

# Challenging Conceptions of Western Higher Education and Promoting Graduates as Global Citizens

Valerie Clifford, Oxford Brookes University,

vclifford@brookes.ac.uk

Catherine Montgomery, University of Hull,

c.montgomery@hull.ac.uk

## Abstract

*Recently there has been a shift in the discourses of university policy from internationalisation towards the contested concept of global citizenship. This paper explores ways of challenging the current interpretation of international education policy through the concept of global citizenship drawing on the discussion forums of two cohorts of participants in an online course. The participants' responses illustrate ways they are rethinking the purpose of international higher education and the relevance of the concept of global citizenship. Whilst most participants whole-heartedly endorsed a more holistic view of higher education, several issues were raised, especially the fit of the ideal of global citizenship with a capitalist society and the Western heritage of the concept, which were perceived to be troublesome issues. Resistance to the inclusion of education for global citizenship was anticipated from institutions and disciplines, both heavily invested in the status quo. The academics' personal beliefs about higher education, and their willingness and potential to design and deliver curriculum for global citizenship were also prominent. Although universities are beginning to include the term global citizen in their policy documents the extent to which this might influence the goals and curricula of higher education is yet to be realised.*

## Introduction

Global citizenship is an intriguing term appealing to current advocates of a wide range of movements from world peace, to sustainability, to social equity and justice. The term is also now appearing in an increasing

number of university policy documents in the United Kingdom (UK), Australia, Canada and the United States of America (USA). The 'good feel' of the concept may be the attraction of the term to tertiary education institutions but the meaning of the term or the implications of it for a holistic approach to tertiary education are rarely investigated (Shultz, 2007).

Change in tertiary education over the last three decades has been predicated on economic rationales for the institutions and for the student as individuals. Tertiary education now serves the economy and debates on educating future citizens are muted (Booth *et al.*, 2009). However, the growth of the movement to internationalise the curriculum has opened up opportunities to revisit the broader aims of education and to question the increasingly reductionist employability agenda.

In this paper the use of the concept of global citizenship and its implications for tertiary education is explored. The contentious nature of the concept is also examined through the voices of tertiary teachers, from ten different countries, participating in an online course on internationalising the curriculum. The paper explores attempts to define global citizenship and considers the issues that arise: its fit with capitalist society; the perception of it as a Western-colonial concept; its clash with current institutional visions; and its acceptance by the disciplines and by tertiary teachers.

### **Global citizenship and cosmopolitanism**

The usefulness of the term 'global citizen' has been questioned when there is no global political structure (Pashby, 2011). However, a moral concept of world citizenship stretches back to the Ancient Greek philosophers with the Stoics describing a person's identity as a series of concentric circles starting with the self and immediate family and moving out to encompass all of humanity (Nussbaum, 1997).

This moral sense of responsibility and obligation to others lies at the heart of the differentiation of a global citizen from the common conceptualisation of a cosmopolitan. Cosmopolitans have been seen as part of a wealthy élite with access to education to enable them to move freely around the world, knowing of, but perhaps not taking action on, moral issues. Rizvi (2005) described cosmopolitans as being seen as rootless, not taking seriously duties to their own community. Some writers seed confusion by using the term global citizen when they are actually describing cosmopolitans, for example, Dower's (2008, p. 39) 'Global citizenship is largely a privileged status of rich Northerners, and a

product of their wealth, leisure, opportunities and access'. Similarly Hamdon and Jorgenson (2009) used the term global citizenship to describe a neo-liberal discourse that privileges individualism, mobility and competition and perpetuates minority privilege. On the other hand, Hill (2000) bridged the gap between cosmopolitanism and global citizenship in his 'moral cosmopolitanism' where people identify the world as their home and hold values such as openness and tolerance and believe in a rights-based society. Shultz (2007, p. 255) drew out the difference between cosmopolitanism, as the outcome of a neo-liberal approach to global education, in contrast to a radical approach, the outcome of which is resistance to globalisation and a strengthening of local and national institutions; and the transformative approach where (global) citizens have an understanding of a common humanity, a shared planet and a shared future.

What appears to be missing from the common cosmopolitan stance is a political discourse that interrogates issues of power, inclusion and exclusion, oppression and marginalisation (Donald, 2008; Joseph, 2012). Andreotti (2006) accused universities of dealing in 'soft citizenship' where students engage in activities such as tree planting, campaigns and cross-institutional visits but that these do not have transformational potential and do not reconstruct the current agenda.

