant quotes are referred to in the findings as **AUS/NZ**, **EU**, **UK** or **US** with identifying Arabic numbers. Place of employment for non-university participants is described by non-government organization (NGO), intergovernmental organization (IGO) or student representative (SR) (for instance, **EU 23_IGO and EU 8_NGO**). The university participants are explained through either their academic (**UA**) role, or executive/corporate (**UE**) role, (for instance either, **AUS/NZ 4_UA** or **EU 9_UE**). The participant quotes are identified with inverted commas, and are shown in bold for emphasis. The resultant themes and subthemes used to report the study are shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Institutional Context of the Global Citizen Themes and Subthemes

Themes	Subthemes
Constructing the global citizen	Ambiguity
	Liberal values
	Language
	Mindset/capacities
	Cosmopolitanism
Enacting the global citizen	Student expectations
	Liberal framework for learning
	Challenging students with values
	Measurable learning outcome
Legitimizing the global citizen	Organisational processes
	Organisational leadership
	Shared values
	Cross-disciplinary thread
The global citizen sidelined	Competition/commercialisation
	Managerial mindset
	Leadership style
	Relativism of values

Findings by theme

Constructing the global citizen. This theme focuses on the building of a more inclusive understanding of what the global citizen concept means in higher education. The majority of participants believed a common definition for the 'ideal graduate' was unrealistic. Yet, by asking about the global citizen or their view of the 'ideal global

graduate', clarity about overlapping terms emerged. Only four participants preferred to use an alternative term to the global citizen; cosmopolitan (1), cross-cultural capability and global perspectives (1), and intercultural competence (2). Twenty-four participants accepted the global citizen as a broadly understood term to describe a desirable curricular outcome for the 'ideal global graduate'.

Regardless of the term participants used to describe the 'ideal global graduate', there was a degree of consistency in the underpinning liberal values they described. They mentioned openness, tolerance, respect, and responsibility for self, others and the planet. According to **EU 17_NGO**, at the advanced stage it could be seen as a "commitment rather than some sort of technical efficiency". **US 12_UA** thought that 'engagement' was a feature that differentiated intercultural competence from the global citizen. However, **EU 21_NGO** said, "I think we could have high and lofty expectations". For instance, while social justice has been associated with cosmopolitanism, these participants' aspirations for graduates were more realistic. These participants did not specifically identify political or environmental activism in their construction of the ideal global graduate. The global citizen emerged as a fluid concept and a way of thinking. Furthermore, many were emphatic that it was not the role of the university to measure or probe into students' values. However, participants unanimously felt universities should provide an education that engaged students with values-based learning.

"I think it probably comes back to liberal virtues.... we should foster those social attributes which go to sociality itself...tolerance, openness, consideration for others, collectivity in certain domains, making institutions work. All that's legitimate, proper, and we [universities] should pursue that."

(AUS/NZ 1_UA)

1
2 In terms of linguistic ability, **EU 17_NGO** thought that “language pain
3 tolerance” was a characteristic of the global citizen, as English was heard in many ways.
4 Two other EU participants thought that global citizenship required foreign language
5 ability, but others did not emphasise language in such strong terms. In contrast,
6
7 **AUS/NZ 1_UA** considered foreign language capability was not essential for everyone.
8
9 “...it’s just one of those things that people aren't wired for the same way. Some people
10 are better at it [relational engagement] than others”.

11
12 The global citizen mindset was explained by participants by using different
13 terms; “interconnected thinking” (**US 12_UA**), “systems thinking” (**AUS/NZ 6_UA**),
14 “ways of thought and ways of knowing” (**AUS/NZ 19_UE**). **EU 23_IGO** described
15 interconnected thinking as the transferring of competences. He/she explained that “you
16 cannot solve problems like climate change, and social cohesion, without those sorts of
17 transference of competences”. Several participants described the ideal global graduate
18 in terms of identity, belonging and the imagination, and in relational terms, as explained
19 by **AUS/NZ 1_UA**:

20
21 “It’s that relational cosmopolitanism, that capacity to enter into the imaginative
22 world of the other... a central principle that you're trying to get through, which
23 is quite hard... I think a lot of people find it hard. And some people can do it
24 with some other cultural sets, and not others.”

