THE CENTER FOR GLOBAL ENGAGEMENT
at the Buffett Center for International and Comparative Studies

Center for Global Engagement
Working Paper Series

I b]j Yfg]hm Ghi XYbhg UbX 7 cbWdh]cbg cZ
; cVU 7]h]nYbg\]d. 5 7 UgY Ghi Xm

Bernhard Streitwieser
Northwestern University

Gregory Light
Northwestern University

BUFFETT CENTER

The Roberta Buffett Center for
International and Comparative Studies
Northwestern University

University Students and Conceptions of Global Citizenship: A Case Study

Bernhard Streitwieser
Gregory Light
Northwestern University·

Abstract

The past decade has witnessed exponential growth in study abroad participation. During these same years the promise that studying abroad will make students into Global Citizens has been a nearly ubiquitous feature in the promotion of the experience. Yet, Global Citizenship remains a highly contested concept that is rarely defined, adequately explained or explicitly aligned with programme outcomes. And among students as the main consumers of study abroad, little in the literature has documented how they conceive of the term. This paper details findings from in-depth interviews with undergraduates who were asked to talk about how they define and understand Global Citizenship. Using variation theory and phenomenographic methodology, the study disclosed five distinct conceptions: 1) global existence; 2) global acquaintanceship; 3) global openness; 4) global participation; and 5) global commitment. These categories provide a student-centered vocabulary that is grounded in empirically-derived data study abroad providers can now use to align their promise of Global Citizenship with their desired programme outcomes.

Author Biographies

Bernhard Streitwieser

Bernhard Streitwieser is a Senior Research Associate at Northwestern University's Searle Center for Teaching Excellence and received his PhD in Comparative Education from Columbia University. During 2010-11 he is serving as a guest professor at the Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, Germany, as a Fulbright Senior Research Fellow. Between 2006-2008 Bernhard was the Associate Director of Northwestern's Study Abroad Office. He is also a Teaching Associate in the School of Education and Social Policy, where he teaches on comparative higher education, and is a former lecturer in the German Department.

Gregory J. Light

Greg Light is the Director of the Searle Center for Teaching Excellence and an Associate Professor in the School of Education and Social Policy. He has taught post-graduate courses in higher and professional education and consulted across the higher and professional education sector in the UK the USA and Canada. His scholarship focuses on the theory and practice of learning and teaching in higher and professional education.

· Searle Center for Teaching Excellence, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208. Email: b-streitwieser@northwestern.edu

Introduction

In an era in which international education has taken on growing significance, many colleges, universities and third party providers of study abroad opportunity market their programmes as essentially guaranteeing Global Citizenship. Yet, most of these offer little or no guidance as to what Global Citizenship actually means. Within the academic discourse there is even less consensus, even if more thoughtful analysis of the notion and what it might entail. This lack of clarity has impeded what should be a more thoughtful analysis of Global Citizenship as it relates to what students do during study abroad and how educators expect them to make meaning of their experiences. This paper details a study of a group of U.S. university students and how they conceive of Global Citizenship. The argument highlights the need for more meaningful discussion, at least as far as the promise of Global Citizenship is used to justify engaging more students in study abroad opportunity.

Over the last decade, study abroad participation has grown at a 150% rate, attesting to the importance many American college and university students today attach to the value of international educational experience (IIE 2008). Indeed, few observers by now dispute that study abroad is one of the most high impact activities of a well rounded educational experience. Most stakeholders are convinced that students engaging in education abroad above all gain greater global awareness and international understanding, among a host of other important competencies Government funded reports, research studies, and declarations by heads of colleges and universities all argue that developing a wide variety of global competencies in today's college and university students is critical (AAC&U 2007; Lewin 2009; NSSE 2007; Stearns 2009). Literature on study abroad is replete with references to 'Global Citizenship'. Although this term is widely used and seems universally understood, it is rarely defined or explained. While scholars have debated the contested status of the term and study abroad observers have criticized its blanket, one-size-fits all use in the study abroad promotional material, studies have not yet shown how students, as the direct consumers of study abroad, interpret and articulate how they understand this concept. This is an empirical study of how U.S. university students understand the concept of Global Citizenship.