Global citizenship discussions are predicated on an idea of agreement on universal ideals such as equity and social justice, at the same time as honouring difference. Although there are some universal frames enacted in human rights law (Donald, 2008), and declarations, such as the UNESCO Declaration on Higher Education for the Twenty First Century have come into force, the incompleteness and contested nature of these still need to be acknowledged (Gacel-Avila, 2005). Also all laws and declarations are still enacted at local level and so are influenced by their context (Osler and Starkey, 2000, 2001). Camicia and Franklin (2011, p. 311) expressed concern about the collapsing of citizenship ideas into an 'imagined consensus'; the complexities and tensions of trying to live together in a global village being detailed by Delors (1996, pp. 15–16). Also Osler and Starkey (2000, 2001) questioned the depth of commitment to multiple identities and dynamic cultures and the lengths to which people are prepared to go to defend rights of those who might seem to be threatening local culture and economy.

The possibility of people's allegiance being primarily to humanity has been questioned by Spivak (2008, p. 225). Spivak saw an 'international class, with nationalist knowledge bases' with people who are internationally mobile but think nationally and impose their ideas

across the globe. Pashby (2011) also saw a focus on national citizenship with global awareness rather than privileging the 'global' in global citizenship. Spivak (1999) suggested that a change of mindset is needed so instead of individuals seeing themselves as global agents intent on mastering the world, they become 'planetary subjects' who inhabit the planet on loan and have responsibility to look after it.

So a global citizen, in the literature, has been seen to have a critical knowledge of her or his self, culture and social-historical positioning, knowledge of other cultures and other peoples and a recognition of the interdependence of all humans (Nussbaum, 2002). They also need to have knowledge of global issues and a moral sensitivity to social injustice, inequality and racism and also to actively pursue a life that does not benefit themselves to the disadvantage of others. Giroux (1988) stressed preparing students to be active, critical, risk taking citizens whose task is to interpret the world with the intention to change it.

### **The research**

This paper draws on a research project that investigated academics' engagement with the concept of global citizenship as a means of internationalising the higher education curriculum. The research explored the perceptions of academics who were taking part in a one-month fully online course on 'Internationalising the Curriculum for All Students'. The project was a longitudinal one that drew data from six iterations of the course over a four-year period from 2008 to 2012, involving a total of 104 tertiary educators working in higher education institutions in ten different countries, although the participants' countries of origin were more diverse than their institutions. Global citizenship was the recurring subject of online discussions that were an integral part of the course introducing participants to a transformative view of internationalising the curriculum. The aim of the course was to enable participants to think afresh about the purpose of higher education in today's globalised, interdependent world and reflect on the sort of education that they should be offering their students.

The online discussion forums on the course provided the research data. The participants wrote their responses to, and reflections on, a framework for introducing transformative learning into the higher education curriculum (Kitano, 1997). The framework involved categorising curricula practices as exclusive (where mainstream perspectives are prioritised), inclusive (that incorporate alternative perspectives) and transformative. For Kitano (1997) a transformative

course challenges traditional views and assumptions through non-dominant perspectives, students being encouraged to develop new perspectives and new ways of thinking. The learning environments are based on the co-construction of knowledge between staff and students, all participants contributing their knowledge and experience. This conceptualisation of higher education curriculum adopts a critical perspective and provided the opportunity to investigate academics' perceptions of the significance of preparing graduates to approach their lives in an ethical and sustainable way.

This paper draws on the discussion forums in two iterations of the course, chosen for a strong focus in the discussions on global citizenship. The 43 participants of these two iterations accessed the course from the UK (England, Scotland and Wales), Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, the Netherlands, South Africa and Colombia, although their ethnic origins were more diverse including for example India, Nigeria and Poland. Eight participants held leadership positions *vis à vis* internationalisation and another 12 held positions of responsibility for learning and teaching and curriculum development at school or faculty level. Fourteen of the group were academic developers (working across faculties), four provided student English language and learning support and three were postgraduate research students. The other 22 participants were discipline-based academics. The disciplines covered were politics, architecture, archaeology, science, mathematics, health, law, business, social work, hospitality, education, French, English language and communication and media. Informed consent was sought by email from all participants with information given on joining the course regarding the research project and a follow-up email sent in order to acquire written consent from participants to use the online discussions as data in academic discussions and publications. Discussion relating to the theme of global citizenship appeared in several of the discussion threads and was thematically analysed leading to the categorisation of issues concerning the concept. The data was analysed by both authors and categories were agreed.

Data generated from online discussion forums is informal, co-constructed spoken discourse but because it is presented in written form is more formal and reflective than a face-to-face conversation. This makes it possible for participants to reflect carefully on their contributions to offer knowledge constructed from experience, social interaction and reflection (Eraut, 2007).

This paper analyses the issues raised concerning the concept of global citizenship. Issues were raised about the ideological fit between the

concept of global citizenship and capitalism and the Western heritage of the concept. There were further issues that had significant implications for policy in higher education and these were the attitudes of institutions, the disciplines and tertiary sector staff. These issues are discussed below.

In the following discussions quotes from the online discussions are represented with a different symbol identifying each of the two iterations of the course (# for the first or \* for the second) and a number identifying the discussion forum and a letter or two letters for each speaker.