25
26 The mindset for imagining difference was explained as questioning assumptions,
27 walking in others’ shoes, imagining difference, and critical and ethical thinking.

28
29 Whereas, **AUS/NZ 4_UA** described the mindset capacities for cosmopolitan thinking:

30
31 “So the epistemic virtues that I talk about are relationality, reflexivity, and
32 imagination. Those are the kind of virtues that become important once you
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 accept the premise of the changing nature of our notions of belonging and how
3
4 we belong”. (AUS/NZ_4UA)
5
6
7

8
9 While only two participants rejected a global notion of citizenship, one of these
10 thought cosmopolitan was a more apt description for the ‘ideal global graduate’.
11
12 However, AUS/NZ 5_UE thought there would be academic resistance towards using
13 cosmopolitanism as it could act as a barrier to broader uptake. In contrast, AUS/NZ
14 4_UA clarified cosmopolitanism as a form of “moral connectedness” and could be
15 promoted in terms of “pedagogical possibilities”.
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 This varied sample of international participants presented a surprisingly similar
23 broad construction of the global citizen in higher education. The descriptions appear to
24 be consistent with a moral and transformative cosmopolitan underpinning, and a
25 mindset and capacities for interconnected thinking.
26
27
28
29
30

31 **Enacting the global citizen.** The second theme focuses on translating the ‘idea’
32 to practice. Several participants thought that enacting the global citizen was a difficult,
33 but not insurmountable problem for teaching and learning. The university responsibility
34 was accepted as complex. Obstacles were explained as a disciplinary emphasis on
35 specialised skill development, over-crowded curricular, and already over-burdened and
36 or sceptical academics. AUS/NZ 19_UE explained how organisational practices were
37 to a certain extent influenced by narrow student expectations of learning, and student
38 satisfaction surveys. However, from the student perspective, AUS/NZ 26_SR said
39 “students think university is where you go to get a degree”. They are not explicitly told
40 that going to university is preparation for global engagement and understanding.
41
42 According to this participant, not enough is made of the benefits of engaging students
43 interculturally, as part of their university learning experience. He/she thought students
44 should have their expectations of learning altered. Furthermore, AUS/NZ 26_SR
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 thought that there is potential to broaden students' expectations of their learning
3
4 experiences through better marketing practices. Many participants identified
5
6 organisational strategies that would be more supportive of educating global citizens.
7
8 Yet, it was commonly felt there was 'no one size fits all' in terms of institutional
9
10 approaches. As EU 8_UA explained "... it's not a set of regulations like we do for the
11
12 traffic... We think that from those values you [students] can think for yourself what that
13
14 means." (EU 8_UA)
15
16

17
18 Several participants discussed a liberal framework for integrating the global
19
20 citizen into education. According to these participants, educating global citizens was an
21
22 approach to learning, where students are challenged by dilemmas and liberal values.
23
24 How students resolve value conflicts is part of their learning, development, and self-
25
26 transformation. Several participants thought the difficulty of linking the global citizen to
27
28 measurable learning outcomes was an obstacle to academic uptake. However, there was
29
30 unanimous support for an educational experience that fostered the development of
31
32 global citizens. Many participants felt that how, and how much, students engaged and
33
34 developed was up to them. EU 8_UA thought a Capstone Unit offered an opportunity
35
36 to monitor and evaluate student engagement, their thinking capacities, and how they
37
38 understood the relevance and interconnected nature of global citizen values across their
39
40 program learning objectives.
41
42
43

