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Abstract

Globalization has created new demands on educational leaders within higher education to prepare students for an increasingly interconnected and global world. The Association of American Colleges and Universities (2007) identified the important role of colleges and universities in fostering global learning, particularly during the undergraduate years. Corresponding to this designation, colleges and universities have significantly increased their global experiential learning programs and stated goals of developing global citizens. However, ambiguity exists regarding how key stakeholders understand global citizenship and associated definitions, learning goals, and specifics in terms of how global experiences affect students’ global citizen identities.

Using an Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) methodology, I investigated how key stakeholders at a private, research university perceived global citizenship and how they saw students’ experiences as transformative in creating students as global citizens. My research employed qualitative techniques to address the primary research question: How do key stakeholders explain and describe the transformative nature of global citizenship learning and the ways in which global experiences impact students as global citizens?

The study focused on nine key stakeholders including faculty, administrators and students at a private, urban university. Through the use of in-depth interviews using open-ended questions I was able to access the data that informed this study. The study’s central research question along with the interview questions and use of an interpretive paradigm, allowed for a focus on the realities and experiences of the study’s participants. Mezirow and Associates (2000) theory of transformative learning and Daloz’s (2000) further theoretical development incorporating development and social justice oriented aspects, provided the theoretical framework through which the findings were analyzed.
Based on results of the qualitative data, I identified three major conclusions that answered the study’s research question. First, the study confirmed that students’ participation in global experiential learning and making personal connections beyond the classroom was transformative in how students viewed themselves and others in the world. Second, the data confirmed that global experiential learning was transformative when it fostered empathy and cultural humility, purpose and action. Third, the study found that institutional commitment and, particularly, support of faculty as mentors was key in building and sustaining student’s global citizenship development.

This study is significant in it’s use of an Interpretive Phenomenological Approach (IPA) approach to capture and provide stakeholders’ rich, detailed accounts of their transformative experiences with global learning and citizenship development. It informs the field in confirming and expanding the university’s critical role in institutionally grounding and building student’s global learning and citizenship.
Chapter One: Introduction to the Study

The purpose of this Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) study was to explore global learning and citizenship education with key stakeholders at a private research university. At this stage of the research, how global citizenship is perceived, defined, documented, and operationalized by key stakeholders is inconsistent and is contested within higher education. Knowledge generated is expected to inform how global learning is transformative to students’ development as global citizens and is perceived at the undergraduate level. This analysis, in turn, will provide clarity regarding definitions, learning objectives, and outcomes.

Context and Background

Over the past twenty years, globalization has changed the way we function in the greater society from what we read, to how we think, to the relationships we create. The dramatic developments of globalization have led many colleges and universities to reconsider their educational programs in light of the new skills, habits of mind, and areas of knowledge that students need to function in a global society (Dower, 2003). At the same time, world issues such as climate justice, ethnic intolerance, and lack of economic equity have prompted reconsideration of how undergraduates are prepared as global citizens to effectively address these global issues and promote social sustainability (Sperandio et al., 2010). Together, globalization and the need to develop engaged global citizens prepared to promote and sustain civic sustainability have led to global citizenship learning becoming a top priority within higher education (Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), 1999; Colby et al. 2003; Hovland, 2005; Dower, 2003; Nussbaum, 2002).

As a result, global experiential learning is part of almost every college and university’s mission statement and is, indeed, one of the top priorities within higher education. As we live in an interconnected and global society, understanding international issues and connected historical
contexts is a fundamental challenge for students and critical for personal, professional, and civic development. While the mission within higher education has expanded to emphasize global experiences at the undergraduate level, the preparation and assessment of student learning have not been developed to align with this expansion. Important issues in this regard include defining global citizenship learning and understanding the impact that global experiences have in creating and transforming students as global citizens and in developing their acquisition of new skills, knowledge, and habits of mind.

Therefore, this study sought to investigate how key stakeholders at a private, research university perceived global citizenship and how they saw students’ experiences as transformative in creating students as global citizens. The study reviewed how global citizenship learning was defined and documented as an integral part of undergraduate education. Specifically, this study sought to explore how key stakeholders perceive global citizenship learning to gain greater insights into program definition and development of specific learning goals and outcomes for students.

**Rationale and Significance**

The rationale for this study is the researcher’s interest in global citizenship learning and exploring how key stakeholders perceive the transformative elements of student’s global experiences at the undergraduate level. Green (2012) argued that it is critical that colleges and universities review and then clarify their own definitions of global citizenship education, identify elements that are central to their educational vision, and add other dimensions. Green (2012) stated:

“-in higher education it is important that campus discussion and planning efforts sort out their language, underlying concepts, and implied or explicit values. Otherwise, people
run the risk of talking past each other and developing strategies that may not match their goals.” (p. 125)

Research on the topic of how global citizenship is integrated at the undergraduate level provides opportunities to initiate important discussions among faculty, program administrators, students, and other key stakeholders about the global citizenship definition and the development of learning goals and outcomes. These discussions are critical in beginning to gain understanding and consensus regarding how colleges and universities provide students with the knowledge and skills to make informed career, personal, and civic decisions as global citizens today (Green, 2012).

The results of this study may contribute to a larger understanding of how educational leaders at the undergraduate level can provide the proper environment and conditions to create experiences that lead to transformative learning in regard to global citizenship. The study may prove helpful in answering questions and addressing existing gaps in research and writing about global learning and citizenship and may provide valuable insight into understanding elements that facilitate transformative learning in undergraduate students. These gaps could include the lack of consensus among higher educational leaders regarding the definition of the term global citizen and the lack of understanding regarding how global learning impacts students’ identities as global citizens.

Broader implications of this study regard policy changes that would promote a consistent definition of global citizenship at the undergraduate level and inform student learning goals, objectives, and outcomes to align with this definition. Since colleges and universities are, as claimed in their missions, instrumental in preparing students for lifelong learning and contributing to the world as active citizens, it is critical that they graduate students who have the skills required to address the global issues of society and to be competitive and productive within
the global society. The findings may serve to inform leaders in higher education responsible for making decisions on how to integrate global citizenship education programs in the United States.

**Research Problem and Research Question**

Globalization has created new demands on educational leaders within higher education to prepare students for an increasingly interconnected and global world. The Association of American Colleges and Universities (2007) identified the important role of colleges and universities in fostering global learning, particularly during the undergraduate years. Corresponding to this designation, colleges and universities have significantly increased their global experiential learning programs and stated goals of developing global citizens. However, ambiguity exists regarding how key stakeholders understand global citizenship and associated definitions, learning goals, and specifics in terms of how global experiences affect students’ global citizen identities. Qualters (2010) argued that if colleges and universities want to engage in meaningful global education, they must establish a means to capture this transformation to document and improve global citizenship learning.

This purpose of this Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) study was to explore how key stakeholders envision, explain, and describe the transformative elements of global learning and the ways in which global experiences affect students’ development as global citizens. Such a study may assist colleges, universities, and accrediting bodies by providing research and findings that inform the integration of global citizenship learning at the undergraduate level. The research question that this study seeks to answer:

How do key stakeholders explain and describe the transformative nature of global citizenship learning and the ways in which global experiences impact students’ development as global citizens?
Theoretical Framework

This study is positioned within Mezirow’s Transformative Learning theory (Mezirow, 1977, 1991, 1996, 2000), which offered a theoretical perspective to help explain why and how integrating global experiential learning in undergraduate programs influences students’ transformation into global citizens.

Transformative Learning theory describes the process of individuals becoming more reflective and critical of their assumptions and beliefs. Transformative learning was chosen as a guiding theory for this study based on the assumption that perspective transformation is an integral part of global learning. The Transformative Learning Theoretical Framework informed my study by framing transformative learning theory within the development of social responsibility. Mezirow’s theory (1991), further developed by Daloz (2000) in Mezirow and Associates (2000), outlines four key conditions that must be present for transformative learning for social responsibility: the presence of the other, reflective discourse, a mentoring community, and opportunities for committed action that contribute to the common good.

Transformative Learning Theory

According to Mezirow’s theory of transformative learning, adult learners engage in constructivist knowing, experience deep shifts in their mental models or frames of reference, and become authors of their own knowledge. More specifically, transformative learning (Mezirow, 1977) was described as a process of change that occurs in a person’s frame of reference. Mezirow (1991) noted that “Approved ways of seeing and understanding, shaped by our language, culture, and personal experience, collaborate to set limits to our future learning” (p.1).

Central to transformation theory is that past beliefs are negated and transformed by new knowledge. This transformation of perspective happens through critical self-reflection and
discourse. In exploring how key stakeholders in this case study defined, documented, and operationalized global citizenship, this study sought to articulate more clearly transformational perspectives on students’ development as global citizens. Further, I examined learning through action to consider how this learning leads to transformation of perspective through critical self-reflection and discourse.

**Transformative Learning for Social Responsibility**

Mezirow’s Transformational Learning approach (1991) shares theoretical underpinnings with Freire (1973). Both perspectives hold that adult education should lead to empowerment and they take a constructivist approach to transformational learning (Freire, 1973; Mezirow, 1991). Knowledge is not discovered, but rather is created from interpretations and reinterpretations in light of new experiences. While Mezirow (1991) focused on the importance of rational thought and reflection in the transformative learning process, Freire (1973) focused on social justice. Freire believed that education’s purpose was for the purpose of liberation. He had students discuss and reflect on relevant life issues. Through this process, students recognized the larger societal structures that oppressed them and how they could overcome these barriers. Through consciousness-raising, students came to see the world and their place in it differently. Empowered in their new perspective, they could act to transform the world (Freire, 1973).

Daloz’s “Transformative Learning for the Common Good” (2000) relates to Mezirow’s initial theory in a social justice oriented manner. Daloz examined the interplay between education and development and posits that students often are in a developmental transition and that they look to education to help them makes sense of their lives. Daloz’s approach to transformational learning humanizes the transformational learning process as he used students’ experiences to demonstrate how students negotiated development transitions and were changed in the process. Daloz defined social responsibility as a commitment to the common good and
one that is grounded in the metaphor of the commons.

Daloz cited the university as providing a proper environment in which students would be mentored to gain civic knowledge, habits of mind and skills development. Daloz, Keen, Keen, and Parks (1996) stated:

“a college or university represents the elements of a good mentoring environment, helping people to cultivate the thinking social and technical skills needed in the new commons, and can be a primary catalyst in galvanizing adult commitment to the common good.”(p.46)

Daloz et al. noted that this commitment is an unending process that requires one to take a stance of openness to dialogue with either those who differ, or those who are not yet full participants in the life of the commons: “It is the growth toward this capacity to identify one’s own self with the well-being of all life that undergirds our use of the term social responsibility” (Daloz, 2000, p. 105).

Daloz’s theory presented four key conditions that must be present for transformative learning for responsibility. The first outlined by Daloz et al. is the presence of the other, which provides that constructive engagement or the development of a strong attachment to someone previously viewed as the other was a key factor in the lives of participants in the study. Encounters with the other must lead one across the boundary of ‘us versus them’ to ‘we’ (Daloz et al. 1996). The second condition of reflective discourse involves having the ability to reflect consciously and critically on earlier assumptions and to incorporate cognitive, emotional, and social components into active dialogue with others. Elements of successful discourse include empowerment and self- determination, a participant-based agenda, and validation of emotions (Daloz, 2000). The third condition Daloz identified is that of a mentoring community through which relationships with significant others including teachers, youth leaders, adults, etc., are
developed. Mentors often demonstrate the ideal and model ways of dealing with problems and issues, offering key insights and analysis. A positive mentoring environment provides for a diverse group of friends and colleagues who share common challenges, hopes, and resources (Daloz, 2000). The fourth condition, opportunities for committed action, provides that the ability to act on, test, and ground one’s convictions are critical to the process of transformation.

Over the years, there have been a number of critical responses to Mezirow’s theory. One of the central criticisms is the theory’s emphasis upon rationality and that Mezirow focused too much attention on critical reflection. Robert Boyd (1991) presented an alternative view of transformative learning as an intuitive and emotional process and emphasized the concept of individuation. In contrast to Mezirow’s view, Boyd argued that personal autonomy has less to do with perspective transformation and more to do with social interdependence and people’s emotions (Boyd & Meyers, 1988). While Mezirow claimed the importance of individuals questioning their previous assumptions in order to change their frame of reference, Boyd claimed that individuals must come to terms with the self and the rational side of human nature, which is vulnerable to the forces of the unconscious which enables one to act on a new perspective (Taylor, 1998).

In her review of transformational learning, Baumgartner (2001) noted the historic criticism of Mezirow for ignoring the affective, emotional, and social context aspects of the learning process. She notes, however, that in Mezirow’s most recent work (2000), he acknowledged the importance in the meaning-making process including real world settings that influence cultural orientations and frames of reference, as well as ‘asymmetrical power relationships,’ which influence the learning process and the role of social interaction in the learning relationship.

Transformative Learning theory seems representative of contradictory views of
transformative learning. One view advocates a rational approach that depends primarily on critical reflection while the other emphasizes intuition and emotion. At the same time, the rational, critical, and intuitive elements all play roles in the complex nature of transformative learning.

**Transformative Learning Theory and Global Citizenship Development**

In using this theoretical framework, the researcher will make important connections between transformative learning theory and global citizenship development within higher education. Education for citizenship within higher education has been seen over the years as essential in developing well-informed students who can think critically about society’s issues and make important contributions as a result. The progressives and classic liberal thinkers of the early 20th century argued for a central place for values and citizenship in education and envisioned university graduates prepared to contribute to alleviate human suffering, ensure human rights, and work to develop a productive society (Fallace, 2011). John Dewey was the foremost proponent of the progressive agenda. The theoretical tenet that best underpins the importance of the role of citizenship education was his belief that schools should improve the way of life of citizens through experiencing freedom and democracy in schools (Fallace, 2011). Dewey’s foundational theory on education and civic sustainability has immense implications for studies on global citizenship and educators in the global era. The literature reveals that many scholars have continued to integrate Dewey’s central tenet and themes in their research and writing as they address citizenship within higher education. Dewey’s experiential focus on learning by doing along with the importance of the role of education has on fostering democracy and engaged citizens provide an important theoretical lens through which to view civic engagement at the undergraduate level.

The theoretical tenets of Mezirow’s transformative learning and further theoretical
development of Daloz incorporating developmental and social justice oriented aspects have been central in the research on development of citizenship among college students. The development of citizenship among college students has been a long-standing goal and practice of higher education within the US. It is a critical developmental phase of their lives in which they question their values, their upbringing, their vision for themselves and their society, and their own lived experiences as their own compares to others. The undergraduate years are often when students, in addition to this questioning and reflection, gain the right to vote and demonstrate their support for particular political ideologies, agendas, and practices. Therefore, this period is an opportune time in which students reflect on their place in the world and how they will use their knowledge and education toward civic sustainability.

**Transformative Learning in Organizations**

My proposed research study focused on how global citizenship learning is defined and documented as an integral part of undergraduate education. Specifically, my study explored how key stakeholders perceived the transformative elements of global learning and the ways in which global experiences affect students’ development as global citizen. The study reviewed the guiding principles for integrating global citizenship learning to determine a level of consensus regarding program definition and development and specific learning goals and outcomes for students.

The transformative learning theory is naturally aligned to my research on the integration of global citizenship in undergraduate education. My study began by acknowledging how the dramatic developments of globalization have transformed the way that colleges and universities think about the way that they educate students. It cited the need to reconsider educational programs in light of the new skills, habits of mind, and areas of knowledge that students will need to function in a global society (Dower, 2003). Important issues in this regard are defining
global citizenship learning, establishing concrete learning goals and objectives, and connecting these elements to the assessment of student learning and acquisition of new skills, knowledge and habits of mind. The complexity of how higher education programs should address challenging issues of defining global citizenship learning and student learning outcomes among faculty, program directors, students and other key stakeholders is critical, but remains unclear.

Summary of Theoretical Context

The historical and theoretical basis for higher education’s role in preparing students as citizens is well-grounded within the literature. In addition, higher education’s critical role in preparing global citizens due to the influence undergraduate education can have on students’ development as ethical, committed, and engaged human beings and citizens is clear. It is in the undergraduate years that students gain the right to vote, are exposed to diverse peoples, ideas, and perspectives, and have the capacity to become active and informed citizens. In reviewing the undergraduate developmental and educational period and reprioritizing education for global citizenship, institutions in higher education can have a major impact on how students come to understand and navigate issues affecting the world both locally and globally.

However, global citizenship learning is complex, and, as previously stated, current challenges exist regarding constructing definitions, establishing learning outcomes, and assessing programs, which confront colleges and universities seeking to integrate global citizenship learning into undergraduate programs.

This study wishes to address a major challenge and an opportunity in higher education and specifically, colleges and universities, to integrate more purposely citizenship education into undergraduate programs so that students graduate with the necessary skills, habits of mind, and areas of knowledge that will enable them to be informed and engaged global citizens. In order to do this goal, colleges and universities need to engage key stakeholders in the foundational work
of understanding the transformative elements of global learning and the ways that global experiences influence and define undergraduates’ global citizenship learning.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

Defining and documenting global citizenship are integral parts of undergraduate education and learning and are important on many levels (Green, 2012). First, global citizenship learning is one of the top priorities within higher education (AAC&U, 2007). Second, today’s climate in higher education focuses heavily on assessment of student learning outcomes (New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), 2011). Third, while the literature has revealed that the mission within higher education has expanded to include an international focus and global citizenship learning, it also provides significant sources that cite ambiguity around exactly how global citizenship learning is defined and how learning goals and outcomes are developed and assessed (Andrzejewski & Alessio, 1999).

The following literature review provides a conceptual framework for this research study. It is organized in four sections in accordance with its goals. First, it examines global citizenship learning for undergraduates in the 21st century. Second, it reviews the historical and moral basis for preparing students as citizens. Third, it explains the importance of defining and developing global citizenship learning in higher education. Fourth, it considers the associated issues of assessing citizenship learning and the implications for further research and practice.

Global Citizenship Learning for Undergraduates in the 21st Century

The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) has focused attention and efforts on global learning and social responsibility emphasizing the need to develop social, civic, and global knowledge in university graduates by linking liberal education with democracy (AAC&U, 1999). A more expansive global education initiative by AAC&U in 2002 focused on “Liberal Education and Global Citizenship: The Arts of Democracy”. The initiative emphasized a sense of increased urgency in integrating global knowledge and skills as parts of the educational goal of undergraduates. Hovland (2007), program director of global initiatives at
AAC&U, emphasized the need for undergraduate institutions to rethink their existing curricula. He held that colleges and universities should implement global citizenship programs and that each institution be responsible for program development. AAC&U stated the important role of colleges and universities in fostering global learning, particularly during the undergraduate years. In fact, the board members named global learning as one of the top priorities and leading demands of the 21st century (AAC&U, 2007).

As we live in a global and interconnected society, understanding global issues and related historical contexts is a fundamental challenge for students at the undergraduate level and is essential to their personal, professional, and civic development. In progressing with these learning goals and objectives for students, post-secondary institutions must play a critical role in the development of future civic leaders, both as U.S. and as global citizens (Grudzinski-Hall, 2007). Caryn McTighe-Musil, Project Director at AAC&U, states that global citizenship has been moved to the center of higher education reform efforts given the world’s complex problems that call for collective and pro-active solutions (AAC&U, 2007). Further, McTighe-Musil argued that higher education is specifically poised to address these issues by educating students about the importance of their engagement in our shared humanity (University of Alaska Fairbanks [UAF], 2002). Colleges and universities have held a responsibility to develop programs that have served to engage students as citizens with stronger global awareness, either as a consequence of their educational mission (Braskamp & Engberg, 2009; Hovland, 2009; Stearns, 2009) in providing greater employment opportunities for their graduates (AAC&U, 2007), or simply by promoting global mindedness among future generations (Banks, 2008).