### **Issues with the concept of global citizenship**

#### *The fit between global citizenship and capitalist society*

Although ideologically attracted to global citizenship the concept was considered problematic by the course participants. Many were familiar with ideas of cosmopolitanism but for some the dimension of active involvement in global issues for themselves and their students was new and sometimes confrontational.

The addition of the aspect of global citizenship and a responsibility for personal activism is some new thinking for me and I am greatly attracted to this idea. This makes good sense in our global environment and the signs are clear that this is going to be needed from all citizens of the world. (\*7L)

I have seen that some of my students become 'cosmopolitan' learning 'global health' but really don't want to participate as global citizens. It may just become too hard. (\*7B)

At the fundamental level participants questioned whether a concept based on an ideology of equality and social justice was compatible with a capitalist economy based on competition. Some saw it as ideological and non-practical and 'a construction of imagined illusion' (\*7W) while others deliberated on the stratified world, including their place within it.

We all have a vision of how the idealised ethical world should look and a notion of how we should think and act to create this new 'happy place'. But the question arises, can we really create a world of equality and harmony, where we each treat each other ethically, with social responsibility, global competence and global civic engagement? Does the system we all tacitly subscribe to (capitalism) allow for an equal world? How can we climb the ladder of success if we throw it away? Where will the reserve pool of labour, needed to keep wages down and profits up come from? How will we maintain our standard of living if we have to earn a little less and give a little more? (\*7W)

Since visiting our hegemonic homeland I am beginning to wonder if the whole notion of global citizenship is nothing but a middle-class indulgence. After all it is very hard to think global when you are hungry and worrying about where your next meal will come from, or when you look out from your dirt floor hut and see the negative impact of (multinational) foreigners on your life. The only ones who can afford to dream the dream of global equality are those that have too much to lose and will not let go of what they already have. (\*7W)

In her study of global citizenship education Pashby (2011, p. 427) found an assumption of a liberal-nation state, where the citizens were expected to work with 'liberal, democratic notion of justice on a global scale' through their local, national and then global communities. Course participants hotly contested ideas of universal global perspectives, global democracies and global values.

I don't think there is anything such as 'truly global perspectives', it can be more global but we can never conclude that any perspective is 'truly global' ... I disagree that it is possible (or even desirable) to have 'authentic perspectives of nations'. Nations in a Carmicia and globalised world has become minefields of identity constructions, claims and counter-claims, which of the claims will be the 'authentic' perspective of 'the nation'? Personally I am also uncomfortable with the establishment of 'global democracy and international social justice' as if there is something universal out there that is not embedded in hegemonic (most probably) market dominated relations and structural injustices. (#7PR)

Pashby (2011) queried whether global citizenship education efforts actually change the power *status quo* or are just superficial liberal gestures. Similarly Camicia and Franklin (2011) saw citizenship education as embedded in the cultural, economic and political economy of society and questioned who benefits from competing visions offered in new curricula. They asked if there are any sites of resistance to the market rationalisation pressure that 'emphasise emancipation, diversity and social justice' (Camicia and Franklin, 2011, p. 312). Despite the difficulties of envisioning the concept of global citizenship in the current economy, some of the course participants presented a philosophy of hope.

It seems there is a growing percentage of [academics] ... [who are] becoming increasingly uncomfortable with the 'business model' of our production and its embeddedness in the capitalist system ... We do have an opportunity, however, through IoC [Internationalisation of the Curriculum] (thanks to the institutional buy in [or] appetite for it), to appropriate this space and use it to actually explore [or] experiment with programmes that will eventually, hopefully, support a shift towards a more just, post-capitalist, society. (\*7CE)

Participants saw the opportunity to challenge old paradigms and emphasised the need for 'safe, critical and sceptical spaces for interrogating and disrupting small and big discourses that shape our lives' (#7PR).

### *A new form of colonialism*

Interwoven into the previous discussion was a concern that the discourses on internationalising the curriculum and global citizenship were being generated by Western pedagogues and that they were just inventing a new form of colonialism where, 'humanistic discourses ... sit unproblematically beside historically embedded colonialist assumptions about difference' (Pashby, 2011, p. 428).

I'm beginning to wonder if the notion of global citizenship, much like Christianity in earlier times, runs the risk of becoming the ideological mouthpiece for a new form of colonisation. (\*7W)

I am troubled by the concepts of 'internationalisation' we are subscribing to: to what extent are these concepts influenced by non-Western thought? How many non-Western people contributed to the defining of the concepts? Surely the participants in this process need to explicitly mention their own cultural backgrounds? (\*1T).