44
45 **Legitimizing the global citizen.** This theme explores how aspirations for
46
47 nurturing global citizens could be legitimated through university processes and
48
49 practices. Several participants thought that engaging in values-based education was a
50
51 secular dilemma of the modern university. AUS/NZ 1_UA explained, academics
52
53 frequently abstain from taking a value stance or disguise their values. Discourse on
54
55 legitimating values in universities frequently defaulted to 'whose values are we
56
57 promoting'? A common thread in the theme associated values to intellectual approaches
58
59
60

1
2 to education, in contrast to solely focussing on the transmission of professional
3
4 competence. In particular, **EU 8_UA** and **EU 9_NGO** discussed how STEM disciplines
5
6 had become more disintegrated due to EU policy decisions and national policy
7
8 directions. Yet, many participants felt the real purpose of higher education was opening
9
10 students' minds. **AUS/NZ 1_UA** explained:

11
12
13 “But I think it is proper domain of staff and for universities, and if we don't do it
14
15 systematically, we can't expect those sorts of values to be fostered in families....

16
17
18 So I think that that creates a kind of vacancy that the universities do need to
19
20 think about filling. (**AUS/NZ 1_UA**)
21
22

23
24 **EU 7_UE** also highlighted how values were assumed to develop through family and
25
26 religion, and that university was preparation for the workforce. However, **EU 7_UE**
27
28 questioned whether this assumption continues to be true.
29
30

31
32 Participants considered the task of identifying shared values in higher education
33
34 a challenge. On the one hand, some participants thought that articulating shared
35
36 university values could risk offending a minority/minorities. Yet alternatively, several
37
38 participants felt that it could be possible to find shared values and develop these, as well
39
40 as new ones, in a moral cosmopolitan sense. As explained by **AUS/NZ 1_UA**:

41
42 “Questions of scientific truth, we could expect to guide us. Questions of
43
44 political fostering we have to be a bit more cosmopolitan about.... the university
45
46 might have to step in as a more objective, and a more public body devoted to the
47
48 conditions that enable you to be public and objective.” (**AUS/NZ_1UA**)
49
50
51

52
53 It was agreed by many participants that shared values should accommodate
54
55 diversity, and multiple perspectives. As a curricular outcome, **EU 9_NGO** suggested
56
57 that shared values could be perceived as a “mandatory cross-disciplinary thread”.
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Furthermore, **EU 9 NGO** suggested that International Universities Association (IUA) could be an appropriate forum for identifying shared university values. There was no support for a regulatory approach. As **US/NZ 1-UA** explained, “I don’t think we should be talking about energising the whole curriculum with normative issues”.

AUS/NZ 4-UA felt that organisational leadership and socially embedding values can help to legitimate an institution’s ethos. In this situation, academics need to show how their academic performance is linked to the institutional mission and the community. Furthermore, the institutional mission is systematically linked to hiring policies, appointments and promotions. There was considerable support among participants for a more explicit and cosmopolitan organisational approach towards legitimating university values.

Sidelining the global citizen. The fourth theme focuses on what participants felt was sidelining the global citizen. The global citizen as curricular outcome is organisationally complex and often those most committed are removed from corporate complexity and responsibility. Many participants blamed the commercial and competitive nature of universities for sidelining the global citizen. In the opinion of **UK 15-UE**:

“The notion of universities contributing to public good is a contradiction, when universities are acting like a business”. (**UK 15-UE**)

Building on this view, **EU_NGO 9** discussed the lack of organisational coherence between commercialisation, competition and public good. This participant felt that educating global citizens was a notion universally supported in the European higher education leadership environment. However, imaginative ideas for translating the ‘idea’ to practice were lacking.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

AUS/NZ 19_UE used the metaphor of ‘the managerial mindset’ to describe how bureaucratic thinking and reasoning can impact on university organisational processes. Boisot and MacMillan (2004) described ‘the managerial mindset’ as an embedded managerial epistemology that “seeks evidence to justify its actions” (p. 513). This epistemology could explain the differing worldviews between the external bureaucracy and the university sector on the appropriateness of particular performance indicators. For instance, AUS/NZ 19_UE felt ‘the managerial mindset’ enforces performance indicators that are poorly conceived, and in some cases are not respected by the university sector. Examples of ethical behaviour and teaching quality were raised:

“What’s the performance indicator for ethical behaviour, 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. They say they are going to measure teaching quality, and hand out money accordingly. They’ve tried in the past and student satisfaction surveys fail. They say, okay well double your efforts, rather than revisit our premise”. (AUS/NZ 19_UE)

Furthermore, AUS/NZ 19_UE felt that internal university management processes reinforce ‘the managerial mindset’. The executive requires staff to report on these poorly conceived performance indicators, as universities are so reliant on external funding. When asked if universities, individually or through Universities Australia, have attempted to challenge these accountability measures, the participant explained that these attempts are misinterpreted by ‘the managerial mindset’ as “university self-interest, and are discarded”.

All participants acknowledged the conflicting demands faced by university leadership. However, several participants considered there was a lack of committed

1
2 leadership to public good. One university leader acknowledged his/her own
3
4 complacency by saying, “I guess in universities, you do take for granted certain things,
5
6 like tolerance and fairness” (AUS/NZ 3_UE). A frequently expressed opinion was that
7
8 leaders failed to “walk the talk” (AUS/NZ 16_UE) or offered “lip service” (EU
9
10 8_NGO). For instance, AUS/NZ 16_UE analysed his/her own university’s policies.
11
12 Internationalisation was mentioned 63 times; however, there was limited organisational
13
14 evidence of this commitment beyond the exchange of students. Many participants
15
16 discussed the corporate leadership style. While one participant attributed corporate
17
18 behaviour to the “self-interested ‘power status’ of senior management” (AUS/NZ
19
20 6_UA), other participants attributed leadership behaviour to external subordinating
21
22 influences, and the internally directed demands of managerialism.
23
24
25

26
27 AUS/NZ 5_UE offered an alternative leadership model:

28
29 “We need more ‘thought leadership’ on it [values] to encourage public debate.
30
31 And I think that's part of the role of Vice Chancellors. They're not just CEO
32
33 managers. They are thought leaders...I think this is where the academy hasn't
34
35 necessarily been helpful, because it's gone into cultural relativism which
36
37 actually then comes right up against the universality of some of our core
38
39 values”. (AUS/NZ 5_UE)
40
41
42
43

44
45 Regardless of sidelining influences, the majority of participants thought university
46
47 leaders and the academy have a role to drive organisational and public discourse on
48
49 values of common human concern. These participants felt that university leaders have a
50
51 responsibility to assist with embedding values-based education systemically into
52
53 organisational processes and disciplinary learning.
54

55
56 Limitations in the depth and scope of this research are acknowledged; however,
57
58 the snapshot of participants’ perspectives offers insight towards a framework for
59
60

educating ethical thinking global citizens. The Eurocentric focus of the research and predominance of Australian perspectives are specifically acknowledged, yet insight to the research purpose was gained.

Discussion

Collectively, the themes offer considerable insight to how the global citizen as the 'ideal global graduate' is and could be positioned in contemporary universities. The participants' perspectives are illustrated through: *Constructing the global citizen*, *Enacting the global citizen*, *Legitimizing the global citizen*, and *The sidelining context*. Surprisingly, there was a broad sense of conformity amongst participants' perspectives on what a global citizen disposition means and the university responsibility for enacting it as part of the student experience. This was an unanticipated finding and is not claimed to be generalisable. With this said, there was no support from participants to adopt prescriptive approaches to enacting and legitimating the global citizen in universities. Organisationally, participants explained how the 'idea' of educating global citizens could be sidelined by instrumentalism, managerial mindsets and leadership behaviour. The complex organisational demands of both executive and academic staff were acknowledged; however, there was some sense of optimism for future organisational and pedagogical possibilities.

