# Stories of Transformation: Memories of a Global Citizenship Practicum

Lloyd Kornelsen

# *Stories of Transformation:*

## *Memories of a Global Citizenship Practicum*


International Contact:
Taisir Subhi Yamin, General Director
Heilmeyersteige 93, D-89075, Ulm, Germany
Email: taisir@icieworld.net
Ph: (+49)172-929-7632

Canadian Contact:
Kari McCluskey, Regional Director
Box 111, Domain, Manitoba, R0G 0M0
Email: ka.mccluskey@lostprizes.com

URL: www.icieworld.net



Printed in Canada

ISBN: 978-0-9936134-3-2

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is impossible to name all those people who supported, encouraged, and challenged me in this three-year project – and who are deserving of public recognition. I name those whom I remember today as being foremost: my fellow Costa Rica 2003 travellers, researchers, and collaborators – without their generosity and remembrances there would have been no story; and Simone Chaput for being there from the beginning.

I am especially indebted to

John Wiens my fellow citizen – care-ful, joyous, and offering,

Debbie Schnitzer my favoured muse – brave, generous, and protecting,

Gary Hunter my mentor – mindful, curious, and listening,

Adina Kornelsen my mom – watchful, proud, and inquiring,

Karen Eidse my best friend – ever interested, and present.

Finally, there would have been no book if not for Ken McCluskey. His tireless and attentive guidance and support, from beginning to end, helped free me to write my story. Thank you.

---

Much of the material used in this book has been drawn from my doctoral dissertation, *Remembering Costa Rica: Exploring the influence of a high school global citizenship practicum through the memories, meanings, and lives of its participants eight years later.* As well, portions of Chapter Three have appeared earlier in *English Quarterly, 2012, 42* (1-2), 90-109. They are used here with permission.

*For Joseph, Jonathan, and Karen*

*In memory of Alvin Kornelsen*

*The existence of programs like yours is offensive to Mexico. I am here to entreat you to use your money, your status, and your education to travel in Latin America. Come to look, to climb our mountains, to enjoy our flowers. Come to study. But do not come to help.*

- Ivan Illich

*In the I-Thou relationship we stand in openness before the Other (any other with whom we have to do) and let that Other be in all their wholeness and uniqueness. We may not measure, deny, or utilize the other person. We may only relate. We meet the other person.*

- Elise Boulding

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# 1

# REVISITING COSTA RICA

*Go travel somewhere, go figure something out about yourself, because when we're most uncomfortable we learn the most.*

- Matt

In the spring of 2003, a colleague and I at *The Collegiate at the University of Winnipeg* took 13 high school students on a trip to Costa Rica. It was a part of an eight-month global citizenship course, which culminated in a two-week stay in the village of Pedrogoso, Costa Rica. Eight-and-a-half years later I revisited the experience with most of the 14 participants (students and co-facilitator), curious to know what they remembered of that time and what sense they made of the experience these many years later. This book is an account of what they said, and what this means for global citizenship education; and why it should matter to those of us who teach for peace and global-mindedness - but first, some background on the practicum, the revisit, and their rationale.

## Personal Background

I have worked in the field of education for over 25 years, teaching high school social studies for much of that time. The Costa Rica practicum was motivated by an unhappy year of teaching grade 12 *World Issues* 17 years ago and a shift in my teaching philosophy. In the 1990s, the government of Manitoba instituted a K-12 standardized testing program, including – for one year – a standardized exam for *World Issues*. The experience of preparing students for writing the exam was not a pleasant one. It felt as though the standards approach to teaching and learning had the effect of objectifying students (Dunne, 1993), de-humanizing their world (Freire, 2007), making learning meaningless (Collins, 1991), and reducing education to mindless utilitarian ends (Arendt, 1958). Around the same time, student comments in end-of-year evaluations began to indicate that increasing exposure to a sensationalist and corporatist mass media and the *World Issues* course – focusing solely on the great problems of the world such as war, genocide, poverty, and propaganda – was leaving students despondent, helpless, or cynical.

And so it was these two concerns – a reaction to the standardized movement in education and disquiet over the

impact of the mass media and my teaching approach – that led me to see teachers' primary responsibility as helping students deal with their sense of fear, inefficacy, and alienation – to help them engage the world with a sense of greater confidence, hope, and agency. It was this that motivated the development of the global citizenship program.

In developing the curriculum and planning the practicum, two teaching practices were assumed to be critical for cultivating qualities of global citizenship and for facilitating transformative learning: first, respecting learners as free and independent Subjects, and second, facilitating critical reflection of real world experience. These two practices echo the epistemological and pedagogical perspectives of constructivism and critical theory and the writings of John Dewey and Paulo Freire.

John Dewey (1897) believed that life experience was central to learning, contending that "education . . . is a process of living and not a preparation for future living" (p. 6), and that "the process and the goal of education are one and the same thing" (p. 12): living life. More succinctly, education is "that reconstruction of [life] experience which adds meaning to experience, and which increases ability to the course of subsequent experience" (p. 74). Furthermore,

Dewey argued that life experience in the social world helps people realize their connection to a larger community and helps them to know who they are in that community. This is how he described it (italics are mine):

> The only true education comes through the stimulation of the child's powers by the demands of the social situations in which he finds himself. Through these demands he is stimulated to act as a member of a unity, to *emerge from his original narrowness of action and feeling,* and to conceive of himself from the standpoint of the welfare of the group to which he belongs. (p. 3)

Paulo Freire (2007) believed that the primary goal of education should be to help learners be human, people who can name their world and act upon it. A teacher's primary responsibility is to help students move from being objects who are alienated from the world (colonized), to being Subjects who are participants in the world – from being spectators to being actors. Freire said this process is partly facilitated by teachers helping "to direct [a learner's] observations towards previously inconspicuous phenomena" (p. 82). How this is done varies; but it cannot be accomplished through didactic teaching methods. According to Freire, means and ends are intimately linked:

To help students be "considerers of the world" (p. 139), teachers must be considerers together with them, and remember that they are not so much preparing students to live in the world, but are living in the world with them, together, now, as interactive Subjects.

More recently, internationally renowned peace educator, John Paul Lederach (2005), building on Freire's critical and constructivist pedagogy, stresses the importance of a moral imagination that is grounded in real-life experience: "the capacity to imagine something [must be] rooted in the challenges of the real world yet capable of giving birth to that which does not exist" (2005, p. ix.). In other words, learning for and about peace begins with one's experiences in, and knowledge of, the real world.

Costa Rica was chosen because the country was seen as a counter-argument to the often pervasively bleak and hopeless Western media characterizations of the 'Third World.' At the time Costa Rica was heralded by many in the international development community as a model for sustainable and peaceful development: It disbanded its military in 1948 to fund universal and free education; it emphasized cooperative community development; it was a world leader in rainforest protection; and it was the home of the first United Nations peace university in the world.

How exactly a 'hopeful' Costa Rica experience might engender a sense of agency and other attributes of global citizenship in students, and whether this would be manifested in their lives later on, we did not know.

## The Practicum

In many ways the Costa Rica 2003 program was typical of North American international global citizenship practicums: It was an organized two-week excursion to a community in the Global South; students and faculty lived with families in the host community and worked on community development projects; and the program's primary learning objective was global citizenship; even though, like most other global citizenship practicums, its curriculum contained no overt definition of the concept.

The curriculum for the program was assembled in the autumn of 2002. It was an eight-month course that, in addition to two weeks in Costa Rica, included significant classroom time, pre- and post-trip. It was granted credit status (*School Initiated Course)* by Manitoba Education in January 2003. Twenty students applied to the program, 18 were accepted, and 13 ended up participating. It should be noted that *The Collegiate at the University of Winnipeg* is unique to the province and the country: It is a university

high school that attracts a diversity of students from a variety of backgrounds. The practicum participants were drawn from grades 11 and 12 and were between the ages of 16 and 17, representing a diversity of socio-economic circumstances and cultural backgrounds.

The cost to each student was roughly $2000.00; this included an optional grade 12 course credit. We did not raise money as a group; however, about half of the students initiated their own money raising drives (several students raised most of the $2000.00). After eight months of weekly meetings, including lessons on Costa Rican history, culture, and geography, tutorials in Spanish, exercises in cross-cultural awareness, and discussions on the concept of global citizenship, the group embarked for Costa Rica in early April. We left under dire circumstances. *Air Canada* had just declared bankruptcy (we were booked with *AC* on the return flight), a strange deadly disease – later called *SARS* – was breaking out in airports across North America, and the United States had just invaded Iraq. School boards across the country were cancelling international school trips for fear of retaliatory 'terrorist' attacks on Western targets. A week before we were to leave, we met with parents, asking for their advice/opinions on the trip before determining whether to go or not. The parents unanimously

agreed that the trip should continue, essentially saying, "This is the world; we can't shelter our children from it for always."

*Canada World Youth* and their partner organization, *ACI Costa Rica*, arranged the logistics of our stay. Following a two-day orientation camp near Dominical, we traveled to the village of Pedrogoso where we lived and worked for almost two weeks. The students were billeted either individually or in pairs with families in the community. (Representatives from *ACI Costa Rica* had visited the community several months previously, meeting with families interested in hosting student-volunteers from Canada, and then making subsequent home-stay arrangements with volunteer families. They also met with community leaders to plan and organize the community development projects on which participants would be working.) Weekdays were spent attending to three community development projects: a community recycling program and two school tropical reforestation and landscaping projects. Evenings and weekends were spent with families or participating in group activities with members of the host community. The group was accompanied by a program leader/translator from *ACI.*

Following the trip, the group met several times over a four-week period, formally and informally, to debrief the experience in Costa Rica. Individual participants then completed dissemination projects, shared their experiences/ learning with their communities, and turned in a collection of reflections written over the previous eight months.

## Why The Revisit

While Dewey, Freire, and Lederach help inform and situate the practicum's pedagogical underpinnings, it was the doubts and wonderings (wanderings) of many years of teaching high school social studies that explain why I went back eight years later to inquire of its impact. One of the issues teachers struggle with is helping students, amidst classrooms brimming with differing and foreign world-views, identities, opinions, and people, to see and understand each another. Often it is hard work; it means shaking off stereotypes, ignorant paternalisms, prejudiced chauvinisms, misunderstandings, and fear of others. However, if students can succeed at this in the classroom, see each other as fellow human beings amidst diversity and difference, it will have implications for their world outlook – one that is empowering and open to diversity, and

providing a sense of common global purpose and responsibility.

Over the years, thinking about the means and ends of education, I came to believe that didactic teaching had little direct influence on student learning, and that the really important things students must learn to live in the world cannot be 'taught;' they are learned through living life. Scholars like Carl Rogers (1969) and Martin Heidegger (1968) agree, suggesting that teachers are at their best when they just let learners learn. The 2003 Costa Rica event mostly confirmed those assumptions. Based on what students told us immediately following the trip, their world outlooks were transformed, not because of any specific thing their teachers said or did, but through a particular life experience: working and living with families. But is that what actually happened? Did the changes last; and if they did, were they attributable to life experience alone?

For a long while following the practicum, these and other questions lingered: What exactly happened in Costa Rica – what was learned and how? Did the Costa Rica experience actually cultivate desirable traits of global citizenship or might it have simply reinforced paternalistic Western attitudes and neo-colonial images? If the experience did bring about positive change, were the

effects lasting? In other words, did the practicum do what it purportedly set out to do? In an effort to understand, I talked with fellow teachers and students, re-read Freire and Dewey, and participated in several more practicums (Costa Rica, India, and Guatemala). Finally, eight years later, I decided to go back to the participants themselves to hear what they had to say.

## What Others Have Learned

As it turns out, my colleague and I have not been the only ones taking young people on organized educational trips abroad. For many youth in North America and Europe, participating in a travel/work/study abroad program, particularly in the Global South, has become a rite of passage. And since the end of the Cold War, much has been researched and written about the beneficial effects of these types of practicums (Norris & Gillespie, 2008). Indeed, today, in the name of cultivating traits of world citizenship, many educators and philosophers of education call for increasing global citizenship practicum opportunities for youth (Appiah, 2008; Basile, 2005; Schattle, 2008; Tarrant, 2010). Literature on global citizenship practicums reveals three clusters of global citizenship qualities they may cultivate: a global

perspective and identity; an awareness of global interconnectedness**,** tied to a heightened respect for diversity and difference; and a sense of agency and responsibility. However, three substantive challenges have been identified. First, if participants are not afforded opportunities for critical reflection – a cornerstone of experiential learning theory – their global-minded perspectives may be thwarted. Second, ethical issues of power and privilege must be addressed if participants are to experience an authentic sense of global connectedness. Third, global citizenship programs need to strike a pedagogic balance between challenge and security if they are to foster a sense of agency and responsibility.

However, the published research is somewhat skewed. Most of the literature on global citizenship practicums is based on college and university programs and focused on college or university-aged youth; little has been written about the high school experience. Also, there has been little longitudinal qualitative research on the long-term effects of these programs. Norris and Gillespie (2009) cite the dearth of research on changes of perceptions of the effects of study-abroad experiences and how they are reported/articulated 5, 10, or 20 years later. Davies (2005) talks about a need to research the longer-term influences

that study-abroad experiences in high school have on subsequent social justice-related career choices. And finally, the Canadian perspective is rarely encountered. There are notable contributions by people like Pike, Epprecht, Shultz and Jorgansen, and Tiessen; but, as Adrienne, my co-facilitator pointed out, much of the literature on these types of programs is based on the British and American experience.

In short, it is documented that global citizenship practicums can have beneficial effects in cultivating qualities of global citizenship; indeed, they may have a transformative impact. However, relatively little qualitative research has been done on longer-term affects, particularly for high school youth, and on how the practicum experience is perceived and understood by participants many years later.

## Why It Is Important

While going back to find out what participants made of their Costa Rica experience might have helped satiate a professional curiosity and fill a gap in academic literature, it also had broad implications for educational theory and practice.

*Program Pedagogy/Teaching Practice*

First, even though it may be cliché, it is an uncontestable fact: We live in an increasingly inter-connected and interdependent world. Global citizenship practicum programs can be an effective means of educating youth for global awareness and 'citizenship' (whether aspirationally, as in cultivating global 'mindedness,' or concretely, as in inspiring a particular career choice). However, whether they in fact do so is not a given. Learning outcomes are critically dependent on pre-experience preparation, in-field awareness, and post-experience reflections (Grusky 2000; Haloburdo & Thompson, 1998; Sichel, 2006; Tarrant, 2010). By having participants talk of their experience from an eight-year post-experience perspective, these programs' pedagogy could be informed, providing insight into guiding participant reflection before, during, and after the planned experiences abroad. And more generally, effective teaching practice in these contexts might be enlightened.

*Program Efficacy, in the Long Term*

One of the most important and obvious benefits is shedding light on the long-term effects of participating in global citizenship practicums. As past participants, eight

years later, shared their perceptions and images of the experience, and talked about what facilitated or hindered their learning and how it might have shaped their being in the world today, they could offer up understanding and perspective for educators – teachers, administrators, program facilitators, and policy shapers.

*Peace Education*

Teaching for global citizenship can be seen as pedagogy of peace. The ethos and objectives that motivate and animate the quest for global citizenship are those that give rise to conceptions of peace. An endeavour that explores a means of global citizenship education would necessarily inform a means of peace education.

*Personal Growth*

Finally, as Feldman (2003) says, when we make representations of our research public, we come to understand and change who we are as teacher educators – we become more responsible. Revisiting and researching a practicum experience with former students and colleagues was an opportunity to think about what I do as an educator and why. I hope my written account, the representation of research that follows, will be that for you too.

## The Theory

As indicated earlier, much has been written recently about notions of global citizenship and pedagogies of practicum practice, literature that necessarily informs and contextualizes an enquiry into a particular global citizenship practicum. For this reason, before introducing the practicum participants and what they had to say about Costa Rica 2003, the next two chapters examine the theoretical and pedagogical landscape of world citizenship and global citizenship practicums. Here is why a preliminary discussion on theory and pedagogy matter:

First, global citizenship has become a familiar and oft-used catch phrase, immersed in popular culture, almost to the point of ubiquity, where the term has come to mean different things for different people and to serve a variety of purposes. But what does the term actually mean? Where does it come from; and what meaning is it intended to convey? And is the idea really a good one, as is assumed by those who educate for its purposes? Because the notion of global citizenship is implicit in the learning objectives of global citizenship practicums, an examination of these questions, along with a theoretical and critical explication of its meaning is essential. The academic debate about global citizenship foreshadows a pedagogical issue at the

heart of all global citizenship practicums, and will help frame the discussion on the Costa Rica practicum.

Second, when it comes to global citizenship practicums, accounts abound of how they activate transformational learning, a dramatic and fundamental change in the way participants see themselves and their world; but so too do concerns of their educational and ethical pitfalls, of experiences that reinforce attitudes of dominance and ethnocentrism and engender perspectives of separation and alienation. Because the Costa Rica practicum was subject to all of these undercurrents, an examination of the question is imperative: How and why do these practicums, rooted in experiential learning, cultivate qualities of global citizenship, and how and why may they be thwarted in so doing? A discussion of the issue, grounded in scholarly literature and nuanced by re-collections of my own practicum experiences, will help provide a critical backdrop for interpreting and understanding participants' responses and memories.

# 2

# GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP:

# *WHAT IS IT?*

*World citizenship is an enigma. It is an elusive, puzzling term with no fixed, universally accepted meaning.*

- Derek Heater, 2002

In the past 20 years, there has been a surge of academic interest and scholarship in the field of world citizenship and cosmopolitanism. This interest seems to be occasioned and inspired by two relatively recent global phenomena. The first is the end of the Cold War and an end to a bipolar world, deeply divided by ideology and military struggle. With the world no longer divided into two opposing armed camps, it has made it easier for people to take a broader perspective and to develop a global consciousness and focus of concern (Boulding, 1990; Nussbaum, 1997a; Pike, 2000a). This transformation in consciousness has led to calls for a global civil society – one where all human beings are equal members – as the

only means to effectively address humanity's most pressing challenges (Boulding, 1990; Kaldor, 2003).

The second phenomenon is the growing reality and recognition of 'globalization.' Global interconnectedness today is unprecedented in its magnitude, pervasiveness, immediateness, and global self-consciousness. People the world over are affected by and face daily choices, issues, and dilemmas of global impact and concern. Moreover, since in part, today's globalization is characterized by globalization from the top down – the hegemonic, pervasive, and undemocratic global impact of corporate interest and power (Falk, 1996) – what is necessitated, according to people like Falk (1996), Featherstone (2000), and Held (2004), is globalization from the bottom up, where the rights of democratic citizenship are accorded every person in the world (i.e., global citizenship).

The concept however, is not uncontested. Much has been written recently in response to those who support and articulate a concept of world citizenship. The questions are asked: If global citizenship implies membership in a world community and an identity that is global, what does it mean to be a citizen of the world and to have an identity that is global? Is it possible to behave, act, and think as a global citizen? Is it desirable to do so?

Given the breadth and depth of 'global citizenship' scholarship, it is beyond the scope of this chapter to render a comprehensive critical analysis of the term. Through referencing the scholarly literature, I will present a brief historical overview, highlighting critical junctures in the development of the concept, including one recent seminal work, and then identify and outline several current and critical contestations surrounding the notion of global citizenship, concluding with an enigma that rests at its centre. Three scholarly communities of concern upon which this critical review relies and which have contributed immensely to the discussion are peace studies (for engaging the idea of a common humanity and a global civic culture), education (for informing a rationale for global citizenship and the traits of a 'good' global citizen), and political philosophy (for explicating the meaning of citizenship in a global context).

## Global Citizenship: A History of the Idea

The idea of global citizenship is not new. Derek Heater and Martha Nussbaum, who have written extensively on global citizenship and its history, trace the notion of world citizenship to the Stoics of ancient Greece and Rome, and to their predecessor, Diogenes. He is said to

be the first person to have uttered the phrase, 'I am a citizen of the world' (Appiah, 2008). The phrase's significance is that it recognizes an identity and an allegiance that transcends city, state, and culture. The Stoics saw themselves as linked to a community that included all humanity. As Heater (2002) says,

> the Stoics recognized that human beings for all their cultural differences, are of a single species and may be perceived as living in one great world society, the *oikoumene* . . . man alone . . . has the power of speech, by means of which faculty he is able to frame his unique capacity for rational thought (*logos*), a capacity which, in turn, he is able to use to comprehend the universal law. (p. 30)

Nussbaum (1997a) asserts this meant that the Stoics believed "we should give our first allegiance to no mere form of government, not temporal power, but to the moral community made up by the humanity of all human beings" (p. 7).

Nussbaum (1997a) points out, however, that the Stoics did not therewith abandon their local affiliations; rather they conceived of themselves as being at the centre of a series of interconnected concentric rings. This is how she describes it:

> (The Stoics) suggested that we think of ourselves not as devoid of local affiliations, but as surrounded by a series of concentric circles. The first one encircles the self, the next takes in the immediate family, then follows the extended family, then, in order, neighbours, or local groups, fellow city-dwellers, and fellow countrymen – and we can easily add to this list groupings based on ethnic, linguistic, historical, professional, gender, or sexual identities. Outside of this circle is the largest one, humanity as a whole. Our task will be to draw the circles somehow to the center making all human beings more like our fellow city-dwellers, and so on. (p. 9)

The 'concentric rings' analogy, as a way of reconciling and explicating the tension between local and global claims to loyalty and moral consideration, continues to animate the current global citizenship debate.

Essentially, the Stoic articulation of world citizenship emerged from their moral philosophy; and it was conceived primarily as metaphor (Bowden 2003). In the Stoic articulation of world citizenship we see the beginnings of two issues that are central to the global citizenship debate today. First, is it possible to think of global citizenship beyond metaphor; and can it ever mean more than belonging to an ethical community? Second, is it possible,

or even desirable, to be equally allegiant to all of humanity; in other words, is the concentric ring metaphor reflective of plausible human imagination?

Almost 2000 years later, when Europe was experiencing a political awakening and undergoing a transition from absolute monarchies to the modern state, much attention was given to the meaning and practice of citizenship. Most of what was written – for example, John Locke's liberalism (rights of citizenship), and Jean Jacques Rousseau's republicanism (citizenship participation) – was premised on the notion of state-bounded political society. However, in the later Enlightenment period, Immanuel Kant, reflecting the Stoic belief that all humans belong to a common humanity "endowed with the capacity for reason and moral behavior" (cited in Heater 2002, p. 35), introduced his categorical imperative – an argument that informs much of global citizenship scholarship today, and a perspective on citizenship that transcends nation-state borders. The categorical imperative can be expressed in several ways: 'so act that your maxim is willed to be a universal law of nature' and 'so act that you treat humanity whether in your own person or any other person never merely as means but as an end in itself' (cited in Dower,

2003). What this means, according to Christine Korsgaard (1996), a Kantian scholar, is that

> treating others as ends-in-themselves is not a matter of discovering a metaphysical fact about them – that they are free and rational, and so have value – and then acting accordingly. When you respect the humanity of others you do not regard them as the objects of knowledge – as a phenomenon – at all. Instead you regard them as active beings, as the authors of their thoughts and choices, as *noumena*. To respect others as ends-in-themselves is to treat them as fellow inhabitants of the standpoint of practical reason. It is therefore to make choices with them or at least in a way that is acceptable from their point of view – that is, to choose maxims which serve as universal laws. To respect the humanity of others is to think and act as a legislative citizen in the Kingdom of Ends. (p. xii)[1]

Treating others as ends-in-themselves, seeing human beings not as phenomena but as active agents, calls for a political space that includes all voices, an 'enlarged mentality for thought' as Kant called it. And since Kant's categorical imperative applies to all humanity, it is a global ethic (requiring a global political space?). He openly

recognized the cosmopolitan aspect as such and, in subsequent works, constructed a model of international relations that would advance peace and moral well-being (Dower, 2009).

Nussbaum (1997b) recognizes the link between the Stoics and Kant, and foresees the implications their moral philosophy has for politics (italics are mine):

> We are told that our moral acts must take their bearings from the equal worth of humanity in all persons, near or far, and that this *moral stance leads politics in a cosmopolitan direction;* we are told that *morality should be supreme over politics*, giving political thought both constraints and goals. Following Cicero, Kant focuses on that moral imperative and its basis in reverence for humanity, and adds the appeals to providence only as a kind of reassurance to the faint-hearted. (p. 18)

And herein lies much contention today: Does a cosmopolitan morality necessarily require forms of global *legal* and *political* citizenship?

After Kant, the idea of global citizenship and the notion of a common humanity received sparse academic attention until 1990. There were a few exceptions in the 20th century: Most notably, the trauma of the Great War and the universal revulsion of war it inspired, led to talk of

one world government (e.g., H.G. Wells and Bertrand Russell).[2] The shock of World War II and the Holocaust led to the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (*UDHR*) (1948) and its preamble, "recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world." The threat of global annihilation during the Cold War led peace activists to appeal to a common humanity and to call attention to a universal planetary concern.

When the Cold War ended, and with the forces of globalization eroding the territorial Westphalian conceptualization of political community, there was an upsurge of academic interest in cosmopolitanism and global citizenship. Martha Nussbaum's (1997a) work, *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education*, represented a watershed in cosmopolitan philosophy and global citizenship thinking. It has received broad and critical attention, and it continues in the cosmopolitan tradition of Immanuel Kant and the Ancients. For this reason, her views on global citizenship will be described at length.

Conceptualizing world citizenship in the geo-political fact of a globalizing world, Nussbaum introduces three

qualities she believes are essential to global citizenship in today's world: a critical understanding of oneself and one's traditions (Socrates' examined life); seeing oneself as a human being bound to all other human beings by ties of recognition and concern; and having an imagination for what it might be to like to be in the shoes of a person different from oneself.

Nussbaum's first attribute of world citizenship is based on the Socratic and Stoic notion of critical self-examination, upon which rests deliberative judgement about the over-all Good. Nussbaum argues for the critical importance of making one's ideas one's own – rather than blindly following rules, principles, and laws – as a basis for becoming a moral agent and for acquiring what Kant calls an enlarged mentality. Along with Socrates, she believes that everyone has the moral capacity to live in society; hence all people should be looked upon as citizens.[3]

Nussbaum's second quality of world citizenship – seeing oneself as a human being bound to all other human beings by ties of recognition and concern – again is reminiscent of Kant and the Stoics. According to the Stoics – and later seconded by Kant – people should give their first allegiance to the moral community made up by the humanity of all human beings. Nussbaum claims this is less

a political idea than a moral one; however it constrains and regulates political life and is the basis for all international law today. She observes, paraphrasing the Stoics,

> We see ourselves and our customs more clearly when we see our own ways in relations to those of other reasonable people . . . Cosmopolitanism recognizes in people what is especially fundamental about them, most worthy of reverence and acknowledgment, namely their aspirations to justice and goodness and capacities for reasoning in this connection. (p. 59-60)

And, endorsing the Stoics concentric ring analogy, Nussbaum says to be allegiant to humanity does not mean giving up one's local affiliations.

Nussbaum's third quality is based on the Stoics – *vivid imagination of the different* – being able to see the world through the eyes of others. In her words,

> to become world citizens, we must not simply amass knowledge, we must also cultivate in ourselves the capacity for sympathetic imagination that will enable us to comprehend the motives and choices of people different from ourselves, seeing them not as forbiddingly alien and other, but as sharing problems and possibilities with us. (p. 85)

Nussbaum goes on to say that respecting difference and seeking to understand and being open to others does not necessarily mean taking a relativist stance; but it is necessary in deliberatively addressing common problems (see Appiah, Boulding, and Habermas,). Furthermore, democracy "according to the world citizen view insists on the need for all citizens to understand differences with which they need to live; it sees citizens as striving to deliberate and to understand across these divisions" (p. 110).

Nussbaum's book touched off a firestorm of debate, discussion, and contestation – much of which serves as the basis for the second part of this chapter. Before engaging that discussion, I want to look at a recent study done with self-identifying global citizens, one that informs, and is informed by Nussbaum's work, and one that may inspire further inquiry. So, I move now from what a political philosopher says a global citizen ought to be (normative claim) to what a professor reports on what practicing and self-identifying 'global citizens' say they are (empirical reflections).

In 2008, Hans Schattle wrote *The Practices of Global Citizenship*. The book is based on 10 years of interviews with hundreds of self-described global citizens from 22

countries. Schattle was interested in examining why these people called themselves global citizens,[4] and what they believed made them so. He concludes that global citizenship is an attitude of mind. There are three primary concepts or 'attitudes of mind' that emerged in the interviews. First is an awareness of self in the world, and being open to difference and reasoning from another's point of view. As one of Schattle's global citizens puts it: "But there's so many more interesting ways of life – and living and being – that's outside of just that finite state . . . so why not be open to it?" (p. 29). Second is an awareness of the interconnectedness of humanity and of a global moral responsibility. Another of Schattle's global citizens:

> If it were your daughter working in that factory, what would you want the conditions to be? Would you want them to have bathroom breaks? Yeah, you would. I see it at the spiritual conceptual, at the highest level of abstraction, as erasing the division between 'us' and 'them' – the ability to create 'other' in the human mind, erasing that, so it's all 'we.' So if you approach policymaking as if it were your family that would be subjected to the policies, what would you want the policies to be? (p. 30)

Third is a sense of responsibility for active participation. Shattle's interviewees based their definitions of, and justified their identities as, global citizens on involvement in activities that contributed to communities both near and far. To be a citizen means contributing to a greater good.

Schattle's findings on what global citizens say about the meaning of global citizenship generally correspond to the normative ideas of Nussbaum's. There are several other important parallels between the two works. First, many of Schattle's interviewees attested to dual national and cosmopolitan identities and allegiances; and as a way of explaining this dichotomy, he invokes the Stoic/Nussbuam concentric ring analogy. He concludes that the dual nature of global citizenship lends to more textured understandings of the public space.

Second, Schattle does not see global citizenship (at least not yet) as having any formal political status, but rather as consisting of a set of attitudes about the world and one's relationship to it. This is much like Nussbaum, who conceives of global citizenship not as legal imperative, but as the natural consequence of a set of moral precepts which shape a person's outlook and behaviour. However, Nussbaum does believe a cosmopolitan morality must necessarily constrain and guide political thought.

## Global Citizenship: The Debate

Having briefly introduced the historical antecedents of global citizenship and their culmination as represented in the works of Nussbaum and Schattle, I now turn to three areas of controversy and contention.

### Whose Idea?

The first challenge has to do with whether the term, global citizen, has global appeal or cache; in other words, is global citizenship an idea to which all peoples of the world can lay claim and to which they might aspire? A number of theorists have challenged Nussbaum and other 'globalists' on this point, suggesting that the concept of global citizenship is the sole concoction of a Western liberal academic elite, and that it has unsavoury colonizing overtones. Here is Brett Bowden (2003):

> The concept of global citizenship is fraught with insurmountable problems . . . the idea is inextricably linked to the West's long and torturous history of engaging in overzealous civilizing-cum-universalizing missions in the non-Western world. A relationship that is in part reflected in the fact that the vast majority of the recent claims to global citizenship

> originate deep within Western academia. (p. 350)

Bowden and others make two points. First, since current formulations of world citizenship are rooted in western liberal-democratic notions of a universal morality, the term global cannot be said to be universal by any means; it is oxymoronic. Not all peoples of the world would be willing to pledge themselves to Nussbaum's (1996b) version of 'world community of justice and reason,' says Bowden. Second, by not including the perspectives and values of the whole of the world, yet making universal claims and calling for global compliance, this can be seen as simply another form of Western, or as Derrida (2001) calls it, *globalatinization.*

Judith Butler (1996), also in response to Nussbaum, elaborates on 'global citizenship' as cultural imposition. Universals, she says, are mostly culturally generated and imagined, including conceptions of global citizenship. And so, when invoking claims of universality, for example Kantian notions of reason and morality, we need to be careful not to claim or impose universals that are not.

> What kind of cultural imposition is it to claim that a Kantian may be found in every culture? For whereas there may be something like a

> world reference in moral thinking or even a recourse to a version of universality, it would sidestep the specific cultural work to be done to claim that we have in Kant everything we might want to know about how moral reasoning works in various cultural contexts.
>
> Importantly, then, the task that cultural difference sets for us is the articulation of universality through a difficult labour of translation. That labour seeks to transform the very terms that are made to stand for one another, and the movement of that unanticipated transformation establishes the universal as that which is yet to be achieved and which, in order to resist domestication, may never be fully or finally achievable. (pp. 51-52)

Butler's warning as relates to global citizenship: It may never have a fixed meaning in a world of diverse cultures, nor can one be imposed. But this does not mean universals do not exist, nor that we should not look for them; they are just very difficult to uncover and translate across cultures; and for the universals to be universal, the search must include us all. Furthermore, world citizenship, as conceived in Kantian terms, is not the product of universal discourse, and so may only be a domestic

(Western) conception. At bottom rests Jessica Senehi's (2009) challenge, who gets to tell which story?