Andreotti (2011a) argued that the global citizenship debate is heavily Eurocentric, even ideas of planetary citizenship having Europe at its centre. Andreotti cites Spivak (1999) who 'calls us ... to be attentive to our privilege and complicities in the political economies of knowledge production' (Andreotti, 2011b, p. 308). She argued that colonialism is part of a Eurocentric expansion of modes of knowing, that claim universality, so positioning other knowledge as inferior. Similarly, Kumar (2004) wrote that knowledge is defined by the social reality of a particular period and locale and the ease with which the disassociation between curriculum and a student's immediate socio-cultural and physical milieu is accepted. This form of epistemic racism, makes a political philosophy of inclusion difficult. Andreotti (2011a) uses the work of Latin American scholars to delineate three dimensions of global citizenship education: 1. 'how educators imagine the 'globe' in global citizenship education'; 2. 'how educators imagine themselves as 'global educators' and their students as global citizens'; and 3. 'how educators imagine knowledge and learning beyond Eurocentric paradigms' (2011a, p. 392). What is vital here is that critical analysis of domination, subordination and invisibility and 'border thinking' (Andreotti, 2011a, p. 393) is involved. It moves beyond the dichotomy



of the west and the rest, allowing it to be possible to learn from each other rather than becoming caught in the relativist's dilemma of feeling unable to enter critical engagement with others (Appiah, 2007; Cousin, 2011).

The course participants discussed the difficulties of moving beyond their own culturally embedded frames of reference, citing assumptions such as democracy being a universal good. They also speculated how they could formulate a counter-narrative from within their own perspectives and if so how legitimate it would be?

You just keep uncovering layers of Western perspectives and premises that you can't escape, because everything here is built upon that, including my own learning! (\*11Q)

How can anyone really 'make paradigm shifts and view their work from the perspectives of different racial, cultural and gender groups', if they have never operated as a member of a minority group for a significant time? Can I as a lifelong member of the majority culture really understand how I look, sound and feel to those from minority cultures? (\*11T)

I really don't think there are many alternatives but to think and formulate transformational agendas but constantly being cognisant of our locations and how they have shaped and are still shaping us. (#7PR)

Opening up opportunities for debate on the possibilities of global values and local interpretations that go beyond the culture and the concepts of current language may be a first step in developing 'global imaginaries' that are needed to create new curricula and pedagogy (Rizvi and Walsh, 1998; Gough, 1999). Singh and Schresta (2008) particularly saw as problematic the hegemony of Western universities, that privilege certain forms of knowledge and learning, in relation to the universities of the developing world, especially when the latter are involved in transnational educational arrangements with Western universities (Reid and Hellsten, 2008).

The privileging of the Western perspective was also discussed by the participants and explained in the context of Africanisation and indigenisation of the curriculum. The development of a global higher education system that espouses principles of equity, social justice and inclusion would appear to be the perfect opportunity to open a space for the voices of African and indigenous academics to be heard (Asmar *et al.*, 2009). However, the participants echo the recent research in the area to point out the challenges involved. Indigenous people are in the minority of populations in Canada, Australia and the USA and this demographic is mirrored in the number of academics in higher education (Asmar *et al.*, 2009). Consequently there is a need for Western academics to engage with the idea of the non-Western other and reflect

these perspectives in their curriculum. The main concern that participants had was how this might be possible.

How do academics who were trained in [culturally specific] epistemologies, manage to indigenise the curricula? It is a big debate in my context (and a personal dilemma). How does someone who is 'outside' of the epistemologies and ontologies, mainstream them? ... I think that we have to respect their epistemologies and ontologies and use that section of their community that is articulating their positions from the education heritage. But it is a learning exercise that as we have done in the past, accept that we probably will get it wrong. (#11PR)

The dangers of misunderstanding or misrepresenting the positions and perspectives of others are therefore very real. Subreenduth (2010) noted how Africa in particular continues to be misread and misrepresented in Western education despite its increasing global, cultural and political impact. Simplistic stereotypes about poverty and exotica are supported by the media and rarely critiqued in any effective way (Subreenduth, 2010). This was an issue picked up by participants:

Freire (1993) has warned that students often describe their worlds using the language of the dominant discourse. As lecturers we should sensitise students to this (another Freirian concept—to make them conscious) and encourage them to describe the world in different terms. In a society where students may think that consumption and 'the good life according to the West' are the norms to which they aspire, we should not only make them uncomfortable with these 'norms' but also [demonstrate] this discomfort! (#11PR)

Whilst discursive approaches in the curriculum may aim to welcome alternative views, there is a complexity in the positioning of the disciplines and systems in higher education that make this difficult. There may also still remain a 'right' and 'wrong' answer in terms of what the Western discipline expects and this may be in conflict with an African or Indigenous view. One participant noted:

Taking a 'global approach' goes just beyond content, to suggest[ing] that there are other ways of thinking about the world. In archaeology, we can draw on indigenous perspectives on, for instance, use of landscape to enrich our understandings of people's sense of place in the past, but much harder are where alternative viewpoints have been heavily criticised in Western academia. As a lecturer, you can present these discussions as alternatives, but ultimately you are working in a particular [Western] paradigm. (#11HA)

Manathunga (2009) underlines the crucial role of interdisciplinarity and its links to post-colonial approaches to education. The border-crossings and 'transculturation' involved in interdisciplinarity enable a re-interpretation of research that foregrounds the identities and lived

experiences of the researcher (2009, p. 132). Promoting a more complex construction of the binary of the insider and outsider (outlining how one can be an insider as well as an outsider in a particular community) is an approach suggested by Subreenduth (2010). Critical interventions and critical dialogue in education that aim to ‘unsettle the hegemony of dominant ways of reading the world’ (Subedi, 2010, p. 15) are crucial. Participants from African countries saw the need to Africanise the curriculum to reclaim their own heritage from the colonial past, the local being counter-hegemonic practice.