Participants' perspectives offered insight into the ambiguous nature of the global citizen. A clearer construction of the global citizen emerged through the 'ideal research approach' (Swedberg & Agevall, 2005). According to these participants, regardless of the describing term (global citizen, intercultural competence, cross-cultural capabilities or cosmopolitan), the 'ideal global graduate' has an ethical disposition underpinned by the liberal values of openness, tolerance, respect and responsibility towards self, others and the planet. The participants' construction of the global citizen was not aligned to

1
2 precise definitions or 'lofty aspirations' of human rights and social justice. This was not
3
4 for all students. As such, this research failed to provide a close 'fit' with strong, weak or
5
6 intermediate forms of cosmopolitanism (Pogge, 2009), or pro-justice, political activism
7
8 or environmental forms of global citizenship (Tarrant, 2012). This research identified
9
10 the global citizen disposition as a process of 'becoming' an ethical thinking person and
11
12 appeared consistent with Rizvi's (2009) description of cosmopolitan learning.
13
14

15
16 Overall, the global citizen disposition and mindset for engagement and
17
18 interconnectedness expressed by participants were interpreted as a broad moral and
19
20 transformative cosmopolitan ethic (Appiah, 2006; Vertovec & Cohen, 2002).
21
22 Participants used different terms to explain the global citizen mindset and ways of
23
24 thinking. **In summary, the global citizen mindset was explained by participants as**
25
26 **having the capacity to think transformatively, imagine other possibilities and**
27
28 **perspectives, question assumptions reflexively, think as the 'other' and walk in**
29
30 **their shoes, and engage in critical and ethical thinking. The theories behind these**
31
32 **capacities are described in more detail by other authors (Beck, 2006; Marginson &**
33
34 **Sawir, 2011; Rizvi, 2009; Taylor, 2004). The 'ideal global graduate' described in this**
35
36 research is a fluid disposition characterised by a global mindset for ethical and
37
38 interconnected thinking.
39
40
41

42
43 It has been claimed that universities lack a theoretical framework to enact the
44
45 global citizen (Rhoads & Szelenyi, 2011). A model of 'social embeddedness' was
46
47 suggested as an organisational approach to institutionalising the global citizen across the
48
49 university. 'Social embeddedness' was explained as a systemic process that spanned the
50
51 university ethos, practice, and research, and into human resource strategies.
52
53 Furthermore, participants considered global citizen values as complementary to
54
55 professional competence. They supported synthesising pragmatic employment aims into
56
57 ethical frameworks for learning, as identified by other authors (Delors, Al Mufti,
58
59
60

1
2 Amagi, & Carneiro, 2010; McArthur, 2011), and by employer groups (Georgetown
3
4 University, 2013; Maguire Associates Inc., 2012).
5

6
7 Participants considered that it was a university responsibility to provide value-
8
9 laden learning experiences; however, there were differing opinions on how this should
10
11 be enacted. For many participants, the university's role was to stimulate students'
12
13 ethical learning frameworks, yet they felt it was not a university role to delve too deeply
14
15 into students' value systems, by attempting to assess student values. In contrast, a few
16
17 participants thought it was important to measure global citizenship attainment in
18
19 learning. A Capstone Unit was suggested as an appropriate monitoring and evaluation
20
21 tool to assess how students' global citizen disposition is developing, or has developed
22
23 over a program. In this case, the purpose of evaluation would be to holistically assess
24
25 how students' were thinking, rather than what they were thinking.
26
27