So, is global citizenship based on reason and justice solely a domestic notion and a Western imposition? And does an ongoing discourse of the universal necessarily preclude commitment to, and an ideal of, global citizenship? On the first point, Indian economist and political philosopher Amartya Sen (2005) says no. Sen contends that reason, its use and purpose, is not solely a Western idea or imposition, but a universal phenomenon. He argues that public reason, including public communication and arguments (he cites Habermas, Mill, and Rauls) is central to the functioning of democracy anywhere. In fact, for example, long before the Enlightenment took hold in Europe, the practice of Buddhism in India – with its commitment to dialogue, public communication and irreverence for authority – had created an environment for public reasoning and cultivated an imagination for democratic discourse. With regard to the universality of justice, Sen disagrees with the notions that many non-Western societies have values that place little emphasis on liberty or tolerance and that people reared in different cultures may systematically lack basic sympathy or tolerance. Sen provides examples from various Asian

societies that discredit these assumptions. The pursuit of reason (and ethical reasoning, which must include liberty and tolerance), he claims, rather than reliance on tradition, is the way to address difficult social issues the world over.

With regard to the second point, Ghanaian scholar, Kwane Anthony Appiah (2006), an ally of Nussbaum's notion of global citizenship, claims that a hallmark of cosmopolitanism or global citizenship is the very thing needed for Butler's cross-cultural discourse: a respect for difference and a willingness to engage in conversations across difference. Humans need to have these conversations, he says, to learn from one another about the right thing to think and feel and do, and for us to begin to see each other. It starts in the imagination:

> Conversations across boundaries of identity – whether national, religious, or something else – begin with the sort of imaginative engagement you get when you read a novel or watch a movie or attend to a work of art that speaks from some place other than your own ... and I stress the role of the imagination here because the encounters, properly conducted, are valuable in themselves. Conversation (as metaphor or otherwise) doesn't have to lead to consensus about anything, especially not values; it's enough that it helps people get used to each other. (p. 85)

Much like Butler, Appiah acknowledges the challenges of cross-cultural communication, the need for a continuous and ongoing dialogue, and the importance of not universalizing the domestic. But this is no reason for abandoning a universalizing project. Ongoing dialogue across difference, and not colonization, he says, is the only way to make a quest common between people and peoples. According to Appiah this is a central task of global citizenship and an end of cosmopolitanism. (Appiah uses the terms global citizen and cosmopolitan interchangeably.) But the challenge issued by Bowden remains: Whose idea is it to seek the universal in the first place?

**Is it Possible or Desirable?**

A second challenge comes from a group of scholars known as communitarians, who question the veracity of citizenship within a global milieu. They argue that any functioning democracies or civil societies – where citizenship has a real legal bearing and political meaning – are found within bounded political spaces (i.e., nation states). Cosmopolitanism or global citizenship is 'thin' and intangible, abstracted and disembodied (Barber 1996), and the cosmopolitan values and rights espoused by globalists

can only be protected by nation states. To expand on this perspective, here is Michael Walzer (1996):

> I am not . . . aware that there is a world such that one could be a citizen of it. No one has ever offered me citizenship, or described the naturalization process, or enlisted me in the world's institutional structures, or given me an account of its decision procedures (I hope they are democratic), or provided me with a list of the benefits and obligations of citizenship, or shown me the world's calendar and the common celebrations and commemorations of its citizens. (p. 124)

Communitarians have three basic problems with global citizenship: workable democratic citizenship can only be expressed within the bounds of nation states (Kymlicka, 1999; Miller, 1999); rights of citizenship (including universal human rights) can only be protected by national governments and constitutions (Bowden, 2003; Scarry, 1996); and global citizenship has no legal bearing in the world (Neff, 1999). I will look at each contention in turn, and then present the globalist response. The debate between communitarians and cosmopolitans on these issues is reflective of the deeply contested meaning of citizenship itself.

Much of communitarian criticism on the workability of cosmopolitan citizenship is focused on the 'domestic analogy' that Hidemi Suganami (1989) characterizes as,

> the presumptive reasoning which holds that there are certain similarities between domestic and international phenomena; that, in particular, the conditions of order within states are similar to those of order between them; and that therefore those institutions which sustain order domestically should be reproduced at the international level. (p. 1)

Communitarians see this analogy as flawed, conflating domestic and international phenomena. For example, democratic order and citizenship as conceived domestically are impossible to replicate globally. For one thing, as Kymlicka (1999) argues,

> collective political deliberation is only feasible if participants understand and trust one another, and there is good reason to think that such mutual understanding and trust require some underlying commonalities. Some sense of commonality or shared identity may be required to sustain a deliberative and participatory democracy. (p. 119)

This type of interpersonal trust and understanding cannot be achieved at the global level concludes Kymlicka;

democratic politics is politics in the vernacular. He presents evidence that suggests there are greater possibilities for genuine participatory politics within linguistic units than at higher levels of organization (i.e., global). Moreover, as Miller (1999) contends in bounded constituencies like the nation state, citizens have notions and relations of ongoing reciprocity (necessary for responsible citizenship), unlike cosmopolitan constituencies which are usually artificial bodies formed to address particular issues: They are not primarily concerned with historical issues of the whole, and promote only singular self-interest. Both Miller and Kymlika are afraid that shifting power away from the national level, where mass vigorous, reciprocally oriented debate is possible, to the global level, where interests are not as accountable to the grassroots and where power rests in the hands of elites or the narrow bands of special interests, will mean a diminution of democracy and a decline in political participation (i.e., citizenship).

Other communitarians fear that the corollary to global citizenship is a 'state of statelessness.' Bowden (2003), appealing to Hannah Arendt and Michael Walzer, says that "statelessness is a condition of infinite danger" (p. 356), because stateless people have no guaranteed rights,

citizenship or any other. "This is because despite the *UDHR* claims to universality, it is still states that are invested with the primary responsibility for securing and maintaining those rights" (p. 356). As Arendt (1967) observed – following her own experiences with statelessness, and concluding that every individual ought to have the 'the right to have rights' – individual rights mean nothing unless embodied and protected by political institutions. This right becomes concrete only in the life of a particular community (Bernstein, 1996). Recent history (since Westphalia) shows that the global community does not have the capacity to protect human rights (those very rights claimed by global citizenship); but it has always been and continues to be the international community of states acting in the interests of states that has done so, or is capable of so doing. And Elaine Scarry (1996) argues it should be thus, because it is almost impossible to imagine the Other (Nussbaum's basis for global citizenship). Scarry contends that the work accomplished by a structure of laws cannot be achieved by a structure of sentiment (the aspirational claims of cosmopolitan citizenship). Constitutions, she argues, are needed to uphold cosmopolitan values; hence state-based citizenship should not be subsumed under a more broadly conceived cosmopolitan citizenship.

Scarry, Bowden, and other like-minded communitarians do not discount the reality of global challenges that necessitate international responses, but believe those responses are most effectively facilitated by state governments, informed by their respective citizenries. Rather than global citizenship, Bowden, for example, holds that a more empirically accurate characterization is globally minded or global-oriented citizenship. International law historian Stephen Neff (1999) concurs; his findings show that a cosmopolitan or global citizen "appears to be distinctly non-legal in character" (p. 118). He sees citizenship as having a legal and political status that can only be bequeathed by state governments. He worries,

> the term 'citizenship' has been chosen as the central descriptive term for the process (becoming a global citizen), which is essentially one of moral education. So long as one is clear what is really meant, perhaps no harm is done. (p. 118)

So how do globalists respond? I turn first to Muetzelfeldt and Smith (2002), who appeal to the concerns of both globalist and communitarian, and attempt to bridge the gap between the present, where nation states still hold

political and legal sway, and the future, where Westphalia has become 'history.' They acknowledge that,

> Global citizenship refers to the still poorly developed capacity for civil society to extend beyond a country's boundaries and take on transnational features in areas such as: communication; development of shared values and mutual respect; coordination of economic, social and environmental policy expectations; and advocacy and political campaigning. (p. 61)

On the other hand, citing social movement theory, Muetzelfeldt and Smith see an emergence of a global politics from 'below,' characterized by formal and informal communication networks that cross international boundaries (e.g., the *www*) and greater involvement in International Non-Government Organizations (INGOs). As more people participate in forms of global communication, networking advocacy, and INGO work, a stronger sense of citizenship will be the outcome. In fact, Featherstone (2000) claims that the protection of cultural citizenship rights (information, representation, knowledge, and communication) will come from 'below' via the Internet.

For the balance of the globalist response, I turn to Derek Heater, who responds directly to the communitarian

criticisms. In terms of citizenship, its workability and political status at the global level, Heater (2002) admits, as do Dower and Schattle, that world citizenship should partly be seen in terms of aspirations and intentions – people committed for moral reasons to creating and strengthening global institutions. However, as Heater points out, the likelihood that

> cosmopolitan law will be established is exceedingly remote without individuals acting as world citizens by exerting pressure on nation-states and the established institutions of global governance in order to bring about the necessary changes. But, by the exertion of pressure, individuals are and will be behaving as world citizens in the political . . . sense. (p. 105)

Moreover, he adds that,

> there are plenty of observers of the world scene who are convinced that a global or transnational civil society does exist at least in the formative stage, and that a consciousness of world citizenship is growing and being nurtured by and through this activity. (p. 139)

To support his assertions, Heater cites sources like *The Guardian*, and provides examples of the recent

exponential increase in the number and reach of INGOs. He also references Richard Falk (1995), who coined the phrase *citizen pilgrim* ("someone on a journey to 'a country' to be established in the future in accordance with more idealistic and normatively rich conceptions of political community" (p. 138-139), and who sees the real and necessary contribution and impact of a 'vanguard of world citizens'), a person who has

> a commitment to an imagined human community of the future that embodies non-violence, social justice, ecological balance, and participatory democracy in all arenas of policy and decision, and embodies these perspectives in current modes of feeling, thought, and action. The citizen pilgrim prefigures humane governance in both imaginative and political modes of being. (pp. 95)

Falk sees people exhibiting aspects of global *political* citizenship when they work towards an imagined and desired and common future.

With regard to human rights, Heater maintains that human rights protection can only finally happen globally; and it is only by people acting as citizens, working at the global level (e.g., Falk's vanguard of citizens), and putting

pressure on global institutions that human rights can be protected universally. Recent history has shown that many states are unwilling or unable to perform those functions necessary to safeguard their citizens, and that the 'community of states,' where each state looks after its own self-interests, has not been able to do so universally.

To summarize, communitarians argue that citizenship, as conceived in a republican sense (active participation), is only workable in bounded legal political spaces; and that citizenship conceived in a liberal sense (protection of liberties and rights) can only be guaranteed through state and national governments. Cosmopolitans argue that, given the increasing nature of global interconnections and the rise of meaningful participation of people at a global level, some form of political global citizenship is needed and is becoming manifest; and that the universal protection of human rights can only happen at levels that transcend national self-interest.

**What is a Global Identity?**

A third contention has to do with identity: Is it possible or desirable to cultivate a global identity, replete with global allegiance; and if so, what is a global identity, and to whom is allegiance owed?

Writing at the end of the Cold War from a peace activist perspective, Elise Boulding (1990) called for the creation of a 'global civic culture.' Her conception was based on the civil society movement that had arisen a decade earlier in Eastern Europe as a response to the militarized and polarizing tyranny of the Cold War. Boulding recognized a changed and interdependent world, and argued that what was needed was a global view and cosmopolitan identity, one that transcended and informed the local and the national. She cautioned that a global identity must be rooted in the local – in a 'species identity' that will encompass cultural diversity. However, world peace, she contended, rests in recognizing that people everywhere, amidst all the diversity, are more alike than they are different. A few years later Nussbaum articulated a similar global-minded identity – human beings bound with all other human beings by ties of recognition and concern. The central task of such persons would be to conceive of all human beings with equal affiliation.

The response to Boulding and Nussbaum has been incisive. Communitarians question the veracity of a cosmopolitan identity and its effectiveness in cultivating the very morality it was intended to cultivate. Beginning with the question of identity, they argue that one's identity

derives not from the cosmos, but from the particulars of one's life; cosmopolitan as an actual identity cannot exist, and to think otherwise has dangerous implications. Here is Himmelfarb (1996):

> What cosmopolitanism obscures, even denies are the givens of life: parents, ancestors, family, race, religion, heritage, history, culture, tradition, community, and nationality. They are essential attributes. We do not come into the world as free-floating, autonomous individuals. We come into it complete with all the particular, defining characteristics that go into a fully formed human being, a being with an identity. It is a given, not willed. To pledge one's 'fundamental allegiance' to cosmopolitanism is to try to transcend not only nationality but all the actualities, particularities, and realities of life that constitute one's natural identity. Cosmopolitanism is an illusion and, like all illusions, perilous. (p. 97)

From this perspective, you end up with an unbounded and non-localized identity, which is no identity at all.

On the question of morality, two issues are raised. First, is a cosmopolitanism that demands equal moral allegiance to everyone in the world realistic or morally possible? How far can our sense of morality extend; and what about the conflicting calls on our concern and sense

of responsibility? Do we not have a special sense of duty and care to family members and compatriots? According to Bok (1996), duties unique to family and kin are known in every moral tradition and no group, large or small, can survive without at least a few special duties and responsibilities to one another as 'insiders.' He concludes that a moral difference does exist between what is owed an 'outsider' and what is owed an 'insider.' Sheffler (1999) asks a similar question: Is there anything that the members of an individual society owe each other, as a matter of justice that they do not owe non-members? He deduces that yes they do, and that the difference rests in the claims of social justice, which he says is localized, and global justice, which is not.

A second issue has to do with the localized nature of how and where we learn and live our morality. If, as Michael Ignatieff points out (as cited in Pike 2000b), we do not live in 'airy' global villages, we live in our language and in our culture; then, communitarians argue, our sense of morality must be derived from our locally lived lives, as our moral actions are embedded in them. To clarify the argument, Walzer (1996) turns Nussbaum's concentric ring metaphor on its head. It works, he says, only as an analogy for real life lived in the local.

> We begin (first) by understanding what it means to have fellow citizens and neighbors; without that understanding we are morally lost. Then we extend the sense of moral fellowship and neighborliness to new groups of people, and ultimately to all people. Nussbaum's cosmopolitan works by analogy: 'regard . . . as . . .' (p. 126)

In other words, cosmopolitanism only works as an imagined moral identity. As Scheffler (1999) says, it is the local community that provides us with an 'infrastructure of responsibility,' not the global village. He describes it in the following manner:

> The community normally supplies individuals with a reasonably clear statement of their responsibilities and encourages the development of the motivations that will lead them to discharge those responsibilities. (p. 271)

If this is the case, that one's sense of morality is derived from the local and particular, Bowden (2003) and others conclude there are no grounds for claiming cosmopolitan allegiance, at least not in a primary sense. Put another way, and to summarize the communitarian case, since a cosmopolitan identity (*global* citizenship) is not grounded in the particulars of one's life, it cannot exist,

and since ones morality emerges from, and is expressed within the local, it is difficult to imagine a morality (and hence a politics) that warrants a global allegiance.

How do globalists respond? Nussbaum (1996a, 1996b) points out that the 20th century is filled with examples of people doing good in the face of horrors like the Holocaust, based on a recognition of a common humanity and a sense of universal justice. These actions and their motivation speak to a global identity and allegiance. And it supports her premise, "that human personhood is the source of our moral worth and that worth is equal," (1996b, p. 133) and should not be subjected to the vicissitudes of origin, nationality, religion, or any other particularity. Appealing one more time to the concentric rings of the Stoics, she claims that the outer ring of allegiance, to all of humanity, is not foreign to anyone, nor for that matter more removed from any of our other allegiances. Our sense of human-ness is enmeshed in all of who we are, and is central to our identity, and has been thus since birth. Nussbaum does not disavow special attention to family, religion, or nationality, not because local is better, but because that is the only sensible way to do good. With regard to Scarry's concern about people's inability to imagine the Other, Nussbaum considers this a

principle task of global citizenship: "What I am saying about education is that we should cultivate the factual and imaginative prerequisites for recognizing humanity in the stranger and the Other" (p. 133). Like Heater and Falk, Nussbaum concludes that global identity and allegiance is today evidenced in many places and is made politically actionable (citizen-like) by many means.

The communitarian criticism of global identity and Nussbaum's response tends towards local-global binaries. However, there are those who speak of identity as fluid and multi-variant, and claim that global citizenship is such an identity. Sen (2005), observing Indian culture, its heterdoxical nature, and its place in a globalizing world, claims that no one person has a particular and overriding characteristic that can claim their identity, local or global. A person's identity is shaped and formed by numerous intersecting characteristics; identity is more choice than discovery, more fluid than fixed. It is not determined solely from the particulars of one's existence, but also from one's choices in interpreting those fluid and particular intersections. World citizenship, Sen says, is such an identity; it is chosen and it is fluid. We live in our language and our culture, yes; but we also live in our imaginations.

Bankowski and Christodouliids (1999), responding to communitarians Miller (1999) and Linklater (1999), also speak of a fluid identity. Like communitarians, they warn of the dangers of a rootless and isolated identity, acknowledging that community is critical to fostering the basic human needs of belonging and identity. However, they fear constructing boundaries around communities (national and local) that are impermeable, and end up producing forms of isolation and exclusion, and preventing reflexivity. They ask: Is it possible to cultivate a sense of commitment and loyalty to a home (*heimat*) that is broader and more inclusive, one that might encompass the whole of the world (not a community defined by those who belong and those who do not)? Yes, they say, but it is an unending process, one of continually reaching out and folding into oneself. They see this beginning to happen in the cultural and political discourse that is being spawned by the European Community project.

George Richardson (2008) sees similar trends elsewhere. Richardson, a self-described globalist skeptic, believes that education systems the world over encourage powerful emotive bonds of national citizenship, and consequently loyalty to nations remains strong. However, citing a landmark study, he sees evidence of a growing

global civic imagination. The study, involving 194 Japanese and Canadian secondary students, showed that despite significant cultural and linguistic differences, these young people shared very common attitudes and concerns about global issues and their responsibilities as citizens of the world. Richardson believes that this study, among others showing similar trends, may be emblematic of a move toward what Kenneth Boulding (1988) asserted was the necessary basis of a global civic culture – the acceptance at some level of a shared identity with other human beings.

The question of identity, whether it is possible (the empirical claim) or desirable (the normative claim) to be a *global* citizen, and whether it is possible or desirable to be allegiant to a global community, continues to be debated. Heater (2002) acknowledges that world citizenship is an enigma because it obliges one to respect cultural diversity, while adhering to a universal ethic; and it requires one to live with an identity that is at once local and global. He believes this issue, and the broader conflict to which it gives rise can and should be resolved. How? By finding ways where "patriotism and nationhood can be expressed in modes that render them consonant with cosmopolitanism, (and where) cosmopolitanism, in turn, can be

defined in a manner that is consonant with a civic patriotism" (p. 183). But this is not just a debate to be resolved between pro- and anti-globalists; this issue animates the very meaning of global citizenship itself.

## Global Citizenship: The Enigma

Because the ubiquitous universalism-pluralism/local-global enigma rests at the heart of global citizenship, those who are sympathetic to its cause continue to wrestle with reconciling its apparent contradictions. What follows is a snippet of that conversation.

**Universalism-Pluralism**.

In a world of profound and sometimes violent cultural difference, the concept of global citizenship envisages a common global community in which all humanity shares membership. Yet what is that community to look like, what is to be held in common, how is the common to be found? According to Maxine Greene (1995), it is an issue that continues to haunt cosmopolitans:

> How do we reconcile the multiple realities of human lives with shared commitment to (global) communities infused once again with principles? How can we do so without regressing, without mythicizing? (p. 197)

There are three representative and interrelated responses. Peace scholars like Boulding (1990) and Lederach (2005) contend that each cultural tradition has ways of thinking about a hoped-for community of humankind; and it is upon an imagined shared future that we can build a common understanding and allegiance. Political philosophers like Appiah (2006) and Ferrara (2008) argue that it is much easier to agree on the what (problems) than the why (values and morals). They suggest that by focusing on the particulars of common challenges in conversations across difference, a common sense may emerge. Educators like Greene (1995) see possibilities of uncovering a common world through heeding and respecting the freedom and voice of all. Here is how she envisions it happening in the classroom:

> Once the distinctiveness of the many voices in a classroom is attended to, the importance of identifying shared beliefs will be heightened. These beliefs can only emerge out of dialogue and regard for others in their freedom, in their possibility (p. 42). Looking through multiple perspectives young people may be helped to build bridges among themselves. (p. 167)

Common with many globalist responses is an acknowledgment that a sense of mutual purpose and

relatedness cannot be imposed; it will (if at all) emerge from an engagement with, and respect for, difference.

**Local-Global Identity**

With regard to the local-global paradox, several synthesizing conceptions are offered in the literature.[5] Schattle's (2008) is representative. Referencing his global citizens' strong multiple allegiances, he concludes that his case studies confirm what political philosophers like Jurgen Habermas have said about the global public space and how the local and global stand in relation to one another. This is what he says:

> Global citizenship in civil society commonly unfolds within local public space and lends itself to more textured understandings of public space. The case studies presented reinforce the writings of political philosophers and social theorists who have argued that a cosmopolitan public sphere should not be conceived primarily as an overarching, worldwide public space but rather as multiple public spaces that intersect at various levels and transcend distinctions between civil society and government institutions. Activists and organizations show how agendas related to global citizenship aim not only to widen public space from domestic politics and society into

> the international arena but also to deepen public space, often within local communities by bring together individuals and groups from a variety of ethnic, cultural, and religious backgrounds in hopes of fostering mutual dialogue, understanding, and respect . . . rendering global citizenship all the more accessible to everyday people. (p. 90)

Integrating the views of self-identifying global citizens with the writings of political philosophers who have given thought to the local-global public space, Schattle concludes that the local and global do not stand in opposition to one another, but are inextricably linked by ties of symbiotic need and concern, and necessarily animate the concept and identity of global citizenship. But his conclusions also bespeak of the formative nature of the cosmopolitan ideal, and of the necessary and ongoing interplay between those ideals and their practices in public spheres, both local and global.

## Summary and Implications

Global citizenship is an idea that can be traced from ancient times through Enlightenment Europe to the Internet-connected world of today. Initially conceived as a metaphor for universal moral obligation, today it vies for

standing alongside centuries-old, state-bounded forms of legal citizenship. But the concept is far from uncontested. Important issues abound: Whose version of global citizenship is being articulated? Is it practically feasible to practice citizenship at a global level? Is it possible or desirable to cultivate an identity and allegiance that is global? Can world citizenship ever be more than an aspiration?

Moreover, the idea of world citizenship is paradoxical. It implies a perspective that is global, but requires connections to the local; it assumes a humanity that is common, but recognizes a community that is diverse.

Given these quandaries at the heart of global citizenship, what are the implications for global citizenship practicums? And, more importantly, what is the significance to this project, which is seeking to decipher the impact of a particular global citizenship practicum? With regard to Costa Rica 2003, the concerns articulated here help provide a lens through which to view the practicum's impact: When participants speak of the experience and its effects, and of their being in the world today, what is revealed of their identities and allegiances (e.g., local, global, and inter-variations), their dispositions

and perspectives, and their practices and vocations; and how do these relate to the formative notions of global citizenship and its inherent tensions?

With regard to global citizenship practicums – educational programs that aspire to educate for world citizenship – the preceding discussion helps inform the criteria by which to determine their learning efficacy and pedagogical merit. The next chapter examines current global citizenship practicums in North America (the field within which resided the 2003 practicum), the experiential learning philosophy on which they are based, the qualities of global citizenship they cultivate, the means by which they so do, and the challenges and limitations they face in this regard.

## Endnotes

[1] Jeremy Rifken (2009), writing about the empathic impulse that gives rise to cosmopolitanism, takes issue with Kant's categorical imperative. Citing Arthur Schopenhauer (1995), he argues that seeing others as equals, respecting their humanity, and a sensibility that others are owed the same regard as ourselves, derives not from duty, but from human nature.

[2] See Stefan Zweig (1943) for an elegant, moving, yet existentially troubling treatment of the cosmopolitan mood and aspirations of people in Europe pre-1914.

[3] This is unlike the Stoics, who believed only the wise, a small elite, could ever be regarded as citizens.

[4] Schattle focused on the term, global citizen, not related variations like being globally aware, or being a global person, or being a member of the human family. This is a critical distinction, according to Bowden (2003); and it is here wherein rests much contention between globalists and anti-globalists.

[5] These conceptions include the concentric rings à la the Stoics and Nussbaum. Appiah (2006) offers a confident view:

> We cosmopolitans can be patriots, loving our homeland (not only the states where we were born but the states where we grew up and where we live). Our loyalty to humankind – so vast, so abstract, a unit – does not deprive us of the capacity to care for people closer by; the notion of global citizenship can have a real and practical meaning. (pp. 26-27)

# 3

# GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP PRACTICUMS:

# *EDUCATING FOR WORLD CITIZENSHIP, OR NOT*

*The question is much discussed whether it is good for young people to travel. A better way of putting it would be to ask whether it is enough for an educated man to know only his own countrymen. For my part I am firmly convinced that anyone who only knows the people among whom he lives does not know mankind. To acquire [this] knowledge it is not enough to travel hastily through a country.*

- Jean Jacques Rousseau, 1762

As noted in Chapter One, international global citizenship practicum programs abound in universities and high schools across North America (Lutterman-Aguilar & Gingerich, 2002); indeed they are a growing trend (Schultz & Jorgenson, 2009). These types of programs are found in many disciplines (e.g., social work, peace studies, education, and international development studies, as well

as high school social studies), take several different forms (e.g., global citizenship internships, work/study abroad programs, international service learning courses), and range in length anywhere from two weeks to six months or more. However, these programs also share several characteristics. First, they are organized excursions taken by students and faculty to different countries where they are immersed (e.g., home-stays) in a culture different from their own (Grusky, 2000). Second, because of their international social justice emphasis, they often take place in the Global South, and include some kind of work, service, or engagement with a local host community. Third, one of their stated objectives – either principally or in addition to others – is to cultivate a sense of global citizenship.

Also common to global citizenship programs is their absence of definitions of the term (Schultz & Jorgenson, 2009). Although the most commonly used definition is Oxfam's, most provide none and offer little clarification beyond stock phrases such as fostering global mindedness and global awareness, or including descriptions of traits of global citizenship. According to Oxfam (as cited in Davies, 2006), a global citizen is someone who is aware

> of the wider world and has a sense of their own role as a world citizen; respects and values diversity; has an understanding of how the world works economically, politically, socially, culturally, technologically and environmentally; is outraged by social injustice; participates in and contributes to the community at a range of levels from local to global; is willing to act to make the world a more sustainable place and; takes responsibility for their actions. (p. 4)

A review of literature sympathetic to the concept of world citizenship (Appiah, 2008; Boulding, 1990; Heater, 2002; Nussbaum, 1997a; Schattle, 2008) reveals a similar conception, clustering around three characteristics. A global citizen is someone who (1) *recognizes a common humanity, and hence appeals to a universal sense of justice and cares about the human and environmental dimensions of global injustices;* (2) *has an open predisposition, being able to see the world through the lens of people who are different from themselves, and hence respects and values cultural diversity; and* (3) *has a sense of agency and responsibility, and hence is able and willing to engage the world thoughtfully, helpfully, and hopefully*. As acknowledged earlier, global citizenship continues to be a contested and differentiated concept. However, for the

purposes of this discussion, I will assume that the objectives of global citizenship practicums are in line with the definitions delineated thus far, and will use these as foci for appraising those programs. These definitions are derived and summarized from the literature; and so, undoubtedly, an investigation of global citizenship programs and the subsequent study extended and enriched these definitions. One of the more significant issues that the Costa Rica revisit raised was the one-sided nature of the investigation (i.e., global citizenship and global citizenship education as understood and experienced by the practicum's participants).

The goal of this chapter is to examine the efficacy of global citizenship programs, experiential and international in nature. It focuses on two questions: What qualities of global citizenship do they cultivate and how? What are the challenges and limitations in this regard? I have been involved with short-term global citizenship practicums for a number of years as organizer, facilitator, participant observer, and researcher, travelling to places like Costa Rica, India, and Guatemala and working with high school and university students, and teacher groups. This experience shapes my perspective and informs, and is informed by, scholarly literature.

## A Philosophy of Experiential Learning

Philosophers from Aristotle to Rousseau to Schattle have advocated the importance of travel abroad for inculcating qualities of citizenship. In fact, calling for increased travel opportunities for youth, Appiah (2008) considers this one of the single most important determinants in desegregating a divided world and for cultivating cosmopolitanism.

> We should be doing, so far as we can, what schools and colleges have increasingly been doing: encouraging young people to go abroad and work and study with young people in other nations, and inviting young people of other nations to study here. Cross-national educational projects . . . are absolutely critical . . . to a cosmopolitan education – an education for a global age. (p. 92)

Hans Schattle's (2008) research of self-described global citizens corroborates Appiah's assertions. In an internationally based study, he found that a pivotal step for many in becoming life-long, self-identifying global citizens was having the experience of travelling abroad within a formal education program sometime in high school or university. The educational programs abroad were for as little as two weeks, but all included a component where

participants worked and lived with local people. My own teaching experiences bear this out, where many former students who have participated in international global citizenship practicums speak of an increased appreciation for cultural diversity and a heightened sense of global and human interconnectedness.

All of this seems rather intuitive: Increased exposure to a wider world is an antidote to parochial mindsets and chauvinistic attitudes, and a basis for informed citizenry. But is this, in fact, what global citizenship practicums do? And, if so, how do they do so? What is it about these types of programs that cultivate global citizenship learning, and what is it about the experience specifically outside of the classroom that is singular in its pedagogic impact? (For it is upon this – a philosophy of experiential learning – that these programs are based.) A partial answer to that question rests in a story, as so many academic stories in the West do, that hearkens back to Plato, his student Aristotle, and the 2300-year-old epistemological debate about whether the world is out 'there' or in 'here.'

Plato argued that the acquisition of knowledge (learning) and the quest for truth (enlightenment) happen within the mind and through contemplative thought. Plato saw knowledge as interior, the mind accessing eternal and

fixed forms of knowledge. The scholasticism of the high Middle Ages, the rationalism of the scientific revolution (a pillar of modern science), and, according to Harkavy and Benson (1998), the classroom-centred approach of the American system of schooling is based on Plato's philosophy. Aristotle (1932), on the other hand, saw the pre-sensory mind as empty, a *tabula rasa*. He saw the world as real, and human beings acquiring knowledge through their senses by observing and experiencing an exterior world. We do not learn, he argued, principally through words and abstract concepts, but through sensory experiences that give rise to abstract concepts and inform the meaning of words. Aristotle's views are the basis for the empiricism of the scientific revolution (the other pillar of modern science), and are today seen in the student-oriented/experiential approaches in education. He held a dim view of didactic teacher-centred forms of instruction. He said:

> For do teachers profess that it is their thoughts which are perceived and grasped by the students, and not the sciences themselves which they convey through speaking? For who is so stupidly curious as to send his son to school in order that he may learn what the teacher thinks? (p. 54)

In the early 1900s, John Dewey (1916) attempted to synthesize this mind-world dualism. He defined education as "that reconstruction of experience which adds meaning to experience, and which increases ability to the course of subsequent experience" (p. 74). In other words, education is rooted in experience (empiricism), but becomes educative only when reconstructed by the mind (rationalism) with a purpose to living life more ably. Or, in his words,

> It is that reconstruction or reorganization of experience which adds to the meaning of experience, and which increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experience. The increment of meaning corresponds to the increased perception of the connections of the activities in which we are engaged. (pp. 82-83)

Not only did Dewey's philosophy of education represent a synthesis of the mind-world dualism, it also framed pedagogy and epistemology in constructivist terms. Paulo Freire's (2007) critical pedagogy – knowledge as constructed by teachers and learners, grounded in the reality of their lives (*conscientization*), collaboratively questing as Subjects to name and act in the world – is rooted in Dewey's conception of education (Saltmarsh, 1996).

American sociologist Kurt Lewin subsequently built on Dewey's notion of learning as reconstruction of experience when he discovered in his leadership and group dynamics work that learning is best facilitated "in an environment where there is dialectic tension and conflict between immediate concrete experience and analytic detachment" (Kolb, 1984, p. 9). Learning cannot be isolated from experience; and those who experience phenomena bring a necessary and indispensable perspective to its analysis. More recently, Kolb (1984) has developed a model of experiential learning that outlines the cyclical and spiraling nature of experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation. She also draws attention to the fact that students come to us not as blank slates but as individuals with different histories, aptitudes, and perspectives (Cone & Harris, 1996), and that this must be accounted for when designing experiential learning programs.

