

Educating for Global Citizenship:
A Theoretical Account and Quantitative Analysis

Eric Hartman
Kansas State University

Author Note

Eric Hartman, School of Leadership Studies, Kansas State University.

Correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to Eric Hartman, Assistant Professor, Kansas State University, Leadership Studies Building, Manhattan, KS 66506. Phone: 412-225-3699. E-mail: emhartman@gmail.com.

Abstract

Universities regularly suggest that they are educating for global citizenship. Yet global citizenship is rarely defined with precision, and the process for encouraging global citizenship is often unclear. This article examines a pedagogical effort to encourage global citizenship through global service-learning (GSL) courses offered by a nonprofit/university partnership. A quantitative instrument examined students' shifts in respect to global civic engagement and awareness. The study compared students in three categories: 1) a typical composition course on campus; 2) GSL courses without the global citizenship curriculum; and 3) GSL courses that include the global citizenship curriculum. The results suggest significant gains in global civic engagement and awareness occur only in the context of a carefully constructed, deliberate global citizenship curriculum in addition to exposure to community-driven GSL.

Keywords: global citizenship, service learning

Introduction

If study abroad efforts are not well-designed, -administered, and -evaluated, students, faculty, and institutions may spend hundreds of thousands of dollars annually in efforts that cement stereotypes, cause considerable personal shock and anxiety, and leave students no better prepared to cooperate across cultures and address pressing global social issues.¹ The literature reviewed here has many deeply difficult personal anecdotes implicit within it. One student broke down in tears in a US mall a month after returning home from Bolivia because she couldn't figure out how to connect the mall's clear opulence with the orphans she had worked with abroad; another student felt he was fundamentally unable to communicate with his family and friends about the lives of rural Ghanaians, and as a result felt isolated and alienated from mainstream culture. These students and others took dramatic steps: switching majors, changing career paths, resigning from positions—all because of the substantially different truths they experienced about the world through GSL.

As will become clearer, three of the elements central to working with students in these volatile and difficult contexts are the ability to suggest a framework for considering individual places within these contexts, which may be offered through consideration of global citizenship; open and critical discussions about asymmetries of power and privilege that relate to university GSL programming; and the ability to share diverse opportunities for actions students may take after completion of their GSL immersion experience. This last element may be understood as an extension of the first. That is, opportunities for global civic engagement are in themselves steps toward integrating newfound knowledge and understanding with one's identity as a person who cares about others and often acts in accordance with those beliefs, even after the challenge of global inequity and injustice becomes dramatically clearer.

This article fills a substantial gap in the service-learning literature by providing a quantitative analysis of global civic engagement and awareness among three populations of students: 1) those who were enrolled in entry level composition classes at a Research 1 University; 2) those who were exposed to GSL experiences through courses at the same university; and 3) those who were exposed to GSL courses with an explicit integration of a global citizenship curriculum at that same university. GSL populations represent diverse disciplines and international locations.

The global civic engagement and awareness scales were developed by adapting domestic scales to the global context. This article provides other researchers with the first multi-course, multi-discipline, quantitative pre- and post- test of GSL students, as well as the first civic engagement scale adapted for that explicit purpose, and important insight regarding the need for integration of global citizenship curriculum on GSL courses.

The curricular model considered here was developed through many years of quantitative and qualitative evaluation and testing before being utilized among the 80 students in eight different, diverse courses who are examined as part of this article. In addition to providing a first foray into quantitative research on GSL, therefore, this article also provides substantive theoretical discussion relating to the essential components of GSL courses.

Global Citizenship and Global Service-Learning

Global citizenship has been identified as one of the key challenges for engaged universities in the coming decades and has been repeatedly put forth as a broad learning goal for all institutions of higher education (Stoddard and Cornwell, 2003; Nussbaum, 1997). Study abroad (Lewin, 2009) and specifically experiential education abroad such as global service-learning (Lutterman-Aguilar & Gingerich, 2002; Bellamy & Weinberg, 2006) are regularly advanced as interventions that support the development of global citizenship. Yet neither the popularity of this ideal nor its connection to particular activities has led to conceptual clarity. The term has been used in so many ways that it has nearly been emptied of meaning. Fifteen essays by higher education faculty, staff, and administrators were written for a Campus Compact effort on the topic of global citizenship (Holland and Meeropol, 2006).

A review of the literature makes the definitional vacuum even clearer and demonstrates the diversity of rationales used for approaching global citizenship which further complicates the creation of a clear definition of global citizenship. Only one of the essays examined clearly articulates a definition of what the writers mean by global citizenship (Richards and Franco, 2006). Blanke and Dahlem (2006) break with the implicit ethos of many of the other writers, by focusing on maintaining American competitiveness in a global economy as the prime driving rationale for global citizenship education.

Conventional political theorists have also contributed to the discussion on the question of global citizenship.² Nussbaum (1997) suggests a global citizen develops the following three characteristics: recognition of the common value of human life, the importance of empathy, and the cultivation of critical distance. In an encyclopedic review of global citizenship thinking spanning millennia, Carter (2001) proposes a belief in equal human dignity, global community, respect for other cultures, and a desire for peaceful coexistence (Carter 2001). A vast literature (Appiah, 2006; Heater, 2002; Held, 2005; Falk, 2000; 2002, Lewin, 2009; Sangiovanni, 2007, Schattle, 2005; Singer, 2002; Wheatley, 2010) exists on global citizenship. Of more interest for GSL professionals and researchers are definitions of global citizenship considered in the contexts of education and action.

Global citizenship theories from the authors reviewed, Oxfam Great Britain, and the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, along with the approach to global citizenship developed by Amizade for use in its global citizenship curriculum (detailed more completely below) are compared in Table 1. Even where global citizenship is defined carefully, it frequently does not include clear articulation of the actionable components of global citizenship. As is clear from the review of GSL literature here, application and action are central concerns for students returning from GSL programs.

Table 1: Definitions and Applications of Global Citizenship

Source	Definition of a global citizen	Application or Characteristics
Nussbaum (1997)	A citizen whose primary loyalty is to human beings the world over, and whose national, global, and varied group loyalties are considered secondary, and [a citizen who holds] a variety of different views about what our priorities should be but says that, however we order our varied loyalties, we should still recognize the worth of human life wherever it occurs and see ourselves as bound by common human abilities and problems to people who lie at a great distance from us.	Recognition of the common value of human life, the importance of empathy, and the cultivation of critical distance.

Carter (2001)	Someone who proposes a belief in equal human dignity, global community, respect for other cultures, and a desire for peaceful coexistence	Not specified.
Oxfam Great Britain (Oxfam GB 2006).	Someone who, “is aware of the wider world and has a sense of their own role as a global citizen; respects and values diversity; has an understanding of how the world works; is outraged by social injustice; participates in the community at a range of levels, from the local to the global; is willing to act to make the world a more equitable and sustainable place; takes responsibility for their actions.” The curriculum notes people will disagree on what constitutes a global citizen, and that the world is sufficiently complex that any such definition will necessarily be revised.	Envisions the development of specific skills, including critical thinking, ability to argue effectively, ability to challenge injustice and inequalities, respect for people and things, and cooperation and conflict resolution.
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (2004)	They review many definitions of global citizenship, world mindedness, and global perspective but do not offer their own definition.	Enriched and expanded student perspectives, so views are not ethnocentric or stereotypical
CC Essays (2006)	Substantially varied.	Varied and somewhat conflicting.
Amizade	Someone who recognizes the common value of all human life and who develops an ability to understand multiple, competing and legitimate value systems in the world, while nonetheless maintaining the ability to make judgments of value among them.	Development of a flexible mind and cultivation of awareness and action related to political, personal, and economic choices that may increase the extent to which humans enjoy equal treatment and opportunities.