28
29 "In terms of *Legitimizing the global citizen*, all participants emphasised the
30
31 university responsibility for promoting liberal values and educating ethical thinking
32
33 global citizens. Several participants believed that students might not be exposed to
34
35 values through family and religion, and the university had a responsibility to fill this
36
37 void. Delanty (2001) claimed a cosmopolitan university could be recognised as a key
38
39 communicative institution in society, as the state retreats from social responsibility and
40
41 cultural direction. Participants discussed the collective role of universities and thought
42
43 that identifying shared values was a central secular issue for universities. Several
44
45 participants considered it could be possible to identify university values that
46
47 accommodated diversity and multiple perspectives, and IUA could be an organisation to
48
49 further this goal. Scientific truth was identified as a guide for some shared values,
50
51 whereas political and moral issues may need a more cosmopolitan approach.
52
53

54
55 Consistent with cosmopolitan learning (Rizvi, 2009), participants' strongly
56
57 considered that the role of the university was to teach students 'how to think', 'not what
58
59
60

1
2 to think' in terms of values. Rather than reinvigorating the curriculum with normative
3
4 issues, values could be used within an ethical learning approach to foster critical and
5
6 ethical thinking. Moreover, the findings highlighted how cosmopolitan 'thought'
7
8 leadership could provide an integral aspect of furthering values-based education.
9

10
11 The managerial mindset' explained how bureaucratic thinking influences
12
13 university organisational processes. Participants were acutely aware of leadership
14
15 corporate responsibilities and the uncertainty of future university public funding, as
16
17 discussed by other authors (Marginson & Consadine, 2000; Marginson, 2011; Rhoads
18
19 & Szelenyi, 2011; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; Slaughter & Rhoads, 2004). Moreover,
20
21 leadership culpability for reinforcing 'the managerial mindset' was also identified by
22
23 Slaughter and Rhoads (2004) and Brady (2012). Brown and Rayner (2013) believed that
24
25 blindly defaulting to reporting requirements avoids critique of the purpose of the data.
26
27 Yet, if university leaders question the appropriateness of the data, one participant
28
29 explained that this was attributed to 'university self-interest' by 'the managerial
30
31 mindset'. Several participants (including leaders themselves) questioned a leadership
32
33 commitment to public good; however university corporate responsibilities are unique
34
35 and complex, as shown by Marginson and Consadine, (2000).
36
37
38
39

40
41 The relativism of university values was specifically raised as a major sidelining
42
43 influence to instituting the global citizen and several participants discussed the
44
45 consequences. They believed the drive for discipline specific skills and measurable
46
47 competencies overshadows values-based education that promotes critical and ethical
48
49 reasoning. Relativism of values has been attributed **to pre-established ignorance**
50
51 **(Beck, 2006) and more specifically** to the declining public good and societal role of
52
53 universities (Appiah, 2006; D'Arms, 2005; Furedi, 2009; Li, 2007). Appiah (2006)
54
55 explained that relativism was thought to promote tolerance. Yet, conversely it stifles
56
57 conversation about what we think and feel, and how we might learn from each other.
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

According to Appiah (2006), in contrast to creating a multicultural open and tolerant society, relativism has created a reason to fall silent instead. This perspective was echoed in the findings.

The suggested notion of ‘thought leadership’ captured a leadership model that could be suitable for mediating between corporate and social responsibilities, and the relativism of values. ‘Thought leadership’ is consistent with Lawler’s (2005) views. He argued that the predominant model of corporate leadership lacks a philosophical basis where responsibility, values and morality are inherent. Instead, adding an existential element promoted moral and ethical, reflective and relational decision-making. The findings of this research and the literature suggest that ‘thought leaders’ with a global citizen mindset could promote an organisational framework that supported the global citizen as a curricular outcome.

Conclusion

Universities often claim to educate global citizens, yet there is little evidence of this occurring. However, in a grounded snapshot, this research offers insight into organisational constraints and enablers for enacting and legitimating the global citizen as a curricular outcome. The participants’ perspectives of the ‘ideal global graduate’ reduced the perceived ambiguity of the global citizen term. The international and inter-sectoral participants presented a shared understanding of the global citizen as a disposition and as a university responsibility. Hindrances to realising values-based education were discussed through the different epistemologies of the managerial and academic mindsets, and corporate and thought leaders. ‘Thought leaders’, acting beyond the role of corporate CEO and with a global citizen mindset, were proposed as having potential to reinvigorate the societal purpose of universities, and promote values-based education. These leaders could be vital to supporting organisational processes, and

pedagogical practices directed toward educating ethical thinking global citizens as well as skilled professionals. This paper is intended to stimulate future academic discourse and research on the organisational enablers for promoting values-based education for students as global citizens.