Indeed many colleges and universities have been developing global citizenship programs and revisiting their institutional mission statements and strategic plans in order to provide support for this new initiative (Hovland, 2005). However, the complexity of how higher
education programs should address challenging issues of definition of global citizenship learning and student learning outcomes remains an issue.

Green (2012) demonstrated that colleges and universities discuss global citizenship education in different ways with varying emphasis depending on whom is using the term. She argues that it is critical that colleges and universities review the many meanings and then clarify their own definition of global citizenship education, identify elements that are central to their educational vision, and then add other dimensions. She cites that it is important that campus discussions and planning efforts clarify their language, underlying concepts, and implied or explicit values in regard to global learning and citizenship in order to develop strategies that match their goals (Green, 2012). According to Hovland and Schneider (2011), the twenty-first century has been characterized as a ‘global century’ due to shifting dynamics, differences in economic structures and realities, new ideas about self-determination and freedom across the globe. They argued that given this new context we, as educators and citizens, need to ask new questions about our role in the world and the kinds of learning that will foster students to be active contributors, successful human beings, and democratic citizens in the current global and interconnected society in which we live. Their research and writing offer important questions for higher education to consider in reference to global citizenship. These questions imply the need to rethink what it means to prepare students to be responsible citizens. Additionally, we need to question what educational priorities and institutional structures need to align to address these global challenges and realities. The current global moment asks educators to intentionally reflect on what it will take to make preparation for democratic and global citizenship mainstream and not just peripheral in U.S. higher education (Hovland and Schneider, 2011; Green, 2012).

Even with the existing ambiguity in defining global citizenship learning and associated outcomes, the work of respected scholars agrees that educating for global citizenship in higher
education remains critical for several important and compelling reasons. First, to be competitive within the global workplace and for social cohesion and sustainability of our greater society, students, as global citizens, must understand the global context (Green, 2012; Joseph & Payne, 2010; 2012; Mickelson & Nkomo, 2012). Second, the primary role of educators is to prepare students for life in the real world in their communities and societies, and, as educators, we know that the real world is more interconnected and interdependent (Banks, 2008; Reich, 2012).

Third, as a global society we all share in facing major planetary challenges—climate change, health epidemics, poverty, economic recessions, unequal distribution of wealth, trade imbalances, human rights issues, terrorism, political instability, international conflicts, and divided societies (Feast & Bretag, 2011). At the same time, we share opportunities for global collaboration in the sciences, the arts, business, the economy, and international cooperation (Joseph & Payne, 2010). Research by Reich (2012) has shown that given the challenges and opportunities that confront our contemporary and future society, students must develop the understanding, perspective, and skills to effectively address these in a collaborative and informed manner.

In review of the literature on students’ development, evidence suggested that college undergraduates are uniquely poised developmentally for citizenship learning. Mickelson and Nkomo (2012) discussed the critical role of higher education in preparing students for their adult responsibilities as workers, parents, neighbors, and citizens. The authors argued that by college age, students are at a significant developmental juncture in their learning and suggested that it is after completing high school, when students leave their family and familiar surroundings and are transitioning to become independent, that they become exposed to new ideas, perspectives, people, and historical and cultural understandings. In fact, academics have long maintained that students at the undergraduate level are developmentally primed for global and civic learning for
many reasons (Clothey, 2011; Colby et al. 2003; Noddings, 2005). According to Braskamp and Engberg (2011), theorists of college student development have long recognized the importance of the college environment and its powerful impact on students’ development of a sense of self and identity formation. Today’s college environment contains more diversity than ever, and undergraduate students have unprecedented access to others at the local, national, and global level. This access occurs whether students make these connections on campus or through study abroad or international experiential research and learning (Sperandio et. al, 2010). Within these broad and varied landscapes, students have opportunities to talk and work with diverse individuals who represent a wide range of social, ethnic, and religious identities.

According to Reich (2012), students must be engaged in repeated and on-going educational opportunities to develop the global competencies and new areas of knowledge necessary for them to participate as active and informed global citizens in an interconnected world. This experience provides for a substantive and informative exchange of global and local perspectives and understandings. Students gain both intrapersonal and interpersonal development as they engage in critical reflection in thinking about themselves and others through these interactions. These reflections and interactions provide a solid foundation from which students can continue to engage across cultures, socioeconomic status, and perspectives in working with others to promote the global common good (Braskamp & Engberg, 2011).

While different educators emphasize different aspects of students’ developmental appropriateness for citizenship learning as undergraduates (Bragaw, 2001; Clothey, 2011; Colby, Beaumont & Stephens, 2003; Stearns, 2009), higher education has traditionally stressed the development of the whole student along several dimensions—intellectual, social, civic, physical, moral, and spiritual. Braskamp & Engberg (2011) argued that as students develop cognitively, they integrate and reflect on learning in new ways and begin to see themselves as part of a larger
whole, and they establish belief systems that can be used to discern their choices and experiences. Given the global and interconnected world in which we live, where a variety of worldviews and cultural perspectives influence how we relate to others, this developmental learning is complex. However, it is important that students understand and empathize with others who have different origins, ethnicities, and religions in order to develop a global perspective (Mickelson & Nkomo, 2012).

The literature indicated that development of citizenship among college students has been a long standing practice of higher education in the United States (Stearns, 2009; Colby et al., 2003). Many reasons exist for this practice. However, two primary aspects position the higher education period as a most effective time and means to educate students in regard to civic responsibilities and citizenship. First, as previously cited, as students leave their familiar surroundings; they are in a developmental phase of their lives in which they question their values, their upbringing, their vision for themselves, their society, and their own lived experiences as they compare to others (Braskamp & Engberg, 2011). Second, in addition to this questioning and reflection, students at college age obtain the right to vote and begin to actively question and participate in the political process (Harkavy, 2006). For these reasons, students, through study and active participation, develop ideas and opinions about contemporary political issues and demonstrate their support for particular political ideologies, agendas, and practices (Harkavy, 2006).

To summarize, the literature has revealed that citizenship learning has been a consistent focus within colleges and universities. The undergraduate years, although only one part of a lifelong developmental process, are situated at a critical juncture of development when students are poised to shape intellectual frameworks and habits of mind that they can bring to their adult experience. Specifically, they are examining and changing the way they understand the
responsibilities that are central to their sense of self. The literature identified changes in our society that have resulted in greater interconnectedness across the globe and pose new challenges and opportunities for citizenship learning. Globalization has created a sense of urgency within higher education to prepare students for an increasingly complex world. The AAC&U (2007) has identified global citizenship learning as a priority within higher education citing the need to rethink how we best prepare and educate students. Respected scholars and researchers maintain the importance of colleges and universities striving to transform students into global citizens through new initiatives, programs, and learning. They also acknowledge that there exists ambiguity and lack of a clear definition for global citizenship learning and understanding of how global learning affects students’ identities as global citizens.

**Historical and Moral Basis for Preparing Students as Citizens**

According to Zahabioun et al. (2013), notions of citizenship beyond the state have existed for over two thousand years and have largely reflected the assumptions, experiences, concerns, and various political and socio-cultural contexts of the time periods in which they were constructed. The authors advance from the notion of world citizenship, which encourages citizens to work for the common good, to the notion of a cosmopolitan citizen as described by Immanuel Kant during the Enlightenment, which encourages citizens to adopt a pragmatic and humane stance (Zahabioun et al 2013). During the 20th century, the notion of citizenship prevalent in the previous two centuries began to shift to align with the emergence of new rights, e.g., racial, ecological, civil, and sexual (Zahabioun et al. 2013). The 21st century has brought additional changes and development through communication and technology that have brought the world closer and have enabled connections transitioning us as global citizens without traditional boundaries and creating new virtual spaces in which to engage (Bragaw, 2001; Harkavy, 2006; Nussbaum, 2002; Reich, 2012; Summit, 2013).
Education for citizenship in higher education has been seen over the years as essential in developing well-informed students who can think critically about society’s issues and make important contributions. This idea dates back to the progressives and classic liberal thinkers of the early 20th century who argued for a central place for values and citizenship in education (Stearns 2009; Sernak, 2011; Noddings, 2005 Giroux, 1992; Andrzejewksi & Alessio, 1999).

With respect to higher education, these educational philosophers and theorists envisioned university graduates prepared to contribute to alleviate human suffering, ensure human rights, and work to develop a productive society (Fallace, 2011). John Dewey was the foremost proponent of the progressive agenda. The theoretical tenet that best underpins the importance of the role of citizenship education was his belief that schools should improve the way of life of citizens through teaching about freedom and democracy in schools (Fallace, 2011).

Dewey (1916) argued that democratic learning meant both maximizing communication between individuals and group as well as the importance of a large variety of shared undertaking and experiences. Dewey maintained that a democratic education implies an exchange of learning and perspectives based on experience. Dewey’s position has tremendous implications today in the global era, both in terms of student learning and activism (Giroux, 1992; Fallace, 2011). In his foundational book, The School and Society (2001) (Original work published in 1915), Dewey placed emphasis on the importance of schools connecting to the issues and concerns of the wider society. He attempted to identify and make clear how schools form connections to everyday life, so that the learners gain experience that can be applied and made useful in society. He noted:

“All studies arise from aspects of the one earth and the one life lived upon it. We do not have a series of stratified earths, one of which is mathematical, another physical, another historical and so on. We live in a world where all sides are bound together. All studies
grow out of relations in the one great common world.” (Dewey, The School and Society, 2001, p. 55)

As stated previously, a focus on universal problems (i.e., healthcare, poverty, hunger, inadequate/inequitable housing and education) that manifest themselves locally are ways that Dewey’s philosophy can be applied in practice in today’s global society (Green, 2012; Fallace, 2011).

Dewey’s thinking on education and civic sustainability has immense implications for educators in the global era. The literature reveals that many scholars have continued to integrate Dewey’s central tenet and themes in their research and writing as they address citizenship within higher education (Andreotti, 2006; Banks, 2008; Bragaw, 2001; Clothey, 2001; Dower, 2003; Giroux, 1992; Green, 2012; Harkavy, 2006; Noddings, 2005; Nussbaum, 2002; Schattle, 2009; Starkey, 2005; Stearns, 2009). Schneider (2001) enthusiastically called for the renewal of civic engagement and social responsibility in the public sphere, particularly within higher education. She advocated for an important shift in emphasis within academia toward involvement with larger social purposes. Spiezio et al. (2005) conducted an empirical study of 1,243 undergraduate students enrolled in 30 courses at four colleges and universities to evaluate the effects that the pedagogy of service learning and a democratic classroom approach had on student attitudes toward civic engagement. The research produced findings that demonstrated statistically significant changes in student attitudes toward the importance of an engaged citizenship when pedagogy and instruction were expressly dedicated to this goal. The authors argued, similarly to Schneider, that restructuring which promotes a systematic approach to civic education is recommended through general education curriculum for institutionally based commitment to civic engagement.
Fujikane (2003) provided that there is a need for revised imperatives that embrace the idea of new world citizens who acknowledge interdependency, act independently of their nation states, and construct a universal morality in order to create a more just society.

Sernak (2011) argued for educational leaders to be advocates for dialogue and to view themselves as a part of, not apart from, society. She called on educators to think not only of themselves as leaders of schools, but of the social and civic worlds. She cited Dewey’s emphasis on the importance of dialogue and the need for educational leaders to learn how to dialogue and interface with civic and political communities. Mezirow (1977) similarly acknowledged that transformation theory holds moral values are legitimized by agreement through discourse. Further, Mezirow argued the universality of such values as truth, justice, and freedom and claimed that if everyone could participate in discourse, under the ideal condition of discourse, there would be a universal consensus regarding these values. Sernak (2011) argued that civic sustainability begins with educational leaders recognizing that we live in a global society and the importance of working toward and building capacity for a peaceful and sustainable world by engaging others in dialogue. She stressed this dialogue is critical in guiding and developing curricula and experiential learning that encourages students to explore what it means to be active and engaged citizens.

Colby et al. (2003) asserted that the moral and civic are inseparable and argued why such education is important in the 21st century. First, they explained the result of global interdependence and increasing complexities in the global society that students must be able to see themselves as members of a community and to take action for the common good. Second, they maintained that the time in which we live promotes individualism, self-interest, and a decline in civility. They provided that moral and civic education could act to counter these trends. Third, they found that there is an increased lack of trust in the United States democratic
process and a decline in participation in civic participation. Fourth, although there is an overall increase in students participating in community service, students must engage in deeper learning about, and understanding of, policy issues in order to affect change in society. The authors argued that civic and moral education would be most effective if these efforts are self-conscious, consistent and intentional.

According to research on democracy and education by Starkey (2005), the world is both more global and more democratic. Thus, he argued for the importance of integrating citizenship learning in higher education. According to his studies, between 1980 and 2001, the number of states (countries) holding multiparty elections more than doubled. By 2001, more than one-half of the world’s population was living in a liberal democratic state (United Nations Development Programme, 2002). Starkey argued that the development of a democratic culture requires education that is about living together. Education is an essential component of democracy, which helps students to learn and practice living together, in the current context amidst the complexities of a global world.

Conclusively, the literature reveals that interconnected citizenship education is vital to our society, democracy, and the global world. As Giroux (1992) stated, since we are living in an interdependent and global world, schools need to close the gap between what they teach and the real world. Further, college undergraduates are poised for this learning and through such learning can increase their effectiveness as active citizens in the global world. It is clear from review of the literature that citizenship education is even more critical given societal changes and challenges in the global society in which we live. The question of how to best address global learning and citizenship is critical. Zahabioun et al. (2013) claimed that as citizens today, we are members of the greater international community, and this situation requires specific education for living, engaging, and participating actively in the current global era and for the challenges
and opportunities it poses. In reviewing both the historical and moral basis for citizenship education, the literature suggested that educators take advantage of the current focus on global learning to wrestle with important questions about how graduates will apply their global and civic learning in the real world.

**Defining and Developing Global Citizenship Learning in Higher Education**

According to research by Sperandio et al. (2010), changing times call for changing approaches. In the current global context in which we live, this change means looking at how to develop an undergraduate interdisciplinary global citizenship program at the higher education level. Using document analysis and in-depth interviews, the authors examined higher education citizenship programs designed to spur civic engagement and social responsibility, promote democracy, and cultivate intercultural competencies. The programs that they reviewed were developed on the assumption that post-secondary institutions play a critical role in the development of future global citizens, both domestically and globally. The programs were developed in accordance with the core belief that students need tools to develop their own individual citizenship in today’s global world. Although the concept of global citizenship is not new, it has been under review given how widely it has been used in higher education (Banks, 2008; Bragaw, 2001; Clothey, 2011; Harkavy, 2006). Many higher education institutions name global citizenship in their mission statements and as an outcome of liberal education and internationalization efforts (Green, 2012).

Zahabioun et al. (2013), in their study of global citizenship and its implications for curriculum goals during the age of globalization, explored defining global citizenship education conceptually and examined its significance and need. In a present day review of global citizenship, the authors hold that components such as identity, dependency, values, morality, culture, ethnicity, and religion as well as concepts such as rights, responsibility, and
contributions need to be taken into consideration from a global perspective (Zahabioun et al. 2013). The authors argue that the shift moving beyond membership in the local and national community to a greater international community requires a review of rights, responsibilities, identity, and social belonging. Thus, becoming a global citizen requires adopting a global perspective that enables one to see the experience of the local community as interconnected with the experiences of others around the world. These findings relate to what Banks (2008) argued for in his review of diversity, group identity, and citizenship in a global age. He explained the need for transformative citizenship education that would enable students to acquire the information, skills and values needed to challenge inequality within their communities, their nations and the world and foster thoughtful individual and collective civic action (Banks, 2008).

Research provides that an evolving and contested notion of citizenship raises important questions about how education will respond to these demands and adequately prepare students’ (Hovland & Schneider, 2011). The literature suggested that educating for global citizenship has become a shared goal of educators and educational institutions that are invested in expanding their own and their students’ understanding of what it means to claim or to have citizenship in the twenty-first century (Stearns, 2009; Harkavy, 2006). Within the study abroad literature, Tarrant et al. (2013) noted that three key dimensions of global citizenship are now commonly accepted: a) social responsibility (concern for others, for society at large, and for one’s environment), b) global awareness (understanding and appreciation of one’s self in the world and of world issues), and c) civic engagement (active engagement with local, regional, national and global community issues). They cited one of the most thorough reviews of the global citizenship concept in the study abroad scholarly field, Schattle’s (2009) proposition that global citizenship entails awareness of responsibilities beyond one’s immediate communities and making decisions to change habits and behavior patterns accordingly.
On the other hand, Green (2012) argued that global citizenship is a choice and a way of thinking. She argued that global citizenship is defined differently from national citizenship. She claimed that rather than something that occurs at birth, as national citizenship does, global citizenship is defined for people through different formative life experiences and that it has different interpretations of what it means to people. She argued that whatever an individual’s particular take on global citizenship is, that the person makes the choice in whether or how to practice it (Green, 2012). Appiah (2007) reviewed global citizenship in the Fordham Law Review noting the evolving notion of citizenship to the present day. He argued that in this global era we do not need a single world government, but that we must care for all human beings both inside and outside our own societies and further described how much we can gain from dialogue across our differences (Appiah, 2007).

Research has suggested that the complexity that colleges and universities face in implementing global citizenship programs stems from the lack of an accepted definition for the term global citizenship (Sperandio et al., 2010). The authors argued that since there is not an accepted definition of the term global citizenship, there is no consensus concerning the design of undergraduate global citizenship programs and that colleges and universities have initiated such programs using a variety of methods. While the struggle to define global citizenship continues, academic pressure mounts to identify learning goals and objectives for preparing students to effectively participate in today’s globalized world. As the ideal of developing citizenship skills is written into college mission statements and educational documents, it is not re-conceptualized based on new global events, nor purposefully integrated into curricula, standards, or assessed in any meaningful way (Andrzejewski & Alessio, 1999). Without this common agreement, comparison of student learning outcomes and short and long-term program assessment becomes more challenging.
Attempting to define global citizenship, Sperandio et al. (2010) explored what it would mean to be a global citizen and how this definition would translate into a workable undergraduate program. The authors reviewed Lehigh University’s process of developing a global citizenship program for undergraduate students including issues surrounding the definition of the term global citizen and underlying assumptions that university programs are an effective means for fostering engaged global citizens. Through their case study and supporting research and documentation, they conducted university discussions on how to define global citizenship, which was guided by the following questions:

“What does it mean to ask of any student, regardless of major or intended career paths, that they become a global citizen? What is the difference between being a person who knows about non-U.S. cultures or languages and a global citizen? Is there a specific content, ideological perspective, or set of beliefs that are inherent in a citizen? What do students need in order to be able to determine, for themselves, their own relationship to the world?” (Sperandio et al., 2010, p.14).

Rather than presenting a tight, prescriptive faculty-determined definition of what a global citizen should be, the discussions led to the determination that since all students will be affected by globalization, they should develop their own understandings and definitions of a global citizen (Sperandio et al. 2010).

Concerning the development of global citizenship learning programs, Harkavy (2006), together with colleagues at University of Pennsylvania, conducted research on the role of universities in advancing citizenship and social justice in the 21st century. His research supports involving colleges and universities working to solve universal problems such as poverty, education, and healthcare that are manifested in their local communities. According to Harkavy (2006), the goal for universities should be to contribute significantly to developing and
sustaining democratic schools, communities, and societies. By working to realize this goal, democratic-minded academics can greatly assist American higher education, in particular, to return to a core mission—effectively educating students to be democratic, creative, caring, constructive citizens of a democratic society.

