Working Papers Series

International and Global Issues for Research

In Search of an Operational Definition and Effective Pedagogy:

Re-conceptualizing Global Citizenship for U.S. College Students Studying

Abroad

Roy Pietro

USA

No. 2015/4 June 2015

INTRODUCTION

Educating American College Students to become Global Citizens

U.S. college administrators and faculty frequently cite the emerging need for their college students to become global citizens in the flat, interconnected world of the 21st century. The cry for global citizenship is also heard from the UK, Australia and across the globe as teachers, administrators, and international educators seek to develop their students into productive members of our global civil society. The main problem with addressing this need is that there is no consensus agreement on what exactly global citizenship is, or a clear understanding of whether or not it can be learned, and if so, how it should be taught.

Can global citizenship be re-conceptualized to allow college educators in the U.S. to intentionally design an effective pedagogy for fostering global citizenship in college students? Assuming it can be learned, the learning outcomes of global citizenship need to be operationalized, in order to select an effective pedagogical approach. The literature on global citizenship is often contradictory and ambiguous, which hinders educators as they attempt to teach this elusive topic without a working operational definition or defined learning outcomes.

This assignment takes a two-phased approach to examining this problem. Initially, I assert that the purpose of teaching global citizenship in higher education is to develop college students who possess globally-oriented citizenship attitudes, worldviews, and mindsets, as evidenced by their intentions and actions to create a better world. As such, I argue that global citizenship is best taught through a critical, transformative and collective learning process that engages both the cognitive and the affective domains while allowing a multi-layered identity to evolve. This type

of transformational education is akin to transformative and social/collective learning pedagogical approaches, rather than the traditional classroom-based education.

A critical look at the literature on global citizenship is undertaken to establish an operational definition of this ambiguous concept. In that the term cosmopolitanism is often used interchangeably with global citizenship, literature on cosmopolitanism is also considered to get a better understanding of commonalities between these two concepts. Key interpersonal indicators (characteristics, attitudes and behaviors) of globally-oriented citizens are identified in this process, and these key indicators comprise my working definition of global citizenship for the purpose of this investigation. To avoid the semantics around the contested meanings of both global citizenship and cosmopolitanism, I argue for this concept to be re-conceptualized, and offer the term of *transformative global citizenship* (TGC) as a new conceptual framework for developing U.S. college students into transformative global citizens. While the limited nature of this study focuses on traditionally-aged American undergraduate college students (18-22 years old), I assert that several key elements of the TGC conceptual framework can be generalized to both secondary school students and college students throughout our global civil society.

Phase 2 of the assignment considers possible pedagogical approaches that appear to have efficacy in fostering the type of learning outcomes that support the development of the key indicators of transformative global citizenship (TGC) in college students. Premising that transformative global citizenship involves moral development and social learning experiences that are experiential and transformative in nature, the literature review includes service-learning, transformative learning and critical social theory to examine their potential usefulness in

fostering TGC. Finally, premising that the development of global citizenship involves transforming from a purely nationalistic identity to a more nuanced global identity that is multi-layered in nature, literature on social and collective learning pedagogies impacting identity development are also examined to evaluate their role in fostering TGC.

The discussion section explores how these pedagogical approaches can be effective in fostering transformative global citizenship. Moving from theory to praxis, I cite findings from several case studies of an emerging college study abroad area referred to as International Service-Learning (ISL). ISL programs appear to offer U.S. college students an ideal opportunity for developing transformative global citizenship, although some problems are noted in actualizing these learning outcomes. A conceptual framework for an intentionally-designing field-based TGC programs is advanced, incorporating the key elements and learning outcomes.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

The need for Transformative Global Citizens in the 21st Century

How do you educate U.S. college students to become transformative global citizens for the new millennium? The 21st century world has become increasingly interconnected over the past two decades. This phenomenon can be attributed to evolving technologies which continue to make us a global civil society. The emergence of the internet has brought populations and societies throughout the world closer to each other. People from India, China and Brazil blog, twitter and communicate with each other and people in the U.S., Britain and elsewhere through social media and affinity websites like Facebook, MySpace and LinkedIn. Technological advances have also brought businesses closer together throughout the world, as Western companies outsource their labor and production, forging independent global supply chains and international business development opportunities.

Many of these technological advances are extremely positive, serving to foster diversity, cooperation, acceptance, global understanding and economic development throughout the world. Globalization and the resulting new global marketplace is not without its downside, as it brings as many challenges and issues as well as opportunities. This includes global warming, terrorism, infectious disease and international law and trade disputes. The more interdependent we are on each other, and the more we get in each other's space (geographically, religiously, educationally, and economically), the more we need to understand and accept each other's perspectives, worldviews, and local community needs – hence the need for transformative global citizens.

The Significance of the Problem

Tensions between countries throughout the world have never been greater or more prevalent than over the last fifteen years. The Western world, especially the U.S. and UK, have been involved in two separate long-term, religious and ethnic conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as Bosnia/ Herzegovina conflict and recent military action in Libya. Hundreds of thousands have lost their lives in these conflicts and other disputes throughout Africa and the Mideast. The U.S. doesn't have a good relationship with nuclear Pakistan, which also still has an ongoing animosity with nuclear power India, Russia is back peddling on democracy, and countries like Egypt and Tunisia have overthrown their governments, with anti-Muslim sentiment still prevalent in the Western world. Israel and the Palestinians are still killing each other's citizens; Syria stands accused of mass murdering citizen protestors, all while Iran is determined to pursue nuclear weaponry and threatens military action to close the Straits of Hormuz.

Simultaneously, disenchanted citizens in major cities across the globe recently formed Occupy groups to protest the fast growing income disparities, similar to the World Trade Organization

protests, all while low lying islands disappear due to global climate change from massive deforestation in the developing world and pollution and over consumption by developed countries. While the ease of international travel has opened up new opportunities for tourism and business, educational and cultural exchanges, it also facilitates the spread of infectious disease and the possibility of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction.