For Peer Review Only

EDUCATING GLOBAL CITIZENS

26

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Appadurai, A. (2000) Grass roots globalisation and the research imagination, *Public Culture*, 12(1), 1-19.
- Appiah, A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. London: Penguin.
- Beck, U. (2006). Unpacking cosmopolitanism for the social sciences: A research agenda. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 57(1), 1-23. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-4446.2006.00091.x
- Boiset, M. & MacMillan, I. (2004). Crossing epistemological boundaries: Managerial and entrepreneurial approaches to knowledge management, *Long Range Planning*, 37, 505-524, Retrieved from doi:10.1016/j.lrp.2004.09.002
- Brady, N. (2012). From 'moral loss' to 'moral reconstruction'? A critique of ethical perspectives on challenging the neoliberal hegemony in UK universities in the 21st century, *Oxford Review of Education*, 38(3), 343-355. doi: 1080/03054985.2012.698987
- Brown, L. & Rayner, S. (2013). Managing leadership in university reform: Data-led decision making, the cost of learning and deja-vu?, *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 1-17. doi: 10.1177/1741143213494890
- Calhoun, C. (2006). The university and public good, *Thesis Eleven*, 84(7), 1-43. doi: 10.1177/0725513606060516
- D'Arms, J. (2005). Relationality, relativism and realism about moral values, *Philosophical Studies*, 126(3), 433-448, Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4321670>
- de Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalisation of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: A historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis*. Boston: Centre for International Higher Education.
- Delanty, G. (2001). *Challenging knowledge: The university in the knowledge society*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

EDUCATING GLOBAL CITIZENS

27

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Delors, J., Al Mufti, I., Amagi, I. & Carneiro, R. (2010). *Learning the treasure within* (3rd Edition ed.). Paris: UNESCO.
- Elwell, F. (1996) *The sociology of Max Weber*, from <http://www.faculty.rsu.edu/~felwell/Theorists/Weber/Whome.htm>
- Furedi, F. (2009). *Wasted: Why education isn't educating*. London: Continuum.
- Gallagher, M. (2011). *Envisioning the future global positioning of Australia's education, training and research*. Canberra: International Education Association Australia.
- Georgetown University. (2013). *Recovery 2020: Job Growth and Education Requirements through 2020*. Georgetown: Georgetown University.
- Giroux, H. (2009). Neoliberalism, Corporate Culture, and the Promise of Higher Education: The university as Democratic Public Sphere, *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(4).
- Green, M. (2012). What is global citizenship? , *IAU Horizons*, 17(3), 27-29, Retrieved from Retrieved from http://www.iau-aiu.net/sites/all/files/IAU_Horizons_Vol17_3_18_1_EN.pdf
- Hoareau, C., Ritzen, J. & Marconi, G. (2012). *The State of University Policy for Progress in Europe*. Maarstricht: United National University.
- International Association Universities. (2012) *Affirming academic values in internationalisation of higher education: A call for action*, from <http://www.iau-aiu.net/content/affirming-academic-values-internationalization-higher-education-call-action>
- Klein, H. & Myers, D. (1999). A set of principles for conducting and evaluating interpretive field studies in information systems, *MIS Quarterly*, 23(Special Issue on Intensive Research), 67-93.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Knight, J. (1997). Internationalisation of higher education: A conceptual framework. In J. Knight & H. de Wit (Eds.), *Internationalisation of higher education in Asian Pacific countries*. Amsterdam: European Association of International Education.
- Knight, J. (2012). Concepts, rationales, and interpretive frameworks in the internationalisation of higher education. In D. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J. Heyl & T. Adams (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of international education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lawler, J. (2005). The essence of leadership: Existentialism and leadership, *Leadership*, 1(2), 216-231, Retrieved from doi:10.1177/1742715005051860
- Leask, B. & Bridge, C. (2013). Comparing internationalisation of the curriculum in action across disciplines: Theoretical and practical perspectives: *Compare: A journal of comparative and international education*, 43(1), 79-101.
- Li, X. (2007). A cultural critique of cultural relativism, *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 66(1), 152-171. doi: 10.1111/j.1536-7150.2007.00502.x.
- Maguire Associates Inc. (2012). *The role of higher education and career development: Employers' perspectives*. Washington, DC: The Chronicle of Higher Education/America's Public Media Market Place.
- Marginson, S. (2007). Globalization, the "Idea of a University" and its ethical regimes, *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 19(1), 1-15. doi: 10.1787/hemp-v19-art2-en
- Marginson, S. (2011). Higher education and public good, *Higher Education Quarterly*, 65(4), 411-433.
- Marginson, S. (2012). The impossibility of capitalist markets in higher education, *Journal of Education Policy*, 28(3), 353-370.
- Marginson, S. & Considine, M. (2000). *The enterprise university: Power, governance and reinvention in Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