In contrast, research conducted by Banks (2008) maintains that it is critical to move beyond American higher education as we think of citizenship education and broadening our vision. Banks reviewed diversity, group identity, and citizenship education in the current global age and suggested that citizenship education must be reimagined and transformed to effectively educate students to function in the 21st century. The author held that in order for this reform to succeed, an underlying shift must occur from mainstream academic knowledge to transformative academic knowledge. He defined mainstream academic knowledge as reinforcing traditional and established knowledge institutionalized in popular culture and in schools, colleges, and universities (Banks, 1993). He defined transformative academic knowledge as consisting of paradigms and explanations that challenge some of the key epistemological assumptions of mainstream knowledge. Referring to (Collins, 2000; Harding, 1992; Takaki, 1993, 1998) Banks cites that the important purpose of transformative knowledge is to improve the human condition. Transformative citizenship education enables students to develop reflective cultural, national, regional, and global identifications and to acquire the necessary knowledge and skills needed to promote social justice at the local and global level.

Preparing students to become knowledgeable citizens has historically been identified as a purpose of the American higher education system; however, it was not until the last ten years that a high quality education has come to encompass “connections between academic disciplines . . . and include global and cross-cultural knowledge and perspectives”(AAC&U, 1999, p.v). The literature reveals that global citizenship program development is complicated, as colleges
and universities have distinctive strengths and differing foci as well as various ways of defining global citizenship and learning outcomes. Defining, documenting, and assessing global citizenship learning require large institutional commitments and a long-term effort. The future of many higher educational programs depends on the development of identifiable learning goals and outcomes. The literature indicates that colleges and universities are initiating new programs and using different measures to evaluate student progress. Conclusively, as noted in the literature, although some scholars recommend that colleges and universities begin such defining of terms and measures through college-based discussions and planning, others call for defining and developing standardized higher education indicators for global citizenship learning.

Issues in Assessing Global Citizenship Experiential Learning in Higher Education

Assessing learning of all students has become a higher priority in higher education (AAC&U, 2007). Accreditation asks colleges and universities to provide more and more detailed data and information on what students are expected to demonstrate or know when they graduate. The New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) 2011 Standards that outline assessment of student learning call for systematic and broad based assessment of what students learn both in the academic program and in experiences outside of the classroom. Standard 4.48 states:

The institution implements and provides support for systematic and broad-based assessment of what and how students are learning through their academic program and experiences outside of the classroom. Assessment is based on clear statements of what students are expected to gain, achieve, demonstrate, or know by the time they complete their academic program. (NEASC, Standard 4.48, p. 12).

In reviewing the literature, the research on assessment of experiential learning suggests that a number of complex variables make the task of defining and assessing learning goals in
global citizenship learning challenging. Faculty and administrators are faced with a variety of practical and pedagogical issues that influence the development of learning goals to determine how and what they assess (Mackaway et al., 2011). For example, Brodie & Irving (2007) suggested that learning goals and assessment in experience-based learning are especially challenging because they need to address learning that is holistic and involves multiple entities. Additionally, the assessment attempts to capture and measure learning of softer skills. Brodie & Irving (2007) noted that student learning objectives within global experiential education are often individualized by student experience, which can vary tremendously, thereby making it difficult to establish universal learning goals by which to assess. A lack of consensus exists regarding preparation of globally competent students and a means to measure competencies and skills.

Research conducted by Cates and Jones (1999) suggested that an assessment plan for experiential learning programs must include defining program goals, establishing learning outcomes, designing evaluation instruments, gathering results of evaluation, and using these results to enhance student learning and make program improvements. They suggest that experiential learning move beyond documenting the learning that takes place and instead assess what the students can actually do with newly developed knowledge and skills. The authors identified that clearly defined program goals and an understanding of the connection of these goals to the institution’s mission are critical to assessment. They furthered this claim in suggesting that all assessment should be articulated in light of the institution’s mission. If colleges and universities include global citizenship learning as part of their mission and top priorities, then learning goals and assessment should reflect these and be developed accordingly. Adams and Sperling (2003) furthered the argument that an institutions’ mission should drive all its activities and initiatives. They also acknowledged that mission statements in higher education are often irrelevant to all but the people who write them. The authors also acknowledge the
complexity of global citizenship, its meaning, how institutions achieve it, and how to prepare students for a future characterized by diversity, global interrelationships, and rapid change.

Cates and Jones (1999) expanded the argument by proposing that the first step towards assessment is to define the global citizenship learning goals in line with the educational mission of the institution and then to convey these goals to all parties in the experiential learning partnership. The second step in formulating the assessment is to state specific learning outcomes to be achieved. Cates and Jones (1999) distinguished outcomes from program goals in that outcomes can be broken down to their measurable, assessable consequences. By contrast, Qualters (2010) suggested that it is important to look at assessment as more than an outcome measurement and that while outcomes are important, they do not reflect the end product of assessment. She cites Ewert and Sibtorp (2009) regarding the difficulty in measuring outcomes in experiential education due to the many confounding variables that make this challenging, such as student maturation, pre-experience anxiety, and demographics.

Designing evaluation instruments is the next step in the assessment process whereby tools or evaluative instruments are developed to measure learning outcomes based on the global citizenship learning goals. Qualters (2010) cites research conducted by Sandra Elman, Executive Director of the Commission on Colleges of the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges (NASC) who identified four “essential questions” that campuses need to seriously discuss before they conceive of an assessment design – WHY are we doing assessment? WHAT are we assessing? HOW do we want to assess in the broadest terms? HOW will the results be used? (Elman, 1993). Qualters (2010) argued that the power of these questions resides in the campus-wide involvement of key stakeholders and the discussion from various perspectives in order to fully answer these questions and obtain buy-in from participants. She further asserted that it is in the interest of each partner in the experiential learning program to answer these questions. For
example, faculty may be concerned with capturing whether or not students are using classroom theory in practice, but students may want to know and articulate how the global learning experience informed their discipline knowledge.

Conclusively, the literature reveals that global citizenship learning is critical to student success in the global world, and assessment of this learning is both important and complex. Currently lacking is consensus regarding how to best prepare and assess globally competent students (Reich, 2012; Colby, Beaumont & Stephens, 2003; Feast & Bretag, 2011; Stearns, 2009). There is a need for assessment that clearly documents the power of global citizenship learning (Zahabioun et al., 2012; Summit, 2013; Reich, 2012 Mackaway et al., 2011).

**Summary**

Over the last decade, the literature has focused on the prioritization of global citizenship learning in higher education and the associated challenges and benefits. Reviewing the literature clarifies that with the onset of globalization, it is imperative that colleges and universities review their mission, definition, and learning goals and objectives to ensure that they adequately prepare students to be active and engaged global citizens. The fundamental reasons for this review have been identified by examining the literature on global citizenship learning at the undergraduate level and have been reported on in this paper. However, they bear repeating in conclusion.

The most recent literature cites that college students who graduate today with a lack of primary understanding of current global economic conditions, knowledge of historical and political contexts, and the ability to relate the local and the global will be insufficiently prepared for effective citizenship (Banks, 2008; Bragaw, 2001; Clothey, 2011; Green, 2012; Hovland, 2005; Mickelson & Nkomo, 2012). In addition, the literature maintains that American institutions of higher education have a special obligation for integrating global citizenship education and preparing students to engage actively in a time of rapid globalization (Reich,
2012; Joseph & Payne, 2010; Sperandio et. al, 2010; Spiezio et al., 2005). More and more students will find themselves in situations where their work, their voting, and their leisure interests depend on awareness of global and historical contexts. It is essential for American higher education to review its current curriculum and programs to ensure alignment with student learning needs in a global and interconnected society (Schneider, 2001; Stearns, 2009; Summit, 2013; Zahabioun et al. 2013).

The historical and theoretical basis for higher education’s role in preparing students as citizens is well-grounded within the literature. In addition, the literature provides that higher education has a continued critical role in preparing global citizens due to the influence that undergraduate education can have on students’ development as ethical, committed, and engaged human beings and citizens (Starkey, 2005; Clothey, 2011; Harkavy, 2006). It is in the undergraduate years that students gain the right to vote, are exposed to diverse peoples, ideas, and perspectives, and have the capacity to become active and informed citizens (Zahabioun et al. 2013). In reviewing the undergraduate developmental and educational period and reprioritizing education for global citizenship, institutions in higher education can have a major impact on how students come to understand and navigate issues affecting the world both locally and globally (Bragaw, 2001; Banks, 2008).

The literature maintains that global citizenship learning is complex and that challenges of defining construct, establishing learning outcomes, and assessing programs are issues that confront colleges and universities seeking to integrate global citizenship learning into undergraduate programs (Sperandio et al. 2010; Mackaway et al. 2011; Qualters, 2010; Reich, 2012; Green, 2012).

In summary, this literature review addresses a major current challenge and an opportunity in higher education and specifically, colleges and universities, which is to integrate citizenship
education more purposefully into undergraduate programs so that students graduate with the necessary skills, habits of mind, and areas of knowledge that will enable them to be informed and engaged global citizens. In order to implement these changes, colleges and universities need to engage key stakeholders in the foundational work of defining and documenting global citizenship learning. Assessment of learning that aligns with the global needs and structure of the present society can then take place. This literature review highlights our role, as educators in higher education, as critical to the preparation of global citizens to become engaged and future leaders.
Chapter Three: Research Design

The goal of this research is to explore the experiences of key stakeholders at a private research university and how they explain and describe transformative aspects of global learning that affect students’ development as global citizens. This study seeks to understand how key stakeholders make sense of global learning and global citizenship transformation during which students identify as global citizens.

A methodological approach that allows for interpretation is necessary in order to access the best information. This study employed a qualitative research approach designed to capture the experiences of key stakeholders who were integrating global learning and citizenship at the undergraduate level. The Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) approach allowed the researcher to investigate how the participants made sense of the phenomenon that the study was exploring. In this study, the IPA approach was used to explore how key stakeholders made sense of global learning and how that contributes to students’ identities as global citizens. This study was inductive as it assumed agency and required the individuals participating in the study to interpret their own experiences.

Research Question

How do key stakeholders explain and describe the transformative nature of global citizenship learning and the ways in which global experiences affect students’ development as global citizens?
Qualitative Research Approach

This study was positioned within an interpretivist paradigm. Rubin and Rubin (2012) suggest the interpretive paradigm is concerned with understanding what people make of the world around them, how people interpret what they encounter, and how they assign meanings and values to events or objects. At its core, the paradigm is an assumption that social actors generate meaningful constructs of the social world in which they operate. The rationale of my selection of interpretivism as a paradigm was to explore and better understand the subjective experiences of key stakeholders at a private research university as they integrate global learning and citizenship education and how they think, explain, perceive and make sense of the transformative aspects of this learning. To explore these subjective experiences, open-ended interview questions were used to gain insight into their experiences.

Based on a review of existing research on global learning and citizenship education, qualitative research was the most appropriate method to further the research on this topic. The interpretivist paradigm best aligns with my research study that explored the question of how colleges and universities integrate global citizenship learning into undergraduate experiential learning programs. In this paradigm, individuals seek understanding of the world in which they live and work. The goal of the research relied on participants' views of their experiences. Using this approach, the intention was to capture the experiences of faculty, students, and administrators at a private research university as they engage in defining, documenting and operationalizing global citizenship learning. Through individual interviews, the empirical data was gathered for the study.

The use of in-depth interviews using open-ended questions was selected as the most effective means to access the information that informed this study. The study’s central research question, along with the interview questions and use of an interpretive paradigm, allowed for a
focus on the realities and experiences of the study’s participants. As the interpretive paradigm focused on understanding the world of the participants (key stakeholders at a private research university), my role as the researcher, was to act as a vehicle ensuring that each individual subjective experience was heard. Through the use of the interpretive paradigm, the researcher, playing the role of a medium, provided a connection between the group and the larger society.

Historically, IPA has been used as a method within the health sciences. IPA became increasingly popular in the mid-1990s, and its use has significantly increased in recent years. IPA is a relatively recent qualitative approach developed specifically within psychology. Smith et al. (2009) referred to IPA’s core interest group as people concerned with the human predicament, which they categorize as a focus on people engaging with the real world. The origins of IPA are phenomenology and hermeneutics. Husserl, Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty, and Sartre contributed significantly to the philosophical foundation of IPA. IPA is phenomenological in that it is concerned with exploring experiences in its own terms (Smith et al. 2009). Husserl urged phenomenologists to go ‘back to themselves’ rather than trying to fix experience in predefined or overly abstract categories (Smith et al., 2009). Husserl’s work established the importance and relevance of a focus on experience and its perception. Heidegger, Meleau-Ponty and Sartre moved away from the more descriptive elements of Husserl and toward a more interpretative position with a focus on understanding the perspective of what it means to be involved in the lived world with a focus on our relationships to the world and each other (Larkin & Thompson, 2012). In this way, IPA is an interpretive process and is thus informed by hermeneutics, the theory of interpretation. Smith et al. (2009) showed that the IPA researcher is engaged in a double hermeneutic as the researcher is trying to make sense of the participant trying to make sense of what is happening to them. Thirdly, IPA is idiographic and, as such, is concerned with the particular. IPA research involves a detailed examination of each case and focuses on what
the specific experience for a particular person and what sense the person makes of the experience (Smith et al, 2009). It is Heidegger’s focus on examining activities and relationships and the individual’s worldview that pertains most to this study on the transformative aspects of global learning and student’s identities as citizens (Smith, 2004).

**Participants**

For the purpose of this study, eight to ten participants were recruited. The participants in this study were composed of eight to ten adults who had been involved in global learning and citizenship at the university. I chose this range to ensure that I had a large enough sample size in the case that a participant withdrew from the study and to procure enough diversity of opinions. This sample size is commensurate with current studies that have used IPA and is confirmed in information provided in (Baker & Edwards, 2012). Smith, Flower, and Larkin (2009) cited that for professional doctorates, a sample size of between four and ten is adopted in most cases, and this range seems to provide for the sufficient development of meaningful points of similarity and difference among participants, but not so many that one is in danger of being overwhelmed by the amount of data generated (Smith et al., p.51).

The researcher used purposeful sampling to select key stakeholders including students, faculty, and administrators of various ages, genders, and ethnicities who had been involved in global learning and citizenship program development. According to Creswell (1994), "the idea of qualitative research is to purposefully select informants that will best answer the research question” (p. 148). Creswell (1998) recommends “long interviews with up to 10 people” (pp. 65, 113) for a phenomenological study. In IPA, sampling is often purposive and homogeneous; the participants share the experience to be investigated, but do not vary much across demographic
characteristics (Langdridge, 2007). Sampling was purposive, as participants must have the experience of being a key stakeholder within global learning and citizenship education at the university located in the Northeast to be considered for this study. The participants were interviewed at a private, research university in the Northeast for the following reasons: I am a cooperative education faculty and currently a doctoral student at the university; I will seek approval from only one Internal Review Board (IRB); this private research university has programs and policies that intend to foster global learning and citizenship.

**Procedures**

In order to begin the study, approval was sought from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) that facilitates and promotes the ethical conduct of research with human subjects to protect the rights of all participants (Creswell, 2003). IRB approval was sought, as mentioned, at the private, urban university where the research participants were gathered and which also serves as the institution where the research will be presented. Before engaging in the research, each interviewee was asked to sign the informed consent form which provides for participant’s rights protection during data collection (Creswell, 2003). Participation in the study was voluntary and participants were free to withdraw consent and end their participation at any time.

**Data Collection**

For the purposes of gaining insight into the experiences of key stakeholders, in-depth, semi-structured interview questions were developed prior to beginning the interviews. The interview questions were forwarded to participants one week prior to the interview to provide an opportunity to think about the questions before the interview. Three series of interviews were conducted including a thirty-minute introduction to the study, a sixty-minute face-to-face interview with participants at a location of their choosing, and a final interview in order for
participants to review the interview transcript. The interview questions were open-ended and as neutral as possible to allow participants to go beyond yes/no answers and to avoid language that may constrict the participants. Langdridge (2007) explained that semi-structured interviews allow time for participants to articulate as much about their experience as possible. As a faculty member at the university, I paid particular attention to the lived experiences that I had had and the influence that these experiences could have on my interviews and analysis (Rubin & Rubin, 2012).

An interview environment was created that encouraged participants to speak freely from their own perspectives and experiences as I questioned, listened, and reviewed responses from the interviews. I understood my role, as the researcher, was to listen attentively and focus on what participants were expressing as their individual perspectives and experiences. The interviews were conducted at locations at or near the university that were deemed safe and appropriate by the participant. These locations were also appropriate and comfortable spaces in which to conduct a recorded interview that allowed the interviewee to talk freely. Participants were informed of the recording prior to their participation and reminded again prior to the interview. The participants were asked to review a copy of the transcription of the interview after the audio recording was transcribed to review for accuracy. Each interview and participant was numbered to be used throughout the study.

Interviews were recorded using Voice Memo, a recording application, on the Apple iPhone and on a back-up handheld recorder. Each recorded interview was downloaded to a password-protected, researcher-owned computer and converted to MP3 files using Apple’s Garage Band program. The MP3 file was saved and sent to a transcription company to be transcribed. Both the transcriptions and MP3 files were saved on the password-protected computer, as well as backed up on my personal, protected Google Drive. The data were
available to only the researcher and study’s participants.

**Data Analysis**

After the individual interviews were conducted, they were transcribed by a transcription service. I organized the data by transcribing the interviews as soon as possible so that the information was fresh in my mind when conducting the initial coding and data analysis. Once transcriptions were completed, the data analysis process began. Within IPA, the focus of the analysis process is toward the participants’ attempts to make sense of their experiences (Smith, Flowers, & Larkin, 2009). The researcher began Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) of the data (Smith et al., 2009), which is inductive in nature. IPA does not include a single step of data analysis, but must include the following characteristics: (a) movement from what is unique to a participant to what is shared among the participants, (b) description of the experience which moves to an interpretation of the experience, (c) commitment to understanding the participant’s point of view, and (d) psychological focus on personal meaning-making within a particular context (Smith et al., 2009).

The research followed the IPA process outlined by Smith et al. (2009) to analyze the data. The authors cite that doing such analysis is inevitably a complex process that is collaborative, personal, intuitive, difficult, creative, intense, and conceptually demanding. The process is designed to encourage a reflective engagement with the participant’s account that ultimately results as a joint product of the participant and the analyst (Smith et al. 2009).

The initial step involved reading and rereading the transcript a number of times. For this study, the researcher used the left-hand margin to annotate what was interesting or significant about what the participant said. Smith et al. (2009) stated that the first stage is done to ensure that the participant is the focus of analysis. Repeated reading of the transcript allowed the
researcher to actively engage with the data and provide for the overall structure of the interview to develop. Smith et. al (2009) also noted that this detailed reading facilitates an appreciation of the rapport and trust that may have developed across an interview, and this highlights the location of richer and more detailed sections, contradictions, and paradoxes.

The second step of data analysis involved the initial noting of the transcript in which the researcher examines semantic content and language use on a deeper exploratory level (Smith et al., 2009). As part of this process, the researcher kept an open mind, noted items of interest in the transcript, and wrote these notes on the transcript while reading. The aim was to produce a comprehensive and detailed set of notes and comments on the data. Through this initial noting, a descriptive core of comments emerged along with interpretative noting, which involves looking at the language that participants used and discerning the context of their concerns (their lived world) and more abstract concepts, which can help make sense of the patterns of meaning in their account (Smith et al. 2009). The researcher at this step then began to engage in an analytic dialogue with each line of the transcript questioning, reflecting and analyzing for meaning.

The third step of the data analysis process involved the researcher developing emergent themes. Smith et al. (2009) stated that in looking for emergent themes, the task of managing the data changes as the researcher attempts to reduce the volume of detail while still maintaining complexity in terms of mapping the interrelationships, connections and patterns between exploratory notes. This process involved shifting to work primarily with the initial notes rather than with the transcript. In the process, the researcher analyzed exploratory comments in order to identify emergent themes.

The fourth step involved searching for connections across emergent themes. Smith et al. (2009) provided that this level of analysis is not prescriptive and that the researcher is encouraged to explore and innovate in terms of organizing the analysis. At this point, the
researcher will be looking for ways to draw together the emergent themes in order to create a
structure, which will allow for the identification of the most compelling aspects of the
participants’ accounts. Although not prescriptive, Smith et al. (2009) identified ways of looking
for patterns and connections among emergent themes such as abstraction, subsumption,
polarization, contextualization, numeration, and function.