Clearly, there has never been a greater need for a transformative global citizenship mindset, in which people cooperate, empathize, and understand each other, accept diversity in the world, and are willing to take action together to address social injustice and improve the lives of those less fortunate. This assignment is significant because transformative global citizenship matters in today's complex, interdependent, globally connected world (Rizvi, 2009). Discovering effective pedagogies to foster transformative global citizenship is indeed a significant endeavor.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Global Citizenship and Cosmopolitanism - Contested Meanings and Ambiguity

One of the problems with implementing an educational pedagogy to 'teach' global citizenship and cosmopolitanism is that the definition of these terms is often contested throughout the literature. To academic researchers like Martha Nussbaum (1997), global citizens and cosmopolitans are socially responsible, compassionate individuals, accepting of others and committed to global social justice. Nussbaum was a staunch propionate of the concept and promise of global citizenship. Numerous scholars, however, disagreed with the usefulness of the concept of global citizenship, referring to global citizens as nomads without personal responsibility to their country, privileged elites or perhaps cultural tourists or even voyeurs (Featherstone, 2002; Roman, 2003; Rosenfeld, 2002). Bowden (2003) premised that the term "global citizenship is fraught with insurmountable problems" (p. 349) due to its "close

association with the ideals of cosmopolitanism while in other ways in is incongruous with the general theory of citizenship" (p. 350), while others such as Miller were skeptical that "global citizenship was even possible, or desirable" (in Arneil, 2007, p.302).

Arneil argued for an alternative theorization of global citizenship, based on 'social rights and shared fate' of all people in our increasingly interdependent and globally connected world. Parekh (2003) rejected the notion of global citizenship, positing that what the world needs is 'globally-oriented national citizenship'. Globally-oriented national citizenship is akin to global mindedness, re-conceptualizing global citizens and cosmopolitans to be nation-based citizens who are mindful of the impact of their actions and those of their country on citizens of other countries. It is clear from surveying the literature on global citizenship and cosmopolitanism that scholars disagree on their definitions and their usefulness as social constructs.

Cosmopolitanism is seen to be synonymous with global citizenship, and is also an ambiguous concept with similar contested meanings. Originally conceived in ancient Greece, where "Kosmopolities literally means citizens of the world" (Germann Molz, 2005 , p.518), cosmopolitans were viewed by many as worldly visionaries, knowledgeable of world cultures and cultures, accepting and engaging others (Hannerz, 1990; Szerszynski & Urry, 2002). "The basis of cosmopolitanism is the individual whose loyalty is to the universal human community" (Delanty, 2006, p.28) . Nussbaum (1996) was a strong proponent of cosmopolitanism, noting how early Stoic philosophers conceived cosmopolitans as citizens of the world who thought of global humanity as having precedence over issues within their own states. Molz also saw cosmopolitans in positive light, seeing the cosmopolitan perspective as being derived from "mobility, detachment and multiplicity as opposed to rootedness or national affiliation" (p.517).

Molz recognized that while individuals may be "evolving away from national affiliations -- towards a global form of belonging" (p.518), he also supported the contention that cosmopolitanism "can allow for multi-placed, multi-layered and multi-scaled forms of identity" (p.520) and often predicated on an individual's national affiliation. Other academics, however, viewed cosmopolitans as disloyal to their own country who neglected their national citizenship responsibilities, moving from country to country without obligations (Bowden, 2003, p.356). Matthews and Sidhu (2005) see cosmopolitanism as appealing mainly to the privileged elite, a perspective disputed by a study by Furia (2005) which utilized the World Values Survey.

Clearly, the meaning of these two terms is contested throughout the literature. Are global citizenship and cosmopolitanism a good thing, representing knowledge of the world's interdependence, an acceptance of diversity, concern for all humankind, and shared personal and social responsibility to engage social injustices in our local and global communities as Nussbaum, Molz, Delanty and others suggest? Or do these terms reflect individuals who are really cultural tourists and/or privileged members of an elite class as Featherstone, Roman, Matthews and Sidhu see them, as they neglect their allegiance and responsibility to their own country in lieu of travelling the world. Perhaps each is right, and their differences lie more with semantics than the actual social construct. I assert that since the U.S. college administrators are seeking to develop college graduates with personal attributes aligned with the positive aspects of global citizenship and cosmopolitanism, it is more productive to re-conceptualize these terms into a new outcome-based operational definition that is neither contentious nor ambiguous.

Cosmopolitan Learning

Education for cosmopolitanism was the subject of Gunesch's (2004) research, in which he differentiates between three ideal types of cosmopolitans – "advanced tourists, transnational cosmopolitans and interactive cosmopolitans" (p.253), depending on their level of engagement with other cultures. In this typology, U.S. college students studying abroad in Western European cities who live together would be aligned with either advanced tourists or transnational cosmopolitans. Those college students, however, who chose to spend their semester studying abroad in home stays with local families in developing countries while working on social development projects would be more aligned with interactive cosmopolitans. Gunesch's model seems somewhat simplistic, and while he does remind his readers of the importance of having clear educational aims and outcomes, the article lacks any indication as to what type of pedagogical approach could be used to develop cosmopolitanism.

Rizvi (2008; 2009) realized that cosmopolitanism needs to be linked to learning. He introduces cosmopolitan learning as "a way of learning about and ethically engaging with, new social formations" (2008, p.253). This type of learning addresses the interdependence and connectivity of 21st century global society and involves engaging students in what he calls epistemic virtues, which underpin critical elements around intercultural learning with moral development and an ethical orientation. Rizvi's epistemic values move us closer to understanding a cosmopolitan from an outcome-based perspective, but like Gunesch falls short in providing a pedagogical framework for cosmopolitan learning. It is somewhat surprising that while Rizvi discusses the importance of criticality, reflexivity, and ethics as students consider cultural differences and social injustices while challenging their previously held beliefs, she doesn't link to the literature on transformative learning in her work.

Marshall (2011) subsequently studied the challenge of identifying an effective pedagogic approach to critical global citizenship education as she seeks to develop "a set of sociological conceptual tools" for advancing "global citizenship education policy, theory and practice" (p.411). Her article aligns Rizvi's work on the epistemic virtues for cosmopolitan learning with the key elements of Andreotti and Souza's (2008) model for global citizenship education (learning to unlearn; learning to listen; learning to learn; and learning to reach out). This article helps reframe global citizenship education to provide "educators with an alternative way of conceiving global citizenship education knowledge and pedagogy" (p.422). Marshall's work is helpful at laying new groundwork for re-conceptualizing global citizenship education and cosmopolitan learning. She also calls for more empirical research to guide the question of how to approach cosmopolitanism education. I premise that re-conceptualizing global citizenship and cosmopolitanism as *transformative global citizenship* along with measurable key indicators is one way to foster empirical research on the efficacy of pedagogical approaches for this concept.