Finally, it is important to note the rise in the 1980s of an epistemological orientation known as embodied and connected knowing. Associated with women's psychology and feminist theory (Clinchy, 1989; Saltmarsh, 1996), it challenges the dominant educational paradigm of separated knowing by building on the idea, and advocating that "the

most trustworthy knowledge comes from personal experience" (Saltmarsh, 1996, p.15). A common refrain of experiential global learning advocates is that an awareness of global connectedness is most effectively derived from connective life experiences.

To conclude: Global citizenship practicum programs are guided by and find their epistemological and pedagogical home in the experiential learning theories of Dewey, Lewin, Kolb, Freire, Clinchy, and others – learning theories that are rooted in two critical interdependent principles: concrete life experience and critical reflection. And as stated, accounts abound of how these programs inspire transformational learning, a dramatic and fundamental change in the way participants see themselves and the world in which they live (Merriam, Caffarella, & Baumgartner, 2007).

## Fostering Global Citizenship

So what exactly are the changes that are wrought, and how are they so produced? What follows is a discussion of three qualities of global citizenship commonly inspired in participants of global citizenship practicums. I chose these three for their recurring

significance in the literature and for their correspondence to my own experience.

**Perspective Transformation: 'Going Global'**

On the 2003 Costa Rica trip, the day before we left to return home, after having spent several weeks living and working in Pedrogoso, a semi-remote mountain village, we visited a large modern shopping mall in the capital city, San Jose. The students had been set free for several hours. At some point in the afternoon I came across a student, Sara (pseudonym), crying quietly in a chair near the mall entrance. Several other students were standing around – all seemed emotionally distraught and shaken. When I asked Sara what the problem was, she said:

> Look around you; look at all the tourists buying and talking and eating. They're not seeing anything or anyone; they're not conscious; they're blind; they're tourists to a Third World country. That was us two weeks ago; that is where we are going back to tomorrow. We don't want to go back.

Sara and her friends were seeing something of themselves and their society they had not seen before, and they found it profoundly troubling. I think that what Sara was saying was not that she and her friends did not want go

back to Winnipeg, but that they did not want to return to their place of un-knowing. They had experienced an awareness of their society and a consciousness of themselves and of the world that they had not had before. Their outlook had become 'larger.'[1] (See Chapter Four endnotes.)

This change in awareness was obvious in debriefing sessions immediately following the trip, and in discussions I have had with several of the participants since (Kornelsen, 2009b). They talk of how their life path has changed since the Costa Rica trip, as a result of choices they would otherwise not have made: choices about travel, education, life-style, or work. In sum, these students appear to be living lives of greater consciousness, of themselves, their world, and their place in it – having undergone a transformation of sorts. So what exactly was the catalyst?

Richard Kiely (2004) from the University of Georgia has taken undergraduate university students on service-learning immersion excursions to Nicaragua for 10 years, and observes similar phenomena in his students. In looking to understand their transformation, Kiely compares his students' evolution in worldview to Jack Mezirow's (1991) notion of perspective transformation, which he defines as,

> The process of becoming critically aware of how and why our presuppositions have come to constrain the way we perceive, understand and feel about our world; of reformulating these assumptions to permit a more inclusive, discriminating, permeable and integrative perspective; and of making decisions or otherwise acting on these new undertakings. (p. 14)

Kiely uses Mezirow's definition to help interpret his students' change in perspective, which he describes as an "emerging global consciousness" and having to "do with expanding their notions of citizenship as global rather than just national" (p. 11). He accounts for the change partially from students undergoing experiential dissonance which transpires from living and working in a foreign culture.

Both theorists and researchers acknowledge the importance of experiential dissonance and disorienting dilemmas for building intercultural awareness, cultivating perspective transformation, and consciously engaging with the world. Mezirow (1995), who has written extensively on the phenomenon, believes that disorienting experiences are central to the process of perspective transformation. Maxine Greene (1995), using the Arendtian phrase, 'startling unexpectedness,' argues that these types of disorienting life experiences are also critical to getting

young people to 'consciously undertake the world.' In making her argument, Greene invokes both Hannah Arendt and John Dewey:

> We have to combat both standardization and what Arendt (1978) calls 'thoughtlessness.'. . . Arendt had particularly in mind the heedless recklessness or hopeless confusion or complacent repetition of 'truths' which have become trivial and empty. . . . Dewey (1954) labeled this a 'social pathology.' (pp. 125-126)

The antidote to thoughtlessness, Greene says, is to go

> intentionally in search of something and seek out the kind of understandings needed for the search, for moving toward what is not yet known. In this search, a refusal of the comfortable is always required, a refusal to remain stuck in everyday-ness. (p. 175)

To consciously undertake the world and shake off their thoughtlessness, Greene says young people need to have experiences of 'startling unexpectedness.' Schools need to devise situations that give students opportunities or experiences that will move them from the habitual and the ordinary, experiences that are highly discomforting and dissonance-inducing.

Recent studies relating to a variety of global citizenship programs corroborate the assertions of Greene and Mezirow. These include Malewski and Phillion (2009) and Kambutu and Nganga (2007), who have studied the impact of international work/study experiences on American pre-service and in-service teachers. These authors concluded that disorienting situations played the biggest role in heightening participants' intercultural understanding and global awareness. I observed a comparable phenomenon in former University of Winnipeg students who participated in student teaching practicums in Costa Rica (Kornelsen, 2009c). When participants discussed their experiences, it became apparent that much of their 'global' learning, as they described it (corresponding to Mezirow's description of perspective transformation), was inspired by experiences that were 'disorienting' or 'startled with unexpectedness.' These were experiences typical to immersion life: living with home-stay families; teaching and communicating in a foreign culture; and feeling overwhelmed with 'foreign' circumstances.

This change in perspective – an expanding global consciousness – speaks also to a shift in identity – a global

one – for which Dewey (1897) offers an account (italics are mine):

> The only true education comes through the stimulation of (a person's) powers by the demands of the social situations in which he finds himself. Through these demands he is stimulated to act as a member of a unity, to *emerge from his original narrowness of action and feeling,* and to conceive of himself from the standpoint of the welfare of the group to which he belongs. (p. 3)

According to Dewey, life experience in the social world helps people realize their connection to a larger community and helps them to know who they are – their social identity – in that community. When Dewey wrote this, over a hundred years ago, he was writing about local and national democratic citizenship. However, if his idea of community is extended to global community and global citizenship, and if social experiences in the world beyond one's domestic borders lead people to *emerge from [their] original narrowness of action and feeling, and conceive of [themselves] from the standpoint of the welfare of the group to which [they] belong* (the whole of the world), then this might explain the changes in international practicum participants. Certainly many participants came to see themselves living lives of greater global consciousness,

being members of a broader global community, and feeling a requisite responsibility. In the studies cited earlier, all observed heightened sensitivities to issues of global and social injustice resulting from experiencing life and encountering demands of social situations in the world beyond the local.

Put another way, the identity of a global community member emerges from living and working with 'foreigners' in a 'foreign' place. As philosopher John Macmurray (1991), a Buberian scholar, says, the Self can only be realized in relationship with the Other.

> The idea of an isolated agent is self-contradictory. Any agent is necessarily in relation to the Other. Apart from this essential relation he does not exit. . . . Persons, therefore, are constituted by their mutual relation to one another. 'I' exist only as one element in the complex 'You' and 'I'. (cited in Creamer 1996, p. 34)

Using Macmurray's conception, the Self that is realized or emerges for practicum participants – owing to the international nature of the experience – is a cosmopolitan Self. To extend this, it follows then that if we belong to a global community, global Others are needed to help define us and illumine our humanity.

Back to the mall in San Jose, and the question of the veracity of global citizenship practicum: One of the most significant transformations these programs may facilitate is transformation of perspective and identity – broadening participants' views of the world and illuminating their place in it. What is the catalyst? It is experiencing the challenges of living life in a society different from one's own.

**Relationship Transformation: Feeling 'Connected'**

A second significant effect on participants of global citizenship is a heightened awareness of human relatedness amidst a world of difference and diversity. How this may happen was demonstrated one night in Costa Rica in 2003. It was the night that the students and their host families met for the first time in a small schoolhouse in Pedrogoso. We had just arrived, and everyone was extraordinarily nervous, the Spanish-speaking Costa Ricans and the English-speaking Canadians, each staring at the foreigners on the other side of the room. A program was presented, and then it was time for student-host introductions. The tension in the room was excruciating, but then something unexpected happened. As our guide/translator was introducing the third student, Jacob, to his host, a short petit grandmother, she

ran across the room and gave him a big bracing hug, almost knocking him to the floor. The room broke up in peels of laughter; and, with it, the tension in the room evaporated. Something of universal meaning had been communicated. We all felt the same thing, I think – we all understood it, and we all witnessed each other 'get it.' And it seemed as if a barrier between us and them, between Costa Ricans and Canadians, had been breached. It felt like we were a part of the same group having a good laugh about the same thing. This is not to say that we saw each other as *us* so much as we *saw* each other. We no longer looked upon one other as types anymore (foreigners, or Costa Ricans, or Canadians), but as singular and actual persons, with whom we had something in common. It felt like Martin Buber's (2006) description of *I-Thou* dialogue, a rare, unexpected and unguarded occasion when our communication is simultaneously open, direct, mutual and present – an occasion when we encounter each other's common humanity. (See Chapter Six endnote.)

What exactly happened in that moment on that night cannot be known; but for the next two weeks, since students lived and worked with local families '24/7,' they encountered many more of these connective-like experiences (at least if students' stories – often told with

great hilarity – are to be believed). And notably, after the trip, the language students used in writing about Costa Rica and Costa Ricans was different than from before the trip. Before, their language tended to be patronizing and objectifying; after Costa Rica it leaned toward humility and relatedness. Whether this shift in attitude was directly caused by specific occasions of Buberian-like dialogue is impossible to know. However, the outcome – feelings of relatedness and commonality – is what Buber predicted of *I-thou* experiences. Living day-to-day with others seems to have been a catalyst.[2]

Further on that point, Nell, one of the participants on the trip, talked about the experience six years later:

> When I think back to the trip, the main thing that stands out for me is a feeling of being aware of, 'wow' there're many different ways to live; not everyone lives the way we do. [And] a feeling of being connected to [Costa Ricans] and to the rest of the world, how your life impacts other people and the environment. [And] the most powerful experience was the home-stay, getting to know my Costa Rican family. (Kornelsen, 2009b, p. 16)

Nell makes a link between living in a home-stay situation, developing a sense of connection to a wider world, and

embracing a broader appreciation of difference. She seems to have had an experience that moved her toward what Martha Nussbaum (1997a) considers critical to world citizenship, which is

> cultivating in ourselves the capacity for sympathetic imagination that will enable us to comprehend the motives and choices of people different from ourselves, seeing them not as forbiddingly alien and Other, but as sharing problems and possibilities with us. (p. 85)

Furthermore, and accounting for Nell's shift in attitude, Greene (1995), like Nussbaum, says the imagination is critical for building a common world amidst diversity and difference, and it is more likely to happen when we have personal encounters with others. When we have knowledge of the common details of another's life, it becomes extraordinarily difficult not to overcome abstractions in dealing with them, and it is less likely that we will categorize and distance each other. This is especially the case when, as Appiah (2008) (hearkening Gordon Allport) says,

> contact between individuals of different groups . . . occurs in a framework that meets a few important conditions: crucially, it must be on terms of equality and it must be in an

> activity where shared goals are pursued in contexts of mutual dependency. (p. 91)

Nell's home-stay experience, as she and others on that trip described it, met those conditions.

Whether it is explicated through Buberian-like dialogue or having personal encounters informed by mutual dependency, or interrelated aspects of both, the experience of living and engaging life with Others (in this case, Costa Ricans) led to a heightened awareness of a common connected world, and an enhanced respect for diversity and difference – at least for Nell. According to the research literature, she is not alone; it is a common outcome of international experiential learning programs. It is attested to by Wilson (1982, 1993) in describing the benefits of cross-cultural studies of teachers and students; by Pence and Macgillivray (2008) as they researched the impact of an international field experience for pre-service teachers; by Kiely (2004) reflecting on his students' participation in a service learning practicum in Nicaragua; and by Haloburdo and Thompson (1998) comparing student nursing experiences in developed and developing countries.

In Saltmarsh's (1996) view,

> Dewey's (1916) main aim for education was with breaking down barriers of social stratification which make individuals impervious to the interests of others, [and to] a cultivated imagination for what men have in common and a rebellion at whatever unnecessarily divides them. (pp. 128-129)

According to the documented experiences of participants, global citizenship practicums foster this sensibility, and along with it, a related and cultivated appreciation for human difference and diversity.

**A Sense of Agency and Responsibility**

Finally, perhaps the most commonly reported impact of global citizenship practicums – particularly those that emphasize community work – is increased self-confidence and empowerment, and a related commitment to engaging on issues of social injustice. I have witnessed this in my high school students, and heard this from the University of Winnipeg Costa Rica student teachers. And it has been broadly reported in the literature since 1984 when Kuh and Kauffman conducted a study of the impact on personal development within study-abroad programs.

Lynn Davies (2005, 2006, personal communication, October 28, 2008) has done extensive research in England

and the United States on citizenship education and global citizenship education. She has come to several conclusions: First, there is agreement that one of the best school-based predictors of whether youth become active citizens is the experience of working in some form of community service. Second, if this is true of local and national citizenship, then schools should make available some form of international experience for teachers and students to facilitate an engaged global citizenry, one that fosters a sense of global agency and responsibility. In short, concrete experience as members of a global citizenry will spawn the very mindset and practice it so engages. Reports of the impact of global citizenship practicums give credence to this argument.

## The Challenges and Limitations

Global citizenship practicums may demonstrate veracity in facilitating traits of world citizenship, but they also face substantive challenges and limitations in so doing, and if not recognized may undermine the very goals to which they aspire and thereby cause deleterious pedagogical and ethical consequences. Three significant challenges and limitations in particular are worthy of further elaboration.

**Thoughtless and Unreflective Experience**

*The existence of programs like yours is offensive to Mexico. I am here to entreat you to use your money, your status, and your education to travel in Latin America. Come to look, to climb our mountains, to enjoy our flowers. Come to study. But do not come to help.*

- Ivan Illich, 1968

Increasingly, global citizenship programs consist of service learning expeditions, where young people from the global North volunteer in communities in the global South. A while ago, I accompanied one such group to Guatemala – a class of graduate education students and their professor from a large Canadian university. As a part of their course, the group was to work on refurbishing a school in the Lidino town of Panabaj, and help with a food/income security project in the Mayan village of Las Vega.

Several days after arriving in Guatemala, Roberto (pseudonym), a ministry of education official spoke to us about the state of education in Guatemala. He explained that not a single new school had been built since 2000; teachers' salaries had been reduced and most lived on less than subsistence wages; families were not able to afford to send their children to school; and public schools were disappearing. We asked why there was no money being set aside for education. Roberto answered that the Structural

Adjustment Policies (SAPs) of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) precluded this, since they required reduction in social expenditures as a condition for continued debt-servicing support. Guatemala's debt was incurred during a 40-year war the government waged against its own people – mostly poor, mostly Mayan – killing 200,000 and displacing two million. Rather perversely, the poor of Guatemala are now paying for a genocidal war that was waged against them. Canada is a member and active supporter of both the World Bank and International Monetary Fund. A day later we heard from Nate (pseudonym), a member of an international human rights watchdog group, who told us how a Canadian company was strip-mining mountains in western Guatemala, destroying sensitive ecosystems, contaminating drinking water, and displacing whole Mayan villages. The company had just been granted exploration rights to the region to which we would be travelling. (Many young people in Las Vega were fearful and suspicious of our intentions when we first met them.)

The point of the story is that it demonstrates the essential role of critical reflection to experiential learning. Experiential learning theorists, from Dewey through Freire and Kolb, speak of how learning is rooted in a symbiotic

relationship between experience and critical observation and reflection. Dewey (1997) explains further (italics are mine):

> Activity that is not checked by observation of what follows from it may be temporarily enjoyed. But intellectually it leads nowhere. It does not provide knowledge about the situation in which the action occurs nor does it lead to *clarification* and *expansion* of ideas. . . . to reflect is to look back over what has been done so as to extract the net meanings which are the capital stock for intelligent dealing with further experiences. It is the heart of intellectual organization and a disciplined mind. (p. 87)

In the case of learning for global citizenship – inculcating global perspectives – a critical aspect of one's reflection on experience 'in the world' must be buttressed with a knowledge of the problems and concerns of others within the global community and how global economic and political systems impinge on specific communities that are visited (e.g., Who has power, and why? Who is subject to that power? What are the consequences? Whose world is being named?). This is especially important in understanding how home communities and host communities are inter-connected and inter-related. Not only is this knowledge important for a more informed global perspective,

but also it is imperative for combating and preventing conceptions that are patronizing ('You poor person'), ethnocentric ('I know better'), or colonial ('Let me help you').

Following the presentations by Roberto and Nate, members of our group began having serious questions about the purpose of our visit. Were we Canadians not benefiting from our association with the IMF – making the Guatemalan government beholden to Canadian banks – and the mining company (partially capitalized by the Canadian Pension Plan), and therefore complicit in contributing to the very social and economic issues we were hoping to help alleviate with our volunteer work? These unexpected, yet coincidental presentations compelled members of the group – those who were willing and able – to reflect on their relationship and experiences with their Guatemalan hosts. Their ideas of the situation in Guatemala and their connection to it were *expanded* and *clarified*. This knowledge humbled and equalized their relationships, and it informed future experience, as Guatemalan hosts began to be seen as allies in a global struggle against injustice, not as objects of academic curiosity or recipients of volunteer philanthropy.

The experience in Guatemala was fortuitous; participants were afforded the opportunity and the information necessary for critical reflection. However, such reflection does not always happen. People like Marc Epprecht, professor of development studies at Queen's University and facilitator of numerous work-study excursions abroad, worry that unreflective or unguided experiences may harden Northern students' pre-existing negative stereotypes or patronizing attitudes of the South. Kate Simpson (2004), writing about the 'gap year' experiences of British youth, sees this as a major flaw and danger for those volunteering in the South. When people encounter new experiences and interactions in these programs without critical reflection, she says, there is a strong tendency to interpret those experiences through a prior explanatory lens. In the case of the Global South, this lens is one that is patronizing, distancing, colonial, and uncritical.

Every article I have read on experiential learning for global citizenship, whether written by researchers or practitioners, acknowledges the importance of incorporating or encouraging guided critical reflection before, during, and after the experience abroad. Interested authors as diverse as Ben Sichel (2006), a Canadian high school

teacher, and Sara Grusky (2000), an American medical doctor, speak of including some grounding in the political, economic, and cultural context of the country that is visited, and particularly its relationship to the home country.

Further to the importance of informed reflection, Haloburdo and Thompson (1998) found that, in comparing the international learning experiences of nursing students (short-term – long-term; developed – developing countries) the greatest impact on learning outcomes (as per global citizenship traits) was not length of program or place of stay, but pre-experience preparation, including opportunities for critical reflection. In 2010, I interviewed previous participants (Lebanon and Senegal) and facilitators (Cote d'Ivoire) of study-abroad and service-learning courses based in Winnipeg (high school and university). These individuals agreed on the negative ethical and pedagogical implications of unreflective experience, and of the importance of informing prospective practicum participants of the current global political and economic reality. A critical challenge for global citizenship practicum programs is providing opportunities for critical reflection, reflection that cultivates a global perspective and fosters global mutuality.

**I-Thou Relationships and Issues of Power and Privilege**

*For where un-reserve has ruled, even wordlessly, between men, the word of dialogue has happened sacramentally*
- Martin Buber, 2006

As argued earlier, one of the greatest benefits of international travel is the potential of experiencing Buberian-like *I-Thou* relationships across cultural difference. However, given that relatively rich students visiting relatively poor countries characterize most global citizenship practicums, what happens when cultural differences are coupled with extreme economic divides? Is it possible to experience connections of mutuality and, if so or not, what are the implications for visiting students and their relationship to the host community/culture? These were questions with which I was confronted in the summer of 2009 as I accompanied a group of graduate students on a university field-study course to India. What follows is my journal account of the event that precipitated those questions.

> *Last night while the rest of the group was being 'hawked' by the merchant class, I went outside to sit down on the steps to breathe. Within a few minutes, in the darkness, I saw a young girl slyly moving her way across the parking courtyard; she had me singled out;*

*she had a bunch of bangles to sell. I was looking for company, didn't care if she sold me stuff. I'm sure she saw me as $; she was very practiced in striking up a friendly conversation with a tourist: young girl, didn't get an education, father blind, blah, blah blah.*

*Her name is Alisha. She taught herself English to survive on the streets selling stuff, which she has been doing since she was seven. She is just a few months older than Jonathan who is traveling alone in Europe (And I hope he is also 'met' by older people in his loneliness.). She showed me letters (probably part of the act) that former tourists had sent her from places like Sweden. She had an obvious practiced charm, but a sadness and tiredness (hopelessness?) that didn't seem quite so practiced. It broke my heart. Hmm . . . How can we humans continue to quest to break through our suspicion and fear and laziness to see and meet each other?*

*Alisha and I had been talking for about half an hour when the rest of the group began trickling out of the door behind me. And I'll never forget what happened next. She looked at me rather sheepishly, as if apologizing for what she had to do now (it is this look, and her subsequent refusal to sell me her bangles 'because they're just cheap plastic,' that gives*

*me hope that perhaps we had met, however fleeting and fraught with her needs and my suspicions) and turned from me to my friends coming out the door. And she began to 'sell.' And this is the other thing I'll never forget, how my friends looked at her. They didn't; they hurried by, looking to escape, and rescue me the vulnerable one, looking to extricate me from the wiles and guiles of this hawker.*

*So what does this mean? How can it be different, this relationship between middle-class visitors from Canada and the street-hawker class of India? I don't know; perhaps this is the price we pay – rejecting people – for the luxury of being voyeurs in a place of extreme poverty and desperation. We don't belong here, like this.*

*I can hear the critical theorists protesting, "How dare you speak of 'meeting' someone – of seeking mutuality with another in circumstances of complete and utter power differential?" Alisha is desperate and completely dependent on rich tourists for her survival and that of her family. I am an incredibly wealthy voyeur. I had enough rupees in my wallet to set her family up for months. The power differential (at least, economic) is total and complete. How, in these circumstances, can I speak of a mutual and*

> *open 'meeting?' Perhaps it is not possible; but, if that is the case, then is any meeting of any kind ever possible? Sure, this is an extreme case, but aren't all relationships fraught with power differences? Maybe I need to ask Alisha; she is in a better position to answer the question, and inform the implications for global citizenship and global citizenship learning for Western youth.*

This encounter with Alisha, and the questions it raised about 'meeting,' speaks to two inter-related challenges of global citizenship practicums. The first has to do with meetings across economic divides; are they possible? Freire (2008) believed that differences in economic class were the most difficult of human divisions to reconcile, given the inherent objectifying nature of the oppressor class. Invoking a critical and Freirean perspective, my relationship with Alisha was solely determined and shaped by me, a representative of the oppressor class – it was my named world we were in, not hers. Alisha did not have an identity in our relationship; she was simply doing what she needed to do access my world and survive (e.g., speaking English, showing me letters from abroad, telling me stories she thought I wanted to hear, etc.). We were not collaborating on naming a common world, but only reproducing mine. In short, under

these circumstances, a critical theorist would argue there was no meeting, nor could there be.[3] This begs the question: Do global citizenship programs operating in the South wittingly or no, foment and reproduce Other-ing perspectives? Simpson (2004), in her research on the gap year industry in Britain, believes so. Invoking Edward Said, she claims that gap year programs, where youth volunteer in Third World countries, create spaces that are distancing and are "populated by Third World needy Others" (p. 683).

However, notwithstanding the difficulty of communicating across economic divides and the dangers of Other-ing in contexts of economic disparity, I believe the encounter between Alisha and me (whether we 'met' or not) also speaks of its critical value, and to the importance of encouraging these kinds of conversations. To become a fully cognizant and engaged member of an interconnected global community requires coming face-to-face – emotionally, intellectually, spiritually – with the world's real and raw power and economic imbalances, and the consequences of these inequities on human relationships, both personal and global. Not only will this facilitate awareness, but it should also lead to questions about the reasons behind global inequality, injustice, and servitude –

questions that might not be raised with the same veracity, urgency, or insight, if not encountered personally. The challenge for educators of global citizenship is daunting: how to facilitate these personal encounters, between privileged and not, in ways that are not distancing, objectifying, or patronizing. Freire doubts they can happen; Simpson has witnessed examples where they do not; I believe educators must find a way to make them happen, for the sake of global community.

The second related challenge raised by the Alisha story has to do with the fact that current programs of global citizenship privilege a global elite – people in the United States, Canada, Australia, and Britain who can afford thousands of dollars for educational excursions (Shultz & Jorgenson, 2009) – who have an impact, conscious or not, on local communities and cultures. As Jennifer Ladd (1990), analyzing the impact of United States students on Indian society, asks,

> How are the [Indians] affected by our process of growth and learning? Are we in danger of using other cultures for our own needs, this time taking personal growth and cross-cultural awareness instead of cotton and tea? Are we exploiters or imperialists unconscious of the consequences of our learning? (p. 123)

Or, as a participant in the Guatemalan program opined, "Is Las Vega just a Petri dish for our study program? We should be working together, us and them; otherwise, are we not just voyeurs, using our Guatemalan hosts for our own pedagogic ends?" Given the goals of educating for global citizenship, international experiential educators must grapple with these ethical questions. Illich (1968), Lutterman-Aguilar and Gingerich (2002), and Epprecht (2004) have written critically on these issues, arguing that the relationship between hosts and visitors must be reciprocal and mutual, one where both are collaborative partners in articulating work-study objectives and both derive equal benefit from the experience. Others who have participated in practicums abroad argue that unless participants first recognize their inherent privilege and power, relationships of reciprocity and mutuality are impossible, both individually and collectively (e.g., Reimer, personal communication, February 18, 2010; Silver, personal communication, March 10, 2010).

Finally, global citizenship practicums remain a practice of a global elite. Alisha and her friends will not be coming to visit me in Canada; it remains my privilege to visit them. And because of my material circumstance (class), I will always be in a position of naming the world

vis-à-vis Alisha. And herein lies, I think, the biggest challenge/limitation for global citizenship practicums. It is only a tiny fraction of the world that is privileged with this experience, and this invariably impoverishes the very meaning, quest, and practice of global citizenship that these programs are intended to foster. For if Macmurray is right that the Self can only be realized in relationship with the Other, then does it not hold that the voices of Alisha and all others in the Majority World are needed to complete our understanding of global community and of our relationship to it?

**Balancing Challenge and Security**

Finally, if the experience abroad is to inspire transformative leaning, then one of the most important challenges for global citizenship programmers is to design the experience so as to meaningfully challenge – affording opportunities for 'startling unexpectedness' – but not to overwhelm. Providing this balance is a basic principle of experiential education (Citron & Kline, 2001). As Dewey (1997) writes, the key to growth and learning is

> the presence of difficulty to be overcome by the exercise of intelligence [and] it is part of the educator's responsibility to see equivocally two things: First, that the problem

> grows out of the conditions of the experience being had in the present, and that it is within the range of the capacity of students . . . The goal is to lead out into an ever expanding world of subject-matter of facts, information, and ideas. (pp. 79, 87)

I have witnessed both responses to this form of experiential education. Most often, I have seen students who, after mastering the challenge of 'Costa Rica,' have thrived and exhibited a heightened sense of confidence, a desire to travel and learn more about the world, and a willingness to engage on issues of social justice. Their change exemplifies Dewey's (1997) process and goal of learning: continuous reconstruction of experience, leading to an ever-expanding world and an ongoing desire to learn more. But on a few occasions I have witnessed the other: students numbed and overwhelmed with anxiety (e.g., home-stays, language barrier, culture shock, realities of global injustices), and upon return showing signs of alienation, reduced self-confidence, and cynicism.

One of the difficulties in designing a program that meets both objectives – challenge and security – is that, as Kolb says, students come to the experience not as blank slates, but as individuals with different histories, aptitudes, and perspectives. Not only must this be taken into account

in program design, but also, because of the variable and unpredictable effects on individuals of living in foreign cultures, it requires of the facilitator an ongoing vigilance and response in the field. As Dewey (1916) suggests, this demands of the educator sage-like insight: knowing when to intervene, and when to let be, and for whom.

## Summary and Implications

Rooted in the experiential and constructivist learning theories of Dewey, Freire, and others, high school and university global citizenship practicums are said to have a transformative impact for participants, inspiring commitment to ideals of global citizenry. What is the veracity of that claim? According to the research literature, and my personal experience, these programs, by having participants experience the intimacies and day-to-day challenges of living life in a foreign culture, cultivate three important qualities of global citizenship: a *global perspective and identity;* an *awareness of global inter-connectedness***,** tied to a heightened respect for diversity and difference; and a sense of *agency and responsibility.*

However, global citizenship practicums face three substantive challenges. First, if participants are not afforded opportunities for critical reflection – a cornerstone

of experiential learning theory – it may thwart *global-minded perspectives*, as attitudes of dominance, ethnocentrism, and separate-ness may prevail. Second, ethical issues of power and privilege must be addressed if participants are to experience an authentic sense of *global connectedness*. (And for the sake of global community, it would be nice if as many people from the Global South came here to help and study us as the reverse.) Third, global citizenship programs need to strike a pedagogical balance between challenge and security if they are to foster a sense of *agency and responsibility*.[4]

The 2003 Costa Rica program was typical of the global citizenship practicums analyzed throughout – in its education philosophy, prospective learning outcomes, and potential risks and challenges. Since the efficacies and challenges of these global citizenship practicums are well documented, they informed the Costa Rica experience and thus helped shape several of the study's key questions. Most obviously, when participants examined Costa Rica and its impact, how did their memories and perceptions relate to the hoped-for transformations (were they lasting?), and how did they inform their pedagogic means? More disquieting, were the ethical and pedagogic challenges cited above manifested in participants perceptions and

experience as well, and if so how? And finally, did participants' memories and stories and perceptions match mine; what were the corroborations; what were the divergences; and how did these broaden our collective horizons?

I return now to the participants of the 2003 practicum, the inspiration behind these questions in the first place. How did they remember the practicum experience and understand it? What did they say about its impact on the course of their lives; and how do their recollections inform this type of human experience, enlighten programs of this nature, and educate its facilitators?

## Endnotes

[1] Geraldine Balzar, Education professor at the University of Saskatchewan, who takes high school students and university graduate students for similar two-week excursions to Guatemala, agrees with this analysis. She observes similar reactions in her students (personal communication, May 2, 2010).

[2] An important question, and curiosity: What are the differences in pedagogical impact between 'embodied' meetings and various forms of 'dis-embodied' meetings (books, letters, Internet, telephone, *Skype,* etc.)?

[3] Clinchy (1989) and other feminist writers speak of the indispensability of a knowing that is derived from personal experience.

[4] Rebecca Tiessen, professor of International Development Studies at Dalhousie University, has been asked whether, given the problems with internships abroad, if global citizen-like practicums are warranted. Her response: "The risks of no cross-cultural communication, which I see as increased stereotyping, racism, lack of understanding, lack of respect for other cultures, etc. are far greater than the problems these internships create" (cited in Sichel, 2006, p. 13).

# 4

# THE TRAVELLERS AND WHAT THEY REMEMBERED

*A research method is only a way of investigating certain kinds of questions. The questions are the important starting points, not the method as such. Rather, the method one chooses ought to maintain a certain harmony with the deep interest that makes one an educator (a parent or a teacher) in the first place.*

- Max Van Manen, 1990

In the summer of 2011, eight-and-a-half years after the Costa Rica practicum, I met individually with the co-facilitator and with each of 10 of the 13 student participants to talk about their Costa Rica experience, an experience they had shared with 12 others when they were 16 or 17 years old. By this time, they resided in many different places – pursuing a variety of ends, living a diversity of lives. The first thing I learned was that what they remembered and how they understood the experience differed in perspective, consequence, intensity, and

complexity. And so, to begin, here is an introduction of the participants, including a brief sketch of what they have been doing since 2003, their most enduring memories of the practicum, and what they make of that experience these many years later. I start with Adrienne, my erstwhile colleague and co-facilitator. (All names are pseudonyms.)

