

## Academic Global Citizenship Education

Herco Fonteijn<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract** An institution-wide Global Citizenship Education initiative at Maastricht University offered teachers a hospitable framework for a world-centered education that prioritizes global competence, social responsibility and transformative engagement. The framework stimulates reflection and design of contextually appropriate teaching and learning innovations in pedagogical partnership with students and external stakeholders within and across disciplines, within and outside curricula. It also targets the broader educational goals of International Education (without problematic mobility). Now that its urgency is underlined by educators who seek an “Education for the end of the world as we know it”, GCED aims to develop tomorrow’s empathic, critical, resilient leaders who can face global challenges in a borderless world of work in which inclusion, sustainability and social accountability concerns are increasing rapidly.

**Introduction** Global Citizenship is an elusive concept. According to a recent definition, it “refers to a sense of belonging to a broader human community, sharing a destiny on this planet, which is in addition to other senses of belonging. It emphasizes political, economic, social and cultural interdependence and interconnectedness between the local, the national, regional and the global, and implies a common global responsibility to build a more just, equal, sustainable and peaceful world” (UNESCO, 2022, p6). Consensus on the goals of global citizenship education (GCED) is harder to find, since approaches to GCED vary over time, across disciplines, across education levels and across the world (e.g., Oxley & Morris, 2013; Gaudelli, 2016; Goren & Yemini, 2017; Davies, Ho, Kiwan et al., 2018; Sant, Davies, Pashby & Shultz, 2018; Yemini, Tibbits & Goren, 2019; Pashby, da Costa, Stein & Andreotti, 2020). In recent educational policy documents (e.g., UNESCO, 2022; Ramos & Schleicher, 2016), GCED is an instrument for learning transversal skills and graduate attributes that are needed to tackle complex societal challenges (e.g., migration, climate change) and ambitions (e.g., Sustainable Development Goals), often framed in human capital language emphasizing graduate employability (cf. Bourn, 2018), and sometimes in critical, postcolonial or ecopedagogical

---

<sup>1</sup> Department of Work and Social Psychology Maastricht University.

[h.fonteijn@maastrichtuniversity.nl](mailto:h.fonteijn@maastrichtuniversity.nl)

language that expresses a need for graduates with system innovation competences (cf. Peiro, Martinez-Tur, Nagorny-Koring & Auch, 2021). Depending on institutional ambitions, GCEd reform can be soft or radical (De Andreotti, 2014). Soft reform typically involves infusion of GCEd elements in the curriculum with adequate support for teachers (training, pedagogical toolbox) while stimulating interdisciplinary collaboration and using a whole institution approach (i.e. not focusing on student learning exclusively). More radical reform would be transdisciplinary, requiring a sustainable dialogue with the local community (e.g., in a quadruple helix), examination of power relations and structural inequalities and often introducing affective pedagogies. The latter are becoming salient as global citizenship education also speaks to students' identity at a time in their life when the impact of stories they tell themselves about how they respond to the world and its diversity is peaking. GCEd can provide valuable input for this so-called narrative identity, i.e., the "*internalized and evolving narrative of (the) self in relation to the world that incorporates the reconstructed past and the imagined future into a coherent whole in order to provide (..) life with unity, purpose and meaning*" (Wright, Warren & Snow, 2021, p. 161).

Despite differences in definitions and approaches, consensus is emerging on how GCEd should be developing. First, GCEd should involve more than the development of flexibility skills and intercultural understanding, with priorities shifting from cognitive to social-emotional and behavioral outcomes. Second, GCEd increasingly targets collective, rather than individual goals/outcomes, taking care to not only look for individual level solutions (e.g., entrepreneurial competency development) for systemic problems. Third, GCEd seems most effective in a holistic, integrated approach: it involves continuous organizational learning and development and goes beyond measuring individual learners.