Although study abroad in the United States has long enjoyed a place within U.S. higher education, historically only a small and privileged segment of society has engaged in it (Hoffa 2007). Participation began to grow in the nineteen sixties, but the last ten years have witnessed unprecedented expansion: between 1996-2006 the rate of American undergraduates engaging in study abroad grew to nearly 250,000 students (Institute of International Education 2008). During this time, pressures from the national level down to individual colleges and universities to increase study abroad participation, and incentives in the form of funding and research support to grow study abroad responsibly and better understand its impact have fueled the drive to engage more U.S. students with the rest of the world. Some observers see current study abroad participation figures as a 'frustrated ideal' (ACE 2008, p.1) and have pushed for participation to grow to one million students by the middle of next decade (Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation Act 2007).

For American higher education institutions, one of the most visible ways to be internationally-minded today is to offer a host of study abroad opportunities. In an increasingly competitive world, study abroad has become a must-have notation on many students' resumes. The pressure

to create, sustain and build a broad range of programmes abroad has increased. Universities and colleges tout a host of perceived and documented benefits of the experience, including greater intercultural competencies, an expanded worldview and sensitivity toward other cultures, adaptability, identity development, appeal to employers, improved in-class performance, language gains, and even increased creativity (Bennett 1993; Bhawuk and Brislin 1992; Burnouf 2004; Deardorff 2006; Dolby 2004; Dwyer and Peters 2004; Savicki, Downing-Burnette, Heller, Binder and Suntinger 2004; Hammer, Bennett and Wiseman 2003; Maddux and Galinsky 2009; Medina–López–Portillo 2004; Rayman, Trooboff and Vande Berg 2008).

In an age in which the very idea of globalization is widely used in popular discourse and variously interpreted in education research literature (Dodds 2008; Spring 2008), more studies over the last decade have sought to explore the competencies that students gain when they engage in international learning experiences (AAC&U 2009; ACE 2009; Bennett 2008; Musil 2006; Deardorff 2006, 2009; Olsen, Green and Hill 2006). While Global Citizenship is generally classified as one of several intercultural learning gains, little consensus exists about how to define or measure what intercultural competence really is (Deardorff 2006; 2009). Since 2001, the Association of American Colleges and Universities' *Shared Futures: Global Learning and Social Responsibility* initiative has partnered with over 100 institutions to collectively grapple with how to define, operationalise and measure global learning. This initiative notes the difficulty of agreeing on definitions and successfully aligning learning goals with outcomes (Hovland 2006; 2009). While some studies have looked at particular aspects of the student learning experience during study abroad and their longer term impact (Dolby 2004; Savicki et al 2004; Paige, Fry, Stallman, Jon, and Josic in press) empirical studies of how students who engage in international experiences understand Global Citizenship have not been conducted.

Global Citizenship and Study Abroad
In ancient Greece the idea of a Global Citizen was articulated through the notion of a *kosmou polite* or 'world citizen,' a person who was endowed with membership in both their community of birth but also defined by membership in a larger community of humans sharing fundamental capacities to engage in rational and enlightened thinking. This understanding of citizenship did not reject local identifications; rather, it viewed humans as surrounded by concentric circles in which local identifications widened to an outermost circle that included all of humanity (Nussbaum 1996, pp. 7, 9). Later, Immanuel Kant invoked a Law of World Citizenship, even foreshadowing the possibility of universal governing bodies in his essay, *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch.* From the vantage point of his time, Kant argued that people might eventually share "the common right to the face of the earth…[that] the human race can gradually be brought closer and closer to a constitution establishing world citizenship (Kant, 1795).' While Kant's sketch has been scrutinized and expanded over time, the debate about the possibility of a type of citizenship that transcends national boundaries has been further elaborated upon by more recent revolutionary thinkers. These have included Albert Einstein, Bertrand Russell and Juergen Habermas and moral philosophers and political scientists including Amartya Sen, Martha Nussbaum, Andrew Linklater, Michael Walzer, Richard Falk, John Urry and prominent others (Schattle 2009).