---

***Adrienne***

*I remember the light; I remember the quality of the light there. It was so different. I remember the darkness; the quality of the darkness, too. And the sounds that would change as day shifted into night. . . . And I can't separate any of my recollections of Costa Rica from that constant awareness of these children whose lives I had to safeguard.*

Until 2011, Adrienne was a teaching colleague of mine at the *Collegiate at the University of Winnipeg.* She and I co-facilitated the Costa Rica Global Citizenship Practicum. Outside of her teaching life, Adrienne is a nationally and critically acclaimed novelist. She has lived and studied in Canada and abroad.

Adrienne had vivid and enduring memories of the Costa Rica trip, considering it one of her most memorable travelling-teaching experiences: because of her incessant

worry and care for participants' safety, because of the 'mind and heart expanding' transformations she witnessed in participants, and because her experience was lived through 'adolescent eyes' of the 'un-travelled and inexperienced.'

Adrienne emphasized the importance of pre-trip preparation, intended to be one that inspired a perspective of openness and raised no specific expectations. Adrienne remains conflicted over the ethical merit of trips like this, acknowledging the potential for profound and enduring transformations, but worrying whether the cost in money and carbon footprint is worth it. 'If you really want to help, isn't cutting them a cheque probably the best, most efficient way?'

***Jayne***

*That was one of the biggest trips of my life. But it was one of the shortest times. . . . Go with an open heart and go without your head, because that is where it's going to have the biggest impact. . . . open your eyes and ears, and watch and listen.*

Since 2003, Jayne has travelled to New Zealand and Australia, worked at many jobs in British Columbia, and is always close to nature (a theme that animated the

interview). She has earned a Master's degree in English literature from the University of Victoria and is currently studying naturopathic medicine in Portland, Oregon.

One of Jayne's most compelling memories of Costa Rica is the relationship that she developed with her host mom. Jayne thought of her as her own 'baba,' with a similar respect, love, and awe: 'She cared for us as her own.' Today Jayne is drawn to the Pedrogoso experience for its non-materialistic values, caring community, and connection to the natural environment: 'I want to be with those people. And I want to have the hope and life that developed in me while with them.'

Jayne was deeply introspective in the interview, seeing the Costa Rica experience as significant in (or related to?) fostering her current awareness of, and respect for the interconnectedness of all life. It means more to her now, she said, than it did eight years ago, but wonders whether she may have come to idealize the community and the experience. When people ask her about the trip, she refuses to use the word volunteering because 'it would be very arrogant of me to say that I didn't derive more from that experience then they took in manual labour and experience from us.'

***Maya***

*I think just how happy I was the whole time. Obviously that kind of experience has ups and downs, but to be honest I only remember being incredibly incredibly happy the whole two weeks we were there. . . . Connecting it to my personal life, I can see its impact because it made me fall in love with languages, and I'm still doing that by learning languages and travelling.*

Since graduating high school in 2004, Maya has travelled to many international destinations. In 2010 she graduated with a B.A. in French literature and linguistics from UW. Today she is living in Spain and teaching English as an Additional Language, having become fluent in both French and Spanish.

When asked about her most compelling memories, the first things Maya talked about were how happy she felt the whole time there, and how incredibly welcoming the families were. In spite of having had other groups 'come through,' the families and the community made us feel 'really special' and that 'we were not burdening them at all.'

Throughout the interview Maya returned to the theme of language. She says that it was the opportunity to learn

another language that drew her to the Costa Rica program in the first place. Maya mused about how her current passion for travel and languages may have been birthed, 'sparked,' or inspired by the Costa Rica experience.

***Sara***[1]

*One of the most significant shifts that I think occurred for me on that trip was the way that I understood people in the context of these systems of oppression that I felt that I understood about the world. . . . [But] that's not what it looks like. . . . People there are like us. . . . The issue isn't that people don't know, or don't know how to do things, or don't know what they need.*

For the past eight years Sara has been immersed in social justice activism and related academic pursuits. Currently, she is a Ph.D. student in sociology at City University in New York. Her research concerns are policing, gangs, and criminalization in the context of Canadian colonialism.

One of Sara's most important memories is getting to know her host mom. 'Seeing her do shit big time,' as community leader and family patriarch, caused an elemental shift in how Sara saw people in systems of oppression. To paraphrase her: I couldn't think of her (my

host mom) as a powerless victim of Third World oppression; I did think that maybe they (our hosts) were doing us a favour much more than we them. (Sara also stressed how the trip helped her to 'stop taking myself so seriously.')

A central concern of Sara's is the relationship between the systemic (racism, oppression, colonialism) and the personal, and how personal experiences with Others affect these systems and theoretical constructs, and vice versa. She reflects upon the value of these travels to the Global South. Are they worth it? She believes yes: they complicate theory and help make it more truthful.

***Nell***

*I remember being so excited to go, and excited when I was there, and afterward. And I loved the landscape, thought it was just such a beautiful place. . . . And I think that the most powerful element of the trip for me was the relationships. I remember just feeling like it kind of cracked open my world.*

Since graduating in 2004, Nell has earned a degree in international development studies, travelled to Europe, volunteered with *Katimavik*, and worked with community development organizations in Winnipeg. Today she is

extensively involved in university student politics and leadership, and anticipating a career in law or government administration.

Nell's most compelling Costa Rica memories have to do with developing close relationships with her host family, amidst all the strangeness and difference, and feeling a profound sense of home and familiarity with her hosts.

Nell links her present day rejection of materialism (she still does not own a TV), and her involvement in local social justice issues to the Costa Rica experience. And she wonders whether her current skepticism of a 'lot of international development work' began in Costa Rica. Today she believes strongly that 'the people who need to lead development work are those whose community is being developed (and that) Westerners need to fix our own exploitive systems before fixing others.'

***Lauren***

*It was the first step into realizing what the world was like . . . [and] toward independence, to do things more on my own. . . . I think [the Costa Rica experience] does lose meaning in some sense. I think it becomes one moment in your life that happened and you're very passionate about*

*for a while, and then comes the next thing you're passionate about.*

Since Costa Rica, Lauren has studied international development, travelled, and working in an array of international locales – Thailand, Turkey, Sri Lanka, Laos, Vietnam, Cambodia, and Syria. In the fall of 2011, she embarked on a graduate program at York University studying nationalism in diaspora groups.

Lauren's foremost thoughts on the Costa Rica experience had to do with development. Costa Rica, she said, figures prominently in how she feels about international development today. She talked about how her host family was 'wonderful' and 'loving' – and pondered how their 'big rich' house did not fit into the community (wondering how a Marxist analysis might shed light on this contradiction). Overall, Lauren was surprised at how limited her concrete memories of Costa Rica were.

A theme Lauren returned to throughout the interview was international development: how quickly she became disillusioned with International Development Studies after Costa Rica, and how her subsequent international travel, study, and work experience have taught her that many international development programs, including global

citizen-like internships, may increase barriers between 'hosts' and 'guests,' between 'helpers' and 'helped.'

***Bill***

*Well it was certainly really interesting to experience a different culture in a different place and actually live there for a bit, to become a little bit more immersed. I almost feel like it was wasted on my 17-year-old mind a little bit.*

Bill is one year away from completing medical school. After high school, and before med school, he travelled in Europe, went on a month-long canoe trip in the Canadian Shield, and worked at a ski resort in the Canadian Rockies.

Bill struggled a little with recalling noteworthy memories. Even though he remembered a lot of events, people, and places, and the trip was certainly memorable (especially getting to know his host mom), its significance to his life now, he said, is somewhat diluted with all that has happened since. He was sorry that his Costa Rica travel journal had gone missing, as it contained important insights and reflections.

Bill wonders whether he might have gotten more out of the trip if he had 'been older or maybe better prepared,' or 'maybe if I spoke Spanish, or had the opportunity to

explore on my own.' Overall, he says, the trip certainly made an important and lasting impression. If he were to go back there now though, he would take more time to explore the cities.

***Lily***

*It made me . . . less judgemental. It's made me sit down and look around and listen instead of telling someone how to do something; listening to what they think. And I think that has stuck through me while I've travelled, but also now being a life coach as well. It's all about empowering people to be the best version of themselves. It made me realize how powerful listening is.*

Since graduating high school, Lily has earned a degree in environmental studies, travelled throughout Europe, and worked in England and France. Today she has a career, 'doing exactly what I was meant to do, helping people realize their dreams' as a life coach.

Lily's most compelling memories of the trip were developing special connections with her host family and encountering an incredibly responsible and caring community. It allowed her 'just to relax into that culture, not be afraid of differences.'

Lily acknowledged that only over the last couple of years has she begun (truly) understanding 'what (she) learned there and what was important and how it influences the person (she is) today.' Several times in our conversation, she talked about how the trip helped her to become more herself – truer to herself (compassionate and open). She admitted to filtering the Costa Rica experience through the lens of someone growing up on a self-sustaining farm, seeing nurturing and symbiotic relationships everywhere.

***Emma***

*I find that being able to embrace yourself into someone else's culture is something you can only learn by travelling a lot. . . . One thing I have difficulty with now is that there aren't that many opportunities like that for young professionals. The opportunities exist in high school. The opportunities exist in university. But there are very few opportunities like that for young professionals.*

As of August 2012, Emma had travelled to all seven continents (studied in Singapore; backpacked in the Middle East and Europe). She holds a B.A. in Commerce and is employed as a product manager at a large telecommunications firm in Winnipeg.

Emma's strongest memories of Costa Rica have to do with living with her host family: what she and her host sisters learned from one another, how attentive her host parents were, and how similar this family was to her own.

Emma says her most enduring learning, one which has informed and been confirmed by all subsequent travel, is this: the importance of immersing yourself in, and embracing and adapting to others' cultures when travelling, living, or studying in foreign contexts. This is hard work, she says; but the Costa Rica experience taught her that she can do it. Emma believes that these types of travel/ practicum opportunities should be accessible to all, regardless of age or station.

***Matt***

*It was a very humbling experience for me just in terms of possessions . . . because it is a lot more wasteful society here as compared to down there. So I try not to consume to a max amount. It makes a guy think about the carbon footprint. I think if I would have known then what I know now, I would have been able to get a lot more out of it – possibly because of my ignorance at that age.*

Matt's existence since 2003 has been somewhat unsettled (his words), from leaving ballet school (he broke

his back), to welding, to restaurant work, to business school, to working in Russia and Ukraine, to backpacking in Australia. Recently he has settled in a small city in Saskatchewan where he owns and runs a tattoo shop.

When talking about Costa Rica, Matt, more than anyone, spoke about memories and learnings that matched specific course objectives (e.g., the political, economic, and cultural differences between Canada and Costa Rica). He remembers being in awe of Costa Rica's natural beauty, and of a concomitant and growing awareness of Canadians' materialist and privileged life style.

Matt 'loved' the experience and 'learned a lot;' but he wonders whether he might have gotten more out of it if he had been a little older. The Costa Rica experience, Matt says, helped him navigate Russian culture many years later, preventing him from having a 'nervous breakdown' while working there.

***Jacob*[1]**

*I will today do anything for anyone if it benefits them. I don't care at all. I have helped tons of small start-up businesses in Toronto get their feet on the ground, not financially but with free consulting services, even if I don't*

*know them. I will do anything for anyone. And it all stems back to this Costa Rica trip, everything.*

Since graduating high school, Jacob has earned a university degree in fine arts (photography), free-lanced with the *Montreal Gazette*, earned a second degree in international business, and started two businesses in Toronto, which he currently owns and manages. For the past eight years he has volunteered at a B'nai B'rith wilderness camp in northwest Ontario.

Jacob's favourite experience and main reason for signing up for Costa Rica was the opportunity for volunteer work. However, in spite of initial anxiety, his most enduring memory was living with his host family – feeling their welcome, care, and love, particularly his elderly host mom's – and experiencing the pulse of the community. He was 'very sad' to leave.

Jacob says it was the Costa Rica experience (studying and travelling with others, living with local hosts, and working in the community) that helped change him into an easy-going, accepting, and generous person. Jacob was passionate and deeply affecting in talking about his memories, and of the lifelong effects of 'Costa Rica.'

---

As can be seen and imagined, each individual brought a distinct perspective, insight, and set of memories to the conversation; and each interview developed its own communication dynamic and culture. However, as the summer of conversations unfolded and the interview transcriptions began to pile up, and in the midst all of the different responses to the questions and queries, several themes began to emerge. They appeared as if materializing from a disparate merging of individual texts, revealing the truth of a central tenant of phenomenology: There is an essence to shared conscious experience that can be mutually understood and to which meaning can be ascribed. And so, even though what participants said and how they said it varied and differed, there were several clusters of memory and meaning around which their accounts began to revolve.

First, participants' recollections spoke to notions of change, changes that correspond to Merriam, Caffarella, and Baumgartner's (2007) understanding of transformative learning: a dramatic and fundamental change in the way people see themselves and the world in which they live. For many, Costa Rica 2003 represented an experience that transformed their perspective of the world, their sense of identity and agency, and their relationship to global Others.

Second, participants' memories spoke of the significance of the home-stay experience. Usually, their most intense experiences, for good or for ill, and those that gave rise to the transformations delineated earlier, derived from living and interacting with host families. Third, participants' musings raised a critical question about the role of teachers-facilitators, revealing a confounding paradox at the heart of their role: How and when are teacher-facilitators most effective in helping students cultivate traits of world citizenship? Finally, participants admitted and pondered the provisional, malleable, and at times confusing nature of memory, particularly as it informed their understanding and meaning of the Costa Rica experience.[2] But even so, all talked of the experience as having significance in the course of their lives. And what they said of it, in a phenomenological sense, suggested an essential lived experience, or set of experiences that were shared and a consciousness of their reverberations to this day.

I turn now, in the next chapter, to a fuller explication and exploration of what these clusters of memory mean, how they relate to literature on world citizenship education, and how, in the end, they speak to the questions about global citizenship practicums that originally inspired this

project. In other words, how do these memories inform what we already know, and how do they enlighten the vocation of teaching and education? (See Appendix II for a full accounting of the data gathering process and interpretive methodologies that were used in conducting the revisit and sifting through the interview transcriptions.)

## Endnotes

[1] One of the purposes of my going back was to compare my memories of CR'03, with the memories of participants. There are two stories that have become particularly iconic in my mind the past nine years. I have written about them and told them often, drawing singular meanings and conclusions. I was curious whether the two protagonists, Sara and Jacob, remembered these stories as I did, and with similar interpretations and conclusions. Here are their responses after reading my version of the story.

*Sara*

Lloyd: Did you recognize yourself in the story?

Sara: Yeah. The crier. I'm always the one that cries.

Lloyd: But there were other people that were crying.

Sara: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. So I thought about that a number of times since then because at that time the way I experienced that was . . .

Lloyd: Do you remember the experience?

Sara: Yeah, totally.

Lloyd: So I got it right.

Sara: Yeah. Yeah. Absolutely. Yeah, I totally remember that experience, and at that time I

think I was thinking . . . The concept that I came away with was cultural imperialism. I understood where imperialism was but then maybe I started thinking about cultural imperialism and that was the lens through which I understood that trip to the mall, where I thought, "What is the mall doing in this pristine place? This mall, this dirty thing of capitalism that belongs to us, that we've imposed . . ." You know? Which is a weird way of thinking about. That's what I was feeling about so strongly and since then I would maybe understand it's a little more complicated than that, like, people want all of our, you know, evil . . . At that time for me that experience was really about the tragedy, that mall experience was really about the tragedy of globalization. And since then different ways I've pieced it together . . . maybe I had this notion of a pure space being contaminated, which is strange.

*Jacob*

Lloyd: Yeah, talk a little bit about that [story]. Is that how you remember it as well? Or how do you remember it?

Jacob: I definitely remember being in that school hall. It was like the younger school. And on top of a hill. I remember walking in there. It was totally fine. But it was very segregated, obviously. It was like a junior high dance. It was exactly like that. Us on one side of the room, and the locals on the other side of the

> room. We were probably a bit tired, and we were kind of like, "Where are we?!" They were just super excited to have us, have this program set up for us. There was sort of a school-like ceremony that they had prepared for us. It's all coming back to me right now actually. And then I guess we went into some sort of formal introduction. And then we learned who our host families were going to be. And then, yeah, you wrote your story, exactly that is what happened. But what most people don't know is that when she hugged me, she said to me, "I don't have coffee in my house. I don't have coffee."

Both Jacob and Sara remembered the account as I described it, and generally the meaning I derived. The two events that I remembered because of what felt like a deeply affecting awareness-shifting experience were remembered by the people at the centre of that experience for similar reasons. However, both Sara and Jacob added to the story, further informing its meaning, and thus raising issues of interpretation and perception.

In Jacob's case, he remembered and experienced a specific gesture no one else did. None of us witnessed the host mom apologize for not having coffee, demonstrating an eloquent awareness of what is expected of a host (to have coffee). It raises the issue of how the roles of guest and host shape expectations, assumptions, and perceived outcomes, and also raises the question of whether we all felt the same thing that night, an instance of human and universal connection. We do not know for certain.

The grandmother has not spoken. And so it must be remembered that this interpretation of a shared event is that of the guests. It is *their* memory – of an embrace that left them feeling less fearful and more connected.

In Sara's case she elaborated on what had upset her in the mall: a stark and in-your-face unveiling of Western imperialism; and it shook her existentially. However, today she sees her response as being a little 'weird,' lacking perspective and nuance. She is less certain of the veracity of her interpretation at the time: 'a pure space being contaminated.' Still, it must be noted that Sara saw and reacted to a real concern Ritzer (2007) calls *grobalization*: unparalleled development (read Westernization) in some parts of the world and cultural and economic impoverishment in others due to reduction or elimination of the role of the local. Sara's eight-year-older self was less certain of her previous 'black-and-white' judgement – wondering whether it might be a little more 'complicated' – bringing to mind Pieterse's (2004) theorizing on a variety of 'hybrid' forms of culture that evolve from a combination of global and local cultures.

[2] Through the course of the interview, most participants talked about the character of memory. Much of what was said, questions and issues that were raised, while informing the nature of the revisit, are beyond the analytical and interpretive ambitions of this book (e.g., How much of memory is shaped by subsequent experience and current states of mind? How is memory affected by the human proclivity to mythologize? Can we ever conclusively know how past experiences affect

current life and circumstance?), and so their analysis will be left for another time. However, these musings did provide a critical function: First, they served as a reminder of the fluid, subjective, and constructed nature of this account, it being a compilation of the recollections of 12 individuals subject to the human impulses of posturing and mythicizing, and relying on memories that are subject to current and fluctuating states of mind and emotion. Second, the participants knew this; and so it demonstrated the group's perspicacity and candour. Third, and most importantly I think, in spite of the subjective nature of memory, individuals' accounts of what happened and how they made sense and meaning, corresponded, overlapped, and associated. Clusters of interrelated and interconnected perceptions emerged; and horizons were fused, broadened, and extended. And this is the substance on which this account, this book, rests.

# 5

# WHAT IT MEANS

*You know theoretically things make sense really easily and connect in ways that make sense, and lead to strong polemical positions, etcetera. Things are always more complicated on the ground.*

- Sara

What these former students, participants in Costa Rica 2003, remember of their experiences, and what sense they made from these memories for their lives today – what they learned, and how they were changed – informed the questions and issues raised in literature and from my personal experience. I draw attention to six significant revelations.

## Dewey and Experiential Learning

A first and most obvious revelation is the long-term impact of experiential learning, particularly in this case, on acquiring qualities commensurate with cosmopolitanism. This is not really a great surprise. Pedagogues from

Aristotle to Dewey have grounded their learning theories on life experience and critical reflection. Paraphrasing Dewey (1916), life experience is the root of all learning; all else is capricious. And philosophers from Rousseau to Appiah have called for 'slow' travel abroad, in other countries and cultures, to learn the dispositions, perspectives, and skills of citizenship, global and otherwise. The greatest learning – the things that were most compelling recalled, and from which clear, easy, and obvious links were made to life, work, and thought today – had to do with life experiences in Costa Rica, particularly the ones most fraught with interpersonal challenge, newness, and uncertainty: getting to know and live with local families. Jacob's story of meeting his host mom most poignantly signified this, as did many recollections of his colleagues. That it might be so was foreshadowed by Dewey (1916) a century ago, when he said in the midst of developing his body of work on experiential learning,

> In final account, then, not only does social life demand teaching and learning for its own permanence, but the very process of living together educates. It enlarges and enlightens experience; it stimulates and enriches imagination. (p. 6)

And furthermore, as Matt learned and subsequently advised: "Go travel somewhere, go figure something out about yourself, because when *we're most uncomfortable we learn the most,* which I think is really good about being separated in those families." This echoes Greene (1995), who says,

> Go intentionally in search of something and seek out the kind of understandings needed for the search, for moving toward what is not yet known. In this search, a refusal of the comfortable is always required, a refusal to remain stuck in everyday-ness. (p. 175)

The efficacy of this approach to learning, this pedagogy, has been confirmed and explained by researchers and scholars since Dewey. As referenced in Chapter Three, Mezirow (1991) argues that learners are holders of meaning who are transformed when they encounter different and disorienting experiences. Freire (1997) maintains that learners need to encounter 'disorienting dilemmas' or situations that do not fit their 'currently held paradigms.' Many other practitioners and researchers have found that because home-stay experiences are rife with dissonance, disorientation, and difference, they can be critical and indispensable in cultivating qualities of mind associated with global citizenship (Norris

& Gillespie, 2009; Pence & Macgillivray, 2008; Stachowski & Mahan, 1995).

In short, recollections of participants' experiences in Costa Rica corroborated the insights and findings of experiential learning theorists, researchers, and practitioners. But what specifically of cosmopolitan import was learned or taken or acquired; and, beginning with Matt's entreaty, what was 'figured out about the self' in that regard?

## Nussbaum and 'Know Thyself'

Participants revealed a growing and critical awareness of themselves and the place from which they came – their communities, society, and culture. This was particularly evident in how they interpreted their hosts' attitudes toward community, material possessions, and the environment; and the subsequent comparisons they made between Costa Ricans and Westerners. Lauren's thoughts are representative: "[We were forced] to think about where we were from and why we did things the way we did, whether that was a factor of our family upbringing, or community in general, or just our culture." Sara's reaction in the mall most dramatically encapsulated this critical

response: "seeing for the first time something about who we were and where we came from."

What has this to do with global citizenship? According to scholars like Nussbaum and Schattle, cosmopolitan perspectives and global engagement begin with critical self-awareness. Nussbaum (1997a), drawing on Socrates' concept of self-examination and Aristotle's notions of reflective citizenship, argues that this approach to education "liberates the mind from the bondage of *habit and custom*, producing people who can function with sensitivity and alertness as citizens of the whole world" (p. 8). Similarly, Schattle (2008) referencing several of his 'global citizens' concludes: "Self-awareness, then, can be considered an initial step of global citizenship and the lens through which further experiences and insights are perceived " (p. 29).

Interestingly, to turn Nussbaum's phrase, in the case of the CR[1] participants, *because* their customs and habits were necessarily upset, and through the process of encountering others and being sensitive and alert to their differences, they became more self-aware, and bondage to a habit and custom became liberated. In other words other-awareness preceded self-awareness. But, was this truly the case? McIntosh (2005) says that ideally the processes of

looking outward and inward happen simultaneously; one educates the other, leading to a more whole and globally oriented person. In talking about her global curriculum she notes,

> Ideally it provides a balance of 'windows' out to the experience of others and 'mirrors' of the students' own reality and validity. When curriculum serves as both 'window' and 'mirror,' students are helped to become whole-souled, complex people. I imagine them as potential citizens of the world, having developed both identities of their own and interconnectedness with others. (p. 32)

Similarly, Schattle, using the metaphor of porous membranes, talks about how self-awareness and other-awareness are linked, each affecting and informing the other. In the case of CR participants, their experience demonstrates that seeing and engaging others necessarily enlightens oneself and one's place, and perhaps in ways indispensable. Merryfield and Subedi (2001) contend, that by encountering the lived experiences of people different from ourselves and seeing that our views are not universally shared, world consciousness is cultivated – our minds become less 'colonized,' our outlooks more global.

An arising and relevant issue must be noted: Participants interpreted and filtered their encounters and looks 'outward' through and within the context of their previously lived experience, including their desires, wishes, and positions. The question remains: How might their accounts and interpretations and awakenings have been affected by these predilections? And how might they be enlightened by the interpretations and accounts of their Costa Rican hosts?

In the quest for critical self-awareness, for making one's thoughts one's own and not the mindless formulations of others or the thoughtless acceptance of whim, fashion, or habit (Arendt, 1958; Meade, 1996), Nussbaum (1997a) warns against normative Arcadianism, describing it as "imagining the Other as untouched by the vices of one's own culture" (p.134). She claims it frequently takes the form of imagining the non-West as paradisiacal, peaceful, and innocent, by contrast to a West that is imagined as materialistic, corrupt, and aggressive. Did participants' talk reveal this tendency? Several did. For example, when Sara told her mall story, she added this:

> I understood where imperialism was but then maybe I started thinking about cultural imperialism and that was the lens through which I understood that trip to the mall

> where I was like, 'What is the mall doing in this pristine place? This mall, this dirty thing of capitalism that belongs to us, that we've imposed . . . '

But then her eight-year-older self said:

> Which is a weird way of thinking about it. That's what I was feeling about so strongly and since then I would maybe understand it's a little more complicated than that. Maybe I had this notion of a pure space being contaminated, which is strange.

But this is, as Nussbaum would characterize, normative Arcadianism. When Jayne first spoke of Pedrogoso, she talked of being drawn to the community for its non-materialistic values, caring community, and connection to the natural environment: "I want to be with those people. And I want to have the hope and life that developed in me while with them." But then she paused and said, "But that's . . . I'm also idealizing their world, I guess. So I've idealized my notion of Costa Rica." In short, and in note, both Sara and Jayne demonstrated some of Nussbaum's normative Arcadianism tendencies, but both also, eight year later, recognized it. Had the intervening eight years helped to contextualize their interpretations?

Finally, in talking about self-awareness, and about the importance of knowing oneself so as to engage the

world more wholly, both McIntosh and Schattle refer to implications for identity, arguing that the process of engaging the world leads necessarily to a multivariant and fluid and more whole identity. And by so doing, they open the contested and controversial issue of cosmopolitan identity and loyalty.

## Schattle and Identity

Identity and selfhood are perceived and conceived of in different ways. Some consider identity to be grounded in the concrete details of our lives (Himmelfarb, 1996), others see it as fluid (Bankowski & Christodouliids, 1999) and multifarious (Sen, 2005), or multi-determined and deriving from the intersectionality with other selves (Kincheloe, 2005). Still others say that personhood is best understood as imagined (Souter in Hall, 1996), or evolving and always in process of becoming (Freire, 2007; Hall, 1996). Byrne (2001) and Senehi (2009) contend that identity is at the root of most conflict, both personal and international, and therefore critical to understanding conflict and deciphering relationships of all kinds.

As recounted in Chapter Two, in the case of global citizenship, there is an exercised debate over issues of identity, particularly the contention around local-global

identities and loyalties. The basic question is this: Is it possible, or even desirable to have an identity that is cosmopolitan? Some, like Himmelfarb (1996), say no, arguing that identity arises from the particulars of one's life within the local, and since cosmopolitanism is unbounded and non-localized, global citizenship is an illusion. Consequently, one's moral allegiance is owed primarily and practically to the local, to one's fellows (Bok, 1996; Bowden, 2003; Scheffler, 1999). Others like Nussbaum say a cosmopolitan identity is possible, arguing that people's sense of human-ness is enmeshed in all of who they are, and therefore central to their sense of personhood, and the basis of a global identity. The 20th century, she says, is filled with examples of people whose actions and motivations speak to a global and human identity and allegiance. Still others, like Appiah and Sen, argue for holding both at once, characterizing identities and allegiances as fluid and permeable – contending that being able to hold both local and global perspectives is the essence of cosmopolitan selfhood. Schattle conceives of cosmopolitanism as being manifest and practiced in overlapping local and global public spaces.

Some approach the global citizenship debate in a normative sense, seeing a transnational identity as a critical

and necessary response to global integration and international conflict. For example, Kenneth Boulding (1988) said more than 25 years ago "the concept of global civic culture requires the acceptance at some level of a shared identity with other human beings" (p. 56). Two years later, at the end of the Cold War, Elise Boulding (1990) called for a cosmopolitan identity that would transcend national self-interest. Byrne (2001), who has written extensively on the Northern Ireland conflict, sees post-modern *EU* as a hopeful and normative model for creating a supra-national identity, one that for the sake of inter-state peace must replace obsolete national identities.

Back to Costa Rica 2003, how did the participants' experience inform this debate on identity? It is noteworthy that in over 160 pages of single-spaced interview transcription text, the term 'Canadian' is used only twice as a personal identifier. Does this mean that participants were not much conscious of a national self? Possibly, and there might be several reasons.

First, Pike (2000b) has found that in contrast to their American counterparts, global education practitioners in Canada and the UK rarely mention their respective nations. This is so, he says, because the curricular focus in the UK and Canada is on global issues and themes, whereas the

American curricular concern is with comparing cultures and countries. The implication is that students in Canada and the UK are less attentive to individual countries, including their own. Furthermore, Richardson's (2008) research indicates a growing trend in Canadian youth thinking of themselves in global rather than national terms. Second, Schattle found that most of the global citizens he interviewed, many of whom had travelled or worked abroad in their youth, "flatly rejected the notion that one's source of national identity should be seen as restricted" (p. 29). They saw themselves as more than citizens of their countries. Participants' experience in Costa Rica may have had a similar effect, shifting their affiliation and allegiance to something larger than Canada. Third, and finally, it may also have had something to do with what it is to be Canadian, and Canadians' existential doubt about what it means to be Canadian. All three reasons may help explain the lack of Canadian identifiers in the text, and their almost complete absence in respondents' lexicon. And it could be concluded that 'Canadian' was not consciously foremost and relevant in participants' identity.

However, there is a critical and parenthetical aside and an arising issue: At one point in our interview, Jayne (one of two people who used the term 'Canadian') said,

"Do I think (our host mom) saw us as Canadian? I still don't know what Canadian is . . . I never thought of her as being Costa Rican." Jayne's revelation may help confirm the conclusion above, but it may also suggest a conscious and purposeful masking or re-masking of Canadian identity. Silence or confusion on Canadian identity may not necessarily mean absence. When I asked Jayne about this, she explained that as the relationship with her host mom became more intimate, as layers of identity were peeled back, national 'distinctives' were the first to fade away. However she puzzled about whether they might have been present still in some unconscious or unspoken forms.

Back to the originating issue, if people did not principally identify as Canadian, nor view their hosts primarily as Costa Rican, what of the broader identity marker, 'global citizen?' The text is equally devoid of it. It is used only once – this in spite of global citizenship being in the course title, embedded in its raison d'être, and used throughout the one-page backgrounder sent to participants prior to the interviews. Does this mean participants were equally oblivious to either being global citizens or to the notion of global citizenship? Perhaps. However, even though they may not have identified with the label, their

responses spoke to a growing sense of global mindedness and identification with a common humanity.[2]

The discovery participants most talked about had to do with witnessing familiarities in the day-to-day lives of their host families, and feelings of connection and affiliation with the same – this amidst the admitted different and foreign – reflecting Nussbaum's (1996a) contention that the task of global citizenship education is "cultivating the factual and imaginative prerequisites for recognizing humanity in the stranger and the Other" (p. 133). That the practicum might have had this effect is evidenced by participants' observations, like this: "A gesture seems to be able to convey a thousand words and seems to be so universal;" "They went about their lives much the same way we do here: 'Where are we getting our food? Who's going to work? Are the kids getting to school?';" "People talk about their families, people talk about the relationships in their family, people talk about their careers, people talk about their schooling;" "Different people all bicker over small things. . . . People have the same passions for the same type of things, whether it be different sports or a different type of art or they're passionate about certain types of music and dancing and . . . ;" "Just how the families interacted; how the siblings fought

amongst themselves; how everyone cooed over the baby when it showed up."

Scarry's (2000) study of European literature showed that the human capacity to imagine the Other is limited; consequently she doubts the veracity of cosmopolitan identities. Greene (1995) agrees that the imagination is critical for seeing others, but unlike Scarry, believes there are ways of cultivating imaginations that are favourable to forging cosmopolitan identities and building a common world amidst diversity and difference. She thinks it is more likely to happen when people have personal encounters with others, thereby seeing others' lives bound up with their own. The experience of Costa Rican participants supports this notion, serving as a means of recognizing a related humanity in others, and giving rise to a bearing that transcends national distinction and geographic allegiance.

With regard to the local-global debate, Ignatieff (1993) and Walzer (1996) make the point that since we actually live in the local – our language, culture, and communities – and not in some 'airy' global villages, we can only understand what it means to have global fellows and to be morally connected to a global community, through first experiencing relationships in the local – with family, friends, and citizen fellows. And according to

participant reports, the global Other, the foreigner, the stranger became a citizen fellow, a friend, a baba, once these foreigners and strangers were experienced as locals and in the domestic.