Africanisation in the context of [university] is therefore primarily a counter-hegemonic strategy to validate African knowledge systems and ways of seeing the world. The danger is that this is a ‘discourse of perpetual and romanticised longing for an Africa that never existed’ (Prinsloo, 2010) ... Having said that, Africanisation is a necessary strategy to discover and celebrate indigenous knowledge systems as equal to Western canons of knowledge. (#7PR)

### **Policy issues for global citizenship in higher education**

#### *Institutional resistance to change*

Governments drive agendas in higher education through financial constraints. This has led higher education institutions to embrace market-driven agendas to maximise financial returns to the organisation, especially through recruitment of international students, establishing international partnerships and exporting tertiary education courses (Chaney, 2013). At the same time the governments in certain countries (for example, the UK and Australia) have demanded that curricula focus on graduate employability. This agenda has left little room for the consideration of the idea of global citizenship. Higher education institutions are also not known for their ability to address change quickly. The course participants saw their institutions and senior management as heavily invested in the *status quo*.

Less likely to get buy-in but arguably more significant for all our futures, is the need for the curriculum to develop ‘global citizens’ who are ‘outraged by social injustice’ and willing to make the world a more sustainable place. There are many powerful forces acting on universities, some of which would not support universities aiming to turn out armies of activist volunteers! (\*7T)

Well—as much as I like the ‘activism’ part I can’t imagine great swathes of the university subscribing to this. It would immediately underscore change that

altered the characteristics of hegemony and too many stakeholders are invested in the *status quo*. (\*7Z)

However, the participants also pointed out that as the purpose of universities is critique and constructing knowledge then they should be open to new ideas.

From the perspective of influencing change, the challenge will be to overcome resistance that is deeply rooted in some of our institutions that were set up for an age long gone. However, if the purpose of university education is to interrogate and challenge old paradigms of knowledge to build new knowledge and ways of knowing then IoC [Internationalisation of the Curriculum] need not sit in contrast but rather be considered a natural development of a dynamic institution. (\*9M)

I believe that within many universities one could also argue that staff 'subjectivities are rationalised and accommodated to existing régimes of truth'. The locus of power is often outside the curriculum and within the decision-making processes of the culture of the institution, within the policy-making processes, within priorities determined at higher committee levels, etc. Universities, like the military and certain churches, have a clearly defined, hierarchical structure where many staff know their pecking order to a peck, so this regime of truth and counter-hegemonic approaches are challenging at the level of individual curricula. (#7DO)

The introduction of the idea of educating students for global citizenship opens up afresh the debate on the purpose of higher education. Camicia and Franklin (2011, p. 41) stated unequivocally that 'choosing a type of education means choosing a type of society'. They argued that universities should be 'independent fully responsible institutions' with the 'intellectual authority that society needs to help it reflect, understand and act' (2011, p. 39), in line with Giroux's call for 'the university's full participation in public life as the protector and promoter of democratic values' (2012, p. 6). Gacel-Avila (2005) saw universities as having a public life that must follow political agendas (such as employability) and a private intellectual life. Joseph (Joseph, 2012, p. 251) described this as 'discourses of neoliberalism, marketization, managerialism and research quality frameworks compet[ing] with discourses of social justice, tolerance, democracy and critical dialogue' requiring academics to perform a 'balancing act between social justice, academic passions and instrumental performativity' (2012, p. 254). This balancing act draws heavily on the resources and the energy of the individual as shown in the section on 'Teachers as Transformative Intellectuals' below, while leaving the policy question of the purpose of higher education unaddressed.

*Disciplinary resistance to change*

In academia ownership of knowledge is seen to be invested in the disciplines. The disciplines have traditionally been seen to be the intellectual homes of academics, rather than their institutions, and they have exerted a strong influence on how knowledge is perceived and how it is taught (Becher and Trowler, 2001). At first international education was dealt with by many disciplines on a micro level; for example, adding an international case study to the curriculum. However, the goal to equip graduates for global citizenship fundamentally challenges disciplines at the macro level to work with paradigm change (Clifford, 2009; 2012). While some disciplines do create spaces to critically engage with issues of epistemological privilege and social justice, many disciplines do not address 'issues of power, inclusion/exclusion, oppression and marginalisation' (Joseph, 2012, p. 254); subject knowledge being seen as central.