**Implementation** Although references to global citizenship and sustainable development in mission statements and strategic programmes of higher education institutions are quite common nowadays, translation to academic educational praxis is not straightforward. For instance, academic global citizenship is likely to be contextualised differently depending on signature pedagogies in academic disciplines. In addition, the behavioural and social emotional learning components associated with GCEd gradually fade as students complete their primary and secondary education, and learning becomes more and more cognitive before they enter higher education (UNESCO, 2019).

In 2019, Maastricht University set a goal to offer students a repertory of GCEd activities in all educational programmes. Two main lines of implementation resulted in centrally coordinated activities to foster institutional alignment, student involvement and staff development on the one hand and faculty plans for embedding GCEd in the curricula on the other. A working group with faculty liaisons and other institutional stakeholders coordinated implementation and provided a platform for sharing experiences and reflection.

Before ideating on how GCEd could be mainstreamed across the university, 25 UM teachers and students tried to grasp the complexity of the local context in a series of design sprints. Various disciplines and perspectives were included in the process, in line with the design thinking philosophy that permeated the holistic, co-creative approach to educational innovation. Opportunities for synergy between goals of GCEd and those of kindred initiatives that focus on education for sustainable development, international education and the international classroom, diversity, equity and inclusion, student well-being, employability and entrepreneurship education were continuously explored.

<b>Global literacy / Systems thinking</b>	<b>Social responsibility</b>	<b>Transformative engagement</b>
<i>understanding complex interdependency; history and futures literacy; cultural world views</i>	<i>understanding of social justice, power, citizenship, human rights, peace,(meta-)ethics, sustainability</i>	<i>understanding (geo)politics, media, behaviour change</i>
<b>intercultural communication</b>	<b>moral/ethical reasoning</b>	<b>(glocal) participatory action</b>
<b>perspective-taking</b>	<b>personal responsibility</b>	<b>change agency</b>
<b>self-reflection</b>	<b>active listening</b>	<b>connect and collaborate</b>
<b>complex problem solving</b>	<b>upstander skills</b>	<b>conflict resolution</b>
<b>critical thinking</b>	<b>emotion regulation</b>	<b>design thinking</b>
<u>commitment to inclusion</u>	<u>integrity</u>	<u>courage</u>
<u>respect</u>	<u>sense of purpose</u>	<u>trust</u>
<u>humility</u>	<u>fairness</u>	<u>resilience</u>

<u>curiosity</u>	<u>empathy</u>	<u>critical hope</u>
------------------	----------------	----------------------

Table 1. Evolving framework for Global Citizenship Education at UM (version 2.3). Knowledge elements in italic, skills are shown in boldface, and attitudes, values, virtues and other characteristics are underlined.

**A hospitable framework** The design sprints yielded an (evolving) UM GCED competence framework along three dimensions (see table 1; cf. Morais & Ogden, 2011). The first dimension centered on understanding today’s complex problems, and the ability to see different perspectives and to be inclusive (global literacy/systems thinking in table 1). A second dimension stressed a sound moral compass, being empathic, and feeling responsibility for betterment of the world (social responsibility). The third dimension highlighted transformative engagement and the ability to make change happen. The GCED framework is hospitable, in that it gives teachers and programme directors framing agency: it offers space for contextualization and for matching knowledge, skills and graduate attributes listed in the framework with signature pedagogies and contents of study programmes. The framework aims to stimulate reflection rather than box ticking (which often results when teachers are told to adhere to yet another competence framework).

In several programmes infusion of GCED helped students to position the discipline in a broader societal context and to reflect on how it can contribute to solving complex societal problems at local, regional and/or global levels. Variations on problem-based teaching and learning methods introduced experiential and dialogic activities involving different societal actors (e.g., challenge-based learning, community-engaged learning and collaborative online international learning, sometimes highlighting SDGs). Such activities address the social responsibility and transformative engagement dimensions of the GCED framework. For example, students investigated responsible deployment of AI models to combat poverty and prevent debt in the province; helped returning undocumented migrants to connect with Dutch entrepreneurs and businesses in countries of origin; explored how European energy companies can better the lives of victims of blood coal in Colombia; and designed teaching and learning activities targeting an Inner Development Goal together with students in Indonesia. Next to novel variations on PBL, longitudinal GC skills trajectories emerged centering on self-reflection (e.g. Barbezat & Bush, 2013), character strength development (Niemiec, 2018), intercultural competence (Deardorff & Berardo, 2012), moral and ethical sensitivity (Safatly et al., 2020), difference