EDUCATING GLOBAL CITIZENS

29

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Marginson, S. & Sawir, E. (2011). *Intercultural education*. Palgrave MacMillan: New York.
- McArthur, J. (2011). Reconsidering the social and economic purposes of higher education, *Higher Education Research & Development*, 30(6), 737-749. doi: 10.1080/07294360.2010.539596
- Miles, M. & Huberman, A. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A source book of new methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Morais, D. & Ogden, A. (2011). Initial development and validation of the global citizenship scale, *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 15(5), 456-466, Retrieved from doi:10.1177/1028315310375308
- Morrow, R. & Torres, C. (2000). The state, globalisation, and education policy. In N. Burbles & C. Torres (Eds.), *Globalisation and education critical perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Neuman, W. (2006). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- OECD (1996) *Internationalization of higher education*. OECD: Paris
- Peters, M., Britton, A. & Blee, H. (2008). *Global citizenship education: Philosophy, theory and pedagogy*. Rotterdam: Sense.
- Pogge, T. (2002). Cosmopolitanism: A defense, *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 5(3), 86-91. doi: 10.1080/13698230410001702672
- Rhoads, R. & Szelenyi, K. (2011). *Global citizenship and the university: Advancing social life and relations in an interdependent world*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Rizvi, F. (2009). Towards cosmopolitan learning, *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education*, 30(3), 253-268. doi: 10.1080/01596300903036863

EDUCATING GLOBAL CITIZENS

30

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Rizvi, F. & Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalising education policy*. Routledge: Abington, UK.
- Schattle, H. (2008). The practices of global citizenship. Roman and Littlefield: Lanham, MA.
- Schultz, L. (2010). Educating for Global Citizenship: Conflicting Agendas and Understandings. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*. 53 (3) 248-258.
- Selby, R. (2008). Designing transformation in international education. In V. Savicki (Ed.), *Developing intercultural competence and transformation: Theory, research, and application in international education* (pp. 1-12). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Slaughter, S. & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new eEconomy: Markets state and higher education*. Baltimore, MD.: John Hopkins University Press.
- Swedberg, R. & Agevall, O. (2005). *The Max Weber dictionary*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Tarrant, M. (2010). A conceptual framework for global citizenship development, *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 14(5), 443-463.
- Taylor, C. (2004). *Modern social imaginaries*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- UNESCO. (2009). *The new dynamics of higher education and research for societal change and development*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Vertovec, S. & Cohen, R. (2002). *Conceiving cosmopolitanism: Theory, context and practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.