I also fear that many of the transformative approaches advocated lend themselves easily to humanities disciplines, but find it harder to see how to replicate in the sciences. (#11HA)

I can't imagine as to how a curriculum team would give up the mantra that 'discipline' is the most important facet in a curriculum. (\*7Z)

The course participants acknowledged these issues and saw challenging the disciplines as a necessary part of obtaining change.

Firstly, it seems to me that a discipline needs to understand that there exists an identifiable culture that is part of a preparation for seeing that it could perform its functions differently (\*1H)

Another layer of resistance was observed in the power of professional associations over curricula, again with a focus on employability of graduates.

Often the accreditation bodies (at least in South Africa) have a very narrow view of education and transformation is not a word they specifically know or like. Technical competence is the most important for them rather than holistic graduates. Although after Enron, Parmalat, and other corporate scandals, they are more sensitive to ethical issues—but still see ethics as a stand-alone module and not embedded throughout the curriculum. (#11PR)

I would, personally, like to delink architectural education from professional accreditation. This would enable change to the curriculum in ways that truly acknowledge different ways of looking at history, skills and practice. (#1SC)

While there was concern about the positioning of discipline knowledge in the context of the idea of the construction of new knowledge, some

participants began to see that internationalisation of the curriculum was already part of their courses and could be built upon.

I already hear ... complaints from teaching staff about the crowded nature of the curriculum when trying to persuade them to engage in more constructivist and student-centred practice and can only imagine the resistance ... at the suggestion that even more content ... is to be added to the curriculum. However, I guess it's a little like changing teaching practice in that you just push a little more each time and slowly the resistance gives! (\*2S)

The problem with accounting and finance is the need to learn a good deal of basic technical building blocks before discussion can be widened into a more critical investigation ... however, some opportunities exist. (\*1D)

### *Teachers as transformative intellectuals*

Critical theorists see educational institutions as powerful places of social, economic and cultural reproduction (a role seen as being endorsed by current quality assurance practices (McBurnie and Ziguras, 2001)) and have argued that educational institutions must not be seen as extensions of the market place but must be democratic public spaces for critical inquiry and meaningful dialogue Giroux (1988, 2012). Giroux envisions teachers in these institutions as transformative intellectuals whose pedagogy develops critical literacy and active citizenship in their students.

While institutions nowadays make pronouncements and policies about their curriculum, that curriculum is developed and enacted by academics, individually or in teams. Academics, therefore, are an essential part of policy implementation and need to have the necessary knowledge and skills to understand and interpret institutional policies and the willingness to put them into practice. The course participants in this study were open to new ideas and the ideology of global citizenship but expressed a lack of confidence in their own knowledge and skills to implement the ideas. Participants saw their own awareness and education, as vital to making shifts in their thinking and stimulating their imaginations.

I think part of the answer to this is that internationalisation requires us to be aware of, and candid about, the cultural underpinnings of the approaches to teaching and lecturing that we are espousing. (\*IT)

Looking back at what I wrote, it seems I'm implying that I (we) as a teacher (teachers) already have a global perspective and all we need to do is make sure that students also do. Of course that's often far from the case, we too need to push back our global horizons! (#7HA)

Rather than internationalising others, e.g. students, we need to start with internationalising ourselves. (#7RA)

Turner and Robson (2006, p. 26) saw teachers' 'epistemological and pedagogical values beneath routine practices remained both implicit and culturally inviolate'. Critically reflecting on our educational beliefs and our practice can be profoundly disturbing, especially if teachers begin to question many years of their own practice. New insights may create dissonance with their disciplinary and personal identities (Reid and Hellsten, 2008).

To become an 'activist' I wonder what would be necessary for personal change to occur? I agree with what I have read so far, that is, we are only dabbling on the peripheries because to engage in real change would be very dramatic to self. (\*11Z)

. . . but a curriculum that commences with inner transformation of the teacher, a commitment to a multicultural world, and an acceptance of the global world in which we live is at once desirable and appealing but also daunting and challenging. (#11DO)

The course participants also expressed a lack of confidence in their own abilities and skills to design and enact a transformative curriculum. Of particular concern was their duty of care to their students, especially with regards to their own sensitivity to the views of others. A transformative education can be frightening for students as it asks them to take risks, move out of their comfort zones and be open to personal change and to become involved in social action (Nussbaum, 2004). Such an education addresses the moral and political values of teachers and students. Gardner (2006) writes of a pedagogy of discomfort and asks at what point individuals should become intolerant of each others' views.