Richard Kiely’s GSL expertise draws from a decade of experiences developing and facilitating GSL courses for community college students from upstate New York in Puerto Cabezas, Nicaragua. Kiely’s work emphasizes the insufficiency of particularized intercultural competencies in the context of the oft-cited goals of global learning, global values, and/or global citizenship. Specifically, Kiely objects to the manner in which intercultural competence encourages capability for interacting in another culture while global citizenship or consciousness should be oriented toward understanding the importance of common human value and therefore working toward new structures that allow that possibility. I discussed these insufficiencies with Kiely in the context of his research and Amizade’s curriculum discussed later in this essay., We concluded that intercultural competence has focused on functionality in other places, while global competence or global citizenship asks whether humans are treated equally in disparate places and, if not, why (see Table 2).

Table 2: Intercultural Competency versus Global Competence

	Intercultural Competence	Global Competence
Knowledge	Utilized to learn customs and habits of host culture	Less emphasis on culture-specific knowledge; more emphasis on identifying one’s own cultural assumptions and predispositions in order to navigate multiple diverse cultures; further, there is a “Contextual Border Crossing” – students engage with local facts and realities previously unknown, unimagined, or misunderstood due to reading and observing rather than feeling and experiencing
Questioning	If included, typically confined to consideration regarding home and host cultures’ differing assumptions and how to navigate those differences	Central to experience and analysis of how all related educational, social, institutional, cultural, political, and economic structures do or do not promote the ethic of fundamental human equality

Culture Shock & Reverse Culture Shock	To be processed and addressed to permit adaptation abroad and at home	Vital learning moment; opportunity to address empirically observed truths and work against unjust global realities
Emotion	Not typically included, emphasis is rather on cognitive understanding and communication skills	Visceral connection with other individuals is emphasized and considering in light of concepts related to human equality and how existing institutions recognize it
Institutions	Accepted for facility of travel and immersion	Questioned and considered in respect to their relevance to human equality
Importance	Competent functioning for nationals in another nation for whatever means	Promotion of the notion of fundamental human equality; encouragement of working toward systems that better recognize that goal
Outcome	Informational and skill competency	Transformation to working toward a world that more clearly recognizes fundamental human equality

Source: Kiely 2002, 2004, 2005 and numerous personal communications.

As Kiely observed and documented, the insufficiency of intercultural competence targets, other international educators were pointing out disturbing trends in international education, including a general lack of deliberate learning goals. According to Jenkins and Skelly: “Many supporters of education abroad have felt, however vaguely, that *any* experience abroad for U.S. students would contribute to the general global need for educated citizens and help to foster greater understanding between people of different cultures” (2004, p. 2). The authors make their stance on this question clear through their title article’s title: “Education Abroad is Not Enough.” In their essay, Jenkins and Skelly call for explicit models designed to develop students’ ability to understand, analyze, and address the substantially complex and global social issues the world currently faces.

The absence of deliberate learning goals highlighted by Jenkins and Skelly raises only one of the vexing issues in GSL. Kiely's research, in addition to pointing to the insufficiency of many existing understandings of intercultural competence, suggests that students returning from GSL experiences develop a 'chameleon complex.' The chameleon complex suggests that students develop markedly different, transformative global understanding after the GSL experience and that, upon return to their families and communities, these students are challenged to negotiate these strong value and identity shifts. Their newfound positions and assumptions about the world often contrast markedly with the values and identities that everyone in their established communities expects of them (Kiely, 2002), a finding buttressed by Tonkin and Quiroga (2004) and, more recently, Locklin (2010).

As Kiely was developing his dissertation on GSL and the chameleon complex, Peterson (2002) examined three models of experiential education with a social justice orientation: the Higher Education Consortium for Urban Affairs (HECUA), the Center for Global Education at Augsburg College (CGE), and the University of Minnesota's Studies in International Development (MSID) program. The models bear a striking similarity to the GSL approach embraced by Amizade, although without the deliberate global citizenship curricular integration.

Peterson points out that it is unclear why study abroad has such power; however it is clear that personal transformation is not an inevitable outcome of living abroad. Experience may be the best teacher, Peterson allows, "but only when it is subjected to critical analysis" (p. 167). Otherwise, as Dewey noted, experience can be miseducative, reinforcing stereotypes and prejudices (Peterson, 2002). This observation is consistent with Eyler and Giles' (1999) documentation of the stereotype-reinforcing potential of poorly designed, unreflective service-learning with other cultures or ethnicities in the domestic context.

Common across all three of the experiential approaches is an effort to ensure students are exposed to multiple perspectives through a focus on comparison, access to diverse voices, exposure to multiple realities, and consideration of the world through various theoretical lenses. This exposure to multiple perspectives, common across the models examined, also provokes discussion on how knowledge is constructed and accepted - and by whom. Questions such as these put structures of power and privilege at the heart of dialogue. Frequently these questions are uncomfortable, and even more often

direct and compelling solutions are not available, but any individual, student, or instructor hoping to honestly engage with questions of global citizenship, rights, or justice must address them (Madsen-Camacho 2004).

In a 2008 *Chronicle of Higher Education* opinion piece, recent graduate Tayla Zemach-Bersin offered a scathing review of an international education experience that did not include deliberate reflective focus on questions of power and privilege:

Why had we not analyzed race, identity, and privilege when those factors were informing every one of our interactions? Why was there never a discussion about commodification when our relationships with host families were built on a commodified relationship? Wasn't a history of colonialism and contemporary imperialism affecting the majority of our experiences and influencing how host nationals viewed us? Was there nothing to be said about the power dynamics of claiming global citizenship?

HECUA, CGE, and MSID all place an emphasis on ensuring these kinds of discussions take place, and they create space for crucial, empirically rooted, critical dialogue. These three programs and Amizade also place emphasis on using internships as study sites and focusing on conscious, critical, and reflective learning throughout the process. The Amizade courses emphasizes analysis that integrates course content, experiences, and personal understanding. Peterson concludes that all of the organizations “express, in different words, a commitment to arming their participants with the knowledge, empathy, and analytical, cross-cultural, and interpersonal skills that can support a life of what is now fashionable in academic circles to call civic engagement” (p. 202). He notes, however, that there is “a special challenge that none of the three organizations feels it has yet addressed successfully: how to tie evaluation procedures directly to mission” (p. 201).

Peterson expresses similar concerns as Kiely in regard to student re-entry, asking, “What does a commitment to justice and sustainability imply for [students’] future roles as citizens, as parents, as professionals?” (p. 202). Lutterman-Aguilar and Gingerich (2002) indicate that CGE faculty regularly incorporate reflection on the re-entry process into closing class sessions and often dedicate one whole day to re-entry orientation. Students are asked to imagine the

best- and worst-case scenarios of talking about their experiences with someone who is important to them, while other students provide suggestions and support. Students are also asked to write letters to themselves that will provide support during the re-entry process, and staff members mail those letters about a month after departure from the host country.