Nussbaum (2002), a prolific writer on cosmopolitanism, stressed the altruistic nature of cosmopolitans who she regarded as transformative citizens of the world with a personal responsibility to act in the interests of all humankind. Nussbaum believed that the cosmopolitan citizen, while possessing global identities and attachments, also should be rooted to and engaged with, their countries, cultures and local communities. Nussbaum's perspective on cosmopolitanism is well-aligned with the key tenets of transformative citizenship education, which is rooted is altruism, empathy, social justice and social responsibility.

Transformative Citizenship Education

It is evident that citizen identities are more nuanced in today's interconnected and increasingly diverse society, which is leading to changes in how citizenship is perceived and taught. Globally-oriented citizens see the world as an interdependent system, "understanding the interconnection of all living things"(Appiah-Padi, 2001). Lapayese (2003) argued for a new critical global citizenship education as a pedagogy of transformation – "critical global citizenship education, through critical thinking, meaningful experiences, and radical activism, can contribute to an understanding of power relations and power structures" (p. 501). This new framework moves the global citizen or cosmopolitan from understanding other cultures and diverse populations to accepting personal responsibility to act to address inequities.

Banks (2008) introduced the concept of transformative citizenship education to promote an understanding of how multi-layered identities are interrelated and constructed, premising that the "purpose of transformative knowledge is to improve the human condition" (p.135). This tenet reinforces the global conscious dimension of the transformative global citizen. Banks sees transformative citizenship education as well aligned with the critical thinking principles of 'critical citizenship education' (Lapayese, 2003) as well as 'critical cosmopolitanism' (Delanty, 2006). Transformative global citizens are neither un-rooted nor neglectful; they just see themselves with a personal and social responsibility to humankind, one that transcends beyond geographic, cultural, religious and nationalistic affiliations.

Banks work provides a staged typology, with transformative citizenship holding the most advanced stage of development at the top. "Transformative citizens take action to promote social justice even when their actions violate, challenge, or dismantle existing laws, conventions, or

structures" (Banks, 2008, p.136). The work of both Lapayese and Banks is helpful in establishing a new theoretical framework and working definition for critical or transformative global citizenship, yet neither provides an actionable pedagogic approach for fostering this somewhat elusive concept. Banks does suggest using multi-cultural textbooks and experiential activities in the classroom to encourage diversity. I assert that a more comprehensive, intentionally designed outcomes-based pedagogical approach is needed to develop college students into transformative global citizens.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Re-conceptualizing Global Citizenship: Transformative Global Citizenship (TGC)

Identifying the key indicators of socially responsible, globally-minded citizenship is the first step to selecting an effective pedagogical approach to attain the desired learning outcomes (attitudes, worldviews and behaviors). Incorporating a 'begin with your end game in mind' approach (Covey, 2004), I propose that a globally-minded citizen would have three basic attributes: *global consciousness*, which I define as a global self-awareness of the interdependence aspect of global citizens and global society and a 'systems based ' understanding of an individual's (and their nation's) place and shared fate within a globally-connected context; a*ccepting of diversity*, which I define as willingness to be open to and cooperative with, individuals and communities from different countries, cultures, races, religions genders, sexual orientations and socio-economic backgrounds; and *social responsibility*, defined here as personal integrity and a moral commitment to local, national and global society, and willingness to take action to address social and economic inequities and injustices at all levels of citizenship.

I further premise that college students who develop and demonstrate the above affective and cognitive characteristics (global consciousness, accepting of diversity, socially responsibility) are transformative global citizens, committed to taking personal action to address social injustices. The term transformative global citizenship (TGC) is proposed to establish a new conceptual framework for developing college students as citizens of the new global civil society. The TGC conceptual framework is aligned with Oxfam's (UK) vision for a global citizenship curriculum (1997, in Davies, 2006, p. 206), which states

"We see the Global citizen as someone who:

- Is aware of the wider world and has a sense of their 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 the local to the global
- Is willing to take action to make the world a more equitable and sustainable place
- Takes responsibility for their actions"

This conceptual framework provides a clear working definition for transformative global citizenship, and offers the opportunity to identify key indicators and related sub-dimensions of a transformative global citizen. These key indicators and related sub-dimensions are useful in establishing specific learning outcomes and effective pedagogic approaches for TGC.

Conceptual Framework for Transformative Global Citizenship (TGC)

Under the proposed conceptual framework, the primary learning outcomes (key indicators) and related sub-dimensions of transformative global citizenship are:

Key Indicators	Related Sub-dimensions
Global Consciousness	**Self-awareness:** Self -awareness of one's place in the world and ability to put things in larger perspective **Systems Thinking:** Understanding of global interdependence and global connectivity and how actions one individual and their country can impact people in other countries
Openness and Acceptance of Diversity	**Openness/ acceptance:** Willingness to accept opinions, perspectives, worldviews and preferences of peoples from different religious, cultural, ethnic or socio-economic backgrounds **Adaptable:** Willingness to look at issues from another person's perspective (walk-in their shoes) and challenge your own preconceptions, beliefs and ideas
Social Responsibility	**Empathic:** Compassionate towards others less fortunate than yourself **Personal Integrity and Social Justice Commitment:** Willingness to take personal action to address social injustices and make a contribution to communities both locally and globally

Key Indicators and Sub-Dimensions of TGC

Global Consciousness – the self-aware and systems thinking global citizen

Global consciousness requires a self-awareness of one's place within the greater global society, and the ability to put personal problems, issues and challenges in a proper context (Sosik, 2000). Frankl's (1992) seminal work on purpose-in-life addressed self-awareness, noting that a leader who is self- aware may possess a greater than average sense of meaning. Personal meaning, as a sub variable of self-awareness, has been described as that "which makes one's life most important, coherent and worthwhile - is always directed towards someone other than oneself" (Frankl, 1992, in Sosik, p. 61) and it is consistent with social responsibility. Global consciousness requires ongoing critical inquiry as individuals continually make sense of their changing world.