In summary, in terms of identity and allegiance, eight years later when participants talked about the CR trip, they did not see themselves so much as citizen types – local, national, or global, with undue allegiance to any of these identity markers – but as individuals from one part of the world who had visited another, albeit strange and different and less 'developed' (The most commonly self-referenced identity was Westerner or Global North/First Worlder). And through this experience they were awakened to similarities and a 'humanity' of people everywhere – a basis for world citizenship. As Benjamin Barber (in Schattle, 2008) says, echoing the sentiments of Greene and Nussbaum, "citizenship is a dynamic relationship among strangers who are transformed into neighbours whose commonality derives from expanding consciousness rather than geographical proximity" (p. 26).

## Greene and Agency

Speaking of expanded consciousness, here are several initial responses to the CR'03 experience: "It was

the first step in realizing what the world was like;" "[I] learned you can't make assumptions about anything;" "It opened my eyes to a lot of things;" and "It kind of cracked open my world." For many respondents, when they spoke of an expanding awareness of the world, they were speaking of their own worlds, of awakening to a broadened sense of possibility and independence.

As observed in Chapter Three, the most commonly reported impact of global citizenship practicums (or variants, like study-abroad programs and international service learning) – particularly those that emphasize community work – is an increased sense of self-confidence and agency. Recently, as an example, in a survey conducted by Norris and Gillespie (2009) of 17,000 college-aged study abroad students (*Institute for the International Education of Students*) spanning 50 years, 96 percent of all respondents "attributed their experience to increasing their self-confidence, a quality that can assist in a multiple of future endeavours" (p. 391). Many of the CR participants spoke similarly about the impact of their experience. Most particularly, they talked about how it helped open possibilities and cultivate confidence for travel, learning languages, engaging in local community service and post-secondary studies.

According to Dewey (1916),

> Growth depends upon the presence of difficulty to be overcome by the exercise of intelligence. . . . The problem [must] grow out of the conditions of the experience being had in the present, and that it is within the range of the capacity of students; and secondly that it is such that it arouses in the learner an active quest for information and for production of new ideas (p. 79) . . . The goal is to lead out into an ever expanding world of subject-matter of facts, information, and ideas. (p. 87)

If this is the case, then for these participants – those with a demonstrated desire and capacity to learn and think and do more because of Costa Rica – the CR practicum struck the right balance between difficulty and capacity. Dewey also says that one can know if an experience is truly educative if a learner subsequently has an "added power of direction and control" (p. 74), and acts with less helplessness and capriciousness. Again, according to their accounts, for many participants, the CR experience seems to have fit the bill.

But what of participants' lives now? Can any definitive links be made to their lives today and the awakened sense of agency experienced eight years ago?

Here is Adrienne's reaction after reading about participant lives and their interview responses:

> I was amazed to discover (again!) what a tremendously gifted group of kids we were privileged to travel with. When I read of their various accomplishments, so soon, so young, I couldn't help but wonder if they would have gone so far – in so very many different ways – without the experience of Costa Rica. Many of them are quick to recognize the influence the trip had on their lives. But it's the whole business of cause and effect, again. Were these kids attracted to an experience like that one because of family values, natural curiosity, and intelligence, and even without CR, would have gone on to do amazing things? Or was CR such a dramatic event in their lives that it propelled them beyond their normal trajectory into a wider acceptance of all things different, a taste for adventure and risk, a thirst for greater connection, broader communion? Finding the answer would require investigation into the ethos of their individual families, their early education, their exposure to people and ideas.

Adrienne is right of course. How would one ever know, given the multiple contingencies between then and now and before? However, CR or not, participants' lives today – their perspectives, attitudes, actions, studies, and work inform of a deep sense of agency and possibility.

Some talk of direct links to CR, others not, but here they are again: Emma has a degree in commerce and has travelled to all seven continents. Today she travels at every opportunity and is working to make CR-type practicum opportunities accessible to young professionals. Bill, post CR, travelled throughout Canada and Europe for a year. He then entered medical school, and just this past year graduated as a medical doctor. Jacob, with university degrees in fine arts and international business, is running two businesses in Toronto; and today says he will do anything for anyone, and 'it all stems back to the Costa Rica trip.' Jayne, has a graduate degree in English literature from the University of Victoria, and is currently studying her 'joy,' naturopathic medicine in Portland. She looks for every opportunity to reconnect with nature and with the hope and life that 'developed within her' in CR. Lily has a degree in environmental studies, lived for a while in England and France, and is now doing 'exactly what she was meant to do, helping people realize their dreams.' CR, she says, taught her to be less judgemental and to 'sit down and look around and listen.' Matt, since CR, has travelled widely, and today owns a small, successful business in Saskatchewan. He talks of CR heightening his environmental consciousness and how,

because of that, he is today ahead of the current and popular 'green wave.' Sara is a Ph.D. candidate studying policing, gangs, and criminalization in the context of Canadian colonialism; and she is grateful for CR complicating notions of oppression. 'Muddying' theory with life experience is something she welcomes in her research today. Maya, with a degree in French literature and linguistics is fluent in three languages, works as an ELA teacher in Spain, and continues to travel and 'adventure while she can.' Lauren has travelled to South Asia and the Middle East, studying politics and political theory (nationalism in diaspora groups), and is about to graduate with a Master's degree in political studies at York University. Nell, after Costa Rica, became disillusioned with the neo-colonial bent in international development studies. She has since travelled widely, worked on local community development projects, and served for many years as an activist leader in university student politics. Today she is studying law at the University of Manitoba.[3]

Greene (1995), when describing emancipatory pedagogies – ones that honour and elicit global diversity and engender an evolving common world – says that imagination is critical to learning and essential for

developing a sense of agency. At its most basic, imagining things being otherwise

> may be a first step toward acting on the belief that they can be changed. And it would appear that a kindred imaginative ability is required if the becoming different that learning involves is actually taking place. A space of freedom opens before the person moved to choose in the light of possibility; she or he feels what it signifies to be an initiator and an agent, existing among others, but with the power to choose for herself or himself. (p. 22)

An ability to imagine a better way of being and living in the world (more humane, pluralist, just, joyful, and whole) linked with a confidence of being able to do so, according to Greene, necessarily underlies global mindedness and a global bearing. She says that the role of imagination is not to resolve, point the way, or improve, but to awaken and disclose the ordinarily unseen, unheard, and unexpected; it should serve to de-centre ourselves. What participants are doing with their lives today, whether because of Costa Rica or not, inform this sensibility and action.

## Buber and Nussbaum and 'Seeing Oneself Bound up with all Other Human Beings'

Since 2003, I have recorded my impressions – stories and memories – of the CR experience, conducted a case study with one of the participants (Nell), investigated other global citizenship programs as a participant, observer, and researcher, and read literature on the pedagogy and ethics of these types of trips/programs. What has turned up consistently, and often, is the singular impact of the home-stay experience, particularly for its influence on perspectives – one's place in the world and one's connection to global others – facilitating what Nussbaum describes as seeing oneself as a human being bound up to all other human beings by ties of recognition and concern. My impressions of, and research into the impact of the home-stay experience as discussed in Chapter Three were borne out by this revisit.

Participants' most compelling recollections derived from living with host families, and the awareness and insights that those relationships wrought. But what exactly was said about those relationships? Here is a recap: First, guest-host relationships were spoken of, and remembered with fondness and affection. For example, here is Jacob talking about the day we left Pedrogoso:

> The relationship when we were leaving was very sad. It was very sad to have to leave. I remember leaving, and everybody didn't want to go. People wanted to stay in Pedrogoso for the rest of the trip. They didn't care what else we had planned. Nobody wanted to see anything else. We just wanted to stay.

Second, participants described their families with 'familial familiarity' and a sense of connectedness (e.g., "I equivocate her to being like my baba . . . I felt so safe with her, because she was so loving . . . And I think this is why I thought of her as being my baba because I remember her being so tender and loving, but so tough."). Third, participants expressed awareness of, and appreciation for their hosts' hospitality (e.g., "She welcomed this random stranger into her home now, could be anybody and do anything . . . when she sort of opened her door for somebody."). Fourth, they talked of the many human commonalities they witnessed in their homes (e.g., "They went about their lives much the same way we do here . . . 'Where are we getting our food? Who's going to work? Are the kids getting to school?'"). And in the end, eight years later, participants perceived their hosts with humility and mutuality (e.g., "And I really got a sense of a

relationship where maybe they were doing us a favour much more than we were doing them a favour.").

How do these recollections and perceptions and meanings inform global citizenship and global citizenship education? Much has already been made of the impact of host family relationships, but here are an additional three observations, and a worrying question:

First, at the centre of the cosmopolitanism idea is a pluralism-universalism tension. In a world of remarkable and striking diversity (some say unbridgeable diversity), where global citizenship envisages a common global community in which all humanity shares membership, the cosmopolitan question becomes what is to be held in common; and how is the common to be found? Most globalists acknowledge that a sense of mutual purpose and relatedness cannot be imposed. It will, if at all, emerge from an engagement with, and respect for difference, and through encountering other people's lives. As a peace activist and sociologist, Elise Boulding (1990) has written extensively on resolving the inherent conflict between being open to others (including cultural difference) and being all-caring (implying a universal ethic). She contends that to truly encounter others' lives and to see their stories

linked with ours, and ours with theirs, one must experience *I-Thou* relationships (à la Martin Buber):

> In the *I-Thou* relationship we stand in openness before the Other (any other with whom we have to do) and let that Other be in all their wholeness and uniqueness. We may not measure, deny, or utilize the other person. We may only relate. We meet the other person. The event of meeting lies in the between-ness, in the space that must reverently be left there, between one being and another. (p. 146)

This is how Boulding says we find commonality amidst diversity, and peace amidst the tension between a need for separateness and a need for belonging.

Is this what participants experienced; these types of ideal communicative relationships, relationships where others were treated as Kantian 'ends-in-them-selves'? There were indications: Participants' expressed appreciation for their hosts' hospitality and awareness of their sacrifice and vulnerability, and they talked of their relationships in ways that that spoke of reciprocity and inter-subjective exchange. But mostly it was what they said about language. Participants universally expressed regret for not knowing more Spanish, and of their desire to learn more for 'next time.' (Several verbalized a shame for

assuming that English was spoken everywhere.) And to what end, and for what purpose? Bill spoke for many when he said, "[If I had spoken the language] I think the relationship probably would have been deeper because we would have understood each other better, or been able to share more and compare more." People desired conversations that were more expansive and fostered deeper relationships. To use Boulding's words, they wanted to 'link their story with their host,' or to 'share and compare,' as Bill would say.

With what intensity and openness people experienced Buberian-like *I-Thou* communication cannot be known. However, what people said of their hosts and of their relationships with them – and how they regarded them eight years later (with humility and mutuality, and with acknowledgments of common humanity) – implies sincere and reciprocal engagement. Political philosopher Charles Taylor (1991) contends that the practice of citizenship in the modern day is in peril because of the social malaise of atomization and fragmentation, which jeopardize engagement with different others in civic relationships. The experience of CR'03 participants serves as a hopeful counter-narrative.

A second observation has to do with the 'intimate everydayness' of the home-stay experience, and how it may help serve to bridge the local-global conundrum within cosmopolitanism. When Jayne was asked how she knew that the relationship with her host was authentic, one of the first things she said was, "The experience was quite intimate and everyday . . . meaning there wasn't much time to consider where we were and why (that we were on a trip abroad visiting foreigners) . . . I never thought of her as being Costa Rican." The implication for cosmopolitanism: Greene (1995), says when we have knowledge of the common details of another's life, it becomes less likely that we will categorize (Costa Rican) and distance (strange foreigner) them. Moreover, as Appiah (2006) contends,

> The great lesson of anthropology is that when the stranger is no longer imaginary, but real and present, sharing a human social life, you may like or dislike him, you may agree or disagree, but if it is what you both want, you can make sense of each other in the end. (p. 99)

Based on Greene and Appiah, encountering and sharing everyday intimacies will have the effect of overcoming distancing abstractions, and open possibilities for understanding different others.

Third, for many participants, the Costa Rica experience fostered an expanded sense of independence and possibility, as reflected in subsequent actions like travelling and living abroad. One of the critical determinants was the practice of independence, and the experience of freedom in new and unfamiliar circumstances and contexts. But what was it about the new and unfamiliar that fostered this expanding embrace of the world? Sharon Todd (2003) may have a partial answer. Drawing on insights from Emmanuel Levinas (1998), she argues that openness to an Other must be presaged with a willingness to be open to otherness. In the case of CR, the implication is that the very decision to participate in the program and live with a strange and foreign family in the first place signified a pre-trip openness to otherness and a desire to learn from the Other – this "being a dangerous life, a fine risk to be run" (Levinas, in Todd, p. 65). But then having succeeded, and survived the danger and the risk – learned about Others and from Others – participants' openness to otherness and desire for more of these experiences was expanded (e.g., travelling and living away) – implying an ever-expanding and interacting spiral of openness and learning.

Finally, a question: The claim is that the home-stay experience helped facilitate 'seeing oneself bound up with all other human beings.' This might have been so, but who said so and from whose perspective was it said? From whose side were relationships described? To ask a Freirean question, whose world was being named? The answer is as clear as it is obvious: the guest's, not the host's. It could have been no other way, this being the nature of the revisit research project, and its greatest limitation. And it raises the question, would the hosts have named a similar world if it were theirs to name; and would their interpretations have conjured *I-Thou* relationships and conceptions?[4]

Did interviewees take this into account, a critical perspective and interpretation in recounting their experiences and relationships with hosts and host society? Most said or implied that they did. If they did, was it the intervening eight years that cultivated this perspective; or was it an attitude they had going in in the first place; or was it a sensibility that was fostered by the practicum itself? These questions are relevant and critical to all global citizenship practicums, for herein lays a most daunting challenge for its facilitators: facilitating cross-cultural, cross-class personal visits in ways that are not distancing, objectifying, or patronizing, but are connective, inter-

subjective, and reciprocating. To do less is to impair the relationship with those with whom one is bound up.

## Dewey and Freire and Questions of Pedagogy and the Role of Teacher-Facilitator

Surprisingly, even though participants expressed appreciation for their teachers, they said or remembered little about the formal pedagogic role those facilitators played in the practicum. In many ways, this ambivalence is reflected in the literature. George Walker (2006), as head of the International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO), one of the most prestigious posts in international education, in his book *Educating the Global Citizen* says this:

> The success of every educational endeavour depends upon a teacher. . . . School buildings are important, the number of books in the library matter, the IB programmes are the gateway to an enlightened education, but without the right teachers the whole lot come crashing down. (p. 45)

But after this singular endorsement of teachers, Walker offers little in clear answers about what teachers do or could do to 'keep the whole lot from crashing down.' He is not alone. The silence on the teacher's role in teaching

has a long history, from Socrates' assertion that teaching anything is impossible (since all learning is recollection), to Heidegger's (1968) contention that teachers should just let learners learn, to Rogers' (1969) claim that teachers don't teach learners anything and are at their best when they don't interfere. Even Dewey (1916), who argued that teachers play an indispensible role in facilitating learning, notes that "we can never teach directly, but indirectly by means of the environment (p.17); [and what] conscious deliberate teaching can do is at most to free capacities [already] formed for fuller exercise" (p.19).

And yet, Todd (2003) says, "teachers, as the vehicles through which the pedagogical demand for learning to become is made real for students, cannot escape their role" (31), nor argue others (Jarvis, 1995; Van Manen, 1990, 2000), their responsibility. I agree. That the CR'03 teachers felt responsible for doing the right thing, pedagogically and otherwise, was an abiding and foremost concern. Here is Adrienne:

> I was very aware of these 13 young people I was responsible for. And so I remember, I think probably the most present memory, is getting on the bus in the morning and I could feel already even before anybody spoke, which way the day was going to go. It was like one big animal. . . . So it was that

> awareness, always. I mean it was a huge responsibility for me, and I don't think I realized till I got there just how big this was. . . . So that's probably my strongest impression, still today.

And mine. I remember sleeping only three or four hours a night, worried about the well-being – physical, emotional, educational – of those 13 young people. And what animated Adrienne's and my discussion more than any other – before, during, and after CR – was the issue of when to intervene and when to let be, for the sake of those frames of well-being. All of this suggests that Adrienne and I must have believed that we were playing a necessary and pivotal role. But what was it exactly? It turns out on closer examination of the interview data and the research literature, teacher-facilitators of global citizenship practicums, wittingly or not, perform three critical functions. And none of them have anything to do with making pedantic entreaties about global citizenship.

First, beyond the most obvious – keeping the students alive and healthy – according to participants, it is being a person who inspires involvement and participation in a global citizenship practicum in the first place. As Phillips (1998 in Todd, 2003) says, it is being an elder whose

judgement can be trusted – trusted for a particular experience's significance.

Not discounting circumstance, personal predisposition, or familial proclivities[5] to engage in international life-altering activities, when participants were asked what or who had been the greatest determinant in their decision to sign up for the Costa Rica practicum, seven named a parent; six identified a teacher or teachers. Jacob echoed what half the group said: "I knew this was something that you [and Adrienne] were interested in . . . so I knew that it would be something I would be interested in [too]." In short, the decision to participate in the program in the first place was significantly influenced by trusted adults, a parent or a teacher, or both. This implies that one of the primary influences of teachers, perhaps their most affecting pedagogy, derives not from delivering course content or facilitating pre-trip preparations, but from establishing a trusting relationship with students.

Second, teachers can help facilitate critical outlooks. According to experiential learning pedagogues, critical thinking and reflection are crucial to any effective learning derived from experience. In unambiguous terms, then, Lutterman-Aguilar and Gingerich (2002) say,

> Any educational endeavour, including study-abroad that does not structure reflection and critical analysis of the international experience itself into the curriculum is not engaging in experiential education. (p. 45)

As argued in Chapter Three, from Freirean and Deweyan perspectives, the biggest challenge for global citizenship practicums, and hence an essential responsibility of its facilitators, is cultivating critical engagement – combating thoughtless and unreflective experience, and addressing issues of power and privilege. To this end, practitioners call for pre- and post-trip critical reflection in study abroad or international service programs (Grusky, 2000; Malewski & Phillion, 2009; Sichel, 2006; Willard-Holt, 2000). For as Fred Dallmayr (2007) concludes in writing about creating a world governed by cosmopolitan ideals, it is best to create spaces for people and cultures to learn about each and from each other as equal participants.

What happened in Costa Rica? Participants had little memory of participating in formal sessions of critical analysis and reflection such as those recommended by the theorists and practitioners cited earlier. Yet there were many occasions where participants responded consciously and critically to previously held assumptions and

perspectives (questioning North American ethnocentrisms, Western cultural domination, etc.), none more emblematic than Sara's epiphany in the mall. Additionally, eight years later, when asked what advice they would give future participants, their responses were direct and unequivocal: "Keep your mouth shut and listen to what they have to say;" " Try not to judge when you see something that's different from how we do things;" "The things that you're going to learn are not what you expect; It's going to be completely different;" "Be open, lose your expectations, and accept good and bad;" "Try to immerse yourself in the situation, the families, the communities;" "Leave everything you know at home;" "If you're not going there to see everything that they're going to show you then don't go;" "Open your eyes and ears and watch and listen;" "It's important to really question everything, and never follow the line, because lines are Western."

So who or what facilitated these occasions, perspectives, or responses of critical insight? A part of it might be accounted for by a critical stance several participants took into the practicum in the first place; a part of it might be attributed to a growing awareness in the intervening eight years, as implied by Sara's observation: "As in any encounter (I realize now) it's not about the trip

itself; it's about the lens you chose to understand it through, and how you factor it into your life, how you position yourself." And a part of it may have been because of an incessant worry Adrienne and I had about students making pre-mature and ill-informed judgements of people and situations. Even though, eight years later, she and I had little memory of making open and formal appeals to think critically – as Adrienne admitted, "Unknowingly, in our blissful ignorance, we just said, 'have no expectations'" – apparently our private anxieties became public. Here is Jayne**:**

> [I remember] how we had been prepared that we were supposed to be very open to the places that we were going, and the cultural differences. There was always a big emphasis put on, 'this is cultural . . . you're going into a different culture.'

However, as time and circumstances revealed, a critical perspective requires both, openness and judgement. (See the preceding discussion on normative Arcadianism, as well as Lily and Jayne's ethical dilemma offered in this chapter's endnotes.)

Third, according to Fred Dallmayr (2007), it is fostering autonomy and independence. Dallmayr says that for students to learn to be cosmopolitan, they must be

respected for their autonomous capacities to learn and self-discover.[6] The truth of that statement was demonstrated in our debriefing sessions following the trip. Here Adrienne expresses amazement at what students had learned independently of us.

> I went with no expectation in terms of the kids, how much they would actually glean from this experience. And we came back with a lot. In our debrief after, I was amazed at what came out, stuff that I hadn't noticed or picked up on: They're very feeling, sentient beings; and they picked up a lot of interesting things.

These were things that neither she nor I necessarily anticipated or predicted; these learnings emerged from students' autonomous selves, and without any conscious pedantry on our part. Dewey (1997) says that

> perhaps the greatest of all pedagogical fallacies is the notion that a person learns only the particular thing he is studying at the time. Collateral learning in the way of formation of enduring attitudes of likes and dislikes, maybe and often is much more important than the spelling lesson or lesson in geography or history that is learned. But these attitudes are fundamentally what count in the future. (p. 48)

The most important things students learn in school, Dewey (1997) claims, are not the content of the formal curriculum per se, but are collateral, such as attitudes that affect one's bearing in the world and one's disposition to future learning and growth. This is not unlike Adrienne's observation that what students 'picked up' independently of us was of critical importance, but not necessarily part of the intended formal curriculum. It is with this in mind that Dewey (1997) said freedom is a critical pre-requisite for students to get to know themselves and their relationship to the world.

What Dewey, Dallmayr, and Adrienne suggest is that students' most important learning is self-discovered, happens autonomously, and often occurs in the cracks of the formal curriculum. But are they saying by this to just let students be, let them find themselves and their own way in the world and they will grow into paragons of cosmopolitan virtue? No, says Dewey (1916); while we may never educate directly, we do so indirectly by means of the environment, and "whether we permit chance environments to do the work, or whether we design environments for the purpose makes a great difference" (p. 18). Teachers play a pivotal role, he says, in creating circumstances and environments of balance, facilitating

experiential continuity through an expanding layering of learning experiences, and providing ongoing experiences that learners find challenging (but not so challenging or different from each other that there is no continuity between them). The goal is to foster independence and growth of an ever-expanding world.

Finding this balance between challenge and capacity was a constant worry for Adrienne and me – keeping students safe and challenged within their means, yet respecting their freedom and sentient independence, with a view to cultivating independence and growth.[7] How was our concern interpreted and experienced by participants? For Lily, having our trust was pivotal.

> The fact that we had your trust, that was huge too. That was really important, and it also I think made us more confident in how we interacted with people. Because by you trusting us made us feel like, "Ok, yeah. I'm trustworthy."

And for Jayne, seeing us as equals meant a lot.

> Adrienne and you treated us like we were one of you when we were there. Yeah. I'll never forget when we went and stopped at Adrienne's house, Lily and I did. And she talked to us like she was a student with us . . . I told my mom that this morning . . . so much of the experience was seeing our teachers in the same place as we are.

What is notable in both Jayne's and Lily's response is the impact of a teacher's 'nod.' In this case, our orientation of trust and equality was remembered vividly eight years later and interpreted with consequential significance; it shows how a teacher's trust and bearing of equanimity can confer confidence and independence. There are two implications for Dewey's learning landscape, as regards CR: First, teacher-relationships are an inextricable part of his challenge-capacity learning dynamic, cultivating students' self-confidence in their own capacities and bearing in the world. Second, if so, heed must be given to Freire's imperative that teachers' can only help learners name their own worlds – to make learning their own – through dialogical and inter-subjective relationships.

Others like Emma and Maya talked about how they felt the program's 'safety net' provided an 'extra comfort zone' and support in processing cross-cultural challenges, precursory for future independent travel. Lily, Sara, Lauren, and Nell talked of how being able to meet the challenges of the experience fostered independence and imagined possibilities. However, for Bill the trip was somewhat restrictive; he desired more freedom to explore and discover and unveil. He did not think the Costa Rica trip had had an immensely significant impact on him. Nor

did he know exactly why – citing possibilities like age, preparation, language challenges – but several times he mentioned a thwarted desire to explore on his own. These diverse accounts speak to the pedagogic challenge of facilitating group learning situations and balancing competing and conflicting needs.

Overall, based on what participants reported on their lives since '03, and using the criterion that education should lead to growth, the learning environment mostly met Dewey's challenge (or at least, to use Roger's dictum, the teachers did not get in the way). In the end Adrienne was 'amazed at what came out,' not so much through anything she or I did, but because of students' sentience. However, these students might not have been as sentient if not for an expanded sense of independence.

Rogers (1969) says the best that teachers can do is not interfere with student learning. This may be so, but teachers are pedagogically responsible for the learning environment (Dewey, 1997), and morally responsible for relationships with their students (Jarvis, 1995). In the case of Costa Rica, both of these – learning environments and relationships with teachers – may have been antecedents for students' growing independence and for them learning beyond teachers' imagined possibilities.

In summary, practicum teacher-facilitators play three interrelated roles, functions important to cultivating cosmopolitan perspectives: being trusted elders, encouraging critical reflection, and facilitating learner independence. And this raises several questions that will be dealt with in the upcoming chapter: How does one become a trusted elder, and what are the moral and pedagogical implications of being one? How is critical reflection best facilitated for cosmopolitan questing youth? How are educative teacher-student relationships fostered in young adults?

## Conclusion

Reviewing the questions that originally inspired the revisit and the subsequent ones that arose from the literature and interviews with participants, there is much to consider – too much in fact. In many ways, this entire discussion is a testament to unfolding questions and open-ended conclusions. What follows are several summative reflections, indicative of what was revealed by the case study in response to questions which animated the project.

According to the memories, meanings, and lives of the 2003 *UW Collegiate* Global Citizenship Practicum participants, high school global citizenship practicums (as short as two weeks) can, in fact, be effective in cultivating

enduring traits and perspectives of global citizenship. By encountering others and other ways of life, participants' perspectives of themselves and their societies were enlightened, and an appreciation for not-before-experienced ways of living was awakened. By living with families in intimate everyday circumstances, participants discovered universal human commonalities and a developed a sense of human relatedness – strengthening identities and broadening civic allegiances. By experiencing life and independence abroad, participants' sense of place in the world was enlarged. Self-confidence and imagined possibilities were expanded.

Also, according to the study, teachers of high school practicums play important, perhaps critical roles in facilitating the same. By being trusted elders, teachers may attract initial student participation and are given power to confer confidence and inspire independence. By reminding participants to go 'without expectations[8] and with an open mind,' they foster critical reflection and analysis. When they balance capacity and challenge, they help facilitate independence and agency.

The revisit made something else clear – Sara's dictum: 'Life experience complicates theory, but makes it more truthful.' The memories, meanings, and lives of

participants revealed a dance within the polarities and paradoxes of global citizenship education. Global identities and affiliations were realized in the local and the familial. Self-knowledge was enlightened through encounters with Others. Commonality and similarity were revealed in visiting places and people that were foreign and different. And it must be said, including these people and their perspectives in this account would have helped 'complicate theory' and make it 'more truthful.'

The study pointed to numerous questions and topics for further research, investigation, and inquiry. It also raised questions, informed issues, and unveiled implications for personal teaching practice, for the practice of global education, and for the implementation of global citizenship practicums. These are the concerns on which Chapter Six is based.

## Endnotes

1 CR and CR'03 denote Costa Rica and the '03 Costa Rica practicum.

2 See MacGinty (2012) for a discussion on growing awareness of hybridity and hybridization of identities in peace processes.

3 Each of the CR participants had proclivities, interests, and life experience coming into the practicum that foreshadowed their lives today: Jacob had a penchant for volunteerism; Nell fostered a *Foster Parents Plan* child; Lily grew up on a farm that nurtured 'relationships of all kinds;' Sara was an avid social justice activist; Matt was living independently at 16; Emma had travelled widely; Jayne had an affinity for nature and holistic perspectives; Bill had a keenly inquisitive and critical mind; Maya was studying Spanish; Lauren's role father worked for the UN in Europe. These interests, proclivities, and life experiences were evident in how each participant spoke of CR and interpreted its significance for their lives today. Dewey (1997) said: "[what] conscious deliberate teaching can do is at most to free capacities [already there] formed for fuller exercise." So perhaps this is the best that be said of CR'03: It helped release, expand, or affirm that which was already there.

4 Power, how it was perceived, understood, and exercised in guest-host relationships, informs questions over the nature and veracity of *I-Thou* connections and relationships. For example, in relationships where substantial power differentials exist, *I-Thou* relationships are impossible.

Power can be understood within the unique dynamics of individual host-guest relationships, by the global constructs of guesting and hosting, or through the socio-economic-political relationships of colonized and colonizer. Since many of the host families of Pedrogoso were financially well-off and well educated, characterizing guest-host relationships solely through a colonized-colonizer paradigm would be inaccurate. In the case of CR'03, the nature of the power relationships (who had it, who did not, on what it was based) between hosts and guests was complex and shaped by the interplay of each of the above – as revealed by how participants spoke of their host families. One way of looking at the issue of power is as Bill did. He saw power as shifting and need-dependent and determined. (See Wilmot and Hocker, 2011.)

5 Parental support and encouragement was a significant factor in many students choosing to participate in the practicum. The nature of that support was demonstrated at the 'do-or-die' meeting a week before we left for Costa Rica. (See Chapter One.)

6 Dallmayr's learning theories are an outgrowth of his observations of historical cross-cultural events, from religious exchanges between Japan, China, and India to intellectual influences of Islam on pre-Renaissance Europe. In every case he says,

> cross-cultural learning was typically not an effort to foist a doctrine or established canon on alien populations, thereby subjecting them to foreign control. Rather, in almost

> every instance, great care was taken to find resonance for transmitted ideas in indigenous cultural and religious traditions, that is, to treat the latter as the very resources needed for genuine learning and transformation. In this manner, a measure of inter-human equality was preserved, and the danger of unilateral violence or manipulation was avoided. (p. 160)

7 Adrienne and I faced daily challenges in helping students respond critically and appropriately to things they found disturbing, strange, or just plain wrong. One example: The morning after we arrived in Pedrogoso, Lily and Jayne reported that there was an old man locked up in a cage in their backyard. They were confused and scared. Here is how Lily and Jayne recounted that experience, what sense they made of it, or not, and how they saw their teachers responding.

> Lily: Something that was quite shocking to us at first was in her house. Her brother had been in an accident. I don't know when, but I think he had mental problems from that; but she kept him in a separate little house. But he had everything he needed; but there was nothing in there to speak of. I'm assuming because he might harm himself. And he was kept locked in there; and sometimes we'd wake up at night because he'd be yelling, and then our mom would kind of call back and say something in Spanish, probably to soothe him. For us it was shocking, at first

because it was so different from anything we'd seen at home, and almost a little frightening because when he yelled, we couldn't understand anything so we had no idea if it were bad things or good things. But now in retrospect, and having talked with it to you and Adrienne, that's the way that they can best deal with mental illnesses. And how that's almost better because he's with people that are familiar with him, and who care for him and love and truly take care of him.

But he might have only been there for the period that we were there, to make us feel more comfortable and safe. But that was kind of shocking; it made us think a lot, made us talk a lot about it, and come to understand why. And it was shocking because it was just nothing like what you would see here.

Jayne: I do remember the guy in our backyard that was living in a cell. He was her brother. He was our host mom's brother who had, when he was in his forties – he might have been in his fifties at the time that we saw him - he had been hit by a bus, and suffered severe brain damage. And this was the only alternative . . . there's no infrastructure in which he could be cared for. And he was incapable of caring for himself anymore. So there he was . . . there was a concrete cell built in our host mom's backyard that from our view looked like a prison cell. It had a bar door, and barred windows. On the inside

there was a toilet and maybe a sink and a concrete bed (perhaps a blanket or something). And I'm not sure if there was much else. She fed him three times a day. And I don't know if he ever came out, but she introduced us to him our first day so that we would know that he lived back there. And as far as she was concerned (I think the daughter translated for us) this was the best care he could have gotten, given the living situation that they were in, and . . . this is a very compassionate way of caring for him, I guess. (I suppose I'm still blown away by it. . . . I still can't make sense of it.) And, so I'll never forget that. I'll never forget the image of the cell because the union of love and imprisonment were and still are difficult for me to understand.

Lloyd: What sense did you make of it at the time? You still remember it.