In the fifth step, the researcher began transitioning to the next case or participant’s
transcript or account, and repeating the process. It was important at this stage that the researcher
treat each case on its own terms and not be influenced by what has already been found. Lastly in
step six, the researcher looked for patterns across cases. Smith et al. (2009) suggest the research
lay out tables of data and examine them for connections across cases, themes in one case that
help illuminate another case, and the most robust themes.

**Ethical Considerations**

Informing the study’s participants of the manner in which anonymity will be preserved
and how documents will be held secure was critical, as I am a current faculty member at the
private research university at which the study was conducted. To be most respectful, participants
were informed that personal, background questions were asked during the interview session and
that the participant was free to choose not to answer without prejudice from the interviewer.
Participants were also informed that all identifying information would be kept in a locked and
secure location and would be destroyed at the end of the study. In addition, they were provided a
transcript of their interviews and the coding to review for accuracy and feedback.

**Trustworthiness**

Due to the more open process of qualitative research, it was critical to consider the issues
of bias, assumptions, member checking, and consistency. Lincoln and Guba (1985) noted
credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability as necessary to establish trustworthiness of a study. Their identification of prolonged engagement in the field and triangulation of data sources, methods, and additional investigators are essential to the trustworthiness of a qualitative study.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) argued that ensuring credibility is one of the most important factors in establishing trustworthiness. In addressing credibility, researchers must demonstrate that a true picture of the phenomenon under scrutiny is presented. In this study, the researcher ensured credibility through extensive interviewing and engagement with the participants. In addition, triangulation will take place through observation, individual interviews, and verifying supporting data. The researcher ensured that each person who was approached to participate in the study was given the opportunity to refuse to participate so as to ensure that the data collection sessions involved only those who were genuinely willing to take part and prepared to offer data freely. Participants were encouraged to speak frankly and had the right to refuse to answer a question and the right to withdraw from the study at any point. The researcher’s colleagues and peers were welcomed to scrutinize the research and their feedback was solicited over the duration of the study. This process provided fresh perspective and allowed for the challenge of possible assumptions made by the researcher. Guba and Lincoln (1985) considered member checks as the single most important provision that can be made to bolster a study’s credibility. In this study, participants were invited to read and review their interview transcripts to confirm their accuracy and that their words match what they actually intended.

Guba and Lincoln (1985) noted the importance of thick description of the phenomenon as an important in promoting credibility and transferability. Along these lines, this study included detailed descriptions and interpretations from the interview transcripts. The authors argued that it is the responsibility of the researcher to ensure that sufficient contextual information about the
site is provided to enable a reader to make such a transfer. It is important that sufficient thick description of the phenomenon is provided to allow readers to have a full understanding of it and enable them to make comparisons between the phenomenon described with those that they have seen in their own situations. In this study, the researcher was attentive to capturing details that not only convey the actual situations that were investigated, but also the contexts that surrounded them. The development of a rich, robust descriptive narrative of the findings is generally viewed as the primary means of achieving external validity (Cresswell, 1994).

Dependability and confirmability were established through an auditing of the research process. In addressing the issue of dependability, Lincoln and Guba (1985) emphasize that a dependable study must have an audit trail for future researchers with evidence to conduct similar studies and come up with similar conclusions. Along these lines, the researcher in this study detailed the processes of the study in such a way that a future researcher could repeat the work. This detailed methodological description comprised an ‘audit trail’ that will allow any observer to trace the course of the research step-by-step via the decisions and procedures described. This detailed process also allows the reader to develop a thorough understanding of the methods and their effectiveness and to assess if proper research practices were followed.

To ensure confirmability, the researcher must ensure as far as possible that the work’s findings are the result of the experiences and ideas of the participants, rather than that of the researcher. It addresses the core issue that “findings should represent, as far as is (humanly) possible, the situation being researched rather than the beliefs, pet theories, or biases of the researcher” (Gasson, 2004, p. 93). It is based on the perspective that the integrity of findings lies in the data and that the researcher must adequately tie together the data, analytic processes, and findings in such a way that the reader can confirm the adequacy of the findings. Miles and Huberman explain that a key criterion for confirmability is the extent to which the researcher
admits his or her own predispositions. In this study, the researcher completed a thorough examination and documentation of her positionality and is aware of factors that could predispose her thinking. In addition, the researcher reviewed beliefs underpinning decisions made and methods adopted, and this was acknowledged in the research report for full transparency.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) reported that confirmability is also achieved by establishing an audit trail of both the process and product on how the findings, interpretations, and conclusions are supported by the data. In this study, the researcher compiled and organized documents developed during the process of research including raw data, interview data, written field notes, summaries such as process notes and information, categorization process including structuring of categories (themes, definitions, codes, and relationships), findings and conclusions, and a final report, including reflective notes in the data analysis process.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) emphasized the role of triangulation in promoting confirmability. According to Creswell (2013), triangulation is a method of ensuring validity of information obtained by using multiple sources, methods, and theories to provide corroborating findings (p. 251). Each interview was audio recorded, transcribed, and coded to ensure triangulation. To ensure accuracy and credibility of interpretation when coding and analyzing interview data, participants were provided access to the analysis, interpretation, and concluding data obtained through the interview and analysis processes (Creswell, 2013).

**Potential Research Bias**

Briscoe posited the central question regarding positionality in the opening statement of his article “Who should research and represent the experience of the other in scholarly discourse?” (Briscoe, 2005, p. 23) He also examined issues of identity, especially positionality to explore how these issues related to scholars’ representations of the other and concludes by
arguing for an inclusive rather than exclusive representation of the other. Briscoe highlights the important and critical examination and consideration of one’s background, biases, and experiences in order to avoid misinterpretation and to allow for the best research and representation of the experience of participants.

I have worked in various education settings over the last twenty-five years within international education. I have traveled, taught, and studied abroad and have always been fascinated and compelled by the transformative nature of international experiences. I have experienced, as a student, and observed, as a faculty member, the many ways that cross-cultural living and learning engage the learner and teacher in moving beyond limited knowledge, perspectives, and thinking to open up to more expansive learning. Through these professional and personal experiences, I have come to believe that these global experiences and learning opportunities can have a profound impact for individuals and collectively as a global society. It is clear that I need to step back from this impassioned stance in order to remain objective and open to what may emerge through research in this area. In order to progress student learning and defining global citizenship, I need to objectively investigate the learning goals and process in this area.

I am currently working with undergraduates who are International Affairs majors at a private, urban university teaching and advising them within cooperative education. For many International Affairs majors, their co-op experiences are international and bring them to various places and situations around the world. As part of this work, I began to look at many of the ways that colleges and universities discuss global citizenship. What I identified as a problem of practice was that the concept of global education and citizenship was too broadly and loosely defined. My experiences have led me to believe that there is something more in this education
that has not yet quite been fully explained. What is it exactly? How are we defining and measuring learning? How can we articulate learning outcomes to students so that the experience can be deconstructed, so that they can bring to their careers, communities, and families?

It can be inferred from my background, interests, and current faculty position that I have clear passions and biases regarding global citizenship and learning. First, from my own experience as a student and faculty member, I have clear biases toward the value and transformational aspect of global learning. I myself have been transformed through my global learning experiences and regularly meet and advise students who have transformational experiences. Machi and McEvoy (2012) maintained that by addressing their personal viewpoints, researchers can better control their biases and opinion. It has been my intention to maintain a level of self-awareness and critical conscience and not let my own thinking and perspective on this issue influence the analysis of data and information obtained through my research study.

My work over the years with international students and programs has also influenced my thinking and biases regarding the impact that global experiences can have on students’ learning and development. I have witnessed first-hand the ways that global learning can affect students’ engagement and commitment to global issues and concerns and how it changes their lives and career goals. It is critical that I remain open and objective in my study and not limit myself to a particular understanding and experience that I have had.

In reviewing my specific research interests in global education and citizenship and student preparedness and assessment, I examined how my experiences could influence my thinking about possible outcomes and results of the research. I believe that this process of
examination was critical and enabled to monitor in a more informed sense my research and findings. Reflecting on my biases and positions assisted in my awareness and accountability, I held myself to high standards and introspection to ensure that my biases did not affect my final research study and report. In addition, I ensured that findings were directly shaped by the participants’ responses; extensive use of long quotations and integration of the participants’ words provided evidence that was used to draw conclusions.

**Limitations**

The main limitation to this study was my pre-constructed knowledge about global learning and the development of students as global citizens and how it may have unconsciously influenced the way I guided the interview processes, analyzed and interpreted the data, and presented the findings. A second limitation existed because this study was limited to a small sample of stakeholders who represent best practices of global learning and citizenship development, the findings may not be transferable. Thus, it may be beneficial to repeat this study with students, faculty and administrators who represent more varied levels of experience with global learning and citizenship development.
Chapter Four: Findings and Analysis

The purpose of this study was to explore the experiences of key stakeholders at a private research university and how they explained the defining aspects of global learning that impact students’ development as global citizens. The participants in this study, students, faculty and administrators, provided detailed accounts of their experiences with global learning and citizenship from their respective perspectives. From the analysis of the transcripts, three superordinate themes and seven sub-themes emerged. These themes captured defining aspects of global learning and citizenship development from the perspective of students, faculty, and administrators. The superordinate and sub-themes were: 1) Beyond Classroom (1.1 Personal Connection, 1.2 Transformation); 2) Global Learning vs. Citizenship (2.1 Empathy and Cultural Humility, 2.2 Purpose, 2.3 Global Action); 3) Building Global Citizenship (3.1 Mentors, 3.2 Models and Practices).

While the existing literature on the topic of global learning and the defining aspects that impact students’ identities as citizens is limited, both anecdotal information and research reveal the powerful experiences of students, faculty, and administrators involved in global learning and citizenship development in higher education. In order to better understand the benefits, challenges, and barriers involved in global and citizenship development, this study aimed to gain insight into how a small group of key stakeholders made sense of their experiences as global learners and citizens.

This chapter will discuss the results of in-depth interviews with key stakeholders. The purpose of the in-depth interviews was to gather open-ended responses that would allow for
better understanding of global learning and citizenship concepts, reflections, and thoughts about global learning, and citizenship education, and participant experiences and perceptions.

Table 4.1 provides a listing of the superordinate and sub-themes that were identified through the analysis process, as well as the recurrence of each theme across participants. In reflecting on the initial research question, global experiential learning was identified as key in participants’ citizenship development. The following analysis of the data was collected from semi-structured interviews and organized by subordinate and sub-themes with direct quotations from the study’s participants. Each of these themes will be reviewed and discussed in this chapter and will each theme will conclude with a summary of findings.

**Table 4.1- Superordinate and Sub-Themes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integrating Global Citizenship Learning in Undergraduate Education</th>
<th>Don</th>
<th>Sean</th>
<th>Laurel</th>
<th>Kate</th>
<th>Michelle</th>
<th>Joe</th>
<th>Elsa</th>
<th>Frank</th>
<th>Sara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beyond Classroom</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Connection</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Learning vs. Citizenship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy and Cultural Humility</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global action</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building global citizenship development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models and Practices</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Beyond Classroom**

It got me in the practice of really looking beyond the campus, beyond the classroom, beyond Ann Arbor, beyond the United States of America. You just can’t learn it; you have to experience it.

The above quotation captures the consensus among faculty interviewed for this study that a critical aspect of global citizenship development was teaching and learning beyond the classroom. This particular faculty member acknowledged how his own global learning
experience changed how he thought about teaching and learning. The data collected during the interview process revealed that a key area guiding students’ global citizenship development evolves from their global learning experiences ‘beyond the classroom’. Beyond the classroom is redefined as a space beyond the four walls of the traditional classroom within a college campus. According to interviewees, a critical aspect of global learning is to physically travel to the place that they were studying. One student participant stated that “being able to go there and actually have experiences and solidify my understanding provided more substantive learning because I have a connection to this place, to this conflict.” One participant noted the importance of learning opportunities outside the classroom: “Book learning, it can only take you so far. Interactions in your home campus, in your community, can only take you so far. For me, it (i.e., global learning) is really an imperative.” Participants also described how learning in different locations and contexts prompted them to reconsider their previous understandings and also to think more critically about themselves.

The researcher found two specific areas of convergence across participants that underpinned the theme beyond classroom. By seeing their own culture through the lens of others, participants developed personal connections with people living in other countries, which played a significant role in their questioning of their own identities and roles in a global society. Participants described their ability to better listen to and value what people said and appreciate different cultural backgrounds while also dispelling myths and stereotypes. One participant acknowledged the transformative nature of these experiences as “not just changing what you know, but how you think.”

In going beyond the classroom, participants compared their ‘campus-centric’ experiences with learning outside the classroom, which they described as providing deep, rich insights, personal connections, and on-location understanding. An administrator expressed the following:
I don’t want to say the only way to break out of the narrow view you have is to go abroad, [but] it’s certainly on the top of the list because no matter how much you read and discuss with people of different cultures and different mores within culture, no matter how much your read about that, you have to experience it by going abroad.

One faculty, through global learning, opened students to new perspectives and ways of experiencing the world, which is a method of affective learning.

It’s the transformational learning model and notion of the disorienting dilemma that Mezirow outlines in his transformational learning theory. There’s nothing I can say to you, no article you can read to prepare you for the experience of working in the places that we go – the sights, smells, touch, engagement, human contact can only be felt when you are there, and so it’s touching on the affective learning, not just the cognitive.

There was consensus among participants that the level of global experiential learning that happens abroad also leads students to increased intellectual and emotional maturity. One student expressed how “You can gain these skills here [on campus] but I feel like it’s going to take years to have that nuanced approach; I felt it happened with me much more quickly when I’m thrown into a situation.” Others described similar accelerated and expanded skill and knowledge development that they felt occurred largely due to the fact that they were out of their comfort zones in learning situations that were very demanding. Another student reflected that “I could take a social entrepreneurship course about Bangladesh, but if you’re on the Bangladesh/India border, applying it there is much more impactful. I can tell you that the perspective sinks in more when you have that applied aspect.”

Key stakeholders all agreed that the process of learning beyond the classroom centered on making personal connections with social and cultural others through which participants became open to transformative experiences and learning.
Personal connection.

The things that stay with me are often not what this politician said to my four questions that I wrote down on a paper and later submitted for whatever. It’s that one conversation I had with a secretary at an embassy who lived under the siege of Sarajevo and told me a really casual story at lunch about it. That personal experience is one of my acute takeaways.

This quotation from a student participant captures the essence of the importance of personal connection as he contrasts his two experiences. There was a general consensus among participants that personal connections to places and peoples as well as encounters with others in global locations were critical to their global learning and citizenship development. It was through these global engagements that they came to distinguish their own background and experiences from others, question their assumptions, look for similarities and differences and points of understanding, and form a greater appreciation of their individual and collective experiences. Much of the participants’ learning derived from these connections. Participants came to new ways of seeing the world and recognizing themselves as being part of a shared humanity. In this process, participants confirmed a belief that through working with others people can make a difference. A sentiment expressed by a faculty participant captured the personal connection in the following way:

Going to Cairo, seeing Tahrir Square, meeting an Egyptian face to face and having him welcome me with a broad smile and a big handshake and really just . . . I’ll say this, it’s a corny phrase, but it’s sort of like holding me to his bosom; this guy was just so warm and welcoming and genuine and sincere and funny, and I felt like I was embraced like all Egyptians.
Additional benefits accrued from personal encounters with others included helping participants to think about where they came from, what their place in the world meant, how it was interpreted by others, what kind of values and behaviors were associated with their place of origin, and how they made decisions regarding their being in the world. Interactions with others revealed participants’ own cultures to have significance in the lived worlds of others; this exposed their own familiar world in the view of another person. Students became cognizant of how others were interpreting them and understanding them and began questioning themselves—Did they fit the stereotype? Did they dispel myths about their home culture? How did they represent themselves and connect with others? One student described the process as follows:

We go out into the world; we have to think about who we are as global citizens. When you interact with other people and you tell them where you’re from, there’s a likelihood they’re going to have a reaction. Thinking about how you’re going to represent where you’re coming from…is a part of it: thinking about what your impact is.

As part of global experiential learning, participants identified gaining insight as to a shared humanity. Students expressed developing more awareness and a sense of responsibility for the way in which their decisions, individually and collectively, affected others. Faculty, in particular, noted the importance of helping students to see beyond particular boundaries and borders. Stepping beyond the traditional classroom border was a microcosm of the process that students engaged in as global learners since they themselves moved beyond boundaries, national identities, set ideas, and entities. Participants began to reformulate their sense of self and reshape their understanding of others, finding themselves living in a place of unexplained similarity. One participant articulated the process as:

Global experience can help develop a new outlook in terms of possibilities and understandings of the global condition. It is an experience that is transformative to the
degree that it can challenge the isolationist view that gives rise to American exceptionality.

As participants connected with the cultural worlds in which they were placed, they realized differences became matters to explore, not to compare. A faculty member interviewed described his approach in guiding students:

I forbid my students from establishing comparisons because that’s the easiest thing to do. I ask my students not to begin by comparing or establishing comparisons, to avoid that temptation and just to accept that the way things are done where they find themselves at that particular moment is the way that things have always been done. I tend to ask students not to focus so much on the cultural differences as in the social hierarchies because that’s really where the essence of human diversity lies.

Participants engaged in eye-opening encounters where not only was new knowledge offered, but new ways of thinking about the world occurred. Participants acknowledged that they did not always understand or agree with some of the ways of thinking presented, but it ultimately enabled them to recognize that these ways of thinking were valid among the people whom they came to know. One student participant articulated the experience as follows:

People from the different ethno-sectarian backgrounds, people of different regional backgrounds, all of these different things that create a person or a civilization or a community, I have an ardent interest in the personal experience and the personal narrative. I don’t think that’s something I had before.

The sub-theme of personal connection centers on respondents’ identification of direct personal encounters with people from other cultures and locations in the world as key to their global learning and citizenship development. Through these encounters, participants gained important insights and new understandings of the global society and also engaged in affective
learning, critically reflecting on their own cultural context. Participants described this personal learning as challenging and enlightening beyond that accomplished in a classroom setting. Stakeholders came to identify themselves as global citizens and members of a community that was larger than the town they came from, their college campus, and their country of origin. Through these personal connections, respondents developed an increased awareness and engagement, realizing that they had to work with others to create change, rather than distancing themselves from social problems. These new relationships not only broadened their horizons, but also their sense of a shared humanity and common purpose.

**Transformation.**

It [going to Cairo] blew my mind, opened my world, totally transformed me as a human being, as a student, as a global citizen: all these things I didn’t even know I was becoming.

Thus, a faculty participant described his own initial transformation into a global citizen through the experience of studying abroad. In this study, transformative learning is described as the process of individuals becoming more reflective and critical of their assumptions and beliefs. As central to this process, past beliefs are challenged, negated, and transformed by new knowledge. Learning beyond the classroom facilitated the transformation of identity, purpose, and the understanding of self and others within a global society. A faculty member interviewed described students as “open to having their world rocked—rock my world, go for it, I know I have these prejudices and preconceived notions; I dare you to shatter my myths.” He acknowledged that most of the time these myths get do shattered and students acknowledging, “Wow, I really learned something new here.”

Participants described the profound impact that occurred in going to a place not yet known or experienced—an experience that changed their level of awareness and confidence. Students became more confident, more prepared, more curious, and more thoughtful and that in
“generally having these experiences brings in a whole set of different ideas into [their] brain[s].” Many participants’ experiences enabled them to understand the world through someone else’s lens. One student explained:

Being interested or willing to step outside of that and apply your own perspectives or try to see something through someone else’s lens is what I think of as global citizenry. That idea that I’m not Middle Eastern. I’m not Muslim. I’m not an Arab, yet I have this interest in the politics and culture there.