Global consciousness also requires the ability to be a systems thinker, and to understand the interdependent nature of individuals and of nations in a global society. An individual with a global consciousness is able to view the world as a system in which the behaviors and actions of one individual and their nation can impact the lives of people in other countries. "If learning about global connectivity is to become cosmopolitan then it must have the potential to help students come to term with their situatedness in the world" (Rizvi, 2009, p.264). The work of Wenger (2002) explores how collective identity is forged by participating in communities of practice. Communities of practice can be helpful in fostering systems thinking and global consciousness as participants develop a sense of belonging to a collective, mutual purpose as they work together towards shared goals and common purposes.

Accepting of diversity –the open and adaptable global citizen

Acceptance of diversity requires a willingness to be open to and accept opinions, perspectives, worldviews and preferences of peoples from different religious, cultural, ethnic or socio-economic backgrounds. It also means that individuals are adaptable, with a willingness to look at issues from other's perspectives and challenge their own preconceptions, and reconsider their previously held assumptions, beliefs and worldviews as appropriate. This willingness to be open to a perspective transformation is critical to transformative global citizenship.

A perspective transformation involves individuals, as a result of processing a critical event through critical reflection and discourse, develop a new mindset and worldview (Tennant, 1993). Mezirow (1991) defined a perspective transformation 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 understandings" (p.14).

Socially Responsibility – the principled and compassionate agent for social justice

A social responsible global citizen is someone with personal integrity, who is empathetic and compassionate towards those less fortunate than themselves. They have strong moral compass and commitment to social justice, and are willing to take personal action to address social injustices and make a positive social development contribution to communities in need both locally and globally. Rizvi (2009) refers to these as "epistemic virtues" which "are best developed collectively, in transcultural collaborations, in which local problems can be examined comparatively, linked to global processes" (p. 265). Teaching character, citizenship, ethics,

values and epistemic virtues is very difficult in the classroom, in that these attributes of social and emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1996) are fostered in the affective domain.

Possible Pedagogies for developing college student learning outcomes consistent with TGC

Moral and psychosocial development of college students has become more relevant today as researchers ponder whether and how thinks like altruism, empathy, character and citizenship can be learned. "A growing literature base reinforces the fact that cognitive, social and emotional processes are inextricably linked" (Cove, 1996, p. 2). Goleman's seminal work on emotional and social intelligence proposed an emotional competence model with affective learning outcomes such as self-awareness, social responsibility, commitment, empathy and cooperation with others.

How do we teach college students to be globally conscious (self-aware), accepting of diversity (cooperate with others) and socially responsible (personal integrity, empathetic towards others) and committed to act for social justice (commitment)? What role if any does identity development play in developing into a transformative global citizen? Several pedagogic approaches seem to be aligned with fostering social learning outcomes relating to the key indicators and their sub-dimensions. This includes transformative learning, service-learning, critical social theory, and social/ collective learning approaches.

Transformative Learning

What type of pedagogy could transform someone to see the world differently, to challenge the way they have always perceived the world through a nationalistic or cultural based prism?

"Transformative learning changes the way people see themselves and their world" (Brown, 2004, p. 84). Perspectives are constitutive of experience and the transformative learning process can "enhance participants understanding of and sensitivity to the way others anticipate, perceive, think, feel while involved with the learner in common endeavors -- to develop empathy, and to develop confidence and competence in such aspects of human relations as resolving conflict" (Mezirow, 1981, p. 18) . Mezirow's seminal work on transformative learning was based on a multi-phase learning process, which included deep reflection and critical discourse about a disorienting dilemma which served as a catalyst to challenge previously held beliefs and presumptions. I premise that the transformative learning process has significant utility for developing the key dimensions of TGC. This includes the sub-dimensions such as self-awareness and understanding of global interdependence; empathy and personal integrity towards social justice; and adaptability of new worldviews and tolerance of diverse ideas and beliefs.

 Critical Social Theory

I further premise that critical social theory is aligned with transformative learning, as individuals critically consider elements of power and wealth within the context of social justice. Critical social theory involves the fostering of a "critical consciousness' and the ability to organize "reflectively for action rather than passivity (P. Freire, 1985, in Brown, p. 82) so that learners are "constantly reflecting and acting on the transformation of their world so that it can be an equitable place for all to live" (Brown, p. 85).   Critical social theory can work hand in hand with a perspective transformation, as learners use critical reflection and discourse to process a disorienting dilemma, examine their own values and basic assumptions of the world, and commit themselves to activism to social justice issues. Freire (2000) advocated for the necessity of action based on reflection. Mezirow also believed that "action is an integral and indispensible

component of transformative learning" (1991, p.209). This type of pedagogy supports the key sub-dimensions of personal integrity towards social justice, as well as the willingness to take act to address social inequalities.

Service-Learning

Service-learning, which blends academic courses with community volunteering, is generally accepted in the U.S. as an effective as an effective way for colleges to foster social responsibility in their students. Service-learning is grounded in the pedagogy of experiential learning, which has intellectual roots from the works of John Dewey (1922), as well as the Vygotsky's (1978) theory on social constructivism (Pietro, 2010). Numerous case studies have identified positive social and emotional learning outcomes from service-learning, including enhanced personal integrity, self-awareness, purpose-in-life, empathy, and acceptance of diversity and social responsibility (Astin & Sax, 1998; J. D. E. Eyler & Giles, 1999; Vogelgesang & Astin, 2000). "Certainly, all evidence points to the current service learning program being beneficial --- as an effective route to promoting a student's sense of social responsibility" (Furia, 2005 p.32).

Researchers have also found evidence that service-learning increases tolerance, reduces stereotypes, and facilitated cultural and racial understanding (Astin & Sax, 1998; Astin, Sax, & Avalos, 1999; J. Eyler, Giles Jr., & Braxton, 1997; J. D. E. Eyler & Giles, 1999; Keen & Keen, 1998), given further substantiation that service-learning is effective in fostering openness to others and the acceptance of diversity. Service-learning experiences, when intentionally designed using elements of a transformative learning process and underpinned by critical social theory, can be transformative in nature. Numerous field based research studies (Kiely, 2002, 2004; Monard-Weissman, 2003; Pisano, 2007; Rhoads, 1997) of college students participating in

international service-learning projects in developing countries have concluded that the students experienced perspective transformations, becoming more empathetic, caring and concerned about the welfare of others less fortunate than themselves Kiely's case study confirmed that "participation in an international service learning program with an explicit social justice orientation had a significant transformative impact on U.S. student's worldview and lifestyle" (Kiely, 2002, in Pietro, 2010, p. 15).