The deep desire to connect such transformative experiences with applicable and manageable life opportunities in the United States was central to the development of Amizade's GSL curriculum. Though each of these organizations and efforts have reflective pedagogy, emphasis on re-entry, and careful consideration of individual values in the context of GSL experiences at their core, none of them have systematically evaluated their programs' approaches to global citizenship education.

Educating for Global Citizenship through GSL

Over the past several years, Amizade has drawn on pedagogical developments in the service-learning field, organizational lessons learned, and evaluation of past intercultural service-learning courses to develop an approach to GSL that integrates the key components of academics, service through community partnership, intercultural immersion and exchange, exploration of global citizenship, and reflective inquiry. The courses and community initiatives are developed in collaboration with local community members. Summer courses typically follow a model involving one month of online academic reading, writing, and preparation followed by one month of immersion, service, and learning in community context. After they return, students have an additional month to complete academic projects and reflective pieces, often online, as students frequently reside in different home communities.

The course developed by Amizade is a six-credit program: three credits are from a home discipline while three represent the integration of GSL theory and practice (see Figure 1). This three and three structure within a six credit program enables a fit with typical university credit-granting structures. The three credits from the home discipline, referred to as the anchor course, have sufficient academic content to stand alone in a manner similar to a comparable on-campus university course. The three GSL credits then become the explicit space where the anchor course and global experience are deepened through reflective activities, readings, and critical analysis. In the critical analysis phase, students consider a

number of factors: the theory and application of community-driven service; intercultural immersion and consideration of identity; the connection between experiential components and anchor course themes; and the meaning of global citizenship.

These areas of targeted, systematic inquiry emerged through the practice, research, and reflection by dozens of faculty members and community partners. They represent a considered synthesis of university, faculty, and community learning desires for GSL programs. An extensive [sample syllabus](#) is available online (Globalsl.org, 2014) and significant theoretical discussion of the rationale informing each component is included in *Building a Better World: The Pedagogy and Practice of Global Service-Learning* (Hartman, Kiely, Friedrichs, & Boettcher, 2014).

Figure 1: The Amizade Program Model



The faculty member's explicit role in any course is to bring academic expertise. Beyond cooperating with established university oversight structures, Amizade required faculty member understanding of and agreement with the principles of the Amizade GSL approach for the courses examined here. In addition to a faculty leader, the Amizade model included a service-learning facilitator and community site director for every program. The service-learning facilitator brought particular background and expertise in service-learning pedagogy and community-driven service, while the site director offered local

knowledge and coordination expertise and represented Amizade in the community throughout the year.

As in similar programs, the facilitator also made an effort to integrate students’ understanding of their own lives, values, and roles with their experiences and learning. Students’ personal histories served as springboards for examining the sources of their received assumptions, opportunities, and common sense. The effort to interrogate and explore personal biases and assumptions was complemented by activities such as [The Culture Pie](#) (Hartman, et al, 2014), in which students visually represent the components of their identities. The diversity of identity representations stimulates richer discussion of the sources of identity. (See Table 3 below regarding exploring, supporting, and challenging students’ considerations of identity and values, human equality, and global citizenship.)

Table 3: Challenging and Deepening Student Thinking through Examining Diverse Rationales for Global Citizenship

Approach	Examples	Application	Challenging Reflective Questions	Examples of Integration
Secular Essentialism – suggesting a secularly-derived notion that human life has certain fundamental features	UN Declaration of Human Rights	Educating others about rights; Advocating for rights	How to reconcile the frequent emphasis on individual rights with the additional emphasis on communal rights?	Drawing on personal faith as a reason to promote a secular expression of human rights.
Faith-Based Essentialism – suggesting a religious basis for supporting the notion that human life has certain fundamental features	World Vision – (“a Christian humanitarian organization dedicated to working with children, families, and their communities worldwide to reach their full potential ...”)	Following faith-based ethics to work with organizations such as World Vision, which is “serving the poor in nearly 100 countries”, facilitating child sponsorship, and organizing fundraisers.	How do our ethics around fundamental human equality relate to discrete faith associations?	Being part of the legacy of liberation theology by cooperating with Catholic and other faith institutions to promote better secular government treatment of individuals as holders of human rights.

Approach	Examples	Application	Challenging Reflective Questions	Examples of Integration
<p>Utilitarianism – suggesting that the greatest good should be sought for the greatest number</p>	<p>Several of the arguments advanced in Peter Singer’s (2002) <i>One World</i>, many classic theoretical conceptions of liberal economics (now neo-liberalism)</p>	<p>Supporting policies thought to raise incomes and life expectancies globally</p>	<p>Is fundamental human equality sufficiently respected in an approach that may ignore individuals and/or marginalized communities in pursuit of the greatest good for the greatest number?</p>	<p>Recognizing broad development indicators such as access to education while integrating an Essentialist approach by putting a new and tighter focus on each individual rights holder and whether he or she is indeed a recipient of the right in question.</p>
<p>Kantian Categorical Imperative – individuals should only undertake actions that they could will as maxims</p>	<p>Kant’s ethic is integrated in much environmentalism and has associations with fair trade.</p>	<p>Consuming resources and buying products with the categorical imperative as a filtering question.</p>	<p>Is it possible to apply this ethic in a lived experience? Does global justice ever demand a breach of this ethic?</p>	<p>Leveraging global civil society (fair trade, reducing consumption) while adhering to other efforts when necessary.</p>
<p>Affirmative Postmodernism – suggests deep criticism of modernity while allowing for possibility of meaningful and valid social movements</p>	<p>Arturo Escobar critiques 50 years of development history while allowing for possibility of progress through listening to local communities.</p>	<p>Locally-driven development efforts; efforts such as The Glocal Forum that connects communities, their resources and experiences worldwide.</p>	<p>Aren’t the communities driving these efforts often articulating an interest in fundamental human rights? Shouldn’t that focus our collective efforts?</p>	<p>Drawing on local experiences and expertise to promote broadly agreed-upon human rights, such as often occurs through Glocal efforts.</p>
<p>Skeptical Postmodernism – suggests reality is relative and fragmented, with no possibility for global thinking</p>	<p>Esteva and Prakash argue that global thinking and global ethics are fundamentally beyond human capabilities.</p>	<p>Creating the possibilities for communities to develop (or not) as they wish, without outside interference whatsoever.</p>	<p>Aren’t there individuals in these communities who may wish for (fundamental?) rights and disagree with the local perspective?</p>	<p>Cooperating with communities to share other perspectives while respecting practices deemed not to be rights violations.</p>

Approach	Examples	Application	Challenging Reflective Questions	Examples of Integration
Particularistic Approaches – suggests self-interested or group-centric rationales for promoting global ethics because that outcome will serve the local group or individual well	Promotion of others’ rights in an effort to build national soft power and enhance national security; promotion of peace and trade in order to expand one’s business	Exchange programs with explicit focus on sharing national values; investment in emerging markets; funding international students’ visits and educations	If a fundamental commitment is basic human equality, shouldn’t the focus be other-oriented rather than self-reverential?	Earnestly promoting global ethics while drawing upon support only made possible by recognizing the particularistic local benefits.