Furthermore, even assuming an appropriate level of broadmindedness, how do we treat very sensitive subjects in the classroom? What do we do if we disagree with the values being exhibited by others? This requires the acquisition of particular skills. (\*11D)

We question our own Western values and accept that there are many other ways. But where does it become apparent that there are some ways, such as the ones we discuss here relating to 'equality' and 'justice'—are we already on shifting sand that we can never accept? (#11MO)

As well as responsibility towards their students the participants envisaged interaction with colleagues and the institution and, while some felt able to interact at this level, others felt this was outside their workplace role or experience, especially when they were introducing counter-hegemonic messages. Joseph (2012) commented on the personal cost of career advancement and research funding in negotiating power structures with institutions.

For us, transformative suggests a research activity that both creates and responds to shifting conditions. So, instead of remaining passively (and safely) contained within our academic environments, we see ourselves as agents acting both within and between the fields of research, practice, education, and civic life. (#11SC)

## Conclusion

This paper contributes to the debate on the purpose of higher education. A central focus of the discussion has been educating students for global citizenship and the implications of this for tertiary education internationally. The historical view of universities as élite institutions with a role to critique society has been replaced in recent times by the expansion of tertiary education to a larger cohort and an orientation of the curriculum to the market economy. Concepts of global citizenship do not sit comfortably in this setting. This study has shown tertiary staff excited by the intellectual challenge of education for global citizenship and the possibility of curricula change but also seeing major policy implications for higher education. The concept of global citizenship sits uneasily within current capitalist societies and requires a review of the goal of higher education. Universities are relatively inert institutions where vested interests see change happening slowly accompanied by further resistance from professional associations. Academics are a vital part of the change process and a lack of confidence was expressed in the knowledge and skills of teaching staff to create and deliver, a curriculum for global citizenship. The ability to move beyond embedded Western, colonial knowledge and envision new curricula was also questioned. Despite all these issues, the internationalisation of the curriculum course opened up a dialogue on a new vision for higher education and the participants endorsed the ideology of global citizenship, remaining optimistic that they could contribute to gradual processes of educational change.

## References

- Andreotti, V. (2006) Soft Versus Critical Global Citizenship Education. *Development Education: Policy and Practice*, 3 (Autumn), pp. 83–98.
- Andreotti, V. (2011a) (Towards) Decoloniality and Diversity in Global Citizenship Education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9 (34), pp. 381–397.
- Andreotti, V. (2011b) The Political Economy of Global Citizenship Education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9 (3–4), pp. 307–310.
- Appiah, A. (2007) *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York: Norton.
- Asmar, C. R., Mercia, O. and Page, S. (2009) ‘You Do It From Your Core’: Priorities, Perceptions and Practices of Research Among Indigenous Academics in Australian and New Zealand Universities. In A. Brew and L. Lucas (eds.), *Academic Research and Researchers*. Berkshire: Open University Press, pp. 146–160.



- Becher, T. and Trowler, P. R. (2001) *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Cultures of the Disciplines*, 2nd edn. Buckingham: Open University Press and SRHE.
- Booth, A., McLean, M. and Walker, M. (2009) Self, Others and Society: A Case Study of University Integrative Learning. *Studies in Higher Education*, 34 (8), pp. 929–939.
- Camicia, S. P. and Franklin, B. M. (2011) What Type of Global Community and Citizenship? Tangled Discourse of Neoliberalism and Critical Democracy in Curriculum and its Reform. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9 (3–4), pp. 311–322.
- Chaney, M. (2013) *Australia Educating Globally Report. Advice from the International Education Advisory Council*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Clifford, V. A. (2009) Engaging the Disciplines in Internationalising the Curriculum. *International Journal of Academic Development*, 14 (2), pp. 133–143.
- Clifford, V. A. (2012) Internationalisation: Troublesome Knowledge for the Disciplines. In P. Trowler, M. Saunders and V. Bamber (eds.), *Tribes and Territories in the 21st Century*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, pp. 197–207.
- Cousin, G. (2011) Rethinking the Concept of Western. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 30 (5), pp. 585–594.
- Delors, J. (1996) *Learning: The Treasure Within. Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Donald, J. (2008) Internationalisation, Diversity and the Humanities Curriculum: Cosmopolitanism and Multiculturalism Revisited. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 41 (3), pp. 289–308.
- Dower, N. (2008) Are We All Global Citizens or Are Only Some of US Global Citizens? In A. Abdi and L. Shultz (eds.), *Educating for Human Rights and Global Citizenship*. New York: State University of New York Press, pp. 39–54.
- Eraut, M. (2007) Early Career Learning at Work: Insights into Professional Development During the First Job. Teaching and Learning Research Briefing. No. 25, March. <http://www.tlrp.org/pub/documents/Eraut%20RB%2025%20FINAL.pdf>, last accessed 25 August 2013.
- Freire, P. (1993) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 30th Anniversary edn. New York: Continuum Publishing Company.
- Gacel-Avila, J. (2005) The Internationalisation of Higher Education: A Paradigm for Global Citizenry. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 9 (121), pp. 121–136.
- Gardner, H. (2006) *Five Minds for the Future*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Giroux, H. (1988) *Teachers as Intellectuals. Toward a Critical Pedagogy of Learning*. Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey.
- Giroux, H. (2012) The Disappearance of Public Intellectuals. The Crisis of Education as a Public Good. *Counterpunch*, 2012/10/08. [Online]. <http://www.counterpunch.org/2012/10/08/the-disappearance-of-public-intellectuals/>, last accessed 20 December 2012.
- Gough, N. (1999) Globalization and School Curriculum Change: Locating a Transnational Imaginary. *Journal of Education Policy*, 14 (1), pp. 73–84.
- Hamdon, E. and Jorgenson, S. (2009) *Global Citizenship Education Policy Issues*. Alberta: University of Alberta International and Faculty of Education.
- Hill, J. (2000) *Becoming a Cosmopolitan: What it Means to Be a Human Being in the New Millennium*. Maryland, MD, USA: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Joseph, C. (2012) Internationalizing the Curriculum: Pedagogy for Social Justice. *Current Sociology*, 60 (2), pp. 239–257.
- Kitano, M. K. (1997) What a Course Will Look Like After Multicultural Change. In A. I. Morey and M. Kitano (eds.), *Multicultural Course Transformation in Higher Education: A Broader Truth*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, pp. 18–30.
- Kumar, K. (2004) *What is Worth Teaching*, 3rd edn. New Delhi: Orient Longman Private Ltd.