literacy (Nielsen & Kepinski, 2016), critical and systems thinking (Sweeney & Meadows, 2010), futures literacy (Poli, 2022), behavior change (Walton & Crum, 2020), design thinking (Liedtka & Ogilvie, 2011, Kernbach et al., 2022) and conflict resolution (Coleman, 2021). Reflection on GCEd within faculties also facilitated interdisciplinary cooperation: global citizenship competences were embedded in an interdisciplinary global studies bachelor and an interdisciplinary sustainability minor.

**Pedagogical partnership** Student-teacher co-creation or pedagogical partnership (Healy, Bovill & Jenkins, 2015) is an important lever to stimulate GCEd innovation, especially when sustainability or social justice outcomes are targeted (De Bie et al., 2023). Pedagogical partnership was stimulated by giving students small grants (up to 3000 EU) to implement their ideas for GCEd, often in co-creation with teachers. Example outputs of student projects include a new model of microfinance to promote a charitable spirit among students; a series of online social justice lectures for students; proposals for solving the divergence of governmental financial support for students in the Euregion; a novel module on the psychology of the climate crisis designed, implemented and taught by students; and a dialogue forum with key practitioners from the African continent. Students also co-designed the meeting space for the international student community in Maastricht, raised decolonization awareness in several faculties, and organized conferences on topics like inclusivity, sustainability and student well-being that attracted both staff and students.

**Teacher support** Lofty goals of GCEd often intimidate teachers. Many feel ill-prepared for infusing these goals in their teaching. Thus, in a series of design sprints teacher training needs were identified. Various challenges were mentioned by teachers during these sessions: balancing GCEd intended learning outcomes with domain content related outcomes; fostering interdisciplinary perspectives; creating real world links; addressing the local in the global; prioritizing collective rather than individual goals; and assessment of GCEd. Based on these outcomes and literature (e.g., Yemini, Tibbits & Goren, 2019; Barbezat & Bush, 2013; Bourn, 2016; McGovern & Miller, 2008; Van Lankveld, Schoonenboom, Volman et al., 2017; Bamber, 2020, Chiba, Sustarsic, Perriton & Edwards, 2021), three teacher training modules were developed, focusing on 1. teacher identity and reflection on how GCEd can impact one's teaching, 2. grappling with social inequalities in the classroom, and 3. citizenship for sustainability. By stimulating framing agency, investing in creativity coaching and encouraging self-reflection (Who am I as teacher? Why do I teach? For what do I teach?) conditions were

created in which participants can develop inspiring ideas for implementing GCEd (and sometimes obtain “innovation vouchers” to have time for implementation). These interfaculty trainings complement bespoke teacher training within faculties - e.g., a vulnerability and personal leadership training (Law), a creativity coaching trajectory (Business and Economics), design thinking for decolonising the curriculum (Arts and Social Sciences).

**Impact** In sum, the ongoing GCEd project allowed the UM community to reflect on what GCEd means, to introduce pilots, novel educational formats, tweaked intended learning objectives, revised problem construction practices, novel longitudinal learning arcs in existing and new, sometimes interdisciplinary curricula, strengthening ties with external stakeholders (often via alumni). While GenZ students become more vocal, teachers who are still unsure of what GCEd is and how it relates to their work are now served as GCEd is embedded in teacher training programmes.