In its most widely understood modern sense, Global Citizenship implies a general belief in the rights of all people to universal justice and basic human dignity; responsibility for the well being

of others and the health of the planet; and an obligation to question or even challenge existing power structures and their associated political, social, governmental, and legal activities (Nussbaum 1996; Roman, 2003). The rise of modern day conceptions of Global Citizenship have contributed to the founding of global organizations such as the United Nations, Oxfam, and Amnesty International, among many others that seek to ensure access to basic human needs and rights and foster an egalitarian ideal of global justice. The Global Citizenship these organizations espouse, and the attendant rise of 'Global Citizenship education' their work has engendered, have come in tandem with increased attention to universal human rights and growing globally-minded activism and grassroots protest. Advances in technology and increased levels of travel and migration have contributed to a sense of global interconnectedness and responsibility for a host of problems, from the environment down to civil strife at regional and national levels.

In the United States, a driving force behind the growth of education abroad has been the belief that more students living and studying abroad helps diminish the image of Americans in the world as being parochial or ethnocentric (de Wit 2009; Stearns, 2009). Unsurprisingly, perhaps, the idea that studying abroad makes you a 'Global Citizen' features prominently in much of the promotional rhetoric around international education: (Dolby 2004; Streitwieser, Light and Wang 2009; Woolf 2009; Zemach-Bersin 2009). This belief hinges on the basic argument that participating in study abroad offers a life changing experience that broadens horizons in unimaginable ways and in the end—whether one studies abroad for a summer or for the full year, in a familiar western context or in a less traditional setting—grants the professional and intellectual credential of Global Citizenship. Indeed, Global Citizenship has often been championed as a guaranteed outcome.

The problem with using this rhetoric is that many study abroad programmes fail to offer an explanation for how they interpret Global Citizenship. There is often little explanation for how a programme develops this competency nor data from participating students that documents an actual alignment between the aspiration for Global Citizenship and the acquisition of it (Woolf 2009; Zemach-Bersin 2009). This gap leaves students who are searching for a study abroad programme with little choice but to make a leap of faith that is premised on a vague ideal—even if that ideal in itself may intuitively be attractive. This easy promise allows study abroad to be presented as an experience that claims to offer something far grander than may realistically be possible. As Zemach-Bersin has suggested: 'If nuanced, clear, and analytical articulations of global citizenship replace the current privatized, individualistic, and elite connotations, it is possible that the concept of global citizenship will be able to provide an alternative discourse to the current commercial narrative of study abroad (p. 318).'

In the academic literature, however, Global Citizenship is a highly contested concept that scholars have articulated in multiple and often competing ways. Some scholars have asked whether the concept can serve as anything more than a mere metaphorical flourish (Carter 2001; Davies 2006, p. 5), while others have asked whether the idea can be separated from the unflattering image of colonialism and neocolonialism and stand on its own, unbiased and as a representation of a more open expression of democracy (Roman 2003, p. 270). Still others have questioned whether trying to interpret the concept may not be premature when reaching consensus on the meaning of national citizenship still eludes us (Clarke 1996).

Within study abroad, moreover, there is no meaningful consensus. Using the term requires specificity and support from a credible base of literature, and assessing the concept as a type of intercultural competency is only possible if it is also aligned with realistically attainable outcomes (Deardorff 2009). In addition, while the field's flagship organization, The Forum on Education Abroad (FEA), has been seeking input for the development of a glossary the field can use, Global Citizenship has not yet been included, indicating the current difficulty of adequately defining the term. Similarly, Lewin (2009) argues that the field of study abroad is still in a phase of 'defining terms, justifying positions,' and de Wit, posits that even among international educators the use of language and terminology often lacks specificity and is inclined toward 'parochial perspectives' (2009, 212).

Scholars who have observed the (mis)use of Global Citizenship as a promotional tool for the study abroad industry have been highly critical (Zemach-Bersin 2009). Michael Woolf (2009) notes that the industry benefits by promoting its 'product' with a simple idea that helps validate its efforts (p. 2):

> 'The use of the term global citizen needs, therefore, to be nuanced and not used as a glib and hyperbolic marketing claim in study abroad. It is a complex, contested proposition and not a condition to be achieved through the purchase of experience....The problems identified here derive, then, from a combination of over-simplification, obfuscation and exaggeration. They burden the field of education abroad with aspirations that can rarely be met, and with concepts that, at best, lack intellectual coherence and, at worst, create obscure fields of jumbled discourse.' (p. 15).