Facilitators are also central to efforts to integrate community-engaged learning. Amizade’s approach to service provides opportunities for students to learn through cooperation with community members and to form relationships by accomplishing shared tasks. Service through community partnership describes Amizade’s ongoing commitment to ensuring community voice in choosing and evaluating service efforts.³ This community-centric development approach increases the likelihood that students will have a fulfilling service experience that includes service with motivated community members as partners.

Amizade courses added an exploration of global citizenship as staff members and associated faculty increasingly realized that students were returning from course experiences with deep-seated desires to affect their global community positively but with little sense of how to *be* global citizens. In Eyler and Giles’ rendering from the domestic context, students had shifts in values and commitment but not in knowledge, skills, and efficacy (1999).

Through reviewing the literature on global citizenship, examining other GSL programs, and conducting extensive qualitative interviews with students and global civil society activists, Amizade settled on an articulation of global citizenship that includes the following: 1) recognition of fundamentally human equality; 2) the ability to acknowledge multiple, legitimate streams of knowledge in the world, while nonetheless retaining the ability to make judgments of value consistent with the fundamental equality of all human life; and 3) clear actionable components for reflecting with students on personal, political, and consumer

habits emanating from their broader recognition of basic human equality. (Amizade's definition of global citizenship is featured in Table 1.)

Students are first asked to consider the extent to which supporting fundamentally equal human worth is radical. This puts a strong focus on asymmetries of power and privilege that others have indicated are an essential (Kiely, 2004, Petersen, 2002) or too-often overlooked (Madsen-Camacho, 2004, Zemach-Bersin, 2008) component of service-learning and international education programs. Simply beginning with the widely disparate life expectancies around the world highlights the importance of location of birth and the structures that accompany it. Several of the points implicit in consideration of such asymmetries are detailed in Table 2. Students are further asked to articulate the philosophical framework through which they consider the equal worth of human life. This question provides students a space through which to consider the interdependence of academic questions, values and ethics, personal history, and action, all while questioning assumptions embedded within their worldviews.

By focusing on students' own philosophical frameworks, instructors have the opportunity to highlight one of the components of global citizenship—the understanding that there are multiple legitimate ways of knowing. Instructors can also challenge students to think more deeply and with more nuance about the contingency of knowledge in the context of the equal value of human life by asking for deeper articulation of their own worldviews and perspectives (Table 3). Instructors and facilitators both challenge and support students in their efforts to articulate their values (Baxter Magolda, 2003; Campus Compact, 2005; Eyler & Giles, 1999). The Amizade approach to global citizenship also focuses on how students may extend their service and their global citizenship beyond a single program experience. From the beginning of the program, students are asked to consider how they define service. The GSL course includes storytelling, communicating with friends and family, and other personal activities that may assist students with re-entry while spreading global awareness. Further, students are given a list of political, personal, and economic steps and structures in order to spark their own consideration of how they will remain involved with global justice efforts after their immersion experience. This start list is included in the *Global Citizenship Resource Guide*. The guide exposes students to a breadth of opportunities for global-citizen participation. All of these opportunities have a common focus on creating a world in which human lives are honored equally. The

resource list and attendant discussion does not follow a set paradigm or ethical approach but rather exposes students to a breadth of explicitly public-serving efforts with global ethical considerations.

Methods and Analysis

This is the question at the heart of this article: Is exposure to the global citizenship curriculum correlated with increases in global civic values to a greater extent than is GSL or university course participation alone? To help answer this question, researchers analyzed data gathered in Year 1 (Y1) and Year 2 (Y2) of the program. Due to the emergent nature of the research question, the process encouraged iterative reflective improvements. The surveys therefore improved over time.

Interest in quantitatively analyzing the effects of Amizade's courses resulted in Y1 data collection. Surveys were developed based on established methods in the domestic service-learning literature and emerging understanding of global citizenship. The targeted variable, global civic values, reflected an interplay between tested measures of civic values and efficacy.

An immediate concern in the study was that those students who applied for and enrolled in the GSL courses were often already highly engaged individuals. Thus the argument could be made that there was a degree of selection bias in the survey sample. A predilection for participation, however, does not of itself automatically inculcate civic values. Indeed, Putnam (2000) argued persuasively that participation is too frequently characterized largely by rather myopic participation, such as volunteering absent other forms of engagement or only episodic service. Elsewhere, community organizers (Serio, 1999) and researchers (Hartman, 2013) express concern about service organized for students that is devoid of consideration of political and values implications. The possibility that individuals who participate in GSL are a unique and specific group does not preclude examining how the experience may affect their dispositions.

When designing the survey instrument, I choose to draw partly from Scott Myers-Lipton's instrument, which was based upon Conrad and Hedin's Social Responsibility scale (Myers-Lipton, 1998). I drew the remainder of the survey from an article that examined the reliability and validity of two scales: the Community Service Self-Efficacy Scale (CSSES) and the Social Responsibility Inventory (SRI) (Reeb, Katsuyama, Sammon, & Yoder, 1998). Reeb, et al, quite

specifically provided evidence of reliability and validity for the CSSES (1998). Although Markus, Howard, and King's SRI (1993) did not receive as much attention, the authors suggested that the SRI did have face validity.

Using both the CSSES and the SRI, I created a 38 question index for civic values. I made minor alterations to the wording in the instrument to reflect the study's global context. This change is consistent with how global citizenship is regularly treated within university discourse—as an implied extension of national citizenship (The definitions of global citizenship shared in Table I also demonstrate the similarity between many domestic definitions and the global manifestations, where the core assumption is frequently extending an ethic of care beyond national borders to the global sphere.) One additional alteration was required due to logistical constraints of this study; both CSSES's 10-item scale and SRI's 15-item scale were compressed into a 5-item scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. (See Appendix A.)

The responses to the Civic Responsibility scale, the Community Service Self-Efficacy Scale, and the Social Responsibility Inventory were combined to create a civic value index. This process resulted in the formation of an additive interval level index for civic values. Y1 results suggested that exposure to GSL had no clear effect on students' global civic engagement and awareness. This finding, along with students' qualitative feedback spurred Amizade to develop the global citizenship curriculum. The Y1 survey was administered as a pre- and post-test to 63 students who participated in intercultural service-learning courses and to 49 students in general introductory composition classes at the same institution, a Research 1 university in the Midwest.

For Y2, there was more time to prepare the survey instruments that students completed before and after participation in Amizade GSL courses. The Y1 scale and existing domestic surveys focusing on awareness and efficacy were tightly reformulated for the global context in Y 2. Civic-engaged questions from existing surveys were also reformulated. (See Appendix B.)

Analysis of the Y2 data suggests the Global Awareness and Efficacy Scale and the Global Civic Engagement Scale are comprised of questions that hang together particularly well. Each of the scales has a Cronbach Alpha above the suggested .75 standard. The Global Awareness and Efficacy Scale, which had a Cronbach Alpha of .83, consisted of the following items, while possible responses

included strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree:

I identify with being part of a global community.

I understand how actions in my local community may affect others around the world.

I am aware of actions I can take to improve the global community.

I feel I have the ability to make a difference in the global community.