Social Learning – Collective Learning, Situated Learning and Communities of Practice

While perspective transformations from global service learning experiences and a transformative learning/ critical social theory process can foster transformative global citizenship, I premise that the multi-layered identity development that needs to occur in TGC development also benefits from an understanding of social learning theory.

Social learning theory premises that learning occurs within a social context in "groups, networks, organizations and communities" (Wildemeersch, Jansen, Vandenabeele, & Jans, 1998, p. 252) and addresses how individuals learn from interacting with each other (Ormrod, 1999). This learning process can impact the identity development of participants. Vygotsky's (1978) theory on learning through social development was the precursor to more recent theories on social learning. Lave and Wenger (1990) work in social learning proposed new theories such as situated learning, collective learning, and communities of practice. Situated learning theory premises that social learning is embedded or situated in the activities contexts and cultures where it takes place (Lave & Wenger, 1990), and is reflective of the social interaction occurring between participants in the activity.

Communities of practice, a theory initially conceived by Lave, "exists because it produces a shared practice as members engage in a collective learning process" (Wenger, 1998, p. 4). Wenger's work (1998) argues that identity formation is an ongoing, lifelong process, and communities of practice assist individuals to learn and form new identities, reinforced by the collective purpose of the group. He calls this learning as belonging. "Learning is an issue of engaging in and contributing to the practices of their communities" (p.7). Clearly, the external environment influences the nature of the informal communities of practice during a community based social development project as part of an international service-learning experience. Wenger argued that individuals "identify most strongly with the communities in which we develop the most ownership and meaning" (p.207, in Pietro, 2009). Working hand in hand with local community members on projects of a social justice nature should provide a strong sense of shared purpose to unite the participating students and members of the local community.

DISCUSSION

From Theory to Praxis – Developing College Students into Transformative Global Citizens

This paper is focused on providing a blueprint from theory to praxis for learning global citizenship. It is evident in the literature that global citizenship and cosmopolitanism have contested meanings and are fraught with ambiguity, which muddies the waters for educators seeking to develop global citizens. Re-conceptualizing global citizenship and cosmopolitanism into a less ambiguous conceptual framework, one that is more aligned with positive learning outcomes of socially responsible, globally-minded citizenship, can enable colleges to start to develop effective educational programs that are intentionally designed with appropriate learning outcomes and pedagogic approaches. Building off concepts of cosmopolitan learning and

transformative citizenship education, I have proposed transformative global citizenship (TGC) as a new conceptual framework.

I have asserted that transformative global citizens are extremely globally conscious, self-aware, empathic, morally developed individuals, open and accepting of others with an ability to understand the unique interdependence of the world and how one individual's actions or the action of their nation can impact other individuals in other nations. I also argue that they have a deep sense of social responsibility and a willingness to take action to address social injustice and help improve the lives of others less fortunate than themselves.

Transformative global citizenship education needs to be grounded in conscious raising activities that are designed to transform the way that students perceive themselves and the world. This type of education seems ideally suited for college students (age 18 – 22) as literature indicates that this is prime time for moral development. Rodgers (1990) definition of college 'student development' involves "the ways that a student grows, progresses, or increases his or her developmental capabilities as a result of enrollment in an institution of higher education (Rodgers, in Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998, p. 4). One of the most influential thinkers on psychosocial theory was Erik Erikson, whose seminal work (1968) was the foundation for other researchers who sought to identify the central social and emotional development tasks of college students. This included Chickering (1997), whose work featured what he referred to as seven –vectors of identity development, which included developing identity, purpose and integrity. Chickering was a believer in the importance of meaningful friendships and encouraging diversity. It is evident that college students are at an ideal stage of identity development to benefit from programs that foster their global consciousness through programs that provide opportunities for multi-layered identity formation. While the focus of this limited

study is primarily on U.S. undergraduate college students, I assert that the key elements of this model can most likely be generalized to develop curricula for students at secondary schools and colleges across the Northern Hemisphere where students can experience disorienting dilemmas from their service in developing or emerging countries in the Southern Hemisphere. Whether transformative learning is an effective pedagogy for students in developing countries is questionable, as they are less likely to experience a disorienting dilemma from engaging in discussions regarding social inequities and social injustices.

College Study Abroad and International Service Learning Projects – Moving from Cultural Tourism to Perspective Transformations

The learning outcomes for developing transformative global citizenship need to reflect the multi-intelligence nature of this new operational definition. While most U.S. college students studying abroad no doubt gain a better understanding of the world, I premise that not all study abroad is created equal. A typical study abroad student may spend a semester in Rome, London or Paris, speaking mostly English and hanging out with fellow Americans and their new friends from one of these Western European countries. While these students may share divergent political leanings or traditions, most have likely enjoyed similar lifestyles and creature comforts that are characteristic of the affluent Western society. The social learning from a traditional study abroad experience is apt to be less than transformative in nature. Rizvi (2003) faults current practices in exchange programs for failing to foster moral imagination and civic responsibility.

However, some students (perhaps less than 5% of U.S. study abroad students) decide to take a different road. They choose to study abroad in a developing country, often immersing themselves in the local language and cultural traditions through home stays while working in the local

community on a joint community service project. These students often return and self-report perspective transformations aligned with transformative global citizenship. For example, many researchers have found students reporting a significant change in moral development and social responsibility, including enhanced empathy and compassion for others and a commitment to take action to address social injustice (Pietro, 2010). Others have reported a new global consciousness, as they become more self-aware their place in the interdependent world and the insignificance of their perceived problems in light of the plight of others less fortunate endure (Pietro, 2010). These individuals often self-report an enhanced openness towards other cultures, as they work together to collectively solve problems and tackle challenges.

Study abroad programs that provide students the opportunity to study and work on a meaningful community service project in local communities in developing a country to implement positive social change may be fertile ground to foster transformative global citizenship. The participation in these immersive international service learning projects appears to offer an effective experiential classroom that supports the development of transformative global citizenship behaviors.