Impact was substantial despite Covid-19 disruptions, partly because faculties could contextualize GCEd to fit existing programmes and pedagogies. For instance, in a bachelor of psychology, character strength exercises and transdisciplinary psychological citizenship projects were introduced to align with a cluster of desired learning outcomes identified by the APA (i.e., “ethical and social responsibility in a diverse world”). The School of Business and Economics embraced a human capital approach to GCEd, recognizing the value of transferable social entrepreneurial competencies for workplace readiness of today’s graduates. Many of them enter an increasingly borderless world of work in which inclusion, sustainability and social accountability concerns are intensifying. And at the Faculty of Health, Medicine and Life sciences, the GCEd liaison joined forces with Employability and Internationalization officers, making GCEd explicit in intended learning outcomes, implementing mentor systems that support development of GC competencies, and introducing more authentic tasks in traditional Problem-Based Learning modules.

A survey measuring aspects of GCEd using validated psychological scales (see table 2) has now been completed by over 1000 students, and will help trace short term impact of educational interventions. Data acquisition will be completed in 2024. To gauge long term impact, researchers from the Research Centre for Education and the Labour Market at UM, added questionnaire items to the Graduate Surveys sent out to alumni five and ten years after graduation, probing the extent to which graduates influence organisations from within to take greater social responsibility (Aarts & Kunn, 2021). Finally, document analysis of curriculum

descriptions have helped to identify courses and programmes that seem to be ahead of the curve implementing aspects of the GCEd framework (cf. Reysen, Larey & Katzarska-Miller, 2012). Recombination of insights obtained across UM and beyond (cf. Xiao, Makhija & Karim, 2022) that are disseminated via teacher training, a website and yearly symposia should stimulate more holistic innovation and convergence on the hospitable GCEd framework.

Scale	Authors	Example item
<b>Global citizenship / <i>Global citizenship identification</i></b>	Reysen & Katzarska-Miller (2011)	I would describe myself as a global citizen
<b>Global citizenship / <i>Normative environment</i></b>	Reysen & Katzarska-Miller (2011)	Most people who are important to me think that being a global citizen is desirable
<b>Psychological sense of global community</b>	Hackett, Omoto & Matthews (2015)	I feel a sense of connection to people all over the world, even if I don't know them personally
<b>Identification with all humanity</b>	McFarland, Webb, & Brown (2012)	When they are in need, how much do you want to help: a. people in my community b. people in my country c. people all over the world
<b>Intellectual humility / <i>Respect for other viewpoints</i></b>	Krumrei-Mancuso & Rouse (2016)	I can respect others, even if I disagree with them in important ways.
<b>Interpersonal Reactivity Index / <i>Empathic Concern</i></b>	Davis (1980)	Other people's misfortunes do not usually disturb me a great deal.
<b>Five-Dimensional Curiosity Scale Revised (5DCR) / <i>Joyous Exploration</i></b>	Kashdan, Disabato, Goodman & McKnight (2020)	I view challenging situations as an opportunity to grow and learn.

<b>Five-Dimensional Curiosity Scale Revised (5DCR) / Overt Social Curiosity</b>	Kashdan, Disabato, Goodman & McKnight (2020)	I ask a lot of questions to figure out what interests other people.
<b>Self-reflection and insight scale / Insight</b>	Grant, Franklin & Langford (2002)	Often I find it difficult to make sense of the way I feel about things
<b>Social Generativity Scale</b>	Morselli & Passini (2015)	I carry out activities in order to ensure a better world for future generations.
<b>Civic motivation</b>	Malin, Ballard & Damon (2015)	Rank the three most important reasons for engaging in political (volunteering) activity from a list of 12 motivations
<b>Resilience - Brief CD-RISC</b>	Campbell-Sills & Stein (2007)	I can deal with whatever comes

Table 2 Scales used to measure facets that were identified in UM’s hospitable GCEd framework (cf. table 1).

## References

- Aarts, B., & Künn, A. (2021). Maastricht University Graduate Surveys 2021. ROA. ROA Fact Sheets No. 001 <https://doi.org/10.26481/umarof.2021001>
- Bamber, P. (Ed.). (2020). *Teacher Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship: Critical Perspectives on Values, Curriculum and Assessment*. Routledge.
- Barbezat, D. P., & Bush, M. (2013). *Contemplative practices in higher education: Powerful methods to transform teaching and learning*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Biesta, G. (2021). *World-centred education: A view for the present*. Routledge.
- Bishundat, D., Phillip, D., & Gore, W. (2018). Cultivating critical hope: The too often forgotten dimension of critical leadership development. *New directions for student leadership*, 91-102.