Faculty and students’ experiences transformed their sense of responsibility and also their recognition of their own privilege and need to act. One student described a transformative lesson living in an area of conflict:

He was bringing this intense experience of being a Palestinian young man living in Israel . . . and me being an American and privileged, but we ended up being good friends, things shifted completely for me; I guess my way of being. Realizing the personal, what privilege I have and the things I’ve been able to do and being thankful for that, but also considering what power structures allow for that which then gets into the whole activist world and our need to act.

Another student said: “[I was] presented with this other reality, and with this other narrative, not only are you presented with it, you’re working in collaboration with it, [and] it changes your whole perspective and previous understanding.”

With this new understanding, students recognized the importance of being proactive and responsible. All respondents shared a belief that students gained a heightened level of local and global awareness and were consequently more likely to engage in sustained global learning and/or participate in local and/or global community service work. One student used an example of working in the Boston Public Schools where she was able to bring perspectives from her
global experiences in a way that helped her to “listen, appreciate, and value what the kids were saying or what backgrounds they were coming from.”

Open-mindedness about and exposure to the world as it really is, not as they have seen it portrayed or previously understood it, resulted in a major transformation in students’ development as global citizens. Several respondents described ways in which paradigm shifts occurred as a result of their global experiences. Faculty participants described different occasions where they noticed shifts in thinking. One, in particular, described his experience:

It happened to me; I went into Middle East studies with the America media and even familial assumptions that the Arabs are bad guys [and that] the Arabs are terrorists. Those Muslims are bad. Then I say, wait a minute. They are just like my family, my neighbors . . . I have developed these relationships, seeing each other as people is important.

Another faculty member referred to peer-to-peer learning activities that she conducted with students while in Zambia. She observed that students often reflected on the complexities and nuances of their own culture as they learned about the culture of someone else. Stereotypes melted as they developed cultural humility. Another faculty reflected on a cohort of students studying social entrepreneurship in South Africa: “I think that there’s something about their [students] openness. They [students] go into it with a deep concern and a caring enough to want to know more and learn more and have their life transformed.”

Participants described their first-hand exposure and associated learning experiences as fundamental in transforming their previously held understandings, perspectives, and mindsets. Participant reflections prompted critical thinking in terms of how they saw themselves and identified with others in the world, particularly in terms of various worldviews, norms, practices, values, and situations. This experience then led to questioning their previously held knowledge
and understandings about themselves, their community, their country, and their position in the world. Speaking with others and going beyond the classroom helped respondents to become more open-minded and to reflect on their own behaviors and actions. Experiencing a foreign culture led them to question how they fit into the world and to realize things were much more complicated and ambiguous than they previously thought. A faculty participant described a particular example of a student experiencing a shift in perspective:

One of my favorite moments was a student reflecting on what it takes for a Zambian student to succeed academically is so much more than what it takes for a student in the U.S.; it challenged these stereotypes, not just changing what they know, but how they think.

With their new understanding and perspective, participants talked about the responsibility to “come home to inform and challenge their home culture,” in addition to understanding more about their own country and approaches to social problems. Participants described how they would take what they had learned to another level by bringing back their new knowledge and experiences to share with their campus community, classes, and to those people whom they perceived to have a limited perspective. One student expressed:

I think it’s important to me and I think it’s important to the world to . . . that not only I step out of my comfort zone, but I also bring it back to the states, bring it back to the people who maybe don’t want to challenge those perspectives and be that window for them as much as I can be, as much as I can speak to those things.

The sub-theme of transformation centers on the recurring observation that moving beyond the classroom thrusts respondents into an eye-opening, myth-shattering, perspective-shifting, heart-rendering transformation in how they saw themselves and the world. Students reflected on what it was like for the ‘the other’ and to walk in their shoes. They began to think differently,
question their reflexive assumptions, and imagine other possibilities and perspectives. This questioning led participants to consciously begin dispelling myths and stereotypes, communicating across cultures, and understanding how others see the world shifting their perspectives. Participants started identifying as global citizens, which informed and shaped their personal values, decisions, actions, and priorities. Participants expressed transformation in terms of their relationships, sense of personal agency, and desire to work with others toward civic sustainability. Through having established a sense of personal connections along with a responsibility to act both locally and globally to address societal issues, participants identified how they could bring new perspectives and understandings to issues facing the global society.

In conclusion, the theme of beyond classroom centers on how the stakeholders, through their global experiences, came to question and eventually understand themselves, as well as other people and places from a different perspective. This questioning, in turn, led participants to examine how they fit into a world that was much more complex than they previously believed. Through this transformative process, participants developed new habits of mind, knowledge and skills. Key stakeholders all agreed that this process included engagement in learning beyond the classroom, making personal connections with social and cultural others, which led them to being open to transformative experiences.

**Global Learning vs. Global Citizenship**

Global citizenship development is the aspiration of global learning. You can teach people and you can point them in the right direction through global learning, but global citizenship, they have to earn it and they have to get there themselves. They have to prove they deserve to be considered…citizen[s] of the world.

In this study, interviewees described a process by which they came to consider themselves as global citizens. In the quotation above, a faculty participant explains how global
learning relates to students’ citizenship development. In their interviews, stakeholders distinguished global learning from global citizenship development, but also saw the two as integrally connected; their consensus was that global citizenship development was an outcome of global learning. Global learning was a critical transformative aspect of students’ identities as global citizens. A faculty administrator noted:

I do think when students travel and participate in global learning, they dispel stereotypes and begin to develop a global mindset, understand why it’s important, be curious about it, and...become bright and curious in the way that they look at the world.

Participants felt that developing global citizenship was part of entering the global society and saw themselves as belonging to a nation, but playing a role in a larger global community. In fact, one faculty member described how global learning was designed to encourage citizenship. He reflected that not only do students gain knowledge, but something much deeper, an appreciation for the importance of inclusion, outreach, and community. Students noted that they began looking beyond themselves to try to make the world a better, safer, and stronger place.

The participants interviewed for this study discussed global citizens as seeing the importance of the ‘interconnectedness’ of all peoples. As global citizens, they sought out information regarding issues of political, economic, and social importance on a global scale and identified themselves as people who act to address the inequities and injustices in the world. They described actions such as collaboration, voting, informing others, participating in direct action, raising consciousness, and seeing the interconnectedness of how all of these fit together across societies. Faculty participants identified students who have transformed into global citizens as having a focused commitment to sustaining and guaranteeing basic human rights. One faculty member cautioned the following:
I don’t think we can confuse or should confuse people who are global travelers with global citizens. Moving around the world because you have the economic means or power to do so does not make you a global citizen. Global citizenship is more about a shared vision of global possibility than travel perks, it’s looking critically at your impact in a global society.

Data collected during the interview process revealed three sub-themes that represent these distinctive elements of global citizenship as identified by participants: Empathy/Cultural Humility, Purpose, and Action.

**Empathy and Cultural humility.**

You can be globally minded and not a global citizen. If you want to focus on global citizenship, the number one thing you have to have is empathy. You have to be able to put yourself in someone else’s shoes. Imagine what it’s like to be a refugee. Okay, now imagine back to who you are. What can you do to help that refugee?

The above quotation from a faculty participant emphasizes an aspect of empathy that was mentioned in multiple instances in interviews with participants—global citizens possessed an understanding of what it was like to “be in the other’s shoes.” The participants in this study described a sense of empathy and cultural humility as one of the key characteristics of a global citizen. One student noted that a global citizen must connect with and care about other individuals, either globally or domestically, and connecting through our shared humanity of similar characteristics, desires and needs. The students interviewed as part of this study stated that it was through developing a greater sense of empathy that they came to see themselves as part of a larger world and the need to challenge existing structures and limitations. Seeing themselves as interconnected with others outside of national boundaries was an important aspect of global citizenship. One student participant expressed this in the following way:
I think it’s empathy that is probably the main part of being a global citizen, recognizing the shared humanity and that you are part of a global community. Yes, there are differences between people, but the boundaries are mainly socially constructed: states, nations. All of this is essentially made up. There’s value to these things, yes, but if you don’t challenge why they’re there and what they’re actually doing, then I don’t think you can be a fully participating global citizen without challenging something and being empathetic.

Participants also talked about differentiating empathy from charity as part of global citizenship. Some students explained how working side-by-side with their peers who were their intellectual equals, and college students, broadened their perception of what cultural diversity looked like. They also learned to reject notions that “Africa [is] just a place where there is a need for charity,” as one student noted. Another student suggested that citizenship is about supporting one another. This student used an example of a tragedy in another country that motivated them to “be supportive, stay connected, and raise their voice.” Another student remarked “it’s about learning from people before you try [to] impose solutions on problems or issues.”

In the data collected, faculty, students, and administrators reflected on their power and privilege as global citizens and the need to develop a sense of cultural humility by paying attention to issues of equity, accessibility, and possibility. They described a perspective shift in how they looked at the world and considered the decisions made by affluent people and societies. One faculty participant considered the ethics of what it means for students and faculty to go into communities as outsiders. She asked, “What are some of the unintended consequences of the engagement that we participate in?” She acknowledged that as a faculty program director for global learning, considering the collective good of current actions from a partnership perspective was challenging. Overall, participants separated global-minded individuals from global citizens
in that global citizenship was more about a shared vision of global possibility and was based on notions of cultural humility versus cultural competence.

Those participants interviewed discussed the importance of interacting with people from other backgrounds and cultures with open-mindedness and an intention to diminish recognized power differentials in their relationships with people. Participants recognized their own positionality within a global society. A student described her growth in understanding more about global trade routes, exploitation of workers, and issues of food justice through her global experiences. These realizations led her to change where she bought her food and clothing. A faculty participant offered the following reflection on students’ global citizenship development: “Students who have evolved to being global citizens, think about issues; they think about them beyond their own immediate community or interests and look at the underlying ethics. It’s a way of looking at the world.”

Participants noted their own experiences of having to release previously held understandings and habits of mind in order to process and debrief their experience, so as to come from a place of understanding and caring. One student described this process as humbling by revealing her judgment of a co-worker in Nicaragua:

…he was saying that the laws were unequal and that they favored women more than men per se, …and I immediately, something came out of me and I just jumped into responding like—you don’t know, that’s not your, you’re not a woman from Nicaragua…Then later I actually did learn that in Nicaragua they did have some really bizarre interesting laws surrounding women. Sometimes you react badly and you think “Oh, they just don’t get it,” but it might be you who’s not getting it.

The sub-theme of empathy and cultural humility is centered on how faculty, students, and administrators see how these characteristics developed as part of students’ transformations
into global citizens. Through their global experiences and learning, students experienced a significant shift in their perspectives and how they saw their relationships with others within the global society. The data revealed a moral imperative embraced by students whereby they acknowledged interdependency while acting independently of nation states. They began imagining and constructing their own moral code to create a more just society. A faculty participant explained this change in the following way:

There’s a moment when you realize that everything you thought was unique about your place of origin can be found pretty much carbon copy everywhere else you go in the world. Hence, the fundamental prerequisite for global citizenship is fulfilled through eliminating the claim to a single chosen destiny as preached by the culture and the institutions of the nation state.

In living among diverse people, participants witnessed multiple cultural perspectives, behaviors and values that they identified as offering them a broader view in which to evaluate what was going on the world. This experience in turn provided them with important perspectives about their own culture in the life experiences of others, exposed the impact that their familiar world had on others in the global society, and fostered a sense of empathy and cultural humility.

**Purpose.**

A model global citizen has a sustained philosophy and behavior over time; individuals who are global citizens are conscious of the geo-political landscape, understanding what forces cause the social, political, and economic conditions that give students purpose and a sustained commitment to the greater good.

All participants noted their global learning stimulated questions regarding how they were and were not contributing to the greater global good. The quotation above, made by a faculty administrator, demonstrates how faculty, students, and administrators defined the purpose and
intentions of a global citizen. The data showed participants questioning and reflecting on the purpose of their experience and how it affected them as well as, the people with whom they encountered and with whom they worked with globally. This purpose and intentionality influenced their personal values and priorities. The interviews revealed that students who identified themselves as citizens of a larger community recognized their responsibilities to that larger community. Their experiential learning transformed them into citizens of a larger community. Participants noted that this transformation could be expressed differently in terms of actions and objectives, but there was a clear consensus that part of being a global citizen was remaining responsible and purposeful. One student participant said “how I portray the way the US interacts with other cultures, I feel responsible for that.”

Another student applied her global learning to her own local community and family in helping to engage and educate others about alternative experiences and perspectives. She said:

I think it’s important to me and I think it’s important to the world that I set [an] example by challenging perspectives of my family who might not be interested. Challenge as far as things accepted by people here in my university or people in my hometown. Something that not only I step out of my own zone, but I also bring it back to the states whether I’m in the states or not. Bring it back to people who maybe don’t want to challenge those perspectives and [for me] to be that window for them as much as I can be, as much as I can speak to those things.

As part of the learning process and transformation into global citizens, participants questioned their work, goals, objectives, interactions, and, ultimately, their impact. This process was an intentional and substantive part of their personal learning and development. One student reflected about the process in saying:
... something was really on my mind, how do you integrate, learn from an experience and work with people there to create impact, because you’re not going to teach anyone anything, it’s more about what you can share with each other.

Participants described students’ transformations into global citizens as involving looking critically at issues related to respect, power, and privilege. It was through this process that students described feeling out of their comfort zones and pushed ethically to examine differences and engage in reflection that resulted in new levels of understanding about themselves and others. One student noticed that:

It definitely put me out of my comfort zone, and there are aspects of that experience afterwards that I’m questioning a bit. I look at it differently now [from] when I went. I met a variety of people, some of whom were very thoughtful and made connections and were respectful. Some people were less respectful, and that made me question where I wanted to be, how I wanted to interact with the community.

Data revealed that students, especially those who perceived themselves as having privilege, had difficulty immersing themselves in a global community because they felt concerned about their power and sense of guilt in terms of their privilege and economic advantage. It was important for students that they had a clear and justifiable sense of purpose in their global location. They questioned the rationale/purpose of their study and distinguished ‘voluntourism’ from an integrated, interconnected learning experience. One student discussed a previous experience in which she identified as a ‘voluntourist’ and her feelings that it not respectful or thoughtful: “We went there for two weeks and built a school house which local individuals could have done really well themselves if they just had the money or resources.”

Another student noted:
The biggest thing for me was definitely that we work with University of Zambia students, and because I was a student in Zambia, it had a different connotation than if I was a volunteer in Zambia, because I was going there with a purpose of learning, which is different [from] going with a purpose of volunteerism. It was meaningful for me because it went back to my purpose and why I was doing this.

A sense of passion and repeated global experiences were aspects that correlated well with how students, faculty, and administrators defined global citizenry. One faculty described a model global citizen as “having a sustained philosophy and behavior over time.” Overall, faculty participants described students who were learning to become global citizens as having a sense of passion and purpose and as open to learning something very different and new. Faculty described these students as “wanting to learn more, wanting to return to a place, wanting to dig deeper, wanting to understand people or a given situation even further and overall, wanting to help.”

The sub-theme of purpose reveals how global citizens differentiated themselves from global learners through the intention that they brought to a global experience. The data revealed that students thought critically and creatively about why and how they participated in global experiential learning. They felt a sense of responsibility and agency to question and reflect on their positions, learning, and objectives. Based on the interviews, students experienced a transformation in their mindset from global learners to citizens as they began reflecting on the value, purpose, and impact of their global experience. They held themselves to a certain moral and ethical standards and had a heightened awareness and consciousness about why and how they were based globally. Students described a self-reflective process that ultimately affected the way that they viewed themselves and the world. As students gained greater understanding and knowledge, they believed that this acquisition was not, by itself, sufficient, but that they also
must identify purpose and understand what they were doing and why it was important. Faculty and administrators considered the ethics behind global learning as well as the challenge of bringing groups of students abroad and how to best prepare, guide, and support them as they unpack and process their learning questions and concerns.

**Action.**

Action orientation is a big piece for me; they [students] want to be there doing. There is a commitment to lifelong learning and social action that is a lifetime commitment to social justice. The action piece is a big distinguisher. It’s good being informed, and it’s a piece of it, but I think the real important piece is those students who are compelled to act.

This faculty quotation illustrates what the consensus of participants expressed about global citizens—they are individuals committed to action. Interpretation of the data revealed that taking action was a critical aspect of students’ transformation into global citizens. As students’ personal connections with others manifested a better understanding of their purpose, they were motivated to act to create a particular situation. Students, faculty, and administrators all described the importance of committed action and sustained global learning over time.

Characteristics that defined global citizens included: persistence, passion, and active participation in a global region or involvement in a global issue. One student reviewed how he saw this change happen for himself through repeated experiences and connections with people and places):

Through global experience and this engagement with the workforce abroad or with the world of academics abroad, I gained experiences and skills of global learning there. However, I think global citizenry is this prolonged engagement whether it’s to keep up with those skills or people or to keep revisiting to keep the consistency with the language, culture or issues. I think that’s more citizenry.
Those participants interviewed described how they prepared for and attended to ways in which they could contribute. They came to see the world as a place in which they could make meaningful, respectful, and educated contributions. Students’ actions were directed both globally and locally. Some talked about addressing global issues locally through participating in campus clubs or organizations, becoming active in social justice organizations, or working with agencies in their local communities (e.g., non-profits, schools, or activist organizations). Other students became involved with related issues in other global regions. Faculty and administrators described students’ sustained engagement with global learning and issues as important aspects of their citizenship development. From their perspectives, the purpose of global experiential programs was that they guided and supported students in their global engagement so as to carry that practice into their personal, academic, and professional lives.

Participants described application of their learning and learning in action. One student talked about how his experience learning on campus and through research and writing enabled him to make connections to certain global issues. Once in the field, he acknowledged things getting “flipped upside down,” and this change compelled him to go back to the region several times to “dig in, really plant some seeds, and develop networks.” Another student reflected on her global learning and choices and identified staying active and connected as integral to global citizenship. She reflected: “I regret my disengagement because I think actually a genuine global citizen would have stayed involved and likely continued to share experiences again.” The idea of maintaining personal connections, staying active, and reaffirming purpose in a given global region was presented consistently by participants in this study as distinguishing characteristics of global citizens. One student stated:

When you go, you have a global learning experience and become more involved on a personal level. So you feel motivated to take action . . . global learning I see more as
absorbing information whereas global citizenship I view more as taking action, staying involved.

Lastly, stakeholders described leadership and associated actions of global citizenship. Faculty and administrators reflected that students who were global learners and citizens tended to exhibit high levels of initiative and leadership, sought out interesting local and global experiences, and maximized their learning opportunities. Faculty discussed their experiences working with this cohort of students who they regard as intelligent, curious, and willing to push themselves out of their comfort zones. One faculty member described integrating student leaders as program assistants for his faculty-led global programs:

You can do so much more when you reach out to student leaders. These students, they work with you, they have the drive, even more passion, more energy . . . find that key undergraduate student leader who can be your muscle, your eyes and ears.

A student participant in thinking about global citizenship reflected that: “Global citizenry has a connotation of more leadership . . . where you are leading and discussing and voicing opinions and sharing with others whereas learning is more the initial process, where you are taking it in.”

The sub-theme of action explains students’ transformation from global learners to citizens who are acting with a sense of purpose and commitment to global issues. Students came to understand that through their active participation they can have an impact at the local and global levels. Students saw themselves doing this through a sustained commitment over time to a global region and/or issue. Faculty, students, and administrators shared their observations that global learning experiences led to a shift in students’ level of motivation, engagement, and personal commitment to taking action on the global level. Through their acquired global knowledge, experiences, and insights, students became transformed into leaders who saw opportunities to make contributions. The information obtained through interviews for this study
points to students moving along the trajectory from global learners to global citizens while developing a sense of connection, purpose, and commitment as both belonging and contributing to a shared humanity.