If the promise, 'study abroad=Global Citizenship' lacks intellectual coherence despite its seductive message and scholarly attention, the critical feature of student understanding of the concept of Global Citizenship is virtually non-existent. Little is known of these understandings and their potential contribution to both the pedagogical and policy debates surrounding study abroad. In the end, debates about particular ideals and the terminology expressing them are immaterial if a robust understanding of the experience that students themselves are having in relation to these terms is essentially missing from the discussion. The study reported here addresses this question: how American university students understand the concept of Global Citizenship.

The Study
Conceptual Frameworks
This study is informed by two related conceptual frameworks: variation theory and phenomenography. The former is a theory of student learning focused on the variation in the different ways people understand a particular phenomenon or concept, while the latter is a dedicated research approach to study that variation. Variation theory claims that there are a finite number of ways of understanding or experiencing a particular phenomenon and that these understandings are hierarchically related such that succeeding understandings are richer and more complex than preceding ones in the hierarchy. These understandings are distinguished from one another by a key dimension or aspect of variation. Learning occurs when a learner becomes aware of the variation that distinguishes a less complex way of understanding a phenomenon or concept from a more complex way (Marton and Booth 1997; Bowden and Marton 1998; Marton,

Runesson, and Tsui 2004; Pang and Marton 2005). The identification of different conceptions and aspects of variation which distinguish them can lead to more informed and targeted educational learning outcomes and assessment (Micari, Light, Calkins and Streitwieser, 2007; Reid and Petocz 2002; Trigwell 2000).

Phenomenography is a qualitative research paradigm developed in Sweden, Australia and the U.K. in the 1970s and 1980s to investigate different ways that students in higher education learn (Bowden 2000; Marton 1981, 1986, 1994; Marton and Booth 1997; Svensson 1997). It is primarily based on in-depth interviews that aim to identify the totality of different ways learners experience or understand a phenomenon in a particular context. Marton (1994) describes the approach as 'the empirical study of the limited number of qualitatively different ways in which we experience, conceptualize, understand, perceive, [or] apprehend various phenomena (p. 4424).' It is important to note that phenomenography is not concerned with describing individual students so much as it is with mapping out a complete typology of different understandings. The approach is particularly useful in providing in-depth insights into how particular inputs—programmes, courses and teaching—can lead to stronger outputs—meaningful experiences, learning and knowledge.

Sample
This study draws on analysis of in-depth, semi-structured interviews with 29 undergraduates at a mid-sized research-intensive university in the Midwestern United States. Researchers contacted students via an email invitation through the following centers and departments on campus, only some of which engage in study abroad programming: Student Life; International Studies; a variety of language, history and political science departments; the International Program Development Office, which runs study abroad programmes in global health, emerging global structures, science and engineering, and journalism; the Center for International and Comparative Studies, which runs study abroad programmes in central and eastern Europe and Africa; and the Study Abroad Office, which affiliates with over 105 study abroad programmes in different locations and of varying duration and thematic focus. All participants were volunteered and no compensation was offered.

In order to identify the maximum number of different understandings of Global Citizenship the student sample was purposefully selected with respect to two general kinds of criteria: the criterion of similarity (Light, 2002) with respect to the context of the experience, and the criterion of variation (Patton 2002). To satisfy the first criteria—similarity—27 of the 29 students interviewed were chosen because they had some form of prior experience in international settings, although not exclusively with participation in structured study abroad programmes. These international experiences included living abroad as a child, travelling with family and friends, and going on organized study abroad tours during high school, in college, or through a church or civic organization. The majority of these students had returned from a structured study abroad opportunity within the past two years while a smaller number of students were just preparing to depart for their study abroad period. Just two students had never traveled abroad but had expressed an interest in knowing more about international issues and seeking to study abroad in the future. In addition, many of the 29 students had also engaged in 'international' activities such as living with international students, participating in campus international events, engaging actively with ethnically, racially and geographically diverse

communities within communities in the United States, or simply taking courses with international thematic content. Regardless of their previous experiences, all shared an interest in international issues and sought out having international experiences.