- Bourn, D. (2016). Teachers as agents of social change. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 7(3), 63-77.
- Bourn, D. (2018). *Understanding global skills for 21st century professions*. London: Palgrave.
- Campbell-Sills, L., & Stein, M. B. (2007). Psychometric analysis and refinement of the Connor–Davidson resilience scale (CD-RISC): Validation of a 10-item measure of resilience. *Journal of Traumatic Stress: Official Publication of The International Society for Traumatic Stress Studies*, 20(6), 1019-1028.
- Chiba, M., Sustarsic, M., Perriton, S., & Edwards Jr, D. B. (2021). Investigating effective teaching and learning for sustainable development and global citizenship: Implications from a systematic review of the literature. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 81, 102337.
- Coleman, P. T. (2021). *The way out: How to overcome toxic polarization*. Columbia University Press.
- Davies, I., Ho, L. C., Kiwan, D., Peck, C., Peterson, A., Sant, E., & Waghid, Y. (2018). *The Palgrave handbook of global citizenship and education*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Davis, M. (1980) A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 10, 85.
- De Andreotti, V. O. (2014). Soft versus critical global citizenship education. In *Development education in policy and practice* (pp. 21-31). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- De Bie, A., Marquis, E., Cook-Sather, A., & Luqueño, L. (2023). *Promoting equity and justice through pedagogical partnership*. Taylor & Francis.
- Gaudelli, W. (2016). *Global Citizenship Education. Everyday Transcendence*. New York: Routledge.
- Goren, H., & Yemini, M. (2017). Global citizenship education redefined—A systematic review of empirical studies on global citizenship education. *Int. Journal of Educational Research*, 82, 170-183.
- Grant, A. M., Franklin, J., & Langford, P. (2002). The self-reflection and insight scale: A new measure of private self-consciousness. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 30(8), 821-835.

- Hackett, J. D., Omoto, A. M., & Matthews, M. (2015). Human rights: The role of psychological sense of global community. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 21*(1), 47.
- Healey, M., Bovill, C., & Jenkins, A. (2015). Students as partners in learning. In *Enhancing learning and teaching in higher education: Engaging with the dimensions of practice* (pp. 141-172). Open University Press.
- Kashdan, T. B., Disabato, D. J., Goodman, F. R., & McKnight, P. E. (2020). The Five-Dimensional Curiosity Scale Revised (5DCR): Briefer subscales while separating overt and covert social curiosity. *Personality and Individual Differences, 157*, 109836.
- Kernbach, S., Nabergoj, A. S., Liakhavets, A., & Petukh, A. (2022). Design Thinking at a glance. An overview of models along with enablers and barriers of bringing it to the workplace and life. *26th International Conference Information Visualisation, IV*, 227-233. IEEE.
- Kosslyn, S. M., & Nelson, B. (2017). *Building the Intentional University: Minerva and the Future of Higher Education*. MIT Press.
- Krumrei-Mancuso, E. J., & Rouse, S. V. (2016). The development and validation of the comprehensive intellectual humility scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 98*(2), 209-221.
- Liedtka, J., & Ogilvie, T. (2011). *Designing for growth: A design thinking tool kit for managers*. Columbia University Press.
- Malin, H., Ballard, P. J., & Damon, W. (2015). Civic purpose: An integrated construct for understanding civic development in adolescence. *Human Development, 58*(2), 103-130.
- McFarland, S., Webb, M., & Brown, D. (2012). All humanity is my ingroup: A measure and studies of identification with all humanity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 103*, 830–853. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0028724>
- McGovern, T. V., & Miller, S. L. (2008). Integrating teacher behaviors with character strengths and virtues for faculty development. *Teaching of Psychology, 35*(4), 278-285.
- Morais, D. B., & Ogden, A. C. (2011). Initial development and validation of the global citizenship scale. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 15*(5), 445-466.
- Morselli, D., & Passini, S. (2015). Measuring prosocial attitudes for future generations: The social generativity scale. *Journal of Adult Development, 22*(3), 173-182.