- Manathunga, C. (2009) Post-Colonial Perspectives on Interdisciplinary Researcher Identities. In A. Brew and L. Lucas (eds.), *Academic Research and Researchers*. Berkshire: Open University Press, pp. 131–145.
- McBurnie, G. and Ziguras, C. (2001) The Regulation of Transnational Higher Education in Southeast Asia: Case Studies of Hong Kong, Malaysia and Australia. *Higher Education*, 42 (1), pp. 85–105.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1997) Kant and Stoic Cosmopolitanism. *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 5 (1), pp. 1–25.
- Nussbaum, M. (2002) Education for Citizenship in an Era of Global Connection. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 21, pp. 289–303.
- Nussbaum, M. (2004) Liberal Education and Global Community. *Liberal Education*, 90 (1) (Winter), pp. 42–47.
- Osler, A. and Starkey, H. (2000) Citizenship, Human Rights and Cultural Diversity. In A. Osler (ed.), *Citizenship and Democracy in Schools: Diversity, Identity, Equality*. Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books, pp. 3–18.
- Osler, A. and Starkey, H. (2001) Legal Perspectives on Values, Culture and Education. In J. Cairns, D. Lawton and R. Gardner (eds.), *Values, Culture and Education: World Yearbook of Education*. London: Kogan Page.
- Pashby, K. (2011) Cultivating Global Citizens: Planting New Seeds or Pruning the Perennials? Looking for the Citizen-Subject in Global Citizenship Education Theory. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9 (3–4), pp. 427–442.
- Prinsloo, P. (2010) Some Reflections on the Africanisation of Higher Education Curricula: A South African Case Study. *Africanus. Journal of Development Studies*, 40 (1), pp. 19–31.
- Reid, A. and Hellsten, M. (2008) Chapter 17 The Future of Research in International Pedagogies. In M. Hellsten and A. Reid (eds.), *Researching International Pedagogies. Sustainable Practice for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*. Sydney: Springer, pp. 295–300.
- Rizvi, F. (2005) *International Education and the Production of Cosmopolitan Identities*. RIHE International Publication Series 9.
- Rizvi, F. and Walsh, L. (1998) Difference, Globalisation and the Internationalisation of Curriculum. *Australian Universities' Review*, 41 (2), pp. 5–7.
- Shultz, L. (2007) Educating for Global Citizenship: Conflicting Agendas and Understandings. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 53 (3), pp. 248–258.
- Singh, M. and Schresta, M. (2008) Chapter 4 International Pedagogical Structures. In M. Hellsten and A. Reid (eds.), *Researching International Pedagogies. Sustainable Practice for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*. Sydney: Springer, pp. 65–82.
- Spivak, G. C. (1999) *Imperatives to Re-Imagine the Planet*. Vienna: Passagem.
- Spivak, G. C. (2008) *Other Asias*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Subedi, B. (2010) Reading the World through Critical Global Perspectives. In B. Subedi (ed.), *Critical Global Perspectives: Rethinking Knowledge about Global Societies*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing Inc, pp. 1–18.
- Subreenduth, S. (2010) Travel Dialogues of/to the Other: Complicating Identities and Global Pedagogy. In B. Subedi (ed.), *Critical Global Perspectives: Rethinking Knowledge about Global Societies*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing Inc, pp. 199–222.
- Turner, Y. and Robson, S. (2006) Beleaguered, Bothered and Bewildered: a Story of Academics and Internationalization, paper presented at *Supporting the Chinese Learner Conference*, University of Portsmouth, 15–16 July.