Jayne: Remembering how we had been prepared that we were supposed to be very open to the places that we were going, and the cultural differences. There was always a big emphasis put on, 'this is cultural . . . you're going into a different culture.' And I think Lily and I both didn't really know what to do with it. So we just responded in as, 'OK, we understand.' but being pretty confused as to wanting very much to talk to you or Adrienne because we didn't know . . . I don't know, you just met these people, so how do you know. What do you compare it to? There's no . . . I'd never seen that before,

and, yeah, I don't know. Can you ask more questions so I can . . . ?

Lloyd: Do you think we should have done more, Adrienne and I?

Jayne: No. I think that would have made us feel like it was wrong, like it wasn't really supposed to happen that way, but that would imply an expectation or preconceived notion of this experience and we weren't supposed to have any of those. . . . I think Lily and I laugh about it now. Or I laugh about it, because it probably was pretty shocking, more than I probably know.

Lloyd: I remember at the time how it bothered you, not quite knowing what to do with it yourself.

Jayne: Yeah, and now when I look back on it I don't think about that part of it. And I wonder whether if that's because I feel like it was treated like it was OK. Maybe it's not OK; maybe I'm wrong. Maybe I'm still terribly confused and am only realizing that now. But I guess, had you guys come in and tried to walk us through it, I think that would have been different because we kind of had to deal with it. So, I don't know, it was our experience. And I'm glad that it was left that way.

The recollections of Jayne and Lily eight years later speak to the teaching dilemma of balancing challenge and capacity, encouraging open minds

and critical analysis, all the while guarding against ethnocentric impulse or normative Arcadianism – in themselves and in their students. They also speak to the moral call on teachers for judgement: knowing when to 'let be' and be quiet, when to intervene and how, and how to help students interpret (name?) their world. Learning that challenges one's understanding of the world, of what is right or wrong, may reverberate for a lifetime. Did Adrienne and I do the right thing? The jury is still out.

8 Adrienne and I did not want students to have expectations. But what did we mean by this? As a colleague has reminded, 'having no expectations' is in fact a nuanced statement and engages a variety of lenses of expectation. Indeed; and this is what I think we meant: My overriding concern, one birthed in my transient childhood, was for students not to make pre-mature and ill-informed judgements of people and circumstances, whether out of fear or ignorance. Adrienne's concern, arising from living and travelling abroad, was not wanting students to have 'preconceived notions of the people' in ways that might impede a flourishing engagement with the world.

# 6

# WHY IT MATTERS

*But I guess, had you guys come in and tried to walk us through it, I think that would have been different because we kind of had to deal with it. So, I don't know, it was our experience. And I'm glad that it was left that way.*

- Jayne

In this final chapter, I discuss the implications – and by extension several recommendations – that have been brought to light by the Costa Rica revisit. Specifically, how did it generate an understanding of my teaching vocation, enlighten the practice of teaching, particularly for cosmopolitan ends, and inform the purposes and practices of global citizenship practicums?

## Vocation

Feldman (2003) suggests that when we make representations of our research public, we come to understand and change who we are as teacher educators. We become more responsible. So how did this research project – this revisit – change me and for what am I now

more responsible? (I offer these musings with the hope that you may identify, consider, or feel less alone.)

As indicated in Chapter One, at the time of CR'03, I had been teaching for 15 years. I was frustrated with the standards movement in education and had come to see that my teaching effectiveness was primarily dependent on respecting learners as free and independent Subjects and helping facilitate critical reflection of the real world. I believed the teaching role called for fostering relationships with students that engendered trust and mutuality, and for engaging course content with enthusiasm and care (Kornelsen, 2006). I had concluded that underpinning all good teaching (effective and moral) is commitment and care, agreeing with Freire that "to be a good educator you need above all to have faith in human beings. You need love" (cited in Kornelsen, 2006, p. 81). My perspective was shaped by 15 years of high school teaching, and deeply affected by 15 years of parenting two children. But it was also informed by those scholars and practitioners who articulated or helped interpret teaching/parenting experience (Alexander, 1979; Buber, 2006; Dewey, 1916, 1997; Freire, 2007, 2008; Hunter 1993; Jarvis, 1995; Palmer, 1998; Schon, 1987; Van Manen, 1990; Vella, 1994; Wheatley, 1999). The Costa Rica practicum

confirmed and encapsulated these beliefs. I wrote this a few years after CR'03:

> Freire (2007) says 'Dialogical theory requires that the world be unveiled. No one can, however, unveil the world for another. Although one Subject may initiate the unveiling . . . the others must become subjects of this act' (p. 169). As a teacher in Costa Rica, I was mostly absent; I was present only in the role of fellow participant, trip organizer, and sounding board (dialogue partner?). Otherwise I was silent. Students came to their discoveries on their own: encountering new experiences, being open to them, and reflecting on their meaning. No one was there to tell them how to think or experience, or pressure them to remember. From a pedagogical perspective, they were living and thinking autonomously and freely as Subjects.
>
> Freire also says that for true dialogue to happen, teachers need to have faith and hope, faith in humankind's vocation to become more fully human and hope in the prospect of a more humane world. Looking back, I think it must have been faith in my students' willingness to be open to new worlds, and hope that high school students were capable of meaningful learning and human becoming that motivated me to develop this course and create this learning opportunity. And I think it was this same faith and hope that may have helped my

> students and me trust each other during and after the trip.

I still believe this perspective and pedagogical interpretation to be true; the revisit mostly corroborated it. However, after having talked with the CR'03 participants about the experience and their memories, these conversations and shared musings affected an understanding of my teaching vocation in ways that the foregoing account overlooks.

**Trusted Elder**

First, I was reminded of the power and inexorable responsibility of teachers. Pedantic entreaties may not carry much pedagogic weight or transformational impact in teaching cosmopolitan perspectives; this is true. But that does not mean teachers are invisible or not present or not without great influence. In the case of CR, students chose to commit to a nine-month practicum because they trusted the judgement of their teachers for a particular experience's significance. A global citizenship practicum was important to them because it was important to Ms. Roberts (Adrienne) and Mr. Kornelsen. Moreover, this trust in their judgement meant that their teachers were accorded power to bestow recognition and interpret experience (Wilmot &

Hocker, 2011). Our 'nod' to individuals, and our view on things mattered in ways that were significantly consequential years later. As McIntosh (2005) says,

> Sometimes it is the heartfelt trust of a teacher in the worth of a student . . . that produces a faith within the student that he or she is connected to the world in a way that matters, and that the world is worth caring about (p. 38).

The power inherent in being trusted must be acknowledged and carefully tended, as the moral and pedagogical implications of its use are consequential and lasting.

**Maternal Pedagogy**

Second, I came to see how my paths have crossed with other conversations where people have been working, thereby extending and enriching my work as global educator. Most particularly, and for example, are the maternal perspectives and pedagogies of McIntosh (2005) and Fiona Green (2011). McIntosh observes that those qualities essential to global citizenship are gender-related. Women and 'lower-caste' men, she asserts, throughout history have been expected to make and mend the fabric of society, and it is those very traits needed of makers and menders of the social fabric that are required of global

citizens and global citizen educators. They include capacities of awareness and respect of self, knowledge and understanding of the Other, and recognition of the interconnectedness of all life. Green, in a similar vein, says, "love and compassion are central to the practice of feminist maternal pedagogies practiced . . . by many [mothers] and feminist teachers in their relationships with [children] and students" (p. 206). Feminist pedagogy, she says, is committed to promoting egalitarian relationships and fostering empowerment and collective action. As if confirming the insights of McIntosh and Greene, it is noteworthy that in Costa Rica it was relationships with host mothers and grandmothers that inspired the most compelling memories and transformational experiences, cultivating feelings of connectedness and a sense of mutuality and commonality. And so, I am indebted to scholars like Green and McIntosh for showing me why it is the mothers and grandmothers (and how it is the maternal me) that educate for global citizenship. The quest for cosmopolitan sensibilities and bearings is realized when I teach from my maternal instincts and help my students appreciate theirs.

In sum, my vocation's call was enriched by being reminded of the nature and responsibility of the power

wielded by a trusted elder and by seeing how my maternal bearing is central to fostering and educating for global citizenship. While, in some ways, I was cognizant of these sensibilities going into the Costa Rica study, these new voices and revisited experiences named, affirmed, and extended the perceptions of my teaching self – like an evolving and reciprocating spiral – and informed the practices of global education.

## Responsibilities of a Global Educator

A while ago, in the midst of outlining this chapter, I read two letters in a local newspaper that lauded the federal government's decision to cut health care benefits to refugee applicants. One letter writer argued that taxpayers were already strapped for cash and so could not afford it; the other implied that our government owed more to Canadians by virtue of their citizenship than it did to foreigners. In the midst of my reverie, writing and thinking about global citizenship education, I found these responses both disquieting and instructive. Disquieting, in that I had assumed the health benefit issue to be a circumstance where allegiance and loyalty to humankind transcended national affiliation. Instructive in that I was reminded that my sentiments are not universally shared. World

citizenship is a contentious issue; people differ on what is owed one's fellows and what is owed the alien. And so, a qualification: My recommendations for teaching practice and responsibility are premised on the notion that allegiance is owed to others by virtue of their humanity, and that educating people to that end, for a sense of global mindedness and responsibility, is a good thing. And a parenthetical aside: I assume that one's teaching practice needs to correspond with that to which one is teaching; in other words, ends and means need to match. To teach students to become autonomous actors in the world, they need to be seen and treated as such.

The CR'03 project pointed to two teaching responsibilities that are important for facilitating enduring traits of global citizenship, particularly in contexts of global citizenship practicums. First, teachers need to be present and take responsibility for their teaching selves. Second they need to relate to students inter-subjectively. The two practices are interconnected and interdependent.

**Being Present and Taking Responsibility for One's Teaching Self**

Much has been written about how a teacher's presence or self is necessary for fostering positive learning environments and moral student-teacher relationships. For

example, in unequivocal terms, Jarvis (1995) says that to deny one's presence objectifies students; and Senyshyn (1999) adds that to reject ones individuality dehumanizes student-teacher relationships. If this is so, the teaching implications for global citizenship educators are several.

First, in the case of CR'03, not rejecting one's individuality or denying one's presence meant living and acknowledging the reality of, and responsibility for being a 'trusted elder.' Being a trusted elder carries with it distinct responsibilities, or reasons for being 'worryingly mindful' (Van Manen, 2000). As mentioned earlier, many of the CR'03 students chose to participate in the practicum because of their teachers. This is not surprising. It is common for students to sign up for global citizenship practicums because of who is leading it. Often it has to do with trusting that person and their enthusiasm for that to which they are committed, the practicum (Kornelsen, 2009c). Furthermore, it is easier for students to trust a teacher and engage with a subject if the teacher is seen to be meaningfully engaging with the subject as well, and is open to exploring it together with students (Kornelsen, 2006). This was demonstrated in a 30-year longitudinal study, in which Carson (1996) found that students' most

influential professors were those who had a passion and love for their subjects and care for their students.

And so it must be remembered and respected that a teacher's self, as expressed and manifest in her/his enthusiasms, commitments, and care is seen and felt, and can have an informing and inspiring influence on students and their choices of global engagement. It is the presence of these same enthusiasms, commitments, and caring that garners students' trust in their teachers in the first place.

Second, a teacher's presence, her or his self, consciously or not, affects students' bearing and relationship with the world. Even though many of the things students learned in Costa Rica appeared to have been by happenstance, deeply affecting concerns which Adrienne and I thought we held privately (e.g., fear of students making premature and ill-informed judgements) were felt by the students and were responded to and remembered by them eight years later. Our worries could not be hidden; they were heard and their hearing had lasting repercussions. Buber (2006) underscores this notion when he says,

> Only his whole being, in all his spontaneity can the educator truly effect the whole being of his pupil. . . . His aliveness streams out to them and affects them most strongly and

> purely when he has no thought of affecting them. (p. 125)

Buber says it is through an educator's whole being that students are most affected, implying also that teachers are at their affecting best not when exercising their teaching intentions, but when most unselfconsciously present. It follows that to minimize, subtract, or deny one's self – and the 'aliveness that steams out of one' – is to diminish opportunities and possibilities for students (e.g., involvement in the subject of your enthusiasms or responses to your deepest pedagogical worries). It negates those students who have chosen you as a teacher, and by default, an attendant teaching responsibility, being 'there,' and being present.

A teacher's whole being, or self, includes his/her enthusiasms and worries, but it also comprises her/his convictions and discernments; and if teachers are to help students interpret new experience and relate to a wider world (Dewey, 1997), these need to be present and a part of being 'there.' The implications are several. First, since global education is a moral enterprise, global educators need to engage in personal reflection at

> unusually sophisticated levels wherein teachers' thinking about their practice

> invokes personal convictions concerning global ethics and education's moral purpose. (Pike, 2000b, p. 70)

A teacher's personal convictions about global ethics and about education's moral purpose are the ground from which they are able to guide and engage student critique on arising questions and issues; so that, for example, when students on a high school global citizenship practicum discover a caged man in their host's backyard their teachers have the wherewithal to respond with insight and integrity, and to help these students who have called them teachers to make sense of their world.

Second, facilitators of global citizenship practicums need to think about their practicum from a global perspective and within a global context – to reflect on the pedagogical and moral purposes and implications of its endeavours. They need to be cognizant of the interdependent nature of the global system, how this informs the connections between the country to which they are travelling and their own, and how this may affect guest and host perceptions and relationships. A teacher's knowledge, understanding, and attitudes are important to facilitating students' outlook (the lens through which they will interpret experience), and in helping them make sense of the experience from a global and critical perspective.

How students are prepared for and given opportunities for critical reflection throughout the practicum can have greater learning consequences for global citizenship than the length of the program or the country of destination (Haloburdo & Thompson, 1998).

Teachers should remember that oftentimes the most lasting and effective critical engagements happen in the moment, at times most unexpected (for example, at the end of a long day when you are tired and two of your students, Lily and Jayne, want to talk to you about something going on in their home-stay they don't understand). How teachers respond at these times may have an enduring impact on how students interpret those experiences for a lifetime. And because these engagements happen mostly outside the classroom, not at prescribed class times, there is no stage; there is no prep time; there is no hiding – teachers need to mindful of these moments. They can prepare for these occasions through personal reflection and knowledge acquisition that inform their personal convictions, moral responsibilities, and global outlooks.

**Cultivating Inter-subjective Relationships**

Teachers need to be aware of their presence and know that it may affect students in significant and lasting

ways in how they see themselves and their relationship to the world. However, since presence necessarily entails relationship, teachers need to be equally attentive and responsive to relationships with students for the same reasons. What does this mean for high school-aged students in the context of global citizenship practicums?

At the outset, it should be said that high school students have a more mature understanding of the world than often characterized in popular culture. In a comprehensive two-year study in England on needs of students and teachers in schools, Davies' (2005) most significant finding was that high school students have a sophisticated concept of global citizens and their multiple identities. Basile (2005) uses the same word, sophisticated, in talking about her global studies high school students in the United States, observing that they are more attuned than adults often believe, despite the fact they are frequently and unfairly treated as objects. The word 'sophisticated' also describes the thirteen CR'03 students. As a group, they had a highly developed understanding of the purposes of global citizenship practicums and their own responsibilities as global learners. One of the participants reminded me of this in a post-interview email, suggesting that even before the practicum began, many participants

were already wary of making patronizing assumptions about 'helping poor people.'

The inference is that high school students should be seen and treated as independent and autonomous learners, people capable of 'naming' their own worlds. That this is the case, that high school students have this capacity, was demonstrated in CR'03 in several ways: It was apparent in Adrienne's discovery that students are 'sentient beings,' surprising us with what they 'brought back,' and with what they learned and discovered on their own. It was manifest in how students' growth in independence, imagined possibilities, and agency was associated with their experience and practice of freedom and self-reliance. It was evident in how students' perspective and relationship transformations transpired within contexts of independent and autonomous experience. Dewey (1997) contended that freedom is a prerequisite for students to get to know themselves and their relationship to the world. CR'03 demonstrated this to be so.

Is the upshot then that teachers, in contradiction of what was said earlier, should absent themselves from their students' lives and have no responsibility for, or influence on their learning? No; but it means that they need to relate to their students as autonomous subjects, as equal and free

partners in dialogue – not unlike Freire's conception of the ideal student-teacher relationship. As referenced earlier, according to Freire (2007) teachers are responsible for helping students be "considerers of the world" (p. 139), to help them move from being objects who are alienated to being Subjects who are Actors. However, since no one can unveil the world for another (i.e., teachers for learners), this can only be accomplished through dialogue, "an encounter between two people, mediated by the world in order to name the world" (p. 88). Teachers must be 'considerers' together with students, and remember that they are not so much preparing students to live in the world, but are living in the world with them, together, now, as interactive and autonomous Subjects. It was an experience like this, I believe, that prompted Jayne to say that what made all the difference for her was that teachers treated her and her colleagues as equals; teachers became learners like themselves. It freed students to experience and interpret the world in ways not otherwise imagined, as autonomous actors rather than merely objectified recipients of teacher talk.

One of the implications for teachers is that they must renew themselves, often. According to Freirean scholar and constructivist learning theorist, Andres Vercoe (1998), to

teach dialogically teachers must always approach the same topic afresh, to relearn and recreate the subject anew each time together with each new student group. It was with this mindset that the well-travelled Adrienne said this:

> I was seeing it through their eyes, like the untravelled inexperienced; because there were many of those kids who'd never been out of the country before. And I really think that I was experiencing it . . . through an adolescent's eyes. And so if there's one reason why it sticks and it stands out in my mind it would be that. I was trying to interpret that new world through these young eyes.

Adrienne's account of how she chose to live the students' experience is emblematic of what it is for teachers to teach dialogically and to relate inter-subjectively.

Even though students may learn most in circumstances of independence and autonomy and in inter-subjective relationships with their teachers, the inevitable reality of teacher power, guidance, and prescription must be acknowledged and tended to. Teacher-facilitators, wittingly or not, set tone, make decisions about power and power sharing, and help shape the learning environment. Dialogical pedagogy envisions students and teachers freely, in a spirit of mutuality, 'uncovering' and 'unveiling'

the world together. But yet, there are times when teachers are called upon to intervene and to prescribe for the sake of balancing the capacity and challenge for those taught to have worthwhile experiences (Dewey, 1997). You do not want to bring back students who are bored, traumatized, cynical, sick, or pregnant. The question is how best can teachers navigate their 'teacherly' concerns and responsibilities within inter-subjective and dialogic relationships – between respecting freedom and autonomy, and intervening and prescribing. It is a challenge in most any teaching-learning situation, whether experientially focused or classroom-based, whether youth or adult. It was a constant worry for the facilitators of CR'03. It is a dilemma on which Freire is mostly silent, though he worried about the issue later in his career (Kincheloe, McLaren, & Steinberg, 2011).

What then is the recommendation for practice? There are probably as many correct responses to this dilemma as there are teacher-student relationships. That is to say, the most fitting response probably lays within each unique relationship dynamic: the teacher, the student, and the occasion. Adrienne and I responded similarly sometimes, differently other times; sometimes she was more interventionist, sometimes I was; sometimes we got it right,

sometimes we did not. And it differed for each individual student. So wherein exists this sensibility, knowing when to let be, and when to act; and are we ever entirely cognizant of doing one or the other? And how might it best be known or practiced or cultivated? The stakes are high: being responsible for the well-being of 16- and 17-year-olds in a foreign country, often for the first time, living on their own with local families. There are no simple answers. A few years ago, in a study looking to understand the qualities of exemplary adult educators, I asked a similar question. The findings showed that exemplary educators have an instinctive sensibility for knowing when to do what, and how. It comes from experience, intuition, and training, but most significantly it is rooted in an abiding care for students and a deep respect and enthusiasm for the course material (Kornelsen, 2006). This suggests that teachers are at their discriminating best when they are mindfully present (as described previously). In other words, cultivating and navigating inter-subjective student-teacher relationships requires the sensitivity and judgement of a teacher who is heedful of her or his whole teaching self.

To summarize, in experiential learning contexts respecting high school students as autonomous learners and

being mindfully present are two interrelated teaching practices or ways of being that can be critically important in helping the young people learn about themselves and their relationship to the world, and for fostering traits commensurate with global citizenship.[1]

## Global Citizenship Practicums

In the Autumn of 2010, a representative from *Manitoba Education* informed the *Collegiate at the University of Winnipeg* that the *Costa Rica Global Citizenship Practicum 41G* course (Appendix I) did not meet the Department policy of 110 hours of student-teacher classroom contact time (standard for all courses for which *Manitoba Education* grants credits). Therefore, unless rectified, the Department would no longer grant credit for the course. Since any practicum time in Costa Rica, spent in any fashion, could not be included as official classroom contact time, the course credit was in jeopardy. The implicit message was – assuming that the credit system is a measure, marker, and recognition of student learning and educational achievement – that the experiential learning component of the course had no quantifiable educational merit.

Whether directly quantifiable or not, this revisit demonstrated that global citizenship practicums like CR'03 can have an immense, enduring, and uniquely indispensable learning benefit for participants. It is doubtful that the representative from *Manitoba Education* would dispute this, nor would the senior administrators who are responsible for implementing government policy. However, since Department personnel need to demonstrate consistency, uniformity, and quantifiability of learning inputs and outcomes to stakeholders to whom they are responsible (government, parents, and business), they need to insist on things like 110 hours of contact time. (This is not unique to Manitoba.) The situation reminds one of Kant's (1960) disgruntlement over 200 years ago, when he wrote that two difficulties in educating youth for the betterment of humankind were parents, who usually only care "that their children make their way in the world, and sovereigns, who look upon their subjects as tools for their own purpose" (p. 14 - 15).

The point is that experiential learning endeavours, especially those that aspire to educate for 'the betterment of human kind,' have a history of being challenged for their educational merit, particularly from those who are concerned with quantifiable outputs. The issue is whether

they constitute education that is worthwhile and whether they make good use of students' time. In the final part of this chapter I argue that practicums like CR'03 are indeed worthwhile. Most principally, in cultivating perspectives and bearings of world citizenry, they can serve as a vital and transformative means of peace education, and are therefore worthy of public support. However, their success is contingent on meeting a most basic and critical challenge. I conclude the chapter by looking at ways and means of addressing that challenge.

**The Aspiration**

The idea that global citizenship and peace are interconnected is not new. Most recently, since the end of the Cold War, there has been an upsurge of academic interest in world citizenship (Heater, 2002), much of it originating in the peace and social justice movements of the 1960s and '70s (Corcoran, 2004; Dower, 2003; Pike, 2000a). And not unlike the '60s and '70s, it is largely inspired by the notion that educating for a sense of global civic responsibility and perspective – one that respects diversity but transcends national and regional and ideological affiliation – will foster peace and global harmony (Boulding, 1990). As peace and education scholar

Nel Noddings (2005) says, global citizenship and peace are necessarily intertwined; one informs and makes possible the other, and education for global awareness and citizenship is basic to global peace building. Hence it follows that global citizenship practicums are a means of educating for peace. The CR'03 study showed this to be true, demonstrating that acquiring perspectives and bearings of world citizenship is a practice of peace. How so?

When peace scholars and practitioners talk of a means of educating for peace (as distinct from educating about peace) from a relational perspective, they emphasize the importance of transformations in thought processes, two in particular (Blumberg, 2006; Sinclair, 2008): a change in the way people look at and think of others, and a change in how people perceive themselves in relation to the world. Education for peace, they say, should lead to weakened stereotypes and prejudices, and greater empathy and humanization (Biton & Salomon, 2006; Lederach, 2003; Mitchell, 2002); and it should bring about a sense of personal empowerment and agency (Bush & Folger, 1994; Galtung, 1996). In the end, Galtung, who coined the phrase 'positive peace,' says peace is "presence of freedom and equity, reinforced with dialogue, integrations, solidarity

and participation . . . including mutuality, cooperation, harmony" (p. 32).

These transformations of which peace scholars and practitioners speak were evident in two changes inspired by CR'03: a transformation in how participants looked at and thought of others – with a greater sense of mutuality, integration, and solidarity; and an evolution in how participants saw themselves in relation to the world – with a greater sense of agency, possibility, and hopefulness. Both changes were reported eight years after CR'03, and today are evidenced in how participants see and live their lives. To recap briefly:

Participants experienced transformations in seeing and thinking of others, most particularly in contexts of living with host families. They experienced their hosts' humanity and generosity, awakening a sense of empathy, humility, and gratitude. They observed differences in lifestyle, relationships, and values, broadening perspectives on the world and revealing unconscious ethnocentric prejudices. They witnessed human commonalities amidst the foreign and the different, fostering a sense of solidarity and common humanity. They experienced *I-Thou*[2] relationships, cultivating a bearing of mutuality, reciprocity, and relatedness with their hosts and global associates

(Spanish-speaking foreigners and 'Third World' Others). According to participants, these changes were lasting, and have affected how they have related to the world since. Two poignantly expressed examples:

> I accept more things (now). I accept young people. I accepted working in groups better. I accepted working with volunteering and doing things for other people and not personally benefiting from those things. (Jacob)

> How do I put it in words? I just . . . I don't know what the word is – compassion for everyone in the world, whether it's another culture, whether it's another person, to really understand what is going on in their life that influences their behaviour now, whether that's on a kind of country scale, like a huge scale, or a smaller person-to-person scale. That was profound. (Lily)

In addition to how others are seen and thought of, conceptions of peace include action – participating, co-operating, and dialoguing – calling for a sense of agency and empowerment (Bush & Folger, 1994; Galtung, 2004; Lederach, 1995). A number of participants reported a growing sense of possibility and agency, something that evolved from the experiential nature of the practicum: exercising freedom and self-reliance living abroad in

foreign and strange circumstances and contexts. The experience engendered a sense of hopeful and confident possibility,[3] manifest in a desire for travel, studying languages, broadened vision of academic choice, living with greater integrity, and an enhanced openness to 'otherness' – leading to a more open and confident embrace of, and engagement with the world. Several representative examples:

> Before you do something like that [Costa Rica], it's difficult to picture what it looks like; and it seems like a really really big deal, and when you get down there things seem more manageable, and I think that really opens up possibilities for future ideas of what you can do . . . It expanded my sense of possibility. (Sara)

> And also the courage to go out there and explore, because without that experience I don't know if I would have been able to travel by myself halfway across the world. And I don't know if I would have been able to have experiences with different cultures like that. (Lily)

> I think it led me to feel that there were a lot of really interesting possibilities, and that they were available to me and that if I chose to do things I could do them, and I could travel, and I could take on challenges even if they're scary. (Nell)

It is evident that global citizenship practicums like CR'03, by cultivating perspectives and bearings commensurate with cosmopolitanism, serve as a means of educating for global peace, engendering ways of thinking and acting that correspond to Galtung's conceptions of positive peace. In a world where Danilo Zolo (1997) predicts globalization will inevitably produce further differentiation and fragmentation, global citizenship practicums work to raise consciousness of a common humanity, facilitate openness to others and otherness, and inspire a broader and more harmonious engagement with the world. These changes are primarily wrought through life experience, participants living in foreign circumstances and contexts, especially and particularly with host families. The enduring and global natures of these changes speak to the singular and efficacious educational potential of global citizenship practicums and of an experiential means of educating for and about the world that more didactic and abstract classroom approaches might not. It is for this reason that we teachers, curriculum developers, administrators, and others who work in systems and institutions of education need to support programming of

this sort, programming that provides opportunities for different others to meet in local and domestic contexts.

**The Challenge**

However, if these practicums are to realize their aspirational potential of educating for global citizenship and world peace, and serve as a hopeful counter argument to Zolo (1997), who says "terms such as global civil society, universal citizenship, world constitutionalism, and transnational democracy may be said to belong to a normative vocabulary which draws strongly on wishful thinking" (p. 153), then they must address a critical challenge referenced throughout this book. Because as Epprecht (2004) cautions,

> Work-study courses, cooperative programs, or internships in the developing world are so obviously a powerful and attractive method of teaching . . . that it is tempting to assume that the benefits automatically outweigh the risks. Clearly this is not the case. (p. 704)

And as Dewey (1997) instructs,

> Activity that is not checked by observation of what follows from it may be temporarily enjoyed. But intellectually it leads nowhere. It does not provide knowledge about the situation in which the action occurs nor does

> it lead to clarification and expansion of ideas. (p. 87)

The critical challenge is overcoming mindsets that are distancing,[4] those attitudes, perceptions, and pre-conceived notions that may blind or blinker participants to human commonality and connection, close them off from being open to others and otherness, and prevent them from more broadly engaging with the world. It is of particular concern in situations where practicums like CR'03 take place in the Global South, where participants come from relatively affluent societies vis-à-vis their hosts; and where the experience itself often exacerbates distancing attitudes. Some examples of how these attitudes may be manifest are through patronizing perspectives (Grusky, 2000); unconscious cultural invasions (Lutterman-Aguilar & Gingerich, 2002); neo-colonial mindsets (Simpson, 2004); hardened exotic stereotypes (Epprecht, 2004); and condescending attitudes (Sichel, 2006).

What to do? Even though critical theorists like Freire are pessimistic about the possibilities of bridging economic and class barriers between individuals, many practicum practitioners are hopeful. They call for engaging participants in critical reflection in the Deweyan tradition and within a Freirean pedagogy, outlining ways and means

of doing so before, during, and after the experience abroad. The goal is to understand historical, political, and economic contexts within which the practicums are taking place, with a view to cultivating relationships of mutuality and reciprocity.

What follows are several representative recommendations, chosen for their principled applicability to CR'03. Illich (1968), as a citizen of a Latin American country (a favoured destination for many North American philanthropic endeavours), says outright, do not come to help, but do come to visit. Grusky (2000), an American speaking about international service learning programs, talks of the importance of collaborating with host communities and of engaging students in critical analysis that focuses on issues of global economic inequality. Lutterman-Aguilar and Gingerich (2002), speaking about study-abroad programs that prepare students for responsible global citizenship, call for broadening students' horizons on global economic, political, and cultural issues, and for immersing students in host communities. Simpson (2004), a British researcher of gap-year programs, believes they should be solely focused on pedagogies of social justice, ones that critically recognize the existence of inequality and seek social change.[5] Epprecht (2004), a

Canadian facilitator of numerous international work-study courses, calls for cultivating humility and global consciousness before the international experience, and for linking experience and critical theory afterward. Sichel (2006), writing on altruism tourism, says participants need grounding in the political, social, and cultural context of the country they are to visit, and speaks of the importance of Southerners participating in educational trips to the North.

These recommendations, and the teaching-learning principles upon which they are based, are generally fitting for practicums like CR'03, both in terms of what was called for before, during, and after the experience, and for what was realized and learned eight years later about structuring and facilitating programs of this sort. If implemented, they should help foster mindsets of critical engagement, cultivate relationships of mutuality and reciprocity, and facilitate transformations in perspective – in short, help address the challenge of distancing mindsets. However, even though generally applicable, most of what is written about global citizenship-oriented practicums is from post-secondary perspectives. There are unique revelations that arise from the CR'03 experience – it being a high school practicum of relatively short duration – that

enlighten programs of this nature. I draw attention to three, using the Lily and Jane episode as a typical and instructive example.

As noted earlier, high school students are more sophisticated than often popularly conceived. They have a sense of themselves and of their relationship to an ever interconnected world that is complex and refined, and an understanding of learning and engaging new experience that is often more open than most (less jaded, less critical, less judgemental). This is particularly so for individuals who sign up and commit themselves to a global citizenship practicum, its rigours, risks, and obligations. And given their youth – for many, this is the first time travelling abroad – international practicums can be uniquely and significantly transformative. What are the programming implications? First, participants should be considered capable of, and sources for unique insight, in-depth knowledge, and critical perspective. Processes should be employed to recognize this, name it, and give it voice throughout the various planning phases of the practicum. Second, program designers and facilitators need to be particularly mindful of a basic experiential learning principle – students learn most if they are challenged beyond their 'comfort zone,' but are not panicked (Citron

& Kline, 2001). And they should know that participants are capable of much. If given a 'nod,' if their autonomy and freedom are acknowledged and respected, most will surprise you and surprise themselves with what they discover and what they can know and do and think.

As an example, Adrienne and I for years talked of the caged-man episode, discussing and debating what the right thing would have been to help Lily and Jayne deal with the situation, understand it, interpret it critically, and respond to it appropriately. At the time, we opted to say and do little. Today, Lily and Jayne say they were glad it was left that way. They say so for several reasons: If Adrienne and I had intervened it might have signalled a negative value judgement, sending a distancing message to participants and hosts alike. They themselves did not have enough information to accurately interpret the situation; any judgement might have been premature. And, since they were on their own, they had to take it upon themselves to 'deal with it,' critically and autonomously. In other words, they took responsibility for their own learning, and eight years later they were grateful for the experience. However, I still worry about whether Adrienne and I should have responded differently and about other situations where we may not have done the right thing, and this concerns a

second CR'03 revelation and a matter to consider for pre-trip preparation.