I premise that there are several key elements that set international service learning apart from the typical study abroad experience. Participants in ISL, through home stay experiences and joint community projects, develop a closer affinity and stronger bond to their hosts which allows them to identify and personalize with their situation. Living in their shoes helps participants identify with these people. Second, studying abroad in a developing country, especially one that doesn't speak English as a first language, can be extremely unsettling. This cross border dissonance is akin to Mezirow's disorienting dilemma, as it forces students to reconsider preconceptions and

beliefs about social justice. This exposure to social injustice often develops empathy, compassion and social responsibly.

Cross-border service learning as praxis for developing transformative global citizenship

Transformative global citizens are socially responsible and globally conscious, demonstrating empathy, self-awareness and openness to, and acceptance of, diversity. They are willing to take action to address social injustice and foster positive social change. Transformative global citizens need to be able to take a systems approach to the world of nations, fully understanding the interdependence of global civil society as the actions of countries or individuals in one area of the world can impact other individuals and countries. I think most would agree that a transformative global citizen would enhance world peace and make the world a better place. I assert that colleges are an ideal place for college students from western societies to learn how to be transformative global citizens. College students are at a prime age and life stage for moral development and multi-layered identity development to take place.

Prototype Program for fostering TGC for U.S. College Students Studying Abroad

TGC programs can be intentionally designed to include these key learning elements to facilitate the development of transformative global citizenship. For example, the initial part of the curricula design should include pre-program assessments and personal cultural auto-biographies or life histories to develop a greater self-awareness for participants. The student should spend considerable time of their semester long study abroad experience in a developing country, staying with a local family of modest means in a community that speaks little English. This would help them personalize the social injustice issues by developing bonds with the people actually impacted, and the language barrier can strengthen the level of cross-border cognitive

dissonance and present an authentic disorienting dilemma or critical moment for the student participants. In order to foster a collective identity development and a community of practice environment, each student would work on a community social development project with other students from the Western countries and local community members.

The project could range from extreme poverty alleviation to building an orphanage or working a public health awareness issues. It would be a social development issue that the participant has a passion for. Each week discussions would be held to critically discuss problems, challenges, lessons learned and intercultural bridges crossed. The participant would keep a critical reflection journal to record their thoughts on these discussions and their development as the experience progresses. Part of the critical reflection and critical reflection and critical discourse processes would be to explore on actions, policies, and behaviors, both positive and negative, in the student's own country and in the host country, can have impact on people in the other's country.

Finally, each student would be challenged to develop a personal plan of action they can share with their classmates, families and friends when they return to demonstrate how they can commit themselves to taking action to address social injustice issues and better local and global society when they return home. Students would be tasked with continuing to blog on how the experience is impacting their worldview, global consciousness and purpose-in-life over the year following their service. I assert that this type of study abroad experience will have a significant impact on the development of a college student into a transformative global citizen.

"the global citizen understands his or her role in building relationships through embracing diversity and finding a shared purpose across national boundaries. Seeks to include and engage others in a sense of shared common humanity. Building understanding on common humanity and shared concerns – the global citizen is a companion, accompanying the other on a journey to find just and compassionate responses to injustice" (Shultz, 2007, p.256).

CONCLUSION

This study attempts to re-conceptualize the contested meanings of both global citizenship and cosmopolitanism in order to identify an effective pedagogic approach to fostering transformative global citizenship. I have proposed an operational definition of transformative global citizenship that involves three basic elements or key indicators: global consciousness; accepting of diversity and social responsibility. I have used these key indicators and related interpersonal sub-dimensions for identifying the learning outcomes for transformative global citizenship.

These learning outcomes were utilized to identify appropriate pedagogical approaches for fostering transformative global citizenship. This included transformative learning, service learning and critical social theory. Sensing that the identity of the transformative global citizen is multi-layered in nature, I also looked at literature on how identity development, especially in college students, is construed in the literature. This literature indicates that individuals of college students at a critical identity development stage for moral development.

Many colleges throughout the U.S. have added the goal of fostering global citizenship in their students and entire campus communities. Most are looking to their study abroad programs to send their students their students overseas to engage them in global society. There appears to be a significant disconnect in their stated goals of fostering characteristics in their students seemingly aligned with our definition of transformative global citizenship, and the corresponding semester long journeys to cities throughout Western Europe where most of these students go. It seems that these college administrators assume that just going overseas will transform them through osmosis. In reality, many of these students go to countries that have a high standard of

living and speak English, and they often spend their time with fellow American college students, becoming in essence cultural tourists. Perhaps they are more knowable about the global marketplace and more marketable professionally, but most likely not becoming transformative global citizens.

The emerging study abroad program area called international service-learning is an avenue where college administrators can intentionally design a field based approach to foster authentic transformative global citizenship in their students. It is evident in the literature that moving an individual from a basic national identity to a multi-layered global identity, as they evolve into transformative global citizens, requires a significant perspective transformation. Underpinning this perspective transformation is the concept of a critical element, which is referred to as a 'defining moment' or 'disorienting dilemma' (Mezirow); and critical inquiry (reflection and discourse) around this critical element. Critical inquiry is a key component to both transformative learning and critical social theory. Critical inquiry involves the sense making of individuals and groups as they ask deep questions that consider their place in relation to the rest of the world.

There remain several issues with using the model of transformative learning to intentionally design an international service-learning program to foster a perspective transformation leading to the development of transformative global citizenship. One issue is with intentionally designing a defining moment (critical incident or disorienting dilemma). Are all defining moments equal? Clearly, each individual has a different level of tolerance for a 'jolt', and therefore what may not cause much critical unsettling to one person may push someone else over the edge. Another issue is that some college students are already globally-oriented, and exhibit the attitudes and actions of transformative global citizens. In fact, one could reasonably assert that the study abroad

participants who self-select into international service projects are most likely predisposed to the key indicators of TGC, and less apt to experience, or need to have, a perspective transformation. The biggest challenge of these programmatic attempts to foster transformative global citizenship is to attract the type of individuals who could really benefit from a perspective transformation. The students who do not possess the key indicators of TGC are the ones that could really benefit from a semester long sojourn to a developing country to work on a social development project.