- Nielsen, T. C., & Kepinski, L. (2016). *Inclusion nudges guidebook: practical techniques for changing behaviour, culture & systems to mitigate unconscious bias and create inclusive organisations*. CreateSpace.
- Niemiec, R. M. (2018). *Character strengths interventions: A field guide for practitioners*. Hogrefe Publishing GmbH.
- Oxley, L., & Morris, P. (2013). Global citizenship: A typology. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 61, 301-325.
- Park, S. Q., Kahnt, T., Dogan, A., Strang, S., Fehr, E., & Tobler, P. N. (2017). A neural link between generosity and happiness. *Nature Communications*, 8(1), 1-10.
- Pashby, K., da Costa, M., Stein, S., & Andreotti, V. (2020). A meta-review of typologies of global citizenship education. *Comparative Education* 56, 144-164.
- Peiró, J. M., Martínez-Tur, V., Nagorny-Koring, N., & Auch, C. (2021). A Framework of Professional Transferable Competences for System Innovation: Enabling Leadership and Agency for Sustainable Development. *Sustainability*, 13(4), 1737.
- Poli, R. (2022). *Working with the future: Ideas and tools to govern uncertainty*. EGEA spa.
- Ramos, G., & Schleicher, A. (2016). *Global competency for an inclusive world*. Paris: OECD.
- Reysen, S., & Katzarska-Miller, I. (2013). A model of global citizenship. *International Journal of Psychology*, 48, 858-870.
- Reysen, S., Larey, L. W., & Katzarska-Miller, I. (2012). College course curriculum and global citizenship. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 4(3), 27-40.
- Safatly, L., Itani, M., Srour, I., & El-Hajj, A. (2020). A comprehensive overview of approaches to teaching ethics in a university setting. *Journal of Civil Engineering Education*, 146(2), 04020001.
- Sant, E., Davies, I., Pashby, K., & Shultz, L. (2018). *Global citizenship education: A critical introduction to key concepts and debates*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Schwartz, S., Benoit, L., Clayton, S., Parnes, M., Swenson, L., & Lowe, S. (2022). Climate change anxiety and mental health: Environmental activism as buffer. *Current Psych.*, 1-14.

Stein, S., Andreotti, V., Suša, R., Ahenakew, C., & Čajková, T. (2022). From “education for sustainable development” to “education for the end of the world as we know it”. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 54(3), 274-287.

Sweeney, L. B., & Meadows, D. (2010). *The systems thinking playbook: Exercises to stretch and build learning and systems thinking capabilities*. Chelsea Green Publishing.

UNESCO (2019). *Educational content up close: examining the learning dimensions of Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship Education*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000372327>

UNESCO (2022). *Revised Recommendation concerning Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace and Education relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000383055>

van Lankveld, T., Schoonenboom, J., Volman, M., Croiset, G., & Beishuizen, J. (2017). Developing a teacher identity in the university context: A systematic review of the literature. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 36(2), 325-342.

Walton, G. M., & Crum, A. J. (Eds.). (2020). *Handbook of wise interventions*. Guilford Publications.

Whitley, C. T., & Yoder, S. D. (2015). Developing social responsibility and political engagement: Assessing the aggregate impacts of university civic engagement on associated attitudes and behaviors. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 10(3), 217-233.

Wright, J. C., Warren, M. T., & Snow, N. E. (2020). *Understanding virtue: Theory and measurement*. Oxford University Press.

Xiao, T., Makhija, M., & Karim, S. (2022). A knowledge recombination perspective of innovation. *Journal of Management*, 48, 1724-1777.

Yemini, M., Tibbitts, F., & Goren, H. (2019). Trends and caveats: Review of literature on global citizenship education in teacher training. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 77(1), 77-89.