In conclusion, the theme of global learning vs. global citizenship focuses on how global learning is a catalyst for students’ development as global citizens. There was consensus among participants that global experiential learning was a transformative element in gaining heightened awareness of diverse peoples and perspectives and becoming more knowledgeable about issues of global concern. Participants expressed the need to understand the underlying causes of global injustices and the cultural context in which they occur. Related to this need, need they identified themselves as connected through a shared humanity and purpose that propelled them to continue their global learning and seek out additional experiences through which to grow and learn. Data collected showed that students developed a sense of connection and purpose in collaborating with communities to solve problems. A faculty participant reflected that a differentiating factor between a student who is a global learner and a student they considered a global citizen is that “the [students have] to be willing and [have] to care enough to want to act on their global mindedness.” Citizenship emerges from how much they care and their interest to take action. Overall, there was consensus among participants that global experiential learning develops stronger global citizens.

Building Global Citizenship Development

It’s really key who is in charge; it’s key who’s the leader, who’s the dean, who’s the provost. My point is deans, provosts, presidents . . . these people matter; they are crucial to the success of these things.

The quotation above, from a faculty stakeholder, aligns with the data collected during the interview process, which revealed the importance of having structures and people, including
leaders, mentors, program models, and practices, in place to foster and build students’ global citizenship learning. Both faculty and administrators acknowledged the critical aspect of university-wide development and support as well as the importance of a thoughtful and inclusive approach through demonstrated policies, protocols, and practices. Faculty and administrators emphasized building capacity by increasing faculty involvement, lowering the barriers for students to participate in global learning, and fostering a sense of curiosity about global issues and civic sustainability.

The significant role of faculty in providing guidance and reinforcement of students’ global citizenship development was also emphasized. One faculty identified his role as:

“Providing opportunities to my undergraduate students that I didn’t have as an undergrad and I got, eventually as a PhD student, [and] that transformed my life and that whole mission that I still follow and that is to bridge this intellectual, linguistic, cultural divide . . .”

Participants described the importance of having structures in place that reinforced key aspects of their global learning. The interviews with participants specifically identified the importance of learning opportunities that allowed students to step outside of their comfort zones, personally connect with diverse individuals and communities, and relate the global with the local. An administrator interviewed described her philosophy of learning as having no boundaries and stressed the value of helping students to understand how learning can happen anywhere and providing guidance in connecting their global experiences with local opportunities.

A critical aspect of helping students to understand learning happening everywhere was to incorporate reflection as part of students’ global learning process. The data revealed that intentional and deliberate reflection practices are important in enabling students to understand
the impact that global learning has on their academic, personal, and professional lives. One interviewee expressed that:

Our students have these powerful global learning experiences, but could miss the meaning without having the opportunity to deconstruct these experiences by reflecting on their own values, perceptions, and assumptions. They need to analyze these experiences to unpack and articulate their learning, to help them understand commonalities, cultural differences, and, ultimately, our shared humanity—how they see and understand their transformation and themselves as a citizen of the world.

The researcher found two specific areas of convergence across participants that underpinned the theme of global citizenship development. These two aspects comprise the sub-themes Mentors and Models and Practices.

**Mentors.**

The power of the mentor got me to where I am so that I could be in a position to be a mentor to . . . every new generation that comes after me . . . sometimes it’s exhausting but mostly it's just enlivening, energizing to be the person who helps these students find their way.

The above quotation captures a faculty participant’s enthusiasm for mentoring students to be global citizens. The consensus among program participants was that faculty mentors played a key role and had significant influence on students’ development as global citizens. It was through faculty’s demonstration of passion and commitment to global learning and citizenship that students gleaned important lessons and perspectives. In fact, data from the interviews indicated that without faculty involvement in global learning programs and leading student trips abroad, participants thought the strength and momentum of global citizenship learning would be
limited. One student commented on the difference he saw between global learning through faculty-led programs and student experiences he observed outside of the university noting:

Comparatively the difference between ‘campus-centric’ universities . . . these places that are doing amazing things in academia, learning about great works and minds at the campus level, but here in universities that prioritize faculty-led global learning, you can really tell the difference . . . it’s not about knowing the most recent report coming out of the Brookings Institute, but about being able to talk about on-the-ground issues in the most concise way.

The majority of faculty and administrators interviewed described how their own global learning and life experiences helped them relate to students participating in global learning and citizenship development. Most common to these interview participants were their passion, enthusiasm, and deep commitment to global learning that ultimately contributed to their roles as valued mentors. One faculty commented:

I love to learn and engage with people [who] are different [from me] or have different backgrounds, experiences, worldviews, languages . . . the big takeaway for me is that all of this motivates me to continue to learn [and] to challenge some of my own assumptions and ways in which I engage with students, and [it] has allowed me to develop depth of relationships with students.

Another faculty member described the role his Jesuit education had on him personally and as a faculty administrator of a global program. He portrayed his own life choices and how he came to create a value-based global learning program:

I use the principles that I learned with a Catholic education, what it means to be a good Jesuit scholar, and have created my own secular Jesuit model, which is to pursue the values of the Jesuits but do it in a non-religious capacity by engaging students in social
justice through global citizenship and learning, empathy, compassion, service . . . and highly valuing education and access to education for everyone.

The majority of students discussed the impact of faculty leaders on their global learning and how they sought to emulate their examples. One student described the thoughtfulness with which a faculty leader went about constructing her global learning program and the intentionality with which the faculty member incorporated various perspectives on different issues. The student acknowledged the inclusivity and consideration that the faculty modeled: “I always admire the way she finagles and balances everything so it is balanced and equal. She gave equal weight to every perspective, every student, every individual, and I think that’s something I definitely try to emulate.”

Another student commented on a professor with whom he traveled on multiple global programs and how the faculty member modeled the importance of lifelong learning. He described a conversation that he had with the faculty member two years after these experiences during which the faculty member commented, “Yeah, I did Fulbright programs, lived in Egypt, (and) as soon as the Arab Spring hit, I’m a student again.” What the student took away from this conversation was the importance of staying relevant and involved in the conversation and learning. He saw the faculty member as “pulling so much on his global citizenry, on his ability to sit down with someone over a cup of Arab coffee and engage in conversation about what’s currently happening in the Middle East.”

Several respondents noted the importance of faculty guidance in mentoring students’ for success and co-learning. For example, two faculty participants identified themselves as colleagues and co-learners with students. This co-learning was accomplished through developing teaching assistantships, incorporating students as leaders in global learning programs, and, ultimately, supporting students in their career development within global and
citizenship learning. One faculty described a student who moved along a trajectory from her first global learning program to becoming a program partner in that country. She tells this story:

One of my very first students [whom] I brought on a global learning experience is now my partner in Zambia. I met her as an undergraduate; she participated in my program to Mexico and was my TA for two years . . . she is now a colleague and someone [whom] I’ve developed a really important professional relationship with. I have other students with similar stories. At this point, I could roll into most countries, and I’ve got a student who has been there and doing work.

A student interviewee described an exchange that he had with a faculty member regarding the similarity of their global learning in which both gained new knowledge, insights, and perspectives. One faculty program leader acknowledged to a student that, although he had spent more time in the field, being in the Middle East together “we are getting our masters and our doctorates right now together . . . we are learning just as much together.” Students made note of the impact it had to see their professors also experience transformation through their global learning. One student described observing a progressive female faculty leader “go to Saudi Arabia to give presentations . . . get her passports approved and dress out in full conservative wear. For this very strong woman . . . it was very interesting seeing this transition.”

A faculty member commented on the importance of demonstrating commitment, not just as faculty and mentors, but also as leaders in a university-wide commitment to global learning. He described his own espoused commitment to a global vision and the need to go further. He was excited by the expressed commitment to global experiences at the university and hoped that the university would involve/require students to have a significant set of global studying, living, and working experiences. He described his own commitment to mentoring and leading students:
I took students abroad every single year throughout my career as a professor. These experiences were initially summer study abroad programs of a month duration starting in 2002 until 2015 when I began taking students for an entire semester [to] Cuba and later [to] Mexico and Spain.

Faculty’s intense level of commitment to leading students on experiences which fostered their global learning and citizenship development was expressed by the majority of faculty participants interviewed. They expressed a clear understanding of and appreciation for their role as mentors to students within the global arena. The data collected from the interviews revealed that the majority of faculty identified mentoring as a key aspect of their role as faculty leaders and part of their learning goals and objectives within global learning programs.

The sub-theme of mentors is focused on the key role that faculty play in supporting, encouraging, and guiding students as part of building global citizenship at the university. Those participants interviewed commented on how significant the role of mentoring was in fostering students’ development as global citizens and also in facilitating their transition along the trajectory from student to global learner to co-learner to global citizen to colleague within the professional field of global citizenship learning. Through their awareness of the importance of mentoring, faculty had significant influence in student learning and development. As one student said “being able to sit in a room with someone and hear what they’re saying in the truest form . . . that’s something that I’ve seen from my professors in working abroad.”

These mentoring relationships allowed students to learn from example and have their important questions answered by people whom they respected and saw as positive role models. The data consistently supported the perception that faculty mentors were in a position to facilitate students acting on their global learning by providing an important touchstone in which that transition and transformation could take place.
Models and Practices.

Bringing global experiential learning and citizenship perspectives back to the classroom . . . I think it’s really important for someone who has dealt with these issues to bring that perspective . . . I have to be in that class. I’m excited to be that person where I feel like I can speak up for people who might not be in the room and can bring this other perspective.

The above quotation captures a student participant describing the value of sharing her global learning in the classroom once back on campus. Interviewees identified this model as important, whereby students bring back knowledge and perspective gained through global learning to inform and educate their peers. Participants pointed to key learning practices and program models as building global citizenship development.

In discussing global citizenship as a learning process, there was consensus that students developed in many different ways. Their learning was described as an ongoing process of ‘becoming’. This transformation was not a ‘one shot deal’, but one that it tended to evolve over time. It was fostered through multiple key practices and learning models. Given the variety of personal and academic global experiences and learning, students’ global citizen development began at different stages. A student interviewed commented:

It’s not that everyone is ready for global learning at the same point . . . I was put in this situation in my second year; I did well and really blossomed in that situation. I loved the challenge, but it’s also a crippling situation for someone else or someone with less exposure.

The most helpful programs and practices were developmental in nature and engaged students appropriately at their individual stages of learning.

Participants described developing a ‘global mindset’ through curriculum and learning
activities. The programs and models identified by students, faculty, and administrators incorporated the following: service to and/or personal connections with others from different communities, reflection, emphasis on social justice, institutional leadership and support. Data revealed orientation and reflection opportunities to be critical in building global citizenship among students and in supporting students’ global citizenship learning. This was bolstered through a network of resources that came through the university community, family, peers, and the educational community in general. A student participant commented that providing a scholarship helped her financially while “[her] family helps [her] to prepare, [she] talk[s] with friends and figure out if [she] know[s] anyone who has gone there . . . [she] look[s] at blogs and resources online, travel blogs, Cambodian tourist agencies; [she has] a whole network of resources.”

Although the data suggested that students’ learning beyond the classroom was key to their formation as global citizens, on-campus classes, programs, and activities also contributed to student readiness, preparation, and development as global learners and citizens. Both students and faculty described ways in which global learning and understanding occurred in the classroom. One faculty member described how he engaged students to think as global citizens by involving them in simulations from different countries and situations around the world. Students chose roles to research and represent with one “hard and fast rule”—they could not represent someone they know well and/or respected. Instead, they had to choose someone with whom they disagreed. He cited one student, an American Jewish woman who represented Yasser Arafat. The student commented: “I couldn’t even tell my grandfather because we hate this guy so much.” Following the activity, she reflected “I don’t like him anymore, but I sure understand him better.” The faculty conducting the simulation maintained: “I’m not here to get you to like
anybody. I am here to get you to understand somebody and/or some situation that you don’t fully understand.”

Preparing students for their global learning experience was also a key classroom-based practice identified by contributors. One faculty participant described how he prepared students on campus prior to their global learning experience. He required them to take his intensive class in order to qualify and prepare for the program. The class was a combination of volunteerism and service learning on campus. Students also completed additional course work and participated in learning activities specifically designed to help prepare them for the culture in which they would be immersed. This preparation included assigned readings and case studies.

Program models and learning activities identified by participants as assistive included helping students to prepare for, orient to, and reflect on their global learning. In particular, learning activities involving reflection were seen as important for students to understand the impact of global citizenship learning. These exercises were identified as occurring in program orientations and classroom activities, both during the global learning experience and upon return to campus. Organized reflection helped students to think beyond their own needs and challenges, allowing them to consider, evaluate, debrief, understand, and conclude on different global situations. Self-assessment was also discussed as helping students internalize and apply their global learning after their experiences.

Several faculty-led programs and practices were described as maximizing students’ global learning and citizenship development. Key aspects of these programs portrayed students working directly with partners/peers abroad, having an underlying purpose of justice/equity, and maintaining an action-oriented attitude. One example was a program that trained students in global business consulting. It was designed to have students use traditional business consulting
practices they to develop a version for slum entrepreneurs. The professor described the learning process as:

We looked at what a slum business requires versus a traditional business and then designed a consulting practice model that students used when they went into the slums in Africa and South and Central America to help entrepreneurs develop their businesses and create opportunities. For example, this year we have 25 slum entrepreneurs in a program that we’ve developed with our partner in Africa to help them grow and develop their business, including transport, which is all derived from the work that we did to design this consulting model.

Participants felt these learning opportunities truly immersed them in the culture and facilitated their learning. The data indicated that students believed that they were able to take away new knowledge, skills, and habits of mind from participation in these immersive learning experiences. In addition, programs in which students interacted directly with peers and worked collaboratively on projects in their local and global communities were seen as helping them develop global competency and understanding. Interview participants agreed that these types of interactions fostered a sense of how to work in a multicultural or global setting while also broadening their perspectives.

A faculty member described an example of a peer-to-peer cross-cultural project-based service learning model where American students worked side-by-side with their Zambian peers “creating a kind of coming of age curriculum for girls essentially focused on issues of reproductive health, employability, job training, giving a space for girls to ask questions about sensitive issues.” She also described another model in which students participated in a blend of project-based and direct-service learning in non-profit organizations as members of teams to do the following:
Co-conceptualize a capacity-building project with the leaders in an organization for purposes of amplifying the work that the non-profit is doing. This can range from curriculum within schools, evaluations that the organization needs to facilitate to better understand the effectiveness of their programming, income-generating activities, workshops, training, a massive range of the types of interventions that students are facilitating.

A faculty participant identified the practice of placing students in homestays as another example of substantive and immersive learning for students by making them feel a sense of belonging and connection. He stated that:

Providing a full language and cultural immersion in the country that they are in . . . There is no better exercise in cultural immersion than to place yourself in the middle of a household in the country that you’re visiting instead of hanging out in a dorm or a hotel with other students . . . This is the most indispensable element in any global learning experience because it’s the quickest way to feel that you belong to the place, which is the goal that we want everybody to have.

The sub-theme of models and practices is centered on those learning programs and practices that were identified as examples that built students’ citizenship development. These models and practices were cited as enabling students to develop cultural humility and global perspectives. These opportunities provided an important foundation for students’ development as global citizens in helping them to prepare, immerse themselves in, and reflect on their global learning so as to be able to practically apply such learning. Without this foundational learning, it can be inferred, from the data, that students’ global experiences would lack purpose, direction, and application. Finally, the data collected through this study demonstrated the value and
importance of providing students with supportive learning practices in the classroom as part of their global learning experiences along with resources and university support.

In summary, the theme of building global citizenship development highlights key structures, programs, and people described by participants as best supporting citizenship development. Two particular aspects were consistently cited. First, participant views identified the role of faculty mentors as a critical aspect of their citizenship learning. Many discussed how faculty, through their teaching and actions, guided and encouraged students as global citizens. Faculty and students both discussed how they realized ways that mentoring and modeling were instructive and could make a significant difference in students’ learning and citizenship development. Through their passion for global learning, modeling good citizenship practices and supporting students as they took risks and pushed beyond perceived limits and mindsets, faculty were identified as major contributors to students’ transformation into global citizens. Second, key practices and program models were seen as critical in building students’ global citizenship development. These practices included both on and off-campus curriculum and activities, a network of resources including the university community, family and community support, and orientation and reflection activities imbedded into the learning.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to investigate how key stakeholders at a private, research university perceive global citizenship and how they see students’ experiences as transformative in creating global citizens. The central research question of the study is as follows: How do key stakeholders explain and describe the transformative nature of global citizenship learning and the ways in which global experiences impact students’ development as global citizens? A close analysis of the interview data yielded several insights into how the participants made sense of the transformative nature of global learning and development as global citizens. The consensus
among participants was that engagement in learning beyond the classroom and making personal connections with social and cultural others led to transformative experiences.

Global learning was identified as key to participants’ transformation to global citizens by providing direct personal encounters with people from other cultures and locations in the world. Through these encounters, participants gained important insights and new understandings of the global society and also engaged in affective learning by critically reflecting on their own cultural context. Participants perceived this personal learning as transformative in prompting them to think differently, question their reflexive assumptions, and imagine other possibilities and perspectives. They also expressed transformation in terms of their relationships, sense of personal agency, and desire to work with others toward civic sustainability.

The majority of participants perceived global learning as a catalyst for students’ development as global citizens. In living among diverse people, participants witnessed multiple cultural perspectives, behaviors, and values that they identified as offering them a broader view by which to question and evaluate what was going on in the world. The data collected through the study revealed that this experience fostered the participants’ senses of empathy, cultural humility, responsibility, and agency. It was perceived as important to both students and faculty that the purpose and intention of their global learning was ethical and explicit.

Global citizenship was perceived as fostered through global learning that is relational, purposeful, sustained, and immersive. Participants cited two particular aspects that were critical to their citizenship development: the role of faculty mentors and identified practices and program models. Many discussed how faculty members, through their teaching and actions, guided and encouraged students as global citizens. Participants recognized the value of both on and off-campus curriculum and activities, a network of resources including the university community,
family, and community support, and preparation and reflection activities embedded in the learning.
Chapter Five: Discussion and Implications

The purpose of this study was to explore global learning and citizenship education by interpreting the experiences of key stakeholders at a private, urban university. This study was positioned within Mezirow’s Transformative learning theory (Mezirow, 1977; 1991; 1996; 2000), which offered a theoretical perspective to help explain why and how integrating global experiential learning in undergraduate programs impacts students’ transformation into global citizens. This study employed a qualitative research approach designed to capture the experiences of key stakeholders (students, faculty, and administrators) who were involved in global learning and citizenship at the undergraduate level. The Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) approach allowed the researcher to investigate how the participants made sense of the phenomenon that the study is exploring, in this case, how these key stakeholders made sense of global learning and its impact on students’ identities as global citizens. To accomplish that goal, the researcher needed an in-depth approach that explicitly captured the unique aspects of the experiences of nine individuals interviewed and the similarities and differences among their experiences. IPA was the best method of investigation for two reasons in particular. First, IPA is primarily concerned with how participants make sense of, or make meaning of, their experiences with a specific phenomenon. Second, IPA recognizes that meaning-making is a shared experience and assumes that the interview process allows for co-construction of meaning. The role of the researcher within IPA is one of a participant. Through the use of IPA and the double hermeneutic experience, the researcher was afforded the opportunity to reflect on her own experiences and learning that came from her role as the researcher of this study.

Data was collected through in-depth, one-on-one interviews, which yielded rich descriptions of the participants’ experiences. The nine participants in this study, students, faculty, and administrators, each provided detailed accounts of their experiences with global
learning and citizenship from their respective perspectives. The researcher followed the rigorous data analysis procedures outlined in the IPA process by Smith et al. (2009) to analyze the data. From the analysis of the transcripts, three superordinate themes and seven sub-themes emerged. These themes captured defining aspects of global learning and citizenship development from the perspective of students, faculty, and administrators. The superordinate and sub-themes were: 1) Beyond Classroom (1.1 Personal Connection, 1.2 Transformation); 2) Global Learning vs. Citizenship (2.1 Empathy and Cultural Humility, 2.2 Purpose, 2.3 Global Action); 3) Building Global Citizenship (3.1 Mentors, 3.2 Models and Practices). Together, these themes answered this study’s research question by suggesting that global learning was transformative to students’ identities as global citizens through direct encounters with others in the larger global society, resulting in changes in participants’ thinking about, engaging in, and seeing the world.