In evaluating the value of these types of programs, college administrators need to remember the benefits to greater society even if the participating students are already transformative global citizens. First, the students are helping to improve the lives of others through their cross-border service projects. They are also experiencing something that they can come back and share with fellow students and the entire campus community, which will hopefully have an impact on their worldviews. Finally, one should not underestimate the learning acquired by individuals in the host communities as they work alongside of visiting college students. Additional benefits to the student's university, community and country will be the intercultural bridge and goodwill established with members of the host community and country.

The emerging trend in higher education in the U.S. is to call for college students to become global citizens. Most colleges in the U.S. see increased levels of participation in study abroad programs as a primary vehicle to develop global citizens. Yet administrators rarely if ever give much forethought as to what global citizenship really is, or how study abroad can be intentionally designed as a pedagogical tool for learning global citizenship. This is surprising since colleges should be experts in learning and pedagogical design.

Approximately 250,000 U.S. college students studied abroad in the 2008-9 school year (Institute of International Education, 2010). The study abroad experience would be significantly enhanced by having more of these students participate in an international service-learning project in a developing country. In an increasingly interdependent globalized society in which events like global warming, terrorism and infectious diseases demonstrate how the actions of individuals and their countries impact the quality of life individuals in other countries, developing thousands of American college students studying abroad into transformative global citizens would be a significant contribution to world peace and human security. The U.S. and other universities in other countries throughout the Western world may want to encourage participation in these programs through tuition rebates, waivers or perhaps give extra class credits for the field based experience as students plan their projects and critically reflect and discuss their challenges, accomplishments and lessons learned in reflection journals, online social media and final papers. Since the students already are going and paying for their own travel expenses and tuition costs, an incentive of $2,000 to encourage 20,000 students to consider going to a developing country and completing an international service-learning project would cost $40 million dollars. In relative terms of U.S. foreign policy, this is a small price to pay, roughly equivalent to the cost of one F-14 fighter jet or about 3 hours of the U.S. war budget for Afghanistan (Belasco, 2009) to foster 20,000 new transformative global citizens.

Global citizenship is often identified as a key learning goal at public secondary schools as well as most private college preparatory and International Baccalaureate schools throughout the Western world. Since student secondary students are in the same identity development stage of life as U.S. college students, I premise that cross-border community service projects in developing countries can also impact the development of TGC for secondary school students as well.

DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This paper indicates that critical inquiry and sense-making around cross-border cognitive dissonance is one way to foster transformative global citizenship. Sense-making or meaning making, as individuals ponder deep existential questions about their purpose-in-life, may be best examined through the lens of philosophical inquiry. Individual philosophical inquiry involves critical reflection and discourse in which the learner questions why they think and act as they do, re-examining their personal beliefs, assumptions and attitudes about their place in the world. Researchers also use philosophical or phenomenological inquiry to make sense of how individuals make sense of their personal learning from a lived experience.

One direction for future research could be to study learning outcomes from participating in intentionally designed international service-learning programs through philosophical inquiry. This approach seems well suited to researchers who are trying to determine the level of perspective transformation and identity change experienced by college students participating in different types of study abroad program. Variables, such as the location of the study abroad experience (Northern or Southern Hemisphere), duration of the program (short-term versus semester or yearlong), type of program (service or no service, home stays versus no home stays) or presence of key critical, transformative learning elements (disorienting dilemma, critical reflection, discourse) could be studied in semi-structured interviews in relation to the level of perspective transformation (if any) experienced. This could help faculty to evaluate whether these theories can inform praxis and assist U.S. college practitioners to develop new study abroad programs to foster transformative global citizens for our interdependent global society.

APPENDIX

Transformative Global Citizenship through International Service Learning Projects

The key elements of a program would be:

Pre- and post assessment

All students should participate in a pre- and post transformative global citizenship assessment (based on measuring the key indicators and related sub-dimensions of transformative global citizenship).

Cross-border dissonance and disorienting dilemma

All students should spend at least four months in a developing country. This will help fuel the cross-border cognitive dissonance that can foster a disorienting dilemma around an issue of social injustice. Language barriers will strengthen the level of cognitive dissonance.

Assimilation, Collective Learning and Collective Identity Development

All students should spend considerable time working on a social development project that addresses human security issues (public health, environmental development, extreme poverty). Staying with a local family will strengthen the level of collective identity development and better comprehend their "roles in the world community" (Banks, 2004, p.300).

Critical Reflection, Critical Discourse and Perspective Transformation

All students should keep a daily journal where they critically reflect on the experience and how it impacts their perceived notions of their beliefs, ideals, lifestyles and personal meaning (purpose-

in-life. All students should have meetings with other students and their host families to discuss how the program may be challenging previously held ideas and transforming their perspectives.

Synthesizing the Lessons Learned and Commitment to Action

All students should participate in a debriefing session to discuss lessons learned about themselves and their place in global society, and develop an action plan to take personal steps to address local and global social injustices. Students "must develop a deep understanding of the need to take action as citizens of the global community" (Banks, 2004, p. 301).

REFERENCES

Andreotti, V., & Souza, L. (2008). Translating Theory into practice and walking minefields: lessons from the project 'Through Other Eyes'. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning 1*(1), 23-36.

Appiah-Padi, S. (2001). How study in North America shapes the global perspectives of African students. *Diversity Digest,* (Spring). Retrieved from http://www.diversityweb.org/digest/Sp01/study.html

Arneil, B. (2007). Global Citizenship and Empire. *Citizenship Studies, 11*(3), 301-328.

Astin, A. W., & Sax, L. J. (1998). How Undergraduates are Affected by Service Participation. *Journal of College Student Development, 39*(3), 251-263.

Astin, A. W., Sax, L. J., & Avalos, J. (1999). Long-term effects of volunteerism during the undergraduate years. *The Review of Higher Education 22*(2), 187-202.

Banks, J. A. (2004). Teaching for Social Justice, Diversity, and Citizenship in a Global World. *The Educational Forum, 68*(4), 296-305.

Banks, J. A. (2008). Diversity, Group Identity, and Citizenship Education in a Global Age. *Educational Researcher, 37*(3), 129-139.