Much has been written about the importance of preparing students for the practicum experience, so as to acquire lenses of interpretation that will 'clarify and expand ideas' and facilitate meetings with different others. In the case of CR'03, the six months of pre-trip classes were mostly for that purpose, and positive and affecting results were witnessed. However, because of what else was observed on the trip, I worry whether too much of a focus on pre-trip consciousness-raising might be detrimental, leading to a fixation with doing and thinking the 'right' thing and discouraging participants from openly embracing and living the experience, and unself-consciously and inter-subjectively meeting others. Rather than living and relating, participants become preoccupied with evaluating and censoring their responses and behaviours. Epprecht (2004) alludes to this dilemma when he talks of the temptations and dangers of imposing stultifying bureaucratic control over students as a way of dealing with potential, but significant and unforeseen, ethical and pedagogical issues that might arise during the practicum experience.

Herein lies a dilemma for administrators and facilitators of global citizenship practicums: necessarily raising critical awareness in anticipation of the placement abroad, but doing so without unduly interfering with participants living the experience. A part of the answer may rest in adjusting the focus of the pre-trip preparation. There are a myriad of situations and circumstances – ethical and pedagogical – that come up daily in a practicum that call for thoughtful interpretation and critical response, and which offer pedagogical opportunity. Oftentimes they are unanticipated and more complicated than previously conceived; they never arrive neatly presented or packaged (e.g., the Jayne and Lily episode). They call for making judgements in the moment, often in circumstances of emotional duress and physical fatigue. In these situations, previous consciousness-raising preparation is important, obviously, but so are the discriminating abilities (practical judgement) of the facilitator and trusting relationships between facilitator and participant (e.g., students feeling safe enough to disclose encounters that they find confusing, disturbing, or challenging; teachers feeling safe enough in trusting students to deal with the situation on their own). The upshot is that practicums benefit from being led by facilitator-teachers who care about their

student-participants, who have a nuanced sense of their capacities and limitations, and who trust and are trusted by their students (buttressed with an understanding of the principles of experiential learning). And if so, then an essential aspect of pre-trip preparation – as important as cultivating critical perspectives, reflection, and engagement – is for teachers to get to know and understand individual participants and for students and teachers to develop relationships of confidence. All of which is to say that if much of critical engagement and learning necessarily happens in the chaotic episodes of life in the practicum, and if too much attention in advance to doing and thinking the right thing might thwart authentic engagement, then a greater balance of the pre-trip preparation should focus on, and attend to teacher-leaders and their relationships with the practicum's participants.

A third revelation, more of an outright recommendation, arises from the unbalanced nature of this study and the inherent one-sidedness of the CR'03 practicum itself, indeed of most practicums of this type (i.e., a group of people on an educational excursion from the Global North visit and are hosted by a community and its members in the Global South). The recommendation is this: Practicum participants should host guests participating in educational

excursions from the Global South, ideally from the community they visited. Ways and means should be explored for members of host communities to participate in educational trips to the North, ideally to those communities whose members they hosted. Playing the role of host, and witnessing guests from the Global South, experience and interpret our world, together with us – drawing attention to our domestic, economic, and cultural unknowns and unconscious postures (our 'caged men in backyards') – would help make the invisible visible, the unconscious conscious, the uncontested contested. Through these transactional meetings, the meaning and practice of global citizenship would be enlarged as it became more widely named and broadly shared, and the means of peace and peace education would be deepened as relationships were balanced, obligations reciprocated, and economic injustices enlightened.

In summary, as global citizenship practicums cultivate perspectives and bearings of world citizenry, they serve as a vital and transformative means of peace education. However, their success in so doing is contingent on meeting the critical challenges set out by people like Freire and Simpson, addressing mindsets that distance and are distancing. Are they worth it? Practitioners like Tiessen

(personal communication, 2011), Epprecht (2004), and Sichel (2006), while acknowledging the ethical and pedagogical risks, believe these programs are inimitable for addressing global challenges like differentiation, fragmentation, and Other-ing. But to do so effectively requires ongoing attention to program practice and practitioner mindfulness.

## Conclusion

The CR'03 revisit generated a new understanding of my teaching vocation, reminding me of the inherent power in my teaching role and enlightening my maternal teaching self and how it serves as pedagogy for world citizenship education. It leaves me to consider my responsibilities for helping aspiring global educators realize and appreciate theirs.

The revisit highlighted two important and interrelated practices of teaching for cosmopolitan ends within contexts of high school global citizenship practicums: Global citizenship education is furthered when teachers take responsibility for their teaching selves and when they relate to students inter-subjectively. These two teaching sensibilities are necessarily uniquely practiced and lived. Therefore, understanding of these practices could be

enhanced by inquiring of global educators their ways of being present, of cultivating dialogical relationships, and of navigating the intersecting spaces of student autonomy and teacher responsibility.

Finally, the revisit informed the purposes and practices of global citizenship practicums, enlightening their transformative effects, reminding of critical challenges, and offering means of addressing those challenges. However, these findings and insights could be extended, possibly contested, and especially enriched by hearing from the families that were visited in Pedrogoso. What do they remember of the experience; what sense do they make of it? Hearing from them would not only deepen and balance an understanding of a global citizenship practicum, but also enrich the meaning of global citizenship itself.

## Endnotes

[1] An important and related concern, one calling for deeper interrogation and broader exploration is this: How might my own learning in Costa Rica, vis-à-vis global citizenship, have informed the student experience? In other words, how might it have affected my teaching 'presence,' my relationships with students, or my perceived role as trusted elder?

Because I was preoccupied with participants' well-being, I was mostly oblivious to any personal learning experiences in Costa Rica. However, upon return, in one of the debrief sessions following the trip, Adrienne and I were told by several students not to return to Costa Rica with the next cohort of students, but to choose another country. Why? Because of much of what they had valued about the CR trip was witnessing their teachers, much like themselves, encountering strangers, engaging with unknown hosts, and navigating newness, uncertainty, and unexpectedness. And furthermore, since both teachers and students were necessarily traversing this new terrain together, it meant that relationships with teachers were more egalitarian, more dialogic, as both students and teachers were learning and growing together. These several students were afraid that if we returned to Costa Rica with a new group of students, something of consequence would be lost. Students and teachers would be in different places.

The obvious implication is that how teachers encounter the global citizenship practicum experience (including what and how they are learning about the world) is seen and invariably felt by their

fellow travellers, and with pedagogic consequence. In the case of Adrienne and myself, at least in the eyes of several students, it appears to have affected our teaching 'presence,' our relationship with students, and the perceived role as trusted elders. It remains to be explored how witnessing their teachers learn about a new world affected CR'03 participants' engagement with that world, and how it might have been different for a new cohort of students that travelled to Costa Rica two years later.

[2] Buber (2006), a theologian and all his life concerned with Jewish-Palestinian co-existence, portrays dialogue as both a type of communication and a kind of relationship, a process and a goal: communicating in a way that is open, direct, mutual, and present; relationships that are characterized by openness, directness, mutuality, and presence. Genuine dialogue, he says, means experiencing the other side of the relationship, and thinking in a way that includes "orienting ourselves to the presence of the other person" (33). This, Buber says, is what it is to communicate with a human being, a Subject (a *Thou,* and not an *It*). It is with this meaning of Buber's that the phrase, *I-Thou* is used.

[3] The question is whether Costa Rica, the country itself, may have had something to do with this hopeful embrace of possibility following the trip. The reason Costa Rica was chosen was because of its hopeful approach to development: no military in a region of intense and violent conflict; a world leader in rainforest preservation and village cooperative.

Scholars, who write about peace education at the high school level worry that social studies curricula are too heavily weighted toward violent and war-like perspectives. In 1920, two years after the Great War, H. G. Wells wrote that to prevent young people from falling into despair, they needed to envision a positive future of possibilities in the world; they needed to know that neither war nor destruction are human inevitabilities (Shlichtman, 2007). Unfortunately today, almost a hundred years later, a number of peace educators contend that social studies education is preoccupied with images and narratives of war, militarism, and violence (Blumberg, 2006; Boulding, 1990, 2000; Danish, 2007; Davies, 2005; Noddings, 2005). The consequence, Anita Wenden (2004) says, is despair and inaction, as students cannot imagine a preferred future. This is how she sees the current situation:

> In the case of those social and ecological realities that inhibit the achievement of a culture of peace, while it is agreed that violence is abhorred, our imaginations often appear to be prisoners of the present, apparently incapable of visualizing . . . the long term future of creating positive alternatives. Reasons put forth to explain this paralysis include the belief that things cannot change . . . and therefore, the unwillingness to face what present realities portend. It is also true that the education system does not usually try to change such beliefs or help students acquire

> skills related to thinking in terms of the distant future. (p. 161)

Wenden goes on to say that a sense of helplessness and powerlessness impedes prospects for building peace, both locally and globally.

Boulding (2000) believes the place to start is to counter fear-laden and fatalistic images and offer students specific images of hopeful possibilities and futures. Liebler and Sampson (2003) agree, arguing from the standpoint of *Appreciative Inquiry* that people move invariably toward the expectations and images they create. For Boulding this means that students should know that war and warrior cultures are not biological inevitabilities. The practice of war is learned and therefore can be unlearned; and that for most of history and in most places people have lived peaceably. It becomes easier to envision a hopeful future, she says, when one has a sense of choice – knowing there are options – and when one knows that in the past and present, peaceful ways of living were and are the preferred options.

Similarly, Lederach (2003, 2005) looking to explain the art and soul of peace-making, talks of the centrality of the moral imagination, describing it as "the capacity to imagine something rooted in the challenges of the real world yet capable of giving birth to that which does not yet exist" (2005, p. ix). If people are to be empowered – overcoming obstacles and moving from *I cannot* to *I can* – then the imagination and ideas of a desired future must be based on what is real and true.

Whether Costa Rica may or may not have had this affect, and played a role in participants' hopeful and confident embrace of the world is beyond the interrogative ambitions of this study. But it raises an important issue for future and further inquiry, as the implications for choosing practicum destinations and encounters are significant and consequential.

4 According to Dewey (1916) the elimination of distance between people accompanies every great expansive period in human history (italics are mine):

> Every expansive era in the history of mankind has coincided with the operation of factors that have tended to eliminate distance between peoples and classes previously hemmed off from one another. Travel, economic and commercial tendencies have at present gone far to break down external barriers; to bring peoples and classes into closer and more perceptible connection with one another. *It remains for the most part to secure the intellectual and emotional significance of this physical annihilation of space.* (p. 82)

This observation of Dewey's, that eliminating physical distance between groups of people connects them more perceptively, contains an implicit appeal: It is not enough to annihilate space between peoples (for example, in a micro sense, in

the case of Costa Rica '03, travelling elsewhere and being in close physical proximity to others), but it is also necessary to understand its significance. Even though Dewey is talking about elimination of space in a macro and global sense, his assertion has implications for the micro (i.e., global citizenship practicums): having people live with far-away families is one thing, having them understand its intellectual and emotional significance is another. And if so, then Dewey's appeal represents a pedagogic call to global citizenship practicums and their facilitators: you need to help students make sense of their experiences of annihilated social and geographic distance, this merging of locals and sharing of 'intimate everydayness.' Doing so will help facilitate student intellectual and cosmopolitan development, but it may also have valued implications in the global sphere where today separated locals are merging and colliding and connecting.

5 Simpson (2004) is quite pessimistic about the possibilities of engaging in critical and perspective-changing reflections with student-participants, particularly in the context of the gap year culture:

> The processes that allow young westerners to access the financial resources, and moral imperatives, necessary to travel and volunteer in a 'third world country,' are the same as the ones that make the reverse almost impossible. Similarly, the colonial legacy that provides a historical context and an inspiration for modern gap year projects, also

> carries with it issues of power. Furthermore, the globalizing language of culture, especially when combined with a colonial history, acts as a vehicle of imperialism, which at the very least needs critical engagement. (p. 690)

Simpson's analysis speaks to the imperative of informing students of these global processes, of their place of privilege and power within this system, and of the moral and ethical implications of relationships with their hosts.

## References


Alexander, C. (1979). *The timeless way of building.* New York: Oxford Press.

Appiah, K. A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Appiah, K. A. (2008). Education for global citizenship. In D. L. Coulter & J. R. Weins (Eds.), *Why do we educate? Renewing the conversation* (pp. 83-99). Malden, MA: National Society for the Study of Education.

Arendt, H. (1958). *The human condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Arendt, H. (1967). *The origins of totalitarianism*. London, UK: George Allan & Unwin.

Arendt, H. (1978). *Thinking.* Vol. 1. Orlando, FL: Harcourt.

Aristotle. (1932). *Politics* (H. Rackham, Trans.). Digital Books: Retrieved from http://digitalbookindex.com/search001a.htm

Bankowski, Z., & Christodouliids, E. (1999). Citizenship bound and citizenship unbound. In K. Hutchings & R. Dannreuther (Eds.), *Cosmopolitan citizenship* (pp. 82-104). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Barber, B. R. (1996). Constitutional faith. In J. Cohen (Ed.), *For love of country: Debating the limits of patriotism* (pp. 30-37). Boston: Beacon Hill.

Basile, C. (2005). Jefferson county open school: Voices of global citizenship. In C. White & R. Openshaw (Eds.), *Democracy at the crossroads: International perspectives on critical global citizenship education* (pp. 347-364). Toronto, ON: Lexington Books.

Bernstein, R.J. (1996). *Hannah Arendt and the Jewish question.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Biton, Y., & Salomon G. (2006). Peace in the eyes of Israeli and Palestinian youths: Effects of collective narratives and peace education program. *Journal of Peace Research, 43* (2), 167-180.

Blumberg, H. (2006). Education. In H. Blumberg, P. Hare, & A. Costin (Eds.), *Peace psychology: A comprehensive introduction* (pp. 31-36). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bok, S. (1996). From part to whole. In J. Cohen (Ed.), *For love of country: Debating the limits of patriotism* (pp. 38-45). Boston: Beacon Hill.

Boulding, E. (1990). *Building a global civic culture: Education for an interdependent world.* Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Boulding, E. (2000). *Cultures of peace: The hidden side of history.* Syracuse, NY: Syracuse Univerity Press.

Boulding, K. (1998). *The meaning of the 20th century: The great transition*. New York: Harper Collins.

Bowden, B. (2003). The perils of global citizenship, *Citizenship Studies*, *7,* 349-362.

Buber, M. (2006). *Between man and man.* (R. G. Smith, Trans.). London, UK: Kegan Paul.

Bush, R. A. B., & Folger, J. P. (1994). *The promise of mediation: Responding to conflict through empowerment and recognition.* San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Butler, J. (1996). Limits of loyalty. In J. Cohen (Ed.), *For love of country: Debating the limits of patriotism* (pp. 52-54). Boston: Beacon Hill.

Byrne, S. (2001). Consociational and civic society approaches to peacebuilding in Northern Ireland. *Journal of Peace Research, 38* (3), 327-352.

Carson, B. H. (1996). Thirty years of stories, The professor's place in student memories. *Change*, November/December, 11-17.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory. A practical guide through qualitative analysis.* London, UK: Sage.

Citron, J. L., & Kline, R. (2001). From experience to experiential education. *International Educator, 10* (4), 18-26.

Clinchy, B. V. (1989). On critical thinking and connected knowing. *Liberal Education, 75*, 14-19.

Collins, M. (1991). *Adult education as vocation*. London, UK: Routledge.

Cone, D., & Harris, S. (1996). Service-learning practice: Developing a theoretical framework. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 3*, 31-43.

Corcoran, P. (2004). The earth charter as an integrative force for peace education and environmental education. In A. Wenden (Ed.), *Educating for a culture of social and ecological peace* (pp. 183-199). New York: State University of New York Press.

Creamer, D. G. (1996). *Guides for the journey: John MacMurray, Bernard Lonergan, James Fowler.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dallmayr, F. (2007). *In search of the good life.* Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.

Danish, H. B. (2007) Education for peace: The pedagogy of civilization. In Z. Bederman & C. McGynn (Eds.), *Addressing ethnic conflict through peace education* (pp. 137-160). New York: Polgrave Macmillan.

Davies, L. (2005). *Global citizenship education: The needs of teachers and learners.* Birmingham, UK: Centre for International Education and Research, University of Birmingham.

Davies, L. (2006). Global citizenship: Abstraction or framework for action? *Educational Review, 58* (1), 5-25.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2005) *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Derrida, J. (2001). *On cosmopolitanism and forgiveness*. New York: Routledge.

Dewey, J. (1897). *My pedagogic creed.* Baltimore, MD: Norman & Munder.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: Macmillan Company.

Dewey, J. (1954). *The public and its problems.* Athens, OH: Swallow Press.

Dewey J. (1997). *Experience and education.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Dower, N. (2003). *An introduction to global citizenship*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Dower, N. (2009) *The ethics of war and peace.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Dunne, J. (1993). *Back to the rough ground:'Phronesis' and 'techne' in modern philosophy and in Aristotle.* London, UK: University of Notre Dame Press.

Ellis, J. L. (1998). *Interpretive inquiry as a formal research process.* In J. L. Ellis (Ed.), *Teaching from understanding* (pp. 15-32). New York: Garland.

Epprecht, M. (2004). Work-study abroad courses in international development studies: Some ethical and

pedagogical issues. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies, 25* (4), 687-706.

Falk, R. (1995). *On human governance.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Falk, R. (1996). Revisioning cosmopolitanism. In J. Cohen (Ed.), *For love of country: Debating the limits of patriotism* (pp. 53-60). Boston: Beacon Hill.

Featherstone, M. (2000). Technologies of post-human development and the potential for global citizenship. In J. N. Pieterse (Ed.), *Global futures: Shaping globalization* (pp. 203-223). London: Zed Publications.

Feldman, A. (2003). Validity and quality in self-study. *Educational Researcher, 32* (3), 26-28.

Ferrara, A. (2008). *The force of the example: Explorations in the paradigm of judgement.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Freire, P. (1997). *Pedagogy of the heart.* New York: Continum.

Freire, P. (2007). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. (30th anniversary ed.). New York: Continuum.

Freire, P. (2008). *Pedagogy of hope.* (3rd edition). New York: Continuum.

Galtung, J. (1996). *Peace by peaceful means: Peace and conflict, development and civilization.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Galtung, J. (2004). *Transcend and transform: An introduction to conflict work.* Boulder, CO: Paradigm.

Green, F. J. (2011). Feminist maternal pedagogies: Inside and outside the classroom. In D. L. Byrd & F. J. Green (Eds.), *Feminist maternal pedagogies: Inside and outside the classroom* (pp. 197-211). Bradford, ON: Demster.

Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination: Essays on education, the arts and social change.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Grusky, S. (2000). International service learning. *American Behavioral Scientist, 43* (5), 858-867.

Hall, S. (1996). Who needs identity? In S. Hall & P. Duguay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 1-17). London: Sage Publications.

Haloburdo, E. P., & Thompson, M. A. (1998). Comparison of international learning experiences for baccalaureate nursing students: Developed and developing countries. *Journal of Nursing Education, 37* (1), 13-21.

Harkavy I., & Benson, L. (1998). De-Platonizing and democratizing education as the bases of service learning. In R. A. Roads & J. P. Howard (Eds.), *New directions for teaching and learning.* No. (73) Spring. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Heater, D. (2002). *World citizenship: Cosmopolitan thinking and its opponents.* New York: Continuum.

Heidegger, M. (1968). *What is called thinking?* (F. D. Wieck & J. G. Gray, Trans.) New York: Harper & Row. (Original work published 1954)

Held, D. (2004). *Global covenant*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Himmelfarb, G. (1996). The illusions of cosmopolitanism. In J. Cohen (Ed.), *For love of country: Debating the limits of patriotism* (pp. 72-77). Boston: Beacon Hill.

Hunter, A., & Brewer, J. (2003). Multi-method research in sociology. In A. Tashkkori & C. Teddue (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioural research* (pp. 577-594). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hunter, G. (1993). Existentialism: Practical classroom applications. *Educational Forum, 57* (2), 191-197.

Ignatieff, M. (1993). *Blood and belongings: Journeys into the new nationalism.* Toronto, ON: Viking.

Illich, I. (1968). To hell with good intentions. In T. K. Stanton (Ed), *Curriculum design for international service learning, INTR 110.* Kingston, ON: Queen's University Press.

Jarvis, P. (1995). Teachers and learners in adult education: Transaction or moral interaction? *Studies in the Education of Adults, 27* (1), 24-35.

Kaldor, M. (2003). *Global civil society: An end to war.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Kamberelis, G., & Dimitriadis, G. (2005). Focus groups: Strategic articulations of pedagogy, politics, and inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). (pp. 887-907). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kambutu, J., & Nganga, L. W. (2007). In these uncertain times: Educators build cultural awareness through planned international experiences. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *24* (4), 939-951.

Kant, I. (1960). *Education* (A. Churton, Trans). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Kiely, R. (2004). A chameleon with a complex: Searching for transformation in international service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 10* (4), 5-20.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2005). Critical ontology and Indigenous ways of being. In Y. Kanu (Ed.), *Curriculum as cultural practice: Postcolonial imaginations* (pp. 181-202). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Kincheloe, J. L., McLaren, P., & Steinberg, S. R. (2011). Critical pedagogy and qualitative research: Moving to the bricolage. In N. K. Denzen & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 163-177). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kolb, D.A. (1984). *Experiential learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kore-Ljunberg, M., Yendol-Hoppey, D., Smith, J. J., & Hayes, S B. (2009). Epistemological awareness, instantiation of methods, and uninformed method-

ological ambiguity in qualitative research projects. *Educational Researcher, 38* (9), 687-699.

Kornelsen, L. (2006). Teaching with presence. In P. Cranton (Ed.), *Authenticity in teaching* (pp. 73-82). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kornelsen, L. (2009a). *Becoming teachers in a globalizing world: The impact of a six week student teaching practicum in Costa Rica.* Unpublished manuscript, Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba.

Kornelsen, L. (2009b). *Global citizenship education: A field experience in India:A personal response.* Unpublished manuscript, Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba.

Kornelsen, L. (2009c). *The impact of a practicum internship on global citizenship learning and becoming*. Unpublished manuscript, Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba.

Korsgaard, C. M. (1996). *Kingdom of ends*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kuh, G. K., & N. F. Kauffman (1984). *The impact of study abroad on personal development of college students.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University School of Education.

Kymlicka, W. (1999). Citizenship in an era of globalization. In I. Shapiro & C. Hacker-Cordon (Eds.), *Democracy's edges* (pp. 112-126). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ladd, J. (1990). *Subject India: A semester abroad.* Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Lederach, J. P. (1995). *Preparing for peace: Conflict transformations across cultures.* Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Lederach, J. P. (2003). *The little book of conflict transformation*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.

Lederach, J. P. (2005). *The moral imagination.* New York, Oxford University Press.

Levinas, E. (1998). *Otherwise than being or beyond essence* (A. Lingis, Trans.). Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Liebler, C., & Sampson, C. (2003). Appreciative inquiry in peacebuilding: Imagining the possible. In M. Abu-Nimer, C. Sampson, C. Liebler, & D. Whitney (Eds.), *Positive approaches to peace-building: A resource for innovators* (pp. 55-82). Washington: Pact.

Linklater, A. (1999). Cosmopolitan citizenship. In K. Hutchings & R. Dannreuther (Eds.), *Cosmopolitan citizenship* (pp. 35-59). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Lofland, J., Snow, D., Anderson, L., & Lofland, L. H. (2006). *Analyzing social settings:A guide to qualitative observation and analysis*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Lutterman-Aguilar, A., & Gingerich, O. (2002). Experiential pedagogy for study abroad: Educating for global citizenship. *Frontiers: Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 7* (Winter), 41-82.

MacGinty, R. (2012). Hybrid reconstruction: The case of Waad in Lebanon. In O. P. Richmond & A. Michell (Eds.), *Hyprid forms of peace: From everyday agency to post-liberalism* (pp. 208-225). London, UK: Palgrave MacMillan.

Macmurray, J. (1991). *Persons in relation*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International.

Malewski, E., & Phillion, J. (2009). International field experiences: The impact of class, gender and race on the perceptions and experiences of pre-service teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25* (1), 52-60.

McIntosh, P. (2005). Gender perspectives on educating for global citizenship. In N. Noddings (Ed.), *Educating citizens for global awareness* (pp. 22-39). New York: Teachers College Press.

Meade, E. M. (1996). The commodification of values. In L. May & J. Kohn (Eds). *Hannah Arendt: Twenty years later* (pp. 107-112). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Research methods in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Merriam, S., Cafarella, L., & Baumgartner, L. (2007*). Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merryfield, M. M., & Subedi, B. (2001). Decolonizing the mind for world-centered global education. In E.W. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes,*

*problems, and possibilities* (pp. 277-290). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J. (1995). Transformative theory of adult learning. In M. R. Welton (Ed), *Defence of the lifeworld* (pp. 39-70), New York: State University of New York Press.

Miller, D. (1999). Bounded citizenship. In K. Hutchings & R. Dannreuther (Eds.), *Cosmopolitan citizenship* (pp. 60-82). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Mitchell, C. (2002). Beyond resolution: What does conflict transformation actually transform? *Peace and Conflict Studies*, *19* (1), 1-23.

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Moustakas, C. (1995). *Being-in, being-for, being-with.* Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.

Muetzelfeldt, M., & Smith, G. (2002). Civil society and global governance: The possibilities for global citizenship. *Citizenship Studies, 6*, 55-75.

Neff, C.N. (1999). International law and cosmopolitan citizenship. In K Hutchings & R. Dannreuther (Eds.), *Cosmopolitan citizenship* (pp. 105-119). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Noddings, N. (2005). Global citizenship: Promises and problems. In N. Noddings (Ed.), *Educating citizens*

*for global awareness* (pp. 1-21). New York: Teachers College Press.

Norris, M. E., & Gillespie, J. (2009). How study abroad shapes global careers: Evidence from the United States. *Journal of Studies in International Education* (382-397). Retrieved from http://jsi.sagepub.com/content/13/3/382

Nussbaum, M. (1996a). Patriotism and cosmopolitanism. In J. Cohen (Ed.), *For love of country: Debating the limits of patriotism* (pp. 2-20). Boston: Beacon Hill.

Nussbaum, M. (1996b). Reply. In J. Cohen (Ed.), *For love of country: Debating the limits of patriotism* (pp. 131-144). Boston: Beacon Hill.

Nussbaum, M. (1997a). *Cultivating humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education*. London, UK: Harvard University Press.

Nussbaum, M. (1997b). Kant and Stoic cosmopolitanism. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 5 (1), 1-25.

Palmer, P. J. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pence, H. M., & Macgillivray, I. K. (2008). The impact of an international field experience on pre-service teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24* (1), 14-25.

Phillips, A. (1998). Learning from Freud. In A. O. Rorty (Ed.), *Philosophers on education: New historical perspectives* (pp. 411-417). New York: Routledge.

Pieterse, J. N. (2004). *Globalization and culture: Global mélange.* New York: Rowan & Littlefield.

Pike, G. (2000a). A tapestry in the making. In T. Goldstein & D. Selby (Eds), *Weaving connections: Educating for peace, social and environmental justice* (pp. 218-241). Toronto, ON: Sumach Press.

Pike, G. (2000b). Global education and national identity: In pursuit of meaning. *Theory into Practice*, *39* (2), 63-73.

Richardson, G. (2008). Caught between imaginaries: Global citizenship education and the persistence of the nation. In A. Abdi & L. Shultz (Eds.), *Educating for human rights and global citizenship* (pp. 55-64). Albany NY: State University of New York Press.

Rifkin, J. (2009). *The empathic civilization.* New York: Penguin Group.

Ritzer, G. (2007). *The globalization of nothing.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Rogers, C. R. (1969). *Freedom to learn.* Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Rorty, R. (1982). *Contingency, irony, and solidarity.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rousseau, J. J. (1762). *Emile.* Retrieved from http://books.google.com/support/bin/answer.py?answer=91570&hl=en

Saltmarsh, J (1996). Education for critical citizenship: John Dewey's contribution to the pedagogy of community service learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, Fall*,* 13-21.

Scarry, E. (1996). The difficulty of imagining other people. In J. Cohen (Ed.), *For love of country: Debating the limits of patriotism.* Boston: Beacon Hill.

Scarry E. (2000). The difficulty of imagining other persons. In E. Weiner (Ed.), *The handbook of interethnic coexistence* (pp. 40-60). New York: Continuum.

Schattle, H. (2008). *The practices of global citizenship*. Toronto, ON: Rowman & Littlefield.

Scheffler, S. (1999). Conceptions of cosmopolitanism, *Utilitas, 11,* 255-276.

Schlichtmann, K. (2007). H.G. Wells and peace education. *Journal of Peace Education, 4* (2), 193-206.

Schnee, E. (2009). Writing the personal as research. *Narrative Inquiry*, *19* (1), 35-51.

Schon, D.A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schopenhauer, A. (1995). *On the basis of morality*. Providence, RI: Berghahn Books.

Schultz L., & Jorgenson S. (2009). *Global citizenship in post-secondary institutions: A review of the literature.* Unpublished manuscript, University of Alberta. Retrieved from http.www.uofaweb.ualberta.ca/uai_globaleducation/pdfs/GCE_literature_review.pdf

Sen, A. (2005). *The argumentative Indian: Writings on Indian history, culture and identity.* London, UK: Penguin Group.

Senehi, J. (2009). Building peace: Storytelling to transform conflicts constructively. In D. J. D. Sandole, S. Byrne, I. Sandole-Staroste, & J. Senshi (Eds.), *Handbook of conflict resolution and analysis* (pp. 201-214). New York: Routledge.

Senyshyn, Y. (1999). Perspectives on performance and anxiety and their implications for creative teaching. *Canadian Journal of Education, 24* (1), 30-41.

Sichel, B. (2006). I've come to help. *Briar Patch, 35* (7), 10-13.

Simpson, K. (2004). 'Doing development:' The gap year, volunteer-tourists and a popular practice of development. *Journal of International Development, 16*, 681-692.

Sinclair, M. (2008). *Learning to live together: Design, monitoring and evaluation of education for life skills, citizenship, peace and human rights*. Eschborn, Germany: Deutsche Gesellschaft.

Stachowski, L. L., & Mahan, J. M. (1995). Leaning from international field experiences. In G. A. Slick (Ed.), *Emerging trends in teacher preparation: The future*

*of field experiences* (pp. 99-107). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Sugamini, H. (1989). *The domestic analogy and world order problems.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Swanborn, P. (2010). *Case study research: What, why, and how.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tarrant, M. A. (2010). A conceptual framework for exploring the role of studies abroad in nurturing global citizenship. *Journal of Studies in International Education* (433-451). Retrieved from http://jsi.sage pub. com/content/14/5/433

Taylor, C. (1991). *The malaise of modernity.* Toronto, ON: House of Anansi Press.

Todd, S. (2003). *Learning from the other: Levinas, psychoanalysis, and ethical possibilities.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Universal Declaration of Human Rights. (1948). Retrieved from http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/

Van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy.* London, ON: Althouse Press.

Van Manen, M. (2000). Moral language and pedagogical experience. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 32* (2), 315-327.

Vella, J. (1994). *Learning to listen, learning to teach: The power of dialogue in educating adults.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Vercoe, A. (1998). The student-teacher relationship in Freire's pedagogy: The art of giving and receiving. *New Zealand Journal of Adult Learning*, *26* (1), 56-73.

Walker, G. (2006). *Educating the global citizen.* Suffolk, UK: Saxmundham, John Catt Educational.

Walzer, M. (1996). Spheres of affection. In J. Cohen (Ed.), *For love of country: Debating the limits of patriotism.* Boston: Beacon Hill.

Wenden, A. L. (2004). Integrating education for social and ecological peace: The educational context. In A. L. Wenden (Ed.), *Educating for a culture of social and ecological peace* (pp. 145-163). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Wheatley, M. J. (1999). *Leadership and the new science: Learning about organization from an orderly universe.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Willard-Holt, C. (2000). The impact of short-term international experience for pre-service teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *17* (4), 505-517.

Willis, J. W. (2007). *Foundations of qualitative research: Interpretive and critical approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wilmot, W., & Hocker, J. (2011). *Interpersonal conflict*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Wilson, A. N. (1982). Cross-cultural experiential learning for teachers. *Theory into Practice, 20* (3), 184-192.

Wilson, A. N. (1993). Conversation partners: Helping students gain a global perspective through cross-cultural experiences. *Theory into Practice*, *32* (1), 21-26.