This chapter will present and discuss the findings of this study. The following paragraphs show how the findings relate to this study’s literature review and theoretical framework. The findings were developed by using the analyzed data and were influenced by the themes that emerged as part of this study. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the implications of this study for research and practice.

**Interconnectedness and Shared Humanity**

The out-of-classroom global experience transforms students through their interconnectedness with others, which leads to an understanding of a shared humanity. As revealed by the superordinate theme ‘Beyond Classroom’ and corresponding sub-themes of ‘Personal Connection’ and ‘Transformation’, the participants in this study revealed how learning in different global locations and contexts prompted them to reconsider their previous understandings and to think more critically about themselves and their relationships with others. This study aligns with recent scholarship in finding that respondents’ identification of direct
personal encounters with people from other cultures and locations in the world was key to their global learning and citizenship development (Tarrant et al., 2013; Hendershot & Sperandio, 2009). Participants described this personal learning as challenging and enlightening beyond that accomplished in a classroom setting. In living among diverse people, participants witnessed multiple cultural perspectives, behaviors, and values that they identified as offering them a broader view through which to evaluate what was happening the world.

Current literature on global learning and citizenship supports the finding that out-of-classroom global experiences are transformative in how students viewed themselves and others in the world. The literature cites the importance of learning that will foster students to be active contributors, successful human beings, and democratic citizens in the current global and interconnected society (Hovland & Schneider, 2011). Colby et al. (2003) argue that, given global interdependence and increasing complexities in the global society, students must be able to see themselves as members of a community and to take action for the common good.

Hendershot and Sperandio (2009) identified the most significant effect on students’ global citizen identity development came from experiences with other cultures and places. In addition, this finding confirms what Schattle (2009) identified as five ways individuals move toward becoming global citizens: through experiences in the childhood years, immigration experiences, political and social activism, professional opportunities, and educational programs. In specifically relating to this finding, he cited that “students identified constructive engagement with those people who are different, particularly during study abroad experiences, as a key program element in driving forward the development of their self-ascribed global citizen identity” (Schattle, 2009, p.15).

Reviewing the literature on students’ development, this finding confirms what the research suggests—that college students are uniquely poised developmentally for citizenship
learning which involves engaging with others in inquiry and reflection. Students who see themselves as connected to others in the global society align with what Braskamp and Engberg (2011) described as students seeing themselves as part of a larger whole. The authors provided that students of college age, as they leave their familiar surroundings, are in a developmental phase of their lives in which they question their values, their image of themselves and their society, as well as their own lived experiences as they compare to others (Braskamp & Engberg, 2011). Students at the undergraduate level are developmentally primed for global and civic learning for many reasons, and given the global and interconnected world in which we live, where a variety of worldviews and cultural perspectives influence how we relate to others, it is important that students understand and empathize with others who have different origins, ethnicities, and religions (Clothey, 2011; Colby et al., 2003; Noddings, 2005; Mickelson & Nkomo, 2012).

This study further complements the literature on global learning and citizenship by revealing the specific ways and processes through which students experienced transformation. Participants in this study agreed that transformation occurred through their personal connections with others in global locations. Participants experienced this transformation by working collaboratively, speaking and engaging in activities with others, and participating in reflexive practice. They described how their experiences with others transformed their views of the world, and they recognized themselves as parts of a shared humanity. There was consensus among those interviewed that this was critical to their development as global citizens, in addition to their developing an awareness and sense of responsibility for the way in which their actions and decisions affected others, both individually and collectively. This finding aligns with one of the most thorough reviews of the global citizenship concept in the study-abroad scholarly field, Schattle’s (2009) proposition, which provided that global citizenship entails awareness of
responsibilities beyond one’s immediate communities and decisions to change habits and behavior patterns accordingly.

This finding supports the current literature in describing how participants went through a shift in perspective, as evidenced by the sub-theme of personal connection; they saw themselves as interconnected with others outside of national boundaries. The literature provides that global learning and interactions that students have with people from other cultures have a great effect on their global citizenship development (Lilley, 2014; Hendershot & Sperandio, 2009; Grudzinski-Hall, 2007; Shattle, 2008). Academia alone is not going to lead to this connection and transformation; this study maintains that experiences beyond the classroom, which connect participants personally and directly with others in the global society, are critical to their transformation as global citizens. This study recognized the relational and affective nature of global citizenship transformation that occurs through connecting personally and developing relationships with each other. It is through these connections that participants changed the way they thought about themselves, others, and their roles in society. This finding represents the essence of citizenship, people coming together to make improvements and changes in the larger society for the common good.

The study diverges and extends from the literature in its recognition that these interactions provided students with important perspectives about their own cultures in the life experiences of others, exposed the impact that their familiar world had on others in the global society, and fostered a sense of a shared humanity. The personal connections and relationships developed through students’ global learning catapulted their transformation into global citizens who think broadly and deeply about their roles within a shared humanity. Traditional study abroad does not have the capacity to lead to this level of transformation. For this change to occur, the learning has to involve participants making personal connections with others through
meaningful global experiences. In developing these connections, transformation from global learners to global citizens takes place, providing students with a new perspective and an understanding of dynamics of power and privilege and the need for equity and justice.

In summation, this finding both confirms and extends the current literature on global learning and citizenship. It confirms what is present in the literature: that global learning is important given the global and interconnected world in which we live; that students are developmentally poised to participate in learning in which they question their previous assumptions and beliefs; and, that in studying abroad, students develop new skills, habits of mind, and areas of knowledge that are important for their success in the world. It extends the literature in the specific recognition that personal connections are necessary components in students’ transformations from global learners to global citizens.

In the next section, the second finding of global citizens distinguishing themselves from global learners by their empathy and cultural humility, purpose, and action will be discussed in relation to the literature.

**Global Citizenship and Cultural Humility**

Global citizens distinguish themselves from global learners through their empathy and cultural humility, purpose, and action. As indicated from the superordinate theme of Global Learning vs. Global Citizenship and corresponding sub-themes of Empathy and Cultural Humility, Purpose, and Action, participants in this study identified a level of intentionality as critical to the development of students as global citizens who were empathetic, purposeful, and active. This aligns with literature that suggests education abroad can effectively prepare students as responsible global citizens if programs incorporate the principles of experiential education and notable action-oriented experiences that encourage reflection, critical analysis, and synthesis.
(Tarrant, Rubin, & Stoner, 2013). This finding builds upon the first finding, importance of the interconnectedness of all peoples, and describes a global citizen as seeking out information regarding issues of political, economic, and social importance in order to address issues of inequities and injustices in the world.

The term global citizenship was found to be a highly contested term within the literature. This finding discusses global learning and students’ development as global citizens best aligned with key commonly accepted dimensions of global citizenship by Tarrant et al. (2013): a) social responsibility (concern for others, for society at large, and for one’s environment), b) global awareness (understanding and appreciation of one’s self in the world and of world issues), and c) civic engagement (active engagement with local, regional, national, and global community issues). Similarly, Banks (2008) suggests the important purpose of transformative knowledge as improving the human condition so as to enable students to develop reflective cultural, national, regional, and global identifications and to acquire the necessary knowledge and skills needed to promote social justice at the local and global levels. This literature aligns with what participants in this study reported—that their global learning and interconnectedness with others led them to recognize the importance of activism in promoting change and becoming global citizens.

This finding also adds to the existing literature on global citizenship, which implies that intentionality and a sense of purpose are necessary for the kinds of learning that will foster students to become active contributors, successful human beings, and democratic citizens (Hovland & Schneider, 2011; Green, 2012). The research points to two areas in particular that resonate with the finding in this study: 1) the importance of sustained global learning over time and 2) the critical aspect of reflection as an integral aspect of students’ global learning experiences. This finding extends the research by Reich (2012) that students need to be engaged in repeated and on-going educational opportunities to develop the global competencies and new
areas of knowledge necessary for them to participate as active and informed global citizens. The participants in this study explained that they came to understand that through their active participation, they could have an impact at the local and global levels. Further, students described how they saw themselves changing through a sustained commitment over time to a global region and/or issue. This finding further extends the research by Braskamp and Engberg (2011) in providing that students gain both intra- and interpersonal development as they engage in critical reflection in thinking about themselves and others through these global interactions. The authors provide that reflexive practice provides a solid foundation from which students can continue to engage across cultures, socioeconomic status, and perspectives in working with others to promote the common good.

According to participants, an integral aspect of their global citizenship formation was their developing a sense of responsibility and agency to question and reflect on their positions, learning, and objectives. In the interviews, students discussed experiencing a transformation in their mindsets from global learners to citizens as they began reflecting on the value, purpose, and impact of their global experience. They described a self-reflective process that ultimately changed the way they viewed themselves and the world. This finding both confirms and extends from the literature in its acknowledgement that as students gained greater understanding and knowledge, they believed this information was not, by itself, sufficient but that they must identify purpose and understand what they were doing and why it was important.

According to Green (2012), fostering a student’s moral compass is an essential component of the global citizen disposition. This study breaks new ground and extends from the current literature in discovering faculty and students’ concerns regarding the ethics around global learning and citizenship. Specifically, participants reflected on their power and privilege as global citizens and the need to develop a sense of cultural humility by paying close attention to
issues of equity, accessibility, and possibility. Important questions that required dedicated consideration and concern included the following: Why and for what purpose were they traveling to particular global destinations? Was this in the collective good of the community? Participants identified the need to be explicit about purpose, learning, and goals so as to ensure ethical action and integrity. Participant remarks about differentiating between voluntourism and substantive global learning and citizenship development shed new light on the importance of reflecting on one’s positionality within the global society and the empathy and cultural humility in understanding global issues, inequities, and historical context of people and places in the world.

In summation, this finding is consistent with the scholarship that suggests in educating our students to be global citizens and empowered to effect positive social change, we need to move beyond merely providing students with global knowledge, embed concepts of citizenship into the learning, and integrate reflective practice into their sustained global learning over time. This finding reveals that at the core of global citizenship is purpose. As such, this study suggests that students who identify themselves as global citizens also identify themselves as members of a community that is larger than where they live and, thus, possess responsibilities to that larger community. However, to fully understand this responsibility and fully internalize and integrate their experiences, opportunities to participate in reflection are critical in order to process and apply their learning. Finally, this finding aligns with and extends from existing literature on the historical and moral basis for preparing students as citizens through participants’ revelation of a moral compass, which guided their learning and perspective about their own cultures in the life experiences of others and exposed the impact that their familiar world had on others in the global society, thus fostering a sense of empathy and cultural humility.
In the next section, the third finding of the institutional role in fostering and sustaining global learning and citizenship development and, most specifically, supporting faculty mentors will be discussed within the literature.

**Institutional Commitment and Faculty Mentoring**

Global citizenship is fostered and sustained through institutional commitment, and supporting faculty as mentors to students’ global learning and citizenship development is key to this goal. As indicated from the superordinate theme of Building Global Citizenship and corresponding sub-themes of Mentors and Models and Practices, participants in this study identified institutional commitment as key in building and supporting global citizenship development. This finding aligns with existing literature that proposes that higher education has a critical role in preparing global citizens due to the influence that undergraduate education can have on students’ development as ethical, committed, and engaged human beings and citizens (Starkey, 2005; Clothey, 2011; Harkavy, 2006). Further, participants in this study identified specific models and practices that were best exemplified by the university’s institutional profile and educational programs. This relates to existing literature that cites a critical aspect of building global learning and citizenship is to identify practices that align best with the university’s mission, goals, and objectives. In this study, participants identified key institutional practices as including curricula and co-curricula activities and resources as well as faculty mentorship and reflexive practices before, during, and after global learning experiences.

The literature reveals that education for citizenship in higher education has been seen over the years as essential in developing well-informed students who can think critically about society’s issues and make important contributions (Stearns, 2009; Sernak, 2011; Noddings, 2005; Giroux 1992; Andrezejewskil & Alessio, 1999). Although the concept of global citizenship is not new, it is now under review given how widely it is discussed in higher education (Banks, 2008;
In addition to clarifying key concepts and goals, pedagogy and instruction are identified in the literature as key in sustaining and supporting global citizenship. For example, Spezio et al. (2005) produced similar findings demonstrating statistically significant changes in student attitudes toward the development of global citizenship when pedagogy and instruction were expressly dedicated to this.

This study illustrated how institutional support has allowed faculty to begin the process of teaching and providing mentorship to students as global citizens. Participants’ descriptions of how faculty supported their global learning and citizenship development aligned with the literature in this area. Sernak (2011) stressed the critical role of faculty in guiding and developing curricula and experiential learning that supports students being active and engaged citizens. Both faculty and students described ways that faculty mentoring and modeling were instructive and made a significant difference in students’ learning and citizenship development. Key was fostering students’ development as global citizens and facilitating their transition along the trajectory from students to global learners to co-learners to colleagues within the professional field of global citizenship learning. In this study, faculty mentors were described as having lived abroad for extended periods of time, led global learning programs, proficiency in at least one other language, and passion for and commitment to global learning and citizenship. Their life experiences along with their demonstrated knowledge, commitment, and enthusiasm for global citizenship learning provided important and positive role models for students that allowed them to learn from example. As such, in this study, institutional commitment was evidenced by individual faculty members taking responsibility for students’ global learning and citizenship development by leading global learning programs, mentoring students, and actively engaging in and facilitating their transformation from global learners to global citizens.
However, in reviewing the literature, the scholarship indicates that a challenge exists in involving faculty in global citizenship programming. Since faculty members are promoted and progress through academic departments based on traditional activities, involvement in a non-traditional, non-departmental program is not incentivized (Grudzinski-Hall, 2007). Further, pre-tenure faculty are focused and committed to getting on a tenure track; thus, without faculty having the incentives, resources, and support to be involved in global learning and citizenship, the strength and momentum of these programs are limited. Faculty participants in this study were leaders in global learning and citizenship development; all had lived abroad for extended periods of time and led student global programs, and two were fluent in another language. In other words, they were global learners and citizens themselves and invested in mentoring and preparing students. Finding ways to build capacity of faculty and expanding beyond a small number of very committed and engaged faculty members will be a challenge in successfully sustaining and building global learning and citizenship. This need is what calls for and makes institutional commitment so critical.

This study both confirms and extends from the current literature on how to best build global citizenship programs. On one hand, the study further complements the literature by revealing specific ways in which global citizenship development is institutionally fostered and sustained to best accomplish this goal. As such, this study identified the role of faculty mentors and key institutional programs and practices as sustaining and building students’ citizenship learning in several ways. First, it identified faculty mentors as key. Second, faculty-led programs, and on and off-campus activities were cited as important in encouraging students to question their pre-transformation belief system. Third, faculty promoted and supported student leaders to pursue global citizenship. Lastly, faculty-led reflection of global learning, which served to provide context for student learning, aided in the internalization of learning and
promoted the development of ethical frameworks, leading to purposeful and sustained global citizenship.

On the other hand, this study extends the literature in its implication that global learning and citizenship development is not a one-size-fits-all endeavor. The literature reveals that global citizenship program development is complicated as colleges and universities have distinctive strengths and differing foci as well as various ways that they are defining global citizenship and learning outcomes (Sperandio, 2010; Andrzejewski & Allesio, 1999; Mackaway et al., 2011; Green, 2012). Thus, it is imperative for universities to initiate conversations and bring people together to define their own models, learning goals, and outcomes to determine what works best for their institution (Green, 2012). These results then can be shared within higher education to help identify best practices and key components. This realization extends from Sperandio et.al (2010) noting that rather than presenting a tight, prescriptive faculty-determined definition of what a global citizen should be, the discussions in their study led to the determination that since all students will be affected by globalization, they should develop their own understandings and definitions of a global citizen. This extension will be discussed further at the conclusion of this section under Implications.

In summation, this finding both confirms and extends from the existing literature in acknowledging the critical institutional role in building students as global citizens and identifying both the importance and challenge to the university in developing faculty mentors, as well as revealing specific institutional practices to be considered. Participants described the importance of having structures in place that reinforced key aspects of their global learning. The interviews with participants reinforced findings (previously discussed) of the importance of learning opportunities that allowed students to step outside of their comfort zones, personally connect with diverse individuals and communities, and relate the global with the local. These
models and practices were cited, here as well as in the second finding, as enabling students to develop cultural humility and global perspectives. These experiences provided an important foundation for students’ development as global citizens in helping them to prepare for, immerse in, and reflect on their global learning so as to be able to practically apply such learning.

In the following section, a discussion of the findings in relation to transformative learning theory, this study’s theoretical framework, will be provided.

**Discussion of the Findings in Relation to the Theoretical Framework**

This study is positioned both within Mezirow’s Transformative Learning Theory (Mezirow, 1977; 1978; 1991; 1996; 2000) and Daloz’s expansion of Mezirow’s theory (Daloz, in Mezirow and Associates, 2000). Together, these theories offer a theoretical perspective to help explain why and how integrating global experiential learning in undergraduate programs impacts students’ transformations into global citizens. Transformative learning was chosen as a guiding theory for this study based on the assumption that perspective transformation is an integral part of global learning. The Transformative Learning Theoretical Framework informed the study by framing transformative learning theory within the development of social responsibility.

Mezirow’s theory describes the process of individuals becoming more reflective and critical about their assumptions and beliefs via what he calls a “disorienting dilemma,” in which they grapple with their previous assumptions and beliefs. Daloz in Mezirow and Associates (2000) further expanded Mezirow’s theory and outlined four key conditions that must be present for transformative learning for social responsibility: the presence of the other, reflective discourse, a mentoring community, and opportunities for committed action that contribute to the common good.

In this study, participants’ learning experiences were consistent with the transformative changes described in Mezirow’s theory, in which he describes a process of change that occurs in
a person’s frame of reference. This frame of reference is composed of structures and assumptions of how we understand, interpret, and make meaning from our experiences. “Approved ways of seeing and understanding, shaped by our language, culture and personal experience, collaborate to set limits to our future learning” (Mezirow, 1991, p.1). The results of this study revealed that in going beyond the classroom, participants experienced what Mezirow described as a “disorienting dilemma” that prompted a transformation in how they viewed themselves, their role in the world, and their connection with others. Participants in this study recognized that going beyond the classroom and moving out of their comfort zone’ were fundamental provisions for their transformations. Their transformations began with the disorienting dilemma of seeing their own culture through the lens of others and developing personal connections with people living in other countries. These perspectives served as catalysts for the rest of their process of examining themselves, self-assessing their previously held assumptions, and questioning of their own identities and roles in a global society. Participants began looking for answers to key questions— Who am I? Who are we? Who are we to each other, and why does this matter?

Daloz’s (2000) first stated condition in his framing transformative learning theory with the development of social responsibility is the presence of the other. This condition was evidenced in finding one of this study, in which participants identified that the personal connections they had directly with people in other global cultures had the most significant impact on their global citizenship development. Daloz (2000) identified the importance of encounters with others who are very different through experiencing critical incidents or defining moments. He provided that these constructive encounters with differences and diversity assist in breaking down the ‘us-versus-them’ mentality and moves us to a sense of trust and community with the other. This related directly to what participants reported in this study, that the direct personal relationships they developed through their global learning led them to develop cultural humility
and a sense of a shared humanity.