Belasco, A. (2009). *The Cost of Iraq, Afghanistan, and Other Global War on Terror Operations Since 9/11.* Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service

Bowden, B. (2003). The Perils of Global Citizenship 1. *Citizenship Studies, 7*(3), 349.

Brown, K. M. (2004). Leadership for Social Justice and Equity: Weaving a Transformative Framework and Pedagogy. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*(1), 77-108. Chickering, A. W., & Reisser, L. (1997). The seven vectors. In K. Arnold (Ed.), *College Student Development and Academic Life: Psychological, Intellectual, Social and Moral Issues*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Covey, S. (2004). *Seven habits of highly effective people : restoring the character ethic*. New York Simon and Schuster.

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

Delanty. (2006). The Cosmopolitan Imagination: Critical Cosmopolitanism and Social Theory. *The British Journal of Sociology, 57*(1), 25-47.

Dewey, J. (1922). *Democracy and education: an introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: MacMillan Company.

Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity, youth and crisis*. New York: Norton.

Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., & Guido-DiBrito, F. (1998). *Student Development in College: Theory, Research and Practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Eyler, J., Giles Jr., D. E., & Braxton, J. (1997). The impact of service-learning on college students. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning., 4*, 5-15.

Eyler, J. D. E., & Giles, J. (1999). *Where's the Learning in Service-Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.

Featherstone, M. (2002). Cosmopolis. *Theory, Culture & Society, 19*(1-2), 1-16.

Frankl, V. E. (1992). *Man's search for meaning: An introduction to logotherapy (4th ed.)*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education*. New York: Seabury Press.

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of freedom*. Lanham, MD.: Rowan and Litchfield Publishers.

Furia, P. A. (2005). Global citizenship, anyone? cosmopolitanism, privilege and public opinion. *Global Society, 19*(4), 331-359.

Germann Molz, J. (2005). Getting a "Flexible Eye": Round-the-World Travel and Scales of Cosmopolitan Citizenship. *Citizenship Studies, 9*(5), 517-531.

Goleman, D. (1996). *Emotional Intelligence: Why it Can Matter More Than IQ*. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Gunesch, K. (2004). Education for cosmopolitanism. *Journal of Research in International Education, 3*(3), 251-275.

Hannerz, U. (1990). Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture. *Theory, Culture & Society, 7*(2), 237-251.

Keen, C., & Keen, J. (1998). Bonner Student Impact. In B. Foundation (Ed.).

Kiely, R. (2002). *Towards An Expanded Conceptualization of Transformational Learning: A Case of International Service-Learning in Nicaragua*. Dissertation. Cornell University.

Kiely, R. (2004). A Chameleon with a Complex:Searching for Transformation in International Service-Learning *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, Spriing*, 5-20.

Lapayese, Yvette Â V. (2003). Toward a Critical Global Citizenship Education. *Comparative Education Review, 47*(4), 493-501.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1990). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Marshall, H. (2011). Instrumentalism, ideals and imaginaries: theorising the contested space of global citizenship education in schools. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 9*(3-4), 411-426.

Matthews, J., & Sidhu, R. (2005). Desperately seeking the global subject: international education, citizenship and cosmopolitanism. [Article]. *Globalisation, Societies & Education, 3*(1), 49-66.

Mezirow, J. (1981). A Critical Theory of Adult Learning and Education. *Adult Education Quarterly, 32*(1), 3-24.

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

Monard-Weissman, K. (2003). Fostering a sense of justice through international service-learning. *Academic Exchange Quarterly, 7*(2), 164(166).

Nussbaum, M. (1996). Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism. In J. Cohen (Ed.), *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Nussbaum, M. (2002). *For Love of Country, Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism*. Boston: Beacon.

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

Ormrod, J. E. (1999). *Human learning* (3rd. ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Parekh, B. (2003). Cosmopolitanism and global citizenship. *Review of International Studies, 29*(01), 3-17.

Pietro, R. (2009). *International Sport Exchanges, Learning Theory and Collective Identity Development* Research Paper.

Pietro, R. (2010). *Learning to lead thru international service: the role of transformative learning and perspective transformations in authentic leadership development* Research paper.

Pisano, R. H. (2007). *Transforming Students through Service in Study Abroad: A Case Study of an International Service -Learning*. Disssertation. University of California- Los Angeles.

Rhoads, R. (1997). *Community service and higher learning: Exploration of the caring self. .* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Rizvi, F. (2003). Democracy and education after September 11. *Journal of Globalization, Societies and Education, 1*(1), 25-40.

Rizvi, F. (2008). Epistemic virtues and cosmopolitan learning. *The Australian Educational Researcher, 35*(1), 17-35.

Rizvi, F. (2009). Towards cosmopolitan learning. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 30*(3), 253-268.

Rodgers, R. F. (1990). Recent theories and research underlying student development. In D. A. Creamer (Ed.), *College student development: Theory and practice for the 1990's* (pp. 27-79). Alexandria, VA American College Student Personell Association.

Roman, L. G. (2003). Education and the Contested Meanings of 'Global Citizenship'. *Journal of Educational Change, 4*(3), 269-293.

Rosenfeld, S. (2002). Citizens of Nowhere in Particular: Cosmopolitanism, Writing, and Political Engagement in Eighteenth-Century Europe. [Article]. *National Identities, 4*(1), 25-43.

Shultz, L. (2007). *Educating for Global Citizenship: Conflicting Agendas and Understandings* (Vol. 53).

Sosik, J. J. (2000). The Role of Personal Meaning in Charismatic Leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 7*(2), 60-74.

Szerszynski, B., & Urry, J. (2002). Cultures of cosmopolitanism. *The Sociological Review, 50*(4), 461-481.

Tennant, M. C. (1993). Perspective Transformation and Adult Development. *Adult Education Quarterly, 44*(1), 34-42.

Vogelgesang, L. J., & Astin, A. W. (2000). Comparing the Effects of Service-Learning and Community Service *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 7*, 25-34.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univerisy Press.

Wenger, E. (1998). Communities of Practice as a Social System. *Systems Thinker, 9*(5), 1-10.

Wildemeersch, D., Jansen, T., Vandenabeele, J., & Jans, M. (1998). Social Learning: a new perspective on learning in participatory systems. *Studies in Continuing Education, 20*(2), 251 - 265.