I will try to find a way to make a positive difference in the community.

The Global Civic Engagement Scale, which had a Cronbach Alpha of .81, consisted of the following items after the prompt: “How often do you/ How often do you plan to,” with possible responses including never, not very often, sometimes, very often, and always.

Write or email newspapers or organizations to voice your views on an issue.

Stay updated on international news.

Vote.

Learn as much as possible about candidates or ballot questions before voting.

Discuss international issues with family members or friends.

Y2 students took part in one of the following courses: Research Writing in Australia, Global Citizenship in Bolivia, International Development in Bolivia, Administration of International Organizations in Brazil, Holocaust History at Auschwitz, Travel Writing in Ghana, Global Citizenship in Jamaica, Literature and the Contemporary in Northern Ireland, Service-Learning Leadership in Peru, and Community Health in Tanzania.

Both the Y1 and Y2 data sets were developed for the same organization and focused on GSL, but the Y2 group included deliberate exposure to a global citizenship curriculum. That curriculum considered the implicit assumption that global citizenship is an extension of the ethic of care beyond national borders and

offered students opportunities to interrogate that assertion, analyze it critically, and consider the global civil society structures that enable the application of this ideal. Important patterns may be gleaned from the data.

The data analyzed here suggest that the GSL curriculum with a deliberate global citizenship component does enhance students' global civic engagement indicators to an extent unparalleled by exposure to GSL alone or through on-campus university course participation alone. This is based on available data that demonstrate Y1 students exposed to GSL did not markedly increase their reporting of global civic engagement indicators, while Y2 students exposed to GSL with the global citizenship component did demonstrate such an increase. Analysis of the two years' student populations indicates that the populations are similar and that the conclusion may reasonably be made that the enhanced curriculum leads to enhanced outcomes.

As mentioned above, the surveys were altered slightly between Y1 and Y2, allowing the possibility that it is the question wording rather than the educational intervention that led to the different outcomes between Y1 and Y2. If the change in wording were the primary cause for different outcomes, however, it would not explain the statistically significant pre- to post- program shift among Y2 GSL program participants. Rather, changes in wording that have impact should have systematic impact across pre- and post-surveys, not differential impact only after an intervention. The Y2 pattern clearly suggests a relationship between the intervention and the outcome of interest that was not present in Y1. Each year's post-survey is available in appendix 1 and 2 for further examination. Examples of Y2 global civic actions are also included below.

Table 4: Y1 Global Service-Learning and Control Group Students

SL or Control		time	N	Mean	Levene's Sig.	T-Sig. (2-tailed)
SL	GlobalCiv	Pre	72	24.9028	0.613	0.626
		post	70	24.6143		0.626
Control	GlobalCiv	Pre	54	22.463	0.569	0.385
		post	50	21.82		0.384

After the global citizenship curriculum was integrated, Y2 student scores on the Globalism Scale and the Civic Engagement Scale increased in statistically significant ways, at the .05 level, before and after exposure to GSL with a global citizenship curriculum. Additionally, all of the individual indicators in each scale demonstrate statistically significant shifts at the .15 level of significance.

Table 5: Y2 GSL Students with Global Citizenship Curriculum

Scale	Time	N	Mean	Levene's Sig.	T-Sig. (2-tailed)
Globalism Scale	Pre	66	19.8182	0.021	0.004
	Post	80	21.275		0.006
Civic Engagement Scale	Pre	62	17.9032	0.722	0.003
	Post	78	19.6538		0.003

Substantial qualitative data buttresses the conclusion suggested by the quantitative data above. This data has been gathered from open-ended sections of post-program surveys, student journals through several courses, and interviews with students completed by an independent researcher (Hartman, 2008). Focusing only on one political science course in Bolivia in Y2 illustrates how students find diverse mechanisms for global civic engagement following programs.

Of the five students on the Bolivia course, one returned to South America for additional semesters of international education, another designed a website dedicated to explaining global citizenship, a third published a story in her

hometown newspaper about service-learning in Bolivia, a fourth returned to South America for two additional study abroad trips and is currently preparing to leave with the Peace Corps, and the fifth said:

Currently, I am studying Spanish on my own. I worked for over a year as a political organizer, which relates to Cochabamba to me in that economic hardship (lack of healthcare, low wages, etc.) knows no national borders. Part of Global Citizenship, as we learned in Cochabamba, is that every person in the world has certain rights, no matter what country they are from. I believe that everyone has a right to adequate healthcare, a good education, etc. So for me, working for these rights in the US is part of the larger job of working for them on a global level. As for the future, I am going to be a volunteer with WorldTeach starting in about a month. I will teach English for around a year, will live with a host family, and so on. This is most definitely connected to my experience in Cochabamba. Indeed, had it not been for that experience, I probably would not be doing this at all.

Together, these data indicate the importance of a clear pedagogical approach that defines global citizenship, works with students to consider it in the context of their own lives, and shares a breadth of opportunities for application. The space for full consideration of available qualitative data is not here, but a brief account from the Y2 Bolivia course group represents an exceptional example of follow through in respect to civic effort post-course.

Conclusion

This article began by focusing on a problem: though universities regularly suggest they educate for global citizenship, they rarely define it, clarify the process through which they educate for it, or evaluate their progress. The preceding pages have shared a nonprofit/university partnership approach to conceptualizing, educating for, and evaluating progress toward engaged global citizenship.

The urgent need to better integrate global citizenship learning throughout university programs is demonstrated by philosophically rigorous critical analysis of conventional study abroad (Jenkins and Skelly, 2004, Madsen-Camacho, 2004, Zemach-Bersin, 2008), along with the quantitative and qualitative data examined

here. That data suggest students must have a framework through which to consider and navigate their global citizenship learning and related asymmetries of power and privilege. In the worst cases, institutions and individuals are currently investing substantial sums of time and money in exchange efforts that, due to their lack of clear learning processes and deliberate learning goals, may simply serve to cement stereotypes or encourage isolation from the host community.

The data contained here suggest quite strongly that short-term programs may have strong effects on students' perspectives. This finding which militates against conventional study abroad wisdom is buttressed by other recent research across numerous institutions and programs (Vande Berg, Paige, & Hemming Lou, 2012). Of course, the short term exposure measured here is integrated with the clear global citizenship curriculum. Overall, the data strongly indicate exposure to a GSL curriculum with a specific focus on global citizenship does more to develop specific measures of global citizenship than typical university classes on campus or simply GSL alone.

In respect to global citizenship learning, this study has suggested that a theoretically consistent and clearly applicable approach to educating for global citizenship leaves students excited to learn about more opportunities for global civic engagement. Indeed, it leaves students poised for global engagement. Given that scholars of domestic citizenship learning have struggled for decades to isolate learning models that enhance students' civic engagement, and that they now have identified several approaches (of which service-learning is one) that enhance students' interest in and skills for U,S, citizenship, scholars of global citizenship should investigate parallel structures as well. Indeed and quite importantly, educating for global citizenship could (and there is a strong argument for should) take place in elementary, middle, and high schools in every community in the United States and around the world. Infusing domestic learning opportunities with global citizenship education would both better prepare young nationals for our contemporary interconnected world and improve the likelihood of broad rights access and recognition of common humanity.