Daloz’s second stated condition, reflective discourse, was evidenced in both the first and second findings of this study—1) Interconnectedness and Shared Humanity and 2) Global Citizenship and Cultural humility. Daloz posited that as part of the transformative process, learners reflect consciously and critically on their earlier assumptions and incorporate cognitive, emotional, and social components into active dialogue with others. Elements of successful discourse include empowerment, self-determination, a participant-based agenda, and validation of emotions (Daloz, 2000). Participants in this study identified personal encounters with people from other cultures and locations in the world as key to their transformations as global citizens. Through these encounters, participants described gaining important insights and new understandings of themselves, others, and the global society. Participants perceived this personal learning as transformative in prompting them to think differently, question their reflexive assumptions, and imagine other possibilities and perspectives.

Daloz’s (2000) third condition, the presence of mentoring community, was evidenced in finding three, which highlighted the importance of Institutional Commitment and Faculty Mentoring. Key to this is supporting faculty as mentors to students’ global learning and citizenship development. Daloz identifies the importance of a mentoring community through which relationships with significant others are developed. He posits that mentors often demonstrate the ideal and model ways of dealing with problems and issues and offering key insights and analysis. The consensus among participants in this study was that faculty mentors played key roles and significantly influenced students’ development as global citizens. Specific valuable traits attributed to mentors were passion, enthusiasm, and a deep commitment to global learning. Interestingly, faculty interviewed for this study identified their own experiences of being mentored as influencing them in their mentoring of students. One faculty participant
discussed “the power of the mentor got me to where I am so that I could be in the position to be a mentor to . . . every new generation that comes after me”; another faculty member identified how mentoring by Jesuit scholars in his Catholic education influenced his global learning program and mentoring of students. What was truly inspiring and unique to this study was faculty-reported mentoring of students along a trajectory from their first global learning experiences to roles as professional colleagues and partners in a global learning program. This study confirms and extends from what Daloz describes as a positive mentoring environment, providing for a diverse group of friends and colleagues who share common challenges, hopes, and resources (Daloz, 2000).

Daloz’s fourth condition, opportunities for committed action, was evidenced in both the second and third findings. Daloz posited that the ability to act on, test, and ground one’s convictions’ is critical to the process of transformation. Therefore, opportunities such as experiential learning “... are powerful formative factors shaping a mature commitment to the common good” (Daloz, 2000, p. 117). In finding two, students described the importance global experiential learning emphasizing cultural humility, purpose and opportunities for action. One participant identified a model global citizen as “having a sustained philosophy and behavior over time . . . understanding purpose and a sustained commitment to the greater good.” A faculty member identified action as a key “distinguisher” in students’ learning and transformation, noting “It’s good to be informed . . . but I think the real important piece is students who are compelled to act.” Finding three discusses ways that the university builds and supports students’ global learning and citizenship, which also aligns with Daloz’s stated fourth condition. Participants recognized both the importance of key practices and faculty mentors as continually providing opportunities to engage in global experiences and to reflect on their learning so as to make thoughtful application in both their local and global communities.
Conclusion

This study was guided by the following research question: “How do key stakeholders explain and describe the transformative nature of global citizenship learning and the ways in which global experiences affect students’ development as global citizens?” Based on the results of the qualitative data, as well as emerging themes documented from the interviews, the researcher identified three major conclusions that answer the study’s research question. First, this study confirmed that students’ participation in global experiential learning and making personal connections beyond the classroom was transformative in how students viewed themselves and others in the world and revealed that students’ global learning was enlightening beyond that accomplished in a classroom setting. This finding aligns with scholarship, which cited that respondents’ identification of direct personal encounters with people from other cultures and locations were key to their global learning and citizenship development (Tarrant et al., 2013).

Second, this study confirmed and expanded that global experiential learning was transformative when it fostered empathy and cultural humility, purpose, and action. The research findings revealed that students’ learning and transformation were deepened through global experiences that were 1) sustained over time and 2) include reflection as an integral aspect of students’ global experiences. Students came to understand, through their active participation and reflective practice, that they could have an impact at the local and global level.

Third, institutional commitment and, particularly, support of faculty as mentors were identified as key to building and sustaining global citizenship development. This study confirmed that higher education institutions play critical roles in preparing students as global citizens. The research revealed that key institutional practices include on and off-campus curricula and activities, resources and, in particular, faculty mentorship and reflective practices before, during, and after global learning experiences. Students identified both faculty mentors
and opportunities for reflection as critical in their abilities to deconstruct their global learning experiences and make meaning.

In the next section, the implications for research and practice will be discussed.

**Implications for Research**

The findings from this study have implications for academic initiatives as well as for future research. The data from this study revealed that engaging students in global learning and connecting with others beyond the classroom has value in terms of students’ education and citizenship development. The findings suggested that academic knowledge and even traditional study abroad programs were not enough to fully transform and develop students as global citizens. A review of existing literature suggests that this study is foundational in articulating a detailed and developmental process that participants experience in their transformations to global citizens. Additionally, this study fills a gap in the research; most studies on global learning and citizenship have predominantly used survey research or a case-study approach. This study fills a gap and contributes to the field in using an Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) to capture and provide stakeholders’ rich, detailed accounts of their transformative experiences with global learning and citizenship development.

This study suggests the need for future research in four areas. First, because this study was limited to a small sample of stakeholders who represented best practices of global learning and citizenship development, the findings may not be transferable. Thus, it may be beneficial to repeat this study with students, faculty, and administrators who represent more varied levels of experience with global learning and citizenship development.

Second, this study revealed the transformative aspect of developing personal connections in the larger global society and the impact that this had on participants’ global citizenship development. More needs to be understood about these personal connections and relationships
and how to build upon this key element of students’ learning and transformation. Thus, additional more in-depth qualitative research on personal connections as an integral aspect of students’ global citizenship learning and transformation and the related notions of empathy, respect, cultural humility, cultivating humanity, and world citizenship may be an informative addition to this line of research.

Third, this study’s findings revealed the nature of citizenship, including notions of cultivating humanity, caring as transformative, the role of power differentials, issues of equity and access, and ethical considerations of entering others’ communities with respect and care. The study also revealed the importance of not just looking at characteristics of global citizens, but also examining how to engage students in thought and action. Further research on the impact this affective learning has for participants and the university community as a whole would be informative to the greater field. Short-term and longitudinal studies that examine what students are doing one to five years out of college and the impact that their global learning and citizenship development has had on their personal and professional lives would provide important data from which to review learning goals and outcomes and assessment.

Fourth, the findings suggested further development of on and off-campus learning and activities as important in preparing students and fostering a global and civic mindset prior to global learning would be optimal for nurturing global citizenry. Further research on how to incorporate both preparation for and assessment of students’ global learning and citizenship development in a synergistic way would further enhance existing research and practice.

**Implications for Practice**

The university plays a critical role in institutionally grounding and building students’ global learning and citizenship. Although global citizenship remains a contested term within
higher education, there is consensus that global citizenship learning is a priority and that colleges and universities play key roles in defining, documenting, and operationalizing this learning. Key to this goal is their commitment to foster university-wide leadership, support, and communication. Green (2012), in particular, cited the importance of campus discussion and planning efforts that clarify language, underlying concepts, and implied or explicit values in regard to global learning and citizenship in order for universities to develop strategies that match their goals. The current global moment asks educators to intentionally reflect on what it will take to make global citizenship development mainstream and not just peripheral in U.S. higher education (Hovland & Schneider, 2011; Green, 2012).

This study has several implications for practice at the local and global levels. In the following paragraphs, the researcher will discuss how the findings that emerged from this study provided her with a deeper understanding of the problem of practice driving her study as well as the phenomenon under investigation. This deepened understanding of the problem and phenomenon enable the researcher to more fully participate in the strategic planning around global learning at her home institution by sharing the results of this study and the developmental process and key findings that were revealed. Although the findings in this study did not address assessment issues, the study does provide a basis from which to further develop learning goals and objectives as well as to build capacity of faculty mentors and greater university-wide participation.

**Engaging the University Community in Global Mindset and Citizenship in Global Society**

The literature reveals that global citizenship program development is complicated as colleges and universities have distinctive strengths and differing foci as well as various ways that they are defining global citizenship and learning outcomes. Defining, documenting, and assessing global citizenship learning require large institutional commitments and a long-term
effort. The future of many higher educational programs depends on the development of identifiable learning goals and outcomes. The literature indicates that colleges and universities are initiating new programs and using different measures to evaluate student progress.

Conclusively, as noted in the literature, although some scholars recommend that colleges and universities begin such defining of terms and measures through college-based discussions and planning, others called for defining and developing standardized higher education indicators for global citizenship learning. The findings in this study suggested that a combination of approaches is necessary. Universities should continue to develop consensus regarding global citizenship, overall definitions, learning goals and outcomes within higher education.

This study suggests that out of classroom, ethics, purpose, empathy, action are key areas to global learning and citizenship development. At the same time, each institution needs to plan, communicate, and develop global learning and citizenship programs that best align with and exemplify its distinct university profile, vision, mission, and academic and experiential learning programs. Findings from this study suggest that leadership to build and sustain global learning and citizenship requires support from higher level administrators, with one participant noting that deans, provosts, and presidents are key to these efforts. As institutions develop their global best practices, these plans could be shared internally and externally to build greater understanding and consensus within the field in regard to global learning and citizenship development.

The findings of this study revealed that there is a potential gap in which faculty mentors were identified as key to students’ global learning and citizenship development—without a formal, structured plan that incentivizes and helps to build capacity among faculty to lead and guide students’ global citizenship development. Faculty in this study were identified as global learners and citizens who themselves were motivated to lead students’ learning in this area; however, the traditional ways in which faculty are compensated and promoted do not currently
include global citizenship programming. Institutions need to find ways to build the capacity of faculty and expand beyond a small number of very committed and engaged faculty members to successfully build and sustain global learning and citizenship.

**Preparation for /Assessment of Global Student Learning and Citizenship Development**

Currently lacking is consensus regarding how to best prepare and assess globally competent students (Reich, 2012; Colby, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003; Feast & Bretag, 2011; Stearns, 2009). There is a need for assessment that clearly documents the power of global citizenship learning (Zahabioun et al., 2012; Summit, 2013; Reich, 2012, Mackaway et al., 2011). The findings from this study suggest that preparation on the front end of global learning programs would foster students’ global and civic mindsets and help prepare students for their global learning with greater focus and purpose. This could include offering on-campus coursework in ethics, citizenship, language, global simulations, and case studies, leveraging the international community on campus to build connections and understanding of diverse perspectives and background, and making connections to local community issues. As learning goals and outcomes become solidified, assessment tools can be implemented to measure student progress and development. As initial assessment protocols, students’ written reflections, pre- and post- global learning evaluations, and documentation of ways that students are applying their global learning and citizenship development would provide a basis from which to further develop.

**Intentional preparation and reflection of student’s global learning/citizenship development**

Students could have the experience, but miss the meaning. Thus, there is a critical need for integrated reflection of the global experience, so that students deconstruct their learning and changes in their values, perceptions, and assumptions. This process is an important element in the analysis and understanding of their global learning and citizenship development. A key
finding in this study recognized the critical aspect of reflective practice for students as part of their global learning and citizenship development in order to deconstruct their learning and make meaning of their global experiences. Global learning can provide students with personal connections, broader perspectives, new knowledge, and skills necessary to become globally engaged citizens. However, we need to help students make the important connections that assist them in sustaining their learning over time. Creating structured opportunities for students to share their global experiences within the larger university community would be a way that students both reflect on their learning and build capacity by educating and sharing with peers and others at the university. If we see global citizen identity as an objective for all students, we need to draw upon insights gained through global learning and what they might offer to develop programs at home—notions of inclusivity, diversity, and connecting global with local. For example, universities could develop capstone experiences centering on responsible global citizenship, in which seniors submit formal reflective essays incorporating their global learning experiences and citizenship development by integrating course work, co-curricular activities, language capabilities, and global learning and travel. The research revealed that organized reflection provides students with a personal assessment that becomes internalized and can be applied as they move forward in their academic, personal, and professional lives. Embedding reflexive practice as part of a developmental learning paradigm is a recommended focus of global learning and citizenship programs integrating intentional articulation, reflection, and assessment of learning outcomes to empower students’ sharing of impact with others. According to the literature higher education struggles with this issue.

A meaningful practical implication of this study was the deepening of the researcher’s understanding of the problem of practice driving her study: capturing the transformative aspects of students’ global learning that leads to their citizenship development. Not only did this study
advance the researchers level of understanding, it helped her better articulate the developmental stages and conditions that take place in regard to students’ global learning and development as citizens. The emergent themes and findings from this study helped to frame the progression and associated factors of students’ learning. The following diagram provides a visual of how participants describe the global learning and citizenship development process.
Summary—Global learners are transformed into global citizens through making personal connections in the larger global society. This transformation and learning is deepened through faculty mentors and guided inquiry, empathy, purpose, and actions. Global citizenship is supported through on- and off-campus practices that are immersive, sustained over time, reflexive and provide a means for students to deconstruct their learning and experiences so as to share with university, local and global community.
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Appendix A: Participant Recruitment Letter

Dear Student/Faculty/Administrator:

My name is Joani LaMachia, and I am a doctoral candidate at Northeastern University in Boston, Massachusetts, and also Associate Cooperative Education Faculty for International Affairs and Asian studies majors in the College of Social Sciences and Humanities. I am conducting a study in collaboration with my Principal Investigator, Dr. Kimberly Nolan, entitled *Integrating Global Citizenship Learning in Undergraduate Education*.

I am currently seeking eight university stakeholders in global learning, a mix of faculty, student and administrators who meet the following criteria to participate in my study:

a. currently a full time student, faculty, or administrator who has been involved in a global learning initiative, program or experiential learning opportunity;

b. have initiated/participated in at least two global learning experiences;

c. have been teaching at the university for at least three years.

In this study, participants will be interviewed and asked questions regarding their experiences with global learning. Specifically, study participants will be asked about the transformative nature of global citizenship learning and the ways in which global experiences affect students’ development as global citizens. Participants will participate in a 90-minute interview that will be conducted at a location at or near the university that is deemed safe and appropriate by the participant. These locations will also be appropriate and comfortable spaces in which to conduct a recorded interview that will allow the interviewee to talk freely. Interviews will be recorded. Participants will be asked to review a copy of the transcription of the interview to confirm accuracy. The total time for participating in this study is less than two hours.

Participation in this study is voluntary, and you may withdraw from this study at any time and for any reason. I would greatly appreciate your willingness and interest in participating in this study. I would be happy to answer any questions that you have about participation or the research under investigation at any time. If you are interested in participating in this study or have any questions, please contact me at j.lamachia@neu.edu.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Joani LaMachia
Appendix B – Consent Form

Northeastern University, Department – College of Professional Studies

Name of Investigator(s): Dr. Kimberly Nolan, Principal Investigator, and Joan LaMachia, Student Researcher

Title of Project: Integrating Global Citizenship Learning in Undergraduate Education: An IPA Study of key stakeholders to explain and describe the transformative nature of global citizenship learning and the ways in which global experiences affect students’ development as global citizens.

Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study
We are inviting you to take part in a research study. This form will tell you about the study, but the researcher will explain it to you first. You may ask questions that you have. When you are ready to make a decision, you may tell me if you want to participate or not. You do not have to participate if you do not want to. If you decide to participate, I will ask you to sign this statement and will give you a copy to keep.

Why am I being asked to take part in this research study?
You have expressed an interest in participating in this study after reading the recruitment letter. To participate in this study, you must be a student, faculty member, or administrator at Northeastern University; have initiated/participated in at least two global learning experiences; and have been at the university for at least three years.

Why is this research being done?
The purpose of this research is to gain understanding of how key stakeholders explain and describe the transformative nature of global citizenship learning and the ways in which global experiences affect students’ development as global citizens. At this stage of the research, how global citizenship is perceived, defined, documented, and operationalized by key stakeholders has yet to be consistent and is contested within higher education. Knowledge generated is expected to inform how global learning is transformative to students’ development as global citizens and is perceived at the undergraduate level. This, in turn, will provide clarity regarding definitions, learning objectives, and outcomes.

What will I be asked to do?
If you decide to participate in this study, we will ask you to participate in an interview that will last between one and two hours. The interview will include questions about your experiences with global learning; your understanding of the relationship between global learning and global citizenship; and how you would describe, define, and distinguish global citizens. If you chose to participate, you may still terminate the interview and your participation in the study at any point without negative repercussions.
Where will this take place, and how much of my time will it take?
You will be interviewed at a time and place that are convenient and comfortable for you. The interview will take between one and two hours. If you chose to participate in this study, you will be asked to create a pseudonym under which your interview will be stored.

Will there be any risk or discomfort to me?
There will be no foreseeable risks, harms, or discomforts associated with participating in this study. If at any time, you will uncomfortable or feel that your participation in the study poses any risk, you may terminate the interview.

Will I benefit by being in this research?
There will be no direct benefits from participating in this research study.

Who will see information about me?
No identifiable information related to the participants will be used in any of the publically available forms of the study. Identifiable information will be available to only the primary investigator and the investigator’s dissertation advisor. Identifiable information will be destroyed at the completion of the study. All identifiable information will be secured on a password protected, personally owned computer.

If I do not want to take part in the study, what choices do I have?
If at any time, you will uncomfortable or feel that your participation in the study poses any risk, you may terminate the interview.

What happens if I suffer any harm from this research?
There are no foreseeable risks associated with participating in this study. You will be free to only answer those questions that are comfortable for you to answer.

Can I stop my participation in this study?
Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. You do not have to participate if you do not want to, and you can refuse to answer any question. Even if you begin the study, you may quit at any time. If you do not participate or if you decide to quit, you will not lose any rights, benefits, or services that you would otherwise have as a student, employee, etc.

Who can I contact if I have questions or problems?
All questions and concerns can be directed to investigator, Joan M. LaMachia, Phone 781-507-1295. Email: j.lamachia@neu.edu or primary investigator, Dr. Kim Nolan, k.nolan@neu.edu

Will I be paid for my participation?
There are no financial incentives for participation.

Will it cost me anything to participate?
There are no costs associated with participation in this study. If you have any questions about your rights in this research, you may contact Nan C. Regina, Director, Human Subject Research Protection, 960 Renaissance Park, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115. Tel: 617.373.4588, Email: n.regina@neu.edu. You may call anonymously if you wish.
Signature of person agreeing to take part

Date

Printed name of person above

Date

Signature of person who explained the study to the participant above and obtained consent

Date

Printed name of the person above
Appendix C: Interview Protocol

Topic: Integrating Global Citizenship Learning in Undergraduate Education

Time of interview:
Date:
Place:
Interviewer:
Interviewee #:
Position of Interviewee #:

Ask permission to begin recording. (Turn on recorder)

Introduction/Description of Project
- Interviewer/Interviewee Introductions
- Provide an approximation of how long the interview will take
- Explain the purpose of the study
- Explain of the sources of data being collected
- Explain what will be done with the data to protect the confidentiality of the participant

Interview Questions:
- What is your connection to global learning experiences and what experiences have you had?
- Can you please describe your role at the university and how it connects to global learning?
- Can you please describe a global learning experience that you engaged in and what was most meaningful about this experience?
- Can you please tell me about global learning and how you see this connected to development of new perspectives and ways of acting and seeing the world?
- Can you describe a job, task, or activity that you associate with or developed as part of global learning?
- Can you explain how you perceive the relationship between global learning and global citizenship development?
- Can you describe what it means to be a global citizen?
  - What characteristics should a global citizen possess?
  - Can you tell me about students or faculty members whom you believe are global citizens? What distinguishes them from others?
- How did global learning affect you and your identity as a global citizen?
  Prompts
  - Have you made specific choices or decisions as a result of it?
  - Have you changed any of your behaviors as a result of it?
  - Have you changed any of your attitudes, beliefs, etc., as a result of it?

Other appropriate general prompts:
- Would you elaborate on that?
• Can you provide more detail?
• What did you mean by “xxxx”? 
• Tell me more.
• Can you provide any documentation I can take with me?

Closing: Thank the individual for his or her cooperation and participation in this interview. Assure him or her of the Confidentiality of his or her responses and inform the participant the interviewer will send an email to schedule the third and final interview.