Wolcott, H. (2001). Description, analysis, and interpretation in qualitative inquiry. In C. F. Conrad, J. G. Maworth, & L. R. Lattuca (Eds.), *Qualitative research in higher education: Expanding perspectives* (2nd ed.) (pp. 573-597). Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Xu, S., & Connelly, M. (2010). Narrative inquiry for school-based research. *Narrative Inquiry*, *20* (2), 349-370.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and method* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Zolo, D. (1997). *Cosmopolis: Prospects for world government.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Zweig, S. (1943). *The world of yesterday.* London, UK: Viking.

# Appendix I

# Global Citizenship 41G:
# *Curriculum Outline*

**Course Rationale**

We live in a global village, according to University of Manitoba graduate, Marshall McLuhan. As the world's population grows and material wealth increases, as weapons of mass destruction continue to proliferate, as increased pressure is placed on resources and the global ecosystem, as communications technology enables us to communicate instantaneously with people anywhere in the world, as mammoth corporations become freer to move capital, technology, and jobs across international borders, the world is indeed becoming a smaller place. In view of this, humanity is faced with several inter-related challenges: dealing peaceably with the inevitable conflicts that arise from rapid social change and the competition over limited resources, overcoming the growing economic gap and power differential between the *haves* and *have-nots* (within countries, between countries, and across regions like the North and the South), and meeting these challenges in a way that respects the dignity of human beings and protects the integrity of the global ecosystem.

The news media tend to limit their dissemination of world events to images of violence, armed conflict, and grinding poverty. What is too often left out of these snapshots is the historical, social, economic, and political context from which these images are derived. Even more disturbingly,

very little mention is made of the concrete and tangible triumphs of the struggles for peace, justice, and sustainable development around the world. This can lead to a distorted view of the world, one that invites apathy, cynicism, and powerlessness – one that distances, rather than connects.

This reality – an interconnected world, portrayed through a disconnecting lens – places a dual responsibility on educators. First, educators need to help students make sense of the shrinking global village of which they are members, providing them with a framework within which to begin understanding the inter-related challenges of peace, justice, and sustainable development. (Sustainable development can have many different meanings. In this course, sustainable development is defined as social and economic development that encourages the active and civic participation of all members of society, respects the dignity of human beings and societies, and strives to protect the integrity of the global ecosystem. This implies peaceful, just, and democratic development.) Second, they need to help students see and understand the context within which world news events take place, so as to place them in the world as active participants (citizens), rather than outside as passive and powerless observers.

By travelling to another country (particularly a country that has a different language and culture, and is at a different level of economic development than Canada), living with the people there, and thinking about that experience in the context of global citizenship and sustainable development, both of these challenges are addressed.

*Why Costa Rica?*

Costa Rica is seen by many in the international community as a model for sustainable and peaceful development: for

disbanding its military in 1948 to fund universal and free education, for its emphasis on cooperative community development, and for its efforts in protecting its tropical rainforests. And so, despite the fact that Costa Rica has a GDP/capita that is only one tenth of Canada's, its literacy and life expectancy rates are among the highest in the Developing World. In short, this society is an ideal place within, and from, which to learn about peaceful and sustainable development.

**Course Aim**

The aim of the course is to give students an opportunity to actively participate in community development, while experiencing life in a Developing World country. By experiencing life in another culture, in a Developing country in particular, students will have their world-view broadened and their understanding of development enriched. Moreover, by working on an actual development project, they will be making a meaningful contribution to a local community and developing a sense of belonging to a larger global community.

In the end, the aim is for students to more fully understand themselves and their relationship to a larger world, appreciate the integrated complexity of the global village, and to have a greater and more enlightened commitment to sustainable development at home and in the world.

**Course Premise/Philosophy**

Transformative learning is more apt to happen through real life experience, and through reflecting on that experience (Schon, 1987).
Learning about global citizenship (and learning to be an enlightened global citizen) is good; it benefits the

individual, her/his community, and the world in which she/he lives.

Global citizenship involves several important responsibilities:

i. to learn about the world outside of one's immediate experience.

ii. to make enlightened choices that respect the dignity of others and the interconnectedness of all life.

**Student Learning Outcomes**

Measurable learning outcomes are a valuable and sometimes indispensable tool in guiding learning/teaching activities, and for allotting grades to student achievement; but, with a course like this, holistic and global in nature, SLOs can be limiting, constricting, and at worst despotic (Paulo Freire, 1997). In other words, it's kind of hard to predict the most significant learning that comes from an experience like this one. The following SLOs are intended to guide the teaching/learning experience, not dictate it.

Upon completion of the Costa Rica Practicum course: *Global Citizenship 41G*, students will

1. **Sustainable Development**

   Know the meaning of the term, sustainable development, and what that means, or how it relates, to the community in which they have lived and worked.

Identify and understand the specific sustainable development accomplishments and successes of the community in which they lived.

Appreciate and understand the challenges of protecting the Costa Rican rainforest.

Reflect on sustainable development issues in Canada.

Be more critically aware of global development issues and challenges.

**2. Global Citizenship**

Recognize the interconnections between Costa Rica and Canada.

Identify some of the differences between how Canadians and Costa Ricans view the world and understand global issues and challenges.

Be reflective of how this experience in Costa Rica informs their understanding of Canada and the rest of the world.

Have the satisfaction that comes from knowing they participated in a meaningful community development project.

Be more open and appreciative of what other people, other cultures, and other countries can teach us about ourselves, our country, and our world.

Know of more options (careers, volunteer work and projects, memberships in international development

advocacy organizations, consumer choices, etc.) for participating meaningfully as a global citizen.

Be able to communicate effectively to others/ groups their most significant learning about global citizenship.

**3. Costa Rica**

Know the basics of Costa Rican geography (human and physical).

Be conversant with several of Costa Rica's greatest successes and challenges vis-à-vis preservation of its rainforests, eco-tourism, community development, and political and economic independence.

Understand the regional political and economic context within which Costa Rica exists.

**4. Culture**

Recognize and identify several important cultural differences and similarities between Costa Rican and Canadian culture.

Acquire a basic vocabulary in Spanish, enough for 'survival' communication.

Respect people whose culture is different from their own, and value Costa Rican culture in particular.

Understand the importance of protecting and celebrating cultural distinctions.

**Instructional Approaches/Course Content: Topics and Themes**

1. Preparation, September-April (40 hours)

   Monthly and bi-monthly meetings and workshops preparing for the trip:

   - Introduction to the trip: lecture, discussion (3 hrs)
   - Assessment of interest and eligibility (3 hours)
   - Administrative concerns: lecture, discussions (4 hrs)
   - Meetings with CWY project officer, finalizing itinerary: discussion (4 hrs)
   - Spanish language, Latin American culture: lecture, discussion (16 hrs)
   - Sustainable development, global citizenship and Costa Rica: lecture, large and small group discussions, video (6 hrs)
   - Pre-departure checks and tests (3 hrs)

2. Living, Working, and Studying in Costa Rica, April (2 weeks, 80 hours)

   - Orientation Camp (2 days)
   - Students live with local families (11 days)
   - Daily communal work on a community development project (mornings)
   - Visiting local national parks, cooperatives, businesses (afternoons)
   - Classes/workshops related to Costa Rican culture (evenings)
   - Participating in community and family cultural activities and festivities (evenings)

3. Costa Rica Follow-up, April & May (20 hours)

    - Debriefing sessions: reports, discussions (14 hrs.)
    - Dissemination project (6 hrs.)

**Assessment and Evaluation**

1. Application assignment:

    i. two reference letters
    ii. an essay on why the student wants to participate in the project/course, what he/she can offer the group, and why he/she is deserving of being chosen.
    iii. assessment by a three-member teacher committee

2. Participation in all pre-trip workshops and seminars

3. Journaling prior to, and during the two-week experience, reflecting and responding to the experience: "What am I seeing, feeling, and thinking; and how does this inform my understanding of global citizenship, sustainable development, culture, and Costa Rica?"

4. Post-trip written evaluations:

    i. trip/study/project assessment
    ii. self-reflection and assessment

5. Post-trip culminating activity and dissemination project that will be shared with the school community. The project will link the student's most

significant and satisfying learning to one of the four SLOs.

**Learning Resources and Bibliographic Information**

The most important learning resources for students will be other people, including but not limited to, the facilitators of preparatory workshops, the families they live with in Costa Rica, the Costa Rican project leaders, the group's Costa Rican guide and interpreter, and the facilitators of tours, workshops and seminars in Costa Rica.

Students' life experience will be supplemented with readings from the following:

Allen, T., & Thomas, A. (2000). *Poverty and development into the 21st century.* Toronto, ON: Oxford University Press.

Burch, M., Harris, J., Rempel, R., & VanderZaag, R. (July 2001). *Topics in IDS: Collection of readings for introduction to international development studies.* Winnipeg, MB: Menno Simons College, The University of Winnipeg.

Kornelsen, L. & Chaput, S. (Winter 2003). *Collection of readings for introduction to Costa Rica.* Winnipeg, MB: The Collegiate, The University of Winnipeg. (Unpublished document)

**School Initiated Course Outline**
***Global Citizenship 41G* (full credit)**
**The Collegiate at The University of Winnipeg**
**Lloyd Kornelsen**
**January, 2003**

**Submitted to *Manitoba Education and Training* January 2003; Approved by *MET*, February 14, 2003**

# Appendix II

# Research Methodology and Interpretive Lens

With a view to laying claim to a measure of validity upon which to draw meaningful and worthwhile conclusions, the data-gathering process and interpretive methodology used in conducting the Costa Rica research project, or revisit, is explicated here. Specifically, I elaborate on the rationale for my research approach, outline the particular research theories/methodologies that were employed, and describe the data gathering, analysis, and interpreting processes that were utilized.

A global citizenship practicum and its 2003 participants were the focus of the study. Many of those students had transformative learning experiences, or so they said immediately following the practicum. My research interest had to do with the nature of that experience and how these former students viewed the Costa Rica event today, in light of who they are now and what they do; and how this might inform global citizenship and peace education and my own teaching practice and understandings. I was curious to know what participants remembered of the experience; how they talked about it and understood it; what they said about its impact on the course of their lives? How did it compare to how I remembered the experience, and its impact on participants, and the original learning objectives of the program? How did participants' discourse inform this type of human experience, enlighten programs of this nature, and educate its facilitators? Given that I was seeking to understand how this experience related to my broader teaching interests and philosophy, the approach

that I believed to be most suitable for addressing these queries fit within a qualitative research tradition.

## Qualitative Research

Recently, scholars of qualitative research have been somewhat reluctant in providing concise definitions of qualitative research (Creswell, 2007); perhaps this is indicative of the fluid and ever-changing emphasis of qualitative research. Nonetheless, here are Denzin and Lincoln (2005) in Creswell (2007):

> Qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible. These practices transform the world. They turn the world into a series of representations, including field notes, interviews, conversations, photographs, recordings, and memos to the self. At this level, qualitative research involves an interpretive, naturalistic approach to the world. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of meanings people bring to them. (p. 36)

This definition speaks to a research philosophy that seeks meaning and understanding, and which includes the voices of research participants and the reflexivity of researchers. It assumes an epistemology that is constructivist, and an ontology that is multi-subjective. Its major modes of data gathering are experiencing (participant observation),

enquiring (interviewing), and examining (studying materials prepared by others) (Wolcott, 2001).

When explicating qualitative research philosophy, contrasting and comparing it to quantitative or more positivist research approaches is helpful. Van Manen (1990) traces current qualitative practices to mid-20th-century Europe, when the 'human science' movement began calling into question the veracity of quantitative research approaches for all topics of inquiry. In particular, the movement questioned the appropriateness of a natural scientific research methodology for questions that had to do with understanding humans as conscious persons.

> The difference between natural science and human science reminds of what it studies: natural science studies 'objects of nature,' 'things,' 'natural events,' and the 'way objects behave.' Human science, in contrast, studies 'persons' or beings that have 'consciousness' and that 'act purposefully' in the world creating objects of 'meaning' that are 'expressions of how human beings exist in the world. (p. 3-4)

This distinction is foreshadowed by two of Aristotle's forms of knowledge, *techne* and *phronesis*; *techne* having to do with knowledge of objects, *phronesis* having to do with knowledge of persons, fellow subjects in relation to oneself. Dunne (1993) renders the distinction: *Techne* is the concept that lays down the Western tradition of purposive rationality. It is a form of activity that

> issues in a durable outcome, a product or state of affairs . . . which can be precisely specified by the maker before he engages in

> his activity . . . and provides it with its end. Techne is the kind of knowledge possessed by an expert maker. (p. 9)

*Phronesis* on the other hand is a knowledge that is practiced

> in a public place with others in which a person, without ulterior purpose and with a view to no object detachable from himself, acts in such a way as to realize excellences that he has come to appreciate in his community as constitutive of a worthwhile way of life . . . a knowledge that is more personal and more experiential, more supple and less formulable than knowledge conferred by techne. (p.10)

Hence, "Aristotle believed that if one's subject matter is the practical and communal life of persons, then one must renounce the methodological purism of *techne*" (p.18).

What were the implications for the study, and why the preference for a qualitative approach? Since the essence of what I was looking to understand concerned a profoundly human experience – personal transformation – in which I myself participated, a research approach that called for open and democratic input of research participants and personal involvement of the researcher was more fitting (and perhaps more valid) than a more positivist objectivist approach. Ellis (1998) and Van Manen (1990) talk about the unique and indispensable value of a researcher's 'caring concern' or 'worrying mindfulness' in data gathering, analysis, and interpretation. Furthermore, if what Freire (2007) says is true, that our society is "rapidly

making objects of most of us" (p. 33), and where much of educational research is driven by economic purposes and utilitarian and technical means (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005), then teacher-researchers have a responsibility to resist, for the sake of their worlds and their students. Knowledge construction that is rooted in deliberative, dialogic, and democratic approaches helps participants to name their own world, to become Subjects. Also, on a personal level and particular to this context, a research methodology that detaches researcher from researched presents an ethical quandary. For if students of mine encountered a transformative learning experience in the context of a dialogical relationship with me, then is that learning and subsequent reflection not a subjective and inextricable part of the knowledge for which I (re)search?

This is not to say that a positivist approach would not have helped inform the questions. Indeed it could have, particularly as it related to the behavioural and quantifiable outcomes of the Costa Rica experience, and with its emphasis on careful and exacting attention to the research question and its objectives (Willis, 2007). However, since I was personally and deeply connected to the phenomena that I was researching, and because I viewed the research participants as fellow subjects, a human science methodology was more fitting.

## Specific Qualitative Research Methodologies/Theoretical Rationale

Whereas my research approach was qualitative and 'interpretist' in perspective, the particular research methodology that was employed was a case study, one that was informed by several other qualitative traditions.

**Case Study**

A case study approach involves the "study of an issue explored through one or more cases within a bounded system" (Creswell, 2007, p. 73). Whether it is an all-encompassing research methodology is debatable. Stake considers it a choice of what is to be studied (Creswell, 2007). Others see it as a strategy of inquiry, a methodology, or a comprehensive research strategy (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2003). Creswell sees it as all four: a methodology, a type of design, an object of study, and a product of inquiry. This is the perspective I took. Case study research, he says is a "qualitative approach in which the investigator explores a bounded system . . . over time, through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information" (p. 73). The intent is to understand an issue or problem using the case as a specific illustration. Or as Swanborn (2010) specifies, "a case study is the study of a phenomenon or a process as it develops within one case" (p. 9).

A case study approach suited my research quest in that my interest was focused on a particular group of individuals who underwent a shared experience, with ongoing reverberations. Doing an in-depth study of a bounded system – in this case the Costa Rica global citizenship program and its participants, including interviews with participants and my co-facilitator, consulting course materials, and written personal reflections – provided a rich data source for eliciting understanding, and a frame around which to organize and de-limit my queries. The case: A particular high school global citizenship practicum program and its participants. The questions: What was the program's long-term impact for students, as explored through memories and meanings of participants and co-facilitators eight years later? How did this speak to the

effectiveness of the program and its facilitators? What are the pedagogical implications for other experientially based high school global programs? In short, using Creswell's conception, the intent was to understand an issue or problem using the case as a specific illustration.

**Other Informing Methodologies**

Even though I employed a case study approach as research methodology, three other qualitative approaches helped illuminate the research project: phenomenology, narrative inquiry, and grounded theory.

*Phenomenology* as a philosophical tradition originated with Edmund Husserl, who applied the term to the study of how people describe things and how they experience them through their senses. Phenomenological research seeks to understand the essence of people's shared experiences and their recollections of those experiences. Van Manen's (1990) description of phenomenology resonates with my understanding of the basic purposes of education and its research: to help facilitate human becoming. (In the Freirean sense, this includes experiencing *conscientization*, and becoming Subjects and naming one's own world.) According to Van Manen, to do research is always to question the way we experience the world, to want to know the world in which we live as human beings so that we can live more thoughtfully, more humanly.

What are typical sorts of questions or problems phenomenological research engages? According to Creswell (2007),

> The type of problem best suited for this form of research is one in which it is important to understand several individuals' common or shared experiences of a phenomenon. It

> would be important to understand these common experiences in order to develop practices or policies, or to develop a deeper understanding about the features of the phenomenon. (p. 60)

This certainly fit the gist of the project's basic question: How did an experience many years ago contribute to who you are today and how you see/are in the world?

Moreover, with regard to the researcher's stance, Van Manen (1990) argues that one can only effectively inquire into what one cares about deeply. Moustakas (1994) believes that (heuristic) inquiries should focus on intense human experiences, one with which both researcher and participants have been involved, and one requiring the reflexive participation of the researcher. Since the Costa Rica trip was an extreme experience for many, and I was intimately involved and continued to think about its implications, it certainly fit the requirements of heuristic phenomenology. Ultimately, though, this was not essentially a phenomenological study since not one narrow band of essential lived experience was mined for its collective meaning or understanding.

*Narrative Inquiry (NI)* begins with experiences as expressed in the lived and told stories of individuals. And Xu and Connelly (2010) make the point: "There are few other forms of inquiry, apart from phenomenology, that are as explicitly defined in terms of the study of experience" (p. 355). In *NI*, people's stories serve as portals to experience, to understanding phenomena. Thinking narratively is a methodological construct, and a way of thinking about phenomena. Much of the memory of the experience in Costa Rica and its effects were evoked and conveyed through constructed narratives. Moreover, many

of the stories participants told, and I remembered, contained singular and life-changing epiphanies. And so, since storytelling plays an important role in bringing meaning to an event, narrative inquiry also seemed a fitting and appropriate approach to furthering understanding. However, as Jessica Senehi (2009) points out, we facilitators of storytelling need to be mindful of asymmetries of power: Whose stories are being told, and to what end? It must be acknowledged that host community voices were absent in the stories that were told of CR'03.

Finally, *Grounded Theory*. According to Charmaz (2006),

> grounded theory involves taking comparisons from data and reaching up to construct abstractions and simultaneously reaching down to tie these abstractions to data. The grounded theory research process is fluid, interactive, and open-minded (p. 181); (*and*) researchers are part of what they study, not separate from it. (p. 179)

Lofland, Snow, Anderson, and Lofland (2006) say that a key to doing good research is being open and adaptable to the myriad of unplanned changes that will happen, all of which may affect data interpretation – things like research circumstances, data collection processes, and interpersonal relationships. Charmaz' response? Do not impose or succumb to preconceived notions/expectations/theories on the data or data collection process for fear of contaminating the eventual findings and not allowing the 'data' to speak. This 'back and forth' methodology was a means of negotiating the tension between order and chaos, and served as a 'grounding' guide (governor?) of the project. This certainly happened during the writing-up-the-data

stage. Charmaz reminds that data are organic and that the research process serves their 'unveiling.'

Each of the above three methodological traditions additionally informed the research questions and spoke to my research proclivities: phenomenology for its quest of the essence of human and shared experience, narrative inquiry for the meaning that stories elicit and convey, and Charmaz' grounded theory for its respect of evolution and emergence and its fitting metaphors which link research, analysis, and interpretation.

Finally though, the research project was framed and conducted as a case study. The data primarily came from interviews with participants, the program's co-facilitator, program documents, and personal reflexive writing since 2003. The interviews were flexible and phenomenologically based, and open to narrative and story. Data collection, interpretation, and analysis respected the emergent spirit of grounded theory, and the unveiling process that started eight years ago.

## Data Gathering/Participants/ Role of Researcher

The program's participants formed the study's research cohort: 13 students and two supervising teachers, including me. The plan was to interview volunteers from this group, including the other supervising teacher. Through email, the nature of the study was explained (describing their potential role in the process). Of the 14 participants, 13 initially expressed interest in being involved but, in the end, 11 ended up participating, including my co-facilitating colleague.

Several days in advance of the interview, a set of the interview questions was sent to the interviewee for her/his review (see Appendix III). Each interview was audiotaped and ranged in duration from 40 to 60 minutes. All interviews were conducted live and face-to-face, except in one circumstance; the interview with Maya was carried out via Skype. Each interview was transcribed and a copy sent to the interviewee for her/his written and, when possible, oral response, inviting any corrections, deletions, additions, further insights, and elaborations.

The interview data were contextualized with relevant texts: the original course outline and accompanying written materials, and writing I had done on the topic since 2003. As Schnee (2009) says, the stories of researcher and researched overlapped, and necessarily informed each other. The interview with my colleague, Adrienne, followed a format similar to the others, including broad-ranging queries on the nature of the program and its pedagogical impact, and more specific questions of her experience and what she witnessed of the students' experiences. Adrienne has spent much of her life travelling and living in different parts of the world. Her experience, situated as it was in time and space, enlightened and richly augmented participant perspectives.

Finally, since I was an interactive part of the research and revisit, it is important to note an affecting personal proclivity. A major theme in my growing up years, one that informed my identity and shaped my pedagogical curiosities, was living and navigating the borderlands between different cultures, ethnicities, and worldviews. In the first seventeen years of my life, I lived in ten different places, including two cities, a Hutterite colony, three different Mennonite towns, and a remote First Nations/ Metis/French/Ukrainian community. I came to feel like a

transient outsider on a perpetual search for home (*heimat*), not unlike my *Kleine Gemiende* Mennonite forbearers. I worried that this propensity – a quest for home and a yearning for experiencing commonality and familiarity – might affect how I analyzed and interpreted the research data, as it was a motivating factor in working with global citizenship practicums in the first place (see Chapter One). I came to realize the dangers of this inclination on a recent research trip to India:

> I learned of my almost militant-like propensity to see and feel the common humanity in the cultural and economic diversity around me. My journal is filled with examples of seeing universalizing conceptions in diversity and difference, from religious practice to market place interaction. But, is this tendency not as problematic as viewing the peoples of the world as exclusively different and separate? Seeing the truth of a common humanity in the human condition and in lived life may be important to sharing a planet and living together peaceably; but does it not also flatten and de-texture humanity? There is real difference and uniqueness in the world; and by not noticing or smoothing out differences and focusing on the common, are we not also denuding the world of its richness, limiting what can be learned from one another, narrowing responses to common problems, and avoiding necessary conflict and debate over issues of global import? (Kornelsen, 2009a, p. 4)

Throughout the research process – interviewing, conversing, analyzing, and interpreting – I needed to remind myself to respect a balance between the similar and the different, to resist the temptation to go 'home', and to recognize that the tension between universalism and pluralism is central to the cosmopolitan mindset.

## Data Analysis

Raw data mainly included interview transcripts, contextualized by texts such as the 2003 curriculum document (Appendix I), related memos, student writings, information briefs, and personal journal entries. The data were analyzed by following Creswell's (2007) data analysis spiral, beginning with several 'naive' readings of the compiled transcripts, sketching ideas, and watching for emerging patterns. In the describing, classifying, and interpreting phase, specific categories were identified and coded, with particular attention to stories, experiences and their contexts. Throughout the process, I checked and tested my interpretations with participants, research literature, and my earlier notes.

I personally transcribed each interview, during which time I jotted down notes, including surprises, connections, arising themes, and any other surreptitious impressions that presented. Transcriptions were sent back to their originating voices for any editing and further insights they wished to add. Three months later, I came back to the edited transcriptions, and did several naive readings. It was actually only one, followed by two less naive readings where I began highlighting and coding emerging themes and categories. All applicable text was filed into requisite themes. In the end 19 categories were delineated, one with 10 subcategories. So I stepped back and, upon the unspoken advice of a favoured muse, read each transcript

for its unique voice and perspective. Until this point, the sifting process had focused on seeking the common theme, the emerging similarity, the surprising connection (in other words, going where I have gone since I have been 12 years old), unwittingly leveling the unique, the distinct and the individual. Now reading and rereading the transcripts, not in a quest to link it to some external and larger commonalities, but to listen for the unique and individual voices, felt liberating and honest. The point was to uncover essential 'distinctives' as related to individuals' Costa Rica experience. I ended up developing a one-page synopsis of each individual participant, essentials derived from the interview – what their life was now, what they remembered of Costa Rica, and how they made sense of it today (see Chapter Four). And I sent it off to the interviewees for their edits, revisions, and permission.

In addition to illuminating unique and individual experience and memory, the exercise helped unveil perspective and nuance that had been overlooked by concentrating on themes, categories, and patterns. But also most remarkably, six weeks later, when I returned to the 19 categories and 11 synopses, four or five larger themes were clearly evident, and three matched or closely corresponded to themes from scholarly literature on global citizenship practicums. I winnowed the 19 categories into four; all of the original categorized text was retained, just rearranged. It was as if by changing focus from the common to the particular, the common became more evident – and richer.

Initially allowing for the 'emergence' of codes/themes in the first several readings, and then opting for categorizing the emerging data into pre-existing categories, echoes the mixed reaction of qualitative research theorists. Marshall and Rossman as well as Crabtree and Miller discuss a continuum of coding strategies from pre-figured to

emergent categories (in Creswell, 2007), depending on the academic disciplines. Creswell encourages a mix of both, beginning with *a priori* codes and then being open to additional codes emerging during analysis. In my case, the opposite happened. The *a priori* categories presented themselves only after an analysis of the emergent codes and themes, and after changing focus from general to particular.

After writing an interpretative and analytical description of the data, a copy was sent to each research participant for her or his response. And finally, the 'findings' were contextualized in a framework from the literature. It should be noted that I endeavoured to protect the anonymity of participants throughout the process.

## Time-line of Study

The first interview took place at the end of June 2011, the last one at the end of August 2011. Transcriptions were sent to interviewees within four days of their interview and, as noted earlier, corrections, deletions, additions, further insights, and elaborations were invited. In January 2012, I wrote a one-page profile assembled from the interview data of each participant, sending it to each for their permission and edits. Finally in May 2012, I sent 75 pages of contextualized interview data to each participant soliciting their input so as to make my account of their words more fitting, accurate, and satisfying.

## Potential Limitations

Despite participants being given the opportunity to talk about how they thought they were seen and experienced by host families, the obvious and most troubling limitation of the study was the absence of host community voices.

Perspectives of our Pedrogosan hosts would enrich, broaden, deepen, challenge, and corroborate the meanings that we made 'here.' It also forewent an opportunity for building community, revisiting a shared and momentous inter-cultural experience, and creating a unifying *life-world* made up of Canadian students and Costa Rican community members which may have led to a greater naming and understanding our human-ness. But for reasons logistic – time and money –this did not happen. At some point, I hope to do a follow-up study – the topic: *Remembering the Canadians: Hosting a Canadian High School Global Citizenship Practicum in 2003.*

A second significant potential limitation had to do with issues of power and authority, and of the 'researcher/ observer' effect, where interviewees (all of whom were former students, excepting the co-facilitator) might have censored and shaped what they said to satisfy me and my research interests. This was mitigated somewhat by the participants' ages; all were adults now and many years had passed since they were my students. And with their diversely assertive personalities, the participants even back at the time of the practicum spoke their minds freely to me (or so it felt), and did so now eight years later. In the interviews, and in written correspondence, I did my best to create spaces of openness, collegiality, and respect for 'truth-speaking.' Participants were given a number of opportunities (oral and written) over ten months to edit changes and 're-vision' their offerings. Finally, though, as Xu & Connelly (2010) – referencing Hunter and Brewer (2003) – say, "the influence of the observer is an aspect or variable of the research situation, not a source of error limiting research" (p. 264).

Third, the study's findings were limited to the participants of one program at one time in history, and to only those

who chose to volunteer for the project (11 of 14 original participants). My hope is that what was given up in breadth (numbers of programs and participants) is compensated for by depth.

## Validity

Finally, what of validity? In the current academic and political climate where many question the design choices, intent, and trustworthiness of qualitative studies, it is important to be open with the purpose of one's study and one's epistemological perspective (Kore-Ljunberg, Yendol-Hoppey, Smith, & Hayes, 2009). Much has been written about validation in the context of qualitative research, what it means and how it is best achieved. At this place in my life and career, I am most interested in understanding (*verstehen*). It is an approach to the question of validation that is affirmed by Harry Wolcott, as paraphrased by Creswell (2007):

> (Wolcott) suggested that validation neither guides nor informs his work. He did not dismiss validation, but rather placed it in a broader perspective. Wolcott's goal was to identify 'critical elements' and write 'plausible interpretations' from them. He ultimately tried to *understand* rather than convince. (p. 205)

This echoes Ellis' (1998) perspective on the process of validating qualitative findings: clarifying the interpretive account to make it more comprehensive and comprehensible. This can only happen, she says, in dialogical encounters with others, as horizons are fused and broadened.

I believed, along with Patton (2002), that if I made understanding a guiding principle for gathering and interpreting data and a measure of its trustworthiness, then those issues that animate concerns over validation would be addressed. In the end, the study will be judged by whether its findings improve quality of experience (Xu & Connelly, 2010); help people live more thoughtfully and more humanly (Van Manen 1990); help us take responsibility for our continued growth; contribute to solving the problems in our communities (Rorty, 1982); and enable my research associates to recognize themselves in this account.

# Appendix III

# Interview Guide/Questions

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study on the impact of the *Costa Rica Global Citizenship Practicum* in which you participated in 2003. The objective of the interview is to have you share your perspective of that experience, and your understanding of how it may have shaped you and your worldview eight years later. (Additionally, for co-facilitator: And what you witnessed and considered of the students' experience.)

The following sets of questions are ordered around four themes: 1. Who are you now? 2. What do you remember of the Costa Rican program experience? 3. Stream of life: What are the connections: pre-trip, trip, post-trip? 4. Meta talk: What have you learned from having this conversation?

The questions are intended to be open-ended, and interactive, the interview a mutual sharing of memories, images, perspectives, and insights. Feel free to share as much (or as little) as you feel comfortable. The questions are there to initiate and generally guide our discussion. We'll focus on those questions you consider most important.

***Who are you now?***

1. Tell me a little bit about yourself: What are you doing now: work, study, travel; thinking; plans for the future?

***What do you remember of the Costa Rica program experience?***

2. Tell me about your most compelling memories/stories of the Costa Rica experience (arriving, living there, coming home, travelling with a group, group leadership): positive, negative, surprises, disappointments, confirmations, dissolutions?

3. What is your response to several of my most compelling memories/stories?

4. Talk a little about your host family, and your relationship with them: What did you talk about? What did you find most interesting/ surprising? Did you stay in contact? How do you think they saw you? What questions do you have now about how they saw you, and our being in their community? How do you think they were changed?

5. What would you say to a young person planning for a similar experience now?

***Stream of life: What are the connections: pre-trip, trip, post trip?***

6. What contributed to your interest and decision to participate in the program: parents, school, teachers, previous experience?

7. Has your understanding of the Costa Rica experience and its impact changed over the years?

8. What did you learn about yourself, your life, and the world (or not), and how?

9. Do you see any links between that experience and your life and world outlook today?

10. If you could return there, what might you like to say to your host family and friends? What story/ies might you like to bring from your life now?

***Meta/Reflexive talk***

11. What have you learned from thinking and talking about the Costa Rica experience now, eight years later?

***Interview addendum for practicum co-facilitator***

12. Why did you choose to get involved in the practicum?

13. What did you observe of the student participants: What do you think were their most significant learning experiences?

14. Given your travel experience and specifically your involvement in Costa Rica '03, what are the benefits, challenges, and risks of these types of programs?

ICIE
THE INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR INNOVATION IN EDUCATION

Eleven years ago, Lloyd Kornelsen and a colleague took 13 high school students on a practicum trip to Costa Rica. Eight-and-a-half years later he revisited that experience with many of those people. This book is an account of what they remembered and the implications for global citizenship education.

*That was one of the biggest trips of my life. But it was one of the shortest times. Go with an open heart and go without your head, because that is where it's going to have the biggest impact. Open your eyes and ears, and watch and listen.*

- Jayne

*Go travel somewhere, go figure something out about yourself, because when we're most uncomfortable we learn the most.*

- Matt

*I think that the most powerful element of the trip for me was the relationships. I remember just feeling like it kind of cracked open my world.*

- Nell

ISBN 978-0-9936134-3-2