As theorists and as concerned citizens, we are only on the cusp of beginning to understand the possibilities that exist for global civil society, global citizenship, and related improvements in education. This study offers a clear conceptualization of global citizenship and the educative and evaluation processes related to it. Institutions, instructors, and indeed anyone concerned with

fundamental human equality now have an immediately applicable framework through which to encourage global citizenship.

¹ This list of potential harms is university- and student-centric. Additional vitally important potential negative effects include the impact on community partners, an area that remains understudied and underfunded in the service-learning literature, though has recently received increasing attention (Hartman & Chaire, 2012; Irie, Daniel, Cheplick, & Philips, 2010; Reynolds, 2012).

² This article does not intend to engage all of the political theory questions surrounding global citizenship and global civil society. It intends, rather, to offer a practicable conception of global citizenship useful for GSL, other study abroad programming, and potentially domestic service-learning considered in global context.

³ Community-driven service was central to Amizade's founding in 1994. As a nonprofit organization that cooperates with several diverse institutions of higher education, religious communities, families, and civic and travel organizations, it is in a position to offer ongoing service partnership with its community partners around the world. It is therefore able to avoid the sporadic and short-term partnering structurally induced by the higher education calendar and individual institutions' finite resource bases. Additionally, Amizade's commitment to community-driven includes project selection, implementation approach, continuous feedback, iterative changes as needed, and direction on future project selection and/or changes.

References

- Appiah, K. A. (2006). The case for contamination. *The New York Times Magazine*. 1 Jan.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2003). Identity and learning: Student affairs role in transforming higher education. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44(2).
- Bellamy, C. & Weinberg, A. (2006). Creating global citizens through study abroad. *Connection: The Journal of the New England Board of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://ourworld.worldlearning.org/site/DocServer/bellamy_weinberg_article.pdf?docID=4521
- Blanke, E and Dahlem, K. (2006). Educating for global citizenship. In *A more perfect vision: The future of campus engagement*. <http://www.compact.org/20th/papers> (March 3, 2007).
- Building a Better World Forum for Global Service-Learning. (2012). <http://criticalservicelearning.org/> (Jan 23, 2012).
- Campus Compact. (2005). Structuring the reflection process. <http://www.compact.org/disciplines/reflection/structuring/> (March 27, 2006).
- Carter, A. (2001). *The political theory of global citizenship*. New York: Routledge.
- Eyler, J., and D.E. Giles, Jr. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Falk, R. A. (2000). *Human rights horizons: The pursuit of justice in a globalizing World*. New York: Routledge.
- Falk, R. (2002). In N. Dower (Ed.). *Global citizenship: A critical introduction*. Routledge: New York.
- Globalsl.org. (2014). Model Syllabi and Syllabi Templates. <http://globalsl.org/wiki/gsl-practice-research-wiki/gsl-tools-and-syllabi/model-syllabi-and-syllabi-templates/> (April 28, 2014).

- Hartman, E. (2008). *Educating for global citizenship through service-learning: A curricular account and theoretical evaluation*. (Doctoral Dissertation). University of Pittsburgh. Retrieved from <http://d-scholarship.pitt.edu/9657/>
- Hartman, E. (2013). No values, No democracy: The essential partisanship of a civic engagement movement. *The Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning* (19) 2.
- Hartman, E. & Chaire, C. (2012). Market pressures, ideals, and Fair Trade Learning. Proceedings of the International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement. Baltimore, MD.
- Hartman, E., Kiely, R., Friedrichs, J., & Boettcher, C. (2013). *Building a better world: The pedagogy and practice of global service-learning*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Heater, D. (2002). *World citizenship: Cosmopolitan thinking and its opponents*. New York: Continuum.
- Held, D. (2005). Principles of the cosmopolitan order. In *The political philosophy of cosmopolitanism*. In G. Brock & H. Brighouse (Eds.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Holland, B. & Meeropol, J. (Eds.) (2006). *A more perfect vision: The future of campus engagement*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact. <http://www.compact.org/20th/papers> (April 11, 2007).
- Irie, E., Daniel, C., Cheplick, T. & Philips, A. (2010). The worth of what they do: The impact of short-term immersive Jewish service-learning on host communities. *Repair the World*.
- Jenkins, K. and Skelly, J. (2004). Education abroad is not enough. *International Educator*. Winter.
- Kant, I. (1784). *Idea for a universal history from a cosmopolitan perspective*. http://yalepress.yale.edu/yupbooks/excerpts/kant_perpetual.pdf (June 18, 2007).
- Kiely, R. (2002). *Toward an expanded conceptualization of transformational learning: A case study of international service-learning in Nicaragua*.

- (Doctoral dissertation) Cornell University: Ithaca, NY. Retrieved from Dissertation Abstracts International, 63 (09A).
- Kiely, R. (2004a). A chameleon with a complex: Searching for transformation in international service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 10 (2), 5-20.
- Kiely, R. (2004b). A transformative model for service-Learning: A longitudinal case study. *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning*, 12 (1).
- Kiely, R. (2005). Transformative international service-learning. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, 9(1), 275-281.
- Lewin, R. (2009). *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad: Higher education and the quest for global citizenship*. New York: Routledge.
- Locklin, R.B. (2010). Weakness, belonging, and the Intercodia experience: The logic and limits of dissonance as a transformative learning tool. *Teaching Theology and Religion* 13(1), 3-14.
- Lutterman-Aguilar, A. and Gingerich, O. (2002). Experiential pedagogy for study abroad: Educating for global citizenship. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, vol. 8: 41-81.
- Lu, C. (2000). The one and many faces of cosmopolitanism. *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 8(2), 244-267.
- Madsen-Camacho, M. (2004). Power and privilege: Community service learning in Tijuana. *Michigan Journal of Community-Service-Learning*, 10(3): 31-42.
- Myers-Lipton, S. (1998). Effects of a comprehensive service learning program on college students' civic responsibility. *Teaching Sociology*, 26: 243-258.
- Nussbaum, M. (1997). *Cultivating humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (2002). *For love of country?* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- OISE/UT. (2004). *Educating for global citizenship in a changing World*. <http://cide.oise.utoronto.ca/globalcitizenship/publishing.pdf> (June 20, 2007).

- Oxfam GB. (2006). *Education for global citizenship: A guide for schools*.
<http://www.oxfam.org.uk/coolplanet/teachers/globciti/downloads/gcguide06.pdf> (June 20, 2007).
- Peterson, C. F. (2002). Preparing engaged citizens: Three models of experiential education for social justice. *Frontiers*, 8: 165-206.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling Alone*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Reeb, R.N., Katsuyama, R.M., Sammon, J.A., & Yoder, D.S. (1998). The community service self-efficacy scale: Evidence of reliability, construct validity, and pragmatic utility. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 4, 48-57.
- Reeb, R. Isackson, N., and Sammon, J. (1999). Clinical application of the service-learning model in psychology: Evidence of educational and clinical benefits. In J.R. Ferrari & J.G. Chapman (Eds.), *Educating students to make a difference: Community-based service-learning*. New York: Routledge.
- Reynolds, N. (2012). Are International Service-Learning Projects Sustainable? Where is the Focus on Community?
<http://criticalservicelearning.org/2012/09/12/are-international-service-learning-projects-sustainable-where-is-the-focus-on-the-community/>
(Jan 18, 2013).
- Richards, L. and Franco, R. (2006). Engagement and global citizenship: Local roots and global reach. In B. Holland & J. Meeropol (Eds.), *A More Perfect Vision: The Future of Campus Engagement*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact. <http://www.compact.org/20th/papers> (January 9, 2007).
- Sangiovanni, A. (2007). Global justice, reciprocity, and the state. *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 35(1): 3-39.
- Schattle, H. (2005). Communicating global citizenship: Multiple discourses beyond the academy. *Citizenship Studies*, 9 (2): 119-33.
- Serio, J. (1999). Service could be the means to end activism. *Prism*.
<http://www.ibiblio.org/prism/oct98/service.html> (January 23, 2013).
- Singer, P. (2002). *One World*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Stoddard, E.W. and Cornwell, G.H. (2003). Peripheral visions: Toward a geoethics of citizenship. *Liberal Education*, Summer.
- Tonkin, H. and Diego Q. (2004). A qualitative approach to the assessment of international service-learning. *Frontiers*, 10: 131-149.
- Vande Berg, M., Paige, R.M., & Hemming Lou, K. (2012). *Student learning abroad: What our students are learning, what they're not, and what we can do about it*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Wheatley, E.S. (2010). "Everyday" cosmopolitical practices in contested spaces: Moving beyond the state of cosmopolitanism. (Doctoral Dissertation). Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ.
- Zemach-Bersin, T. (2008, March 7). A Student's Excursion into "Global Citizenship." *Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Appendix A

Y1 GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP SURVEY

Information from this survey will be used as part of a research project that studies the effects of different kinds of teaching methods. Completing the survey should take a maximum of ten minutes. You were selected either as part of a control group or as part of a group that is exposed to the teaching method that is being studied. All of your answers will be anonymous. This study is designed only to track group patterns, and not to assess individuals alone. If you have any questions about this project, please feel free to call the primary researcher at 412-648-1488.

COMPLETING THIS SURVEY IS ENTIRELY VOLUNTARY
THANK YOU

Please complete the following survey. We appreciate your honest answers. Thank you for your participation. Choose only one answer for each question unless otherwise noted. In the questions that follow, the term “serve” refers to voluntary or free work that is completed on behalf of the community, either as part of a course or completely on your own.

1. Age:

- | | |
|-------|----------------|
| A. 18 | D. 21 |
| B. 19 | E. 22 |
| C. 20 | F. 23 or above |

2. Your current GPA is

- | | |
|-----------------|------------------|
| A. 3.5 or above | D. 2.0 – 2.49 |
| B. 3.0 – 3.49 | E. 1.5 – 1.99 |
| C. 2.5 – 2.99 | F. 1.49 or below |

3. Ethnicity:

- | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| A. African-American | E. Asian |
| B. Caucasian | F. Hispanic |
| C. Native American | G. Other (Please Specify) _____ |
| D. Pacific Islander | |

Indicate the highest level of education completed by your parent(s) or guardian(s):

4. Mother:

- A. Eighth Grade
- B. High School
- C. Two Year Trade, Technical, or Associate's Degree
- D. Bachelor's Degree
- E. Graduate or Professional Degree

5. Father:

- A. Eighth Grade
- B. High School
- C. Two Year Trade, Technical, or Associate's Degree
- D. Bachelor's Degree
- E. Graduate or Professional Degree

6. Please indicate the yearly income range that you believe applies to your household:

- A. Under \$20,000
- B. \$20,000- \$50,000
- C. \$50,000 - \$100,000
- D. Over \$100,000
- E. I don't know or I'd rather not say.

7. When you were younger, do you recall any of the following occurring?
(Indicate all that apply).

- A. Mother serving in the community.
- B. Father serving in the community.
- C. Mother and Father serving in the community
- D. Serving as a family

8. Did you serve in the community when you were a high school student?

- A. Yes
- B. No (If no, skip ahead to question 11.)

9. If you did serve during high school, please indicate your primary reason for serving.

- A. Personal Decision
- B. Parents' Urging
- C. Encouraged to as part of church activities
- D. Encouraged to for civic organization activities (student gov., 4-H, Red Cross, etc.)
- E. School Requirement
- F. Court Order
- G. Other

10. If so, how many hours per month did you serve in high school, on average?

- A. 1-5
- E. 21-25

- B. 6-10
- C. 11-15
- D. 16-20
- F. 26-30
- G. 30+

11. Do you currently serve in the community?

- A. Yes
- B. No (If no, skip ahead to question 14.)

12. If so, how many hours per month do you serve, on average?

- A. 1-5
- B. 6-10
- C. 11-15
- D. 16-20
- E. 21-25
- F. 26-30
- G. 30+

13. If you do currently serve, please indicate your primary reason for serving.

- A. Personal Decision
- B. Parents' Urging
- C. Encouraged to as part of church activities
- D. Encouraged to for civic organization activities (student gov., 4-H, Red Cross, etc.)
- E. Encouraged to in order to fulfill a Greek Organization requirement
- E. Class Requirement
- F. Court Order
- G. Other

Please respond to the statements below using the following scale:

A = Strongly Agree, B = Agree, C = Neutral, D = Disagree, E = Strongly Disagree

14. I will serve in the community one year from now.

- A
- B
- C
- D
- E

15. I will serve in the community five years from now.

- A
- B
- C
- D
- E

16. The real value of a college education lies in being introduced to different values.

- A
- B
- C
- D
- E

17. Individuals have a responsibility to help solve our social problems.

- A
- B
- C
- D
- E

18. I enjoy having discussions with people whose ideas and values are different from my own.

- A
- B
- C
- D
- E

19. I enjoy talking with people who have values different from mine because it helps me understand myself and my values better.
 A B C D E
20. Voting is the only real obligation placed on a citizen living in a democracy.
 A B C D E
21. The world is run by a few people in power and there is not much the average person can do about it.
 A B C D E
22. If I choose to participate in community service in the future, I will be able to make a meaningful contribution.
 A B C D E
23. In the future, I will be able to find community service opportunities that are relevant to my interests and opportunities.
 A B C D E
24. I am confident that, through service, I can help in promoting social justice.
 A B C D E
25. Most inequality around the world is due to structural inequality and exclusion.
 A B C D E
26. Learning about people from different cultures is a very important part of college.
 A B C D E
27. I enjoy taking courses that challenge my beliefs and values.
 A B C D E
28. I am confident that, through service, I can help in promoting equal opportunity.
 A B C D E
29. Through service, I can apply knowledge in ways that solve “real-life” problems.
 A B C D E
30. I am comfortable in situations where I am a minority.
 A B C D E
31. I am able to interact easily with people from other cultures.
 A B C D E
32. The courses that I enjoy the most are those that make me think about things from a different perspective.
 A B C D E
33. It is very important to work toward equal opportunity for people all around the world.
 A B C D E
34. It is very important to me to develop a meaningful philosophy of life.
 A B C D E

35. It is very important to me to be involved in efforts to improve the community.
A B C D E
36. Contact with individuals whose background (e.g. race, national origin, sexual orientation) is different from my own is an essential part of my college education.
A B C D E
37. I enjoy courses that are intellectually challenging.
A B C D E
38. It is very important to me to give 3% or more of my income to help those in need.
A B C D E
39. It is very important to me to find a career that provides the opportunity to be helpful to others or useful to society.
A B C D E
40. Individuals should give sometimes for the good of their community, country or world.
A B C D E
41. Having an impact on the world is within the reach of most individuals.
A B C D E
42. Many misfortunes that occur to people are frequently the result of circumstances beyond their control.
A B C D E
43. If I could change one thing about society, it would be achieve greater social justice.
A B C D E
44. The issues I address through service may also be addressed through the political system.
A B C D E
45. I can describe the connection between my vote and the social issues I address through service.
A B C D E
46. I feel that I can make a difference in the world.
A B C D E
47. It is important to consider an occupation's social ramifications when choosing a career.
A B C D E
48. By choosing to vote or not to vote, I affect people around the world.
A B C D E
49. Political issues are often too complex for a simple, obvious answer.
A B C D E
50. The United States should consider the affect of its policies on other countries to a greater extent than it currently does.

A B C D E
51. Individuals, regardless of their nationality or citizenship, have an obligation to consider how their actions affect people around the world.

A B C D E
52. It is important to be aware of current events.

A B C D E

Appendix B

Y2 GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP POST-SURVEY

Amizade Evaluation Form

Please take a moment to fill out this evaluation form. It is very helpful to Amizade as it works to serve individuals and communities. Thank you for your contribution

Demographics: _____ Date of Birth _____ Educational Status _____
 Major _____
 Marital Status: _____ Single _____ Married _____
 Partner/Significant Other _____
 Permanently Reside In: _____ Rural Area _____ Urban Area _____
 Suburban Area _____
 Racial/ Ethnic Identity _____ Gender: _____ Male _____ Female
 Approximate annual household income: _____
 Occupation: _____ (FT/PT)

1. Please rate the following aspects of the program on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being the best and 1 being the worst:

	Poor	Satisfactory	Excellent	Not		
	Applicable					
Your Overall Experience	1	2	3	4	5	NA
The Service Project(s)	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Your Interaction with Local People	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Your Learning Experience	1	2	3	4	5	NA
The Recreational Activities	1	2	3	4	5	NA
The Accommodations	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Meals	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Site Director	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Facilitator	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Instructor	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Course Content	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Course Integration with Experience	1	2	3	4	5	NA

2. Please list three things you would keep as part of the experience:

1. _____

2.

3.

3. Please list three things you would change about the experience:

1.

2.

3.

4. Please comment on the length of work days and/or recreational activities (i.e. are they too long, too short, just right).

5. Please respond to the statements below using the following scale:

5 = Strongly Agree 4 = Agree 3 = Neither Agree or Disagree

2 = Disagree 1 = Strongly Disagree

I identify with being part of a global community.	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
I understand how actions in my local community may affect others around the world.	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
I am aware of actions I can take to improve the global community.	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
I feel I have the ability to make a difference in the global community.	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
I will try to find a way to make a positive difference in the global community.	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 1

6.

	5	4	3	2	1
--	---	---	---	---	---

I adjust easily to new situations					
I have many coping skills					
I enjoy trying to communicate in another language					
I enjoy trying new food from a different culture					
I am comfortable as a minority in a new environment					
I would consider myself materialistic					
I am a very spiritual person					
I am careful with how I spend my money					
I live above my means					
I am very independent					
I am usually a conformist					
I am shy					
I have friends from many different cultures/ethnic backgrounds					
The society I live in values social status highly					
I consider social status very important for success					
I have high self-esteem					
I adapt easily					
I work well with people					
Cooperation is essential for progress					
Communication is essential for positive a relationship					
I am from an upper class family					
I am from a family of poverty					
I have been involved with projects for the poor or homeless					
I have had many interactions with people of poverty					
I have been a volunteer on many occasions					
I am well versed in global affairs					
I get homesick when I go away					

7. Please indicate how often you plan to do the following in the future:

		Not			
		Very	Some-	Very	Always
	Never	Often	Times	Often	s
Attend community meetings, celebrations,	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
or activities.					

	Never	Not Very Often	Some- Times	Very Often	Always
Join organizations that support issues that are important to you.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Write or e-mail newspapers or organizations to voice your views on an issue.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Stay updated on international news.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Vote	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Learn as much as possible about candidates or ballot questions before voting.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Discuss international issues with family members or friends.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5

Please use the following response scale for items 8 through 10.

1. Much less than in most courses I've taken
2. Somewhat less than in most courses I've taken
3. About the same as in most courses I've taken
4. Somewhat more than in most courses I've taken
5. Much more than in most courses I've taken

8. How much work did you do for this course?

1 2 3 4 5

9. How difficult did you find this course?

1 2 3 4 5

10. How much did you learn in this course?

1 2 3 4 5

Please use the following response scale for items 11 through 15.

1. Hardly at all
2. To a small degree
3. To a moderate degree
4. To a considerable degree
5. To a very high degree

The instructor:

11. Explained subject matter in a way that made it understandable.

1 2 3 4 5

12. Integrated course content with international and service experiences.
1 2 3 4 5

13. Provided useful feedback on work submitted or presented.
1 2 3 4 5

14. Stimulated student interest in this subject.
1 2 3 4 5

15. Maintained an environment where students felt comfortable asking questions.
1 2 3 4 5

For item 16, please use the following scale:

1. Teaching was ineffective.
2. Teaching was only fair.
3. Teaching was competent.
4. Teaching was well above average.
5. Teaching was excellent.

16. Instructor's overall teaching effectiveness.
1 2 3 4 5

17. What is global citizenship?

18. What are two specific ways you could be a good global citizen?

19. Are there any ways you will act differently as a global citizen once you get home? Explain.

20. What do you feel are the most pressing global issues and why?

21. What, if anything, have you reconfirmed or challenged about the way you live and what is important to you at home?

22. What do you most want to tell family members and friends who you are close with about this experience?

23. What have you learned from this experience?

24. Please provide any further information you feel appropriate. We strongly urge you to indicate the reasons for any especially high or low marks on the first page in number one. Thank you very much for your time!

Author Biography



Eric Hartman will begin the 2014-15 academic year as an Assistant Professor in the School of Leadership Studies at Kansas State University, where he is excited to support the School's mission to "develop knowledgeable, ethical, caring, inclusive leaders for a diverse and changing world." As a socially engaged academic and as a nonprofit leader, Eric has continuously worked to expand community and advance respect for human dignity around the world. The global citizenship pedagogy he was central in developing has been utilized with hundreds if not thousands of students across scores of institutions, and the government of Northern Ireland recently announced scaling up their Belfast youth participation in that pedagogy and process through the organization where Eric serves on the board, Amizade Global Service-Learning. As a member of the International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement, he has advocated for values inquiry, consideration, and commitment within the university-community engagement movement, as expressed in his recent article, "No Values, No Democracy: The Essential Partisanship of a Civic Engagement Movement" in the Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning, and through the association's efforts to affirm the importance of values inquiry within the field. His research and organizing has recently focused on the movement for Fair Trade Learning, which is a multi-organizational and multi-institutional initiative that aims to make the means of global citizenship and community development education match the idealistic ends. He publishes widely on these themes while cooperating with community organizations to advance their goals. He edits globalsl.org.