To satisfy the second criterion, variation, the study ensured maximum diversity across the sample by a selection based on five criteria of variation: gender, year of study, discipline, duration of time spent abroad and programme type. There were 8 males and 21 females in the study—a proportion similar to current national averages for gender representation in study abroad. The sample also comprised two freshmen, seven juniors, and 20 seniors. No sophomores volunteered to be interviewed. The distribution of the sample included students majoring in 12 different disciplines across the natural sciences (3), social sciences (18) and humanities (7). One freshman had not yet declared a major. In addition, 8 students studied on a short-term programme (8 weeks or less); 17 students on a semester length programme (12 to 17 weeks), and 1 on a full year programme (25-39 weeks).

Students in the sample represented a range of programme types. For the purposes of this paper these programmes have been placed into three main categories based on type of exposure to another culture: Island programmes (which here include Hybrid programmes), Direct-enrollment programmes (which here include Internship programmes); and Immersion programmes (which here include Research and Field Studies programmes). Island programmes generally offer little cultural immersion and are either led by a study abroad institute ('third-party provider') or by a faculty member from an academic department; students take classes and excursions together (in some cases also taking a local university course) and often also live together. Direct-enrollment programmes are those in which students study directly at the local university or higher education institution or engage in a practicum (Internship) at a local school or business but do not do so facilitated through a U.S. institution or programme provider. Finally, Immersion programmes are built around providing substantive interactions with the local culture through Field Study opportunities and in-depth Research programmes or faculty-led community development and civic engagement projects. Within the study sample, ten students had studied on Island programmes; five in Direct-enrollment programmes; and eleven in Immersion programmes; and three students had never studied abroad. Table I displays the variation of the sample by programme group and student discipline.

TABLE I. Sample distribution by programme type and discipline

		Programme Type				
		Island	Direct-enrollment	Immersion	Other International Experience	Total Participants
Discipline	**Natural Sciences**		1	2		3
	Social Sciences	7	1	8	2	18
	Humanities	2	3	1	1	7
	Undecided	1				1
	Total Participants	10	5	11	3	29

Data Collection and Analysis
Interviews were semi-structured, following a set list of nine main questions divided into four sub areas with follow up probes asking respondents to elaborate on certain answers in greater detail. The same interview protocol was used for all students, with only minor adaptations according to the idiosyncratic nature of the interviewee's background and experiences. The interview protocol was structured to encourage interviewees to move from concrete questions about their experiences to deeper reflection on the impact and meaning of the experiences. Subjects moved from basic demographic and background questions to discussing how they came to engage in international experiences to explaining what they did on each experience to finally comparing the experiences in a way that enabled them to reflect on the value and meaning of each experience in turn. The last section was purposefully situated at the end of the interview so that the interviewees' initial concrete descriptions of their activities could later become the basis for reflecting on them. Some of the reflection-type questions included, 'What made your experience international? How did you go about drawing meaning from your experience? What do you consider to be the key elements of an international experience? How would you describe the way you went about learning while you were abroad?' and 'What does Global Citizenship mean to you and do you see yourself as a Global Citizen?'

All interviews were tape-recorded and independently transcribed by a professional transcription service. Interviews ranged from 30 to 60 minutes. The interview process followed a

phenomenographic interviewing technique explicated by Gerlese Åkerlind (2005a; b). The transcriptions were analyzed through a detailed, iterative process that involves both focusing on specific parts of the interview and then also on the totality of each interview on its own and compared against other interviews. Data analysis was conducted by two researchers who worked independently but also met regularly to present and discuss their emerging interpretations. A third, more experienced phenomenographic researcher also provided critical feedback on a regular basis and suggested further avenues for the analysis. Given that qualitative analysis of any kind includes the possibility of unintended error, such as subjective misinterpretation and inherent biases, each step of the analysis involved checking and cross-checking statements from different parts of the transcript, as well as discussing findings with the more experienced analyst as a way to ensure consistent interpretation of meaning and categorization of the data. Because interpretation in phenomenographic analysis depends in part on the ability of the analysts to understand through some measure of their own experiences how respondents talk about the meaning of their experiences, it is important to ensure that 'the categories provide an accurate description of 'recognized reality' (Entwistle and Entwistle 1992, 5-6.

The data analysis process included six main steps. Step 1; analysts read each of the transcripts on their own, underlining particular utterances and making notes in the margins as a way to generally acclimate themselves to each interview as well as to the totality of the entire sample. Step 2; each analyst conducted another full reading of the transcripts, this time with a focus on specific sections related to questions of specific interest—in this case how students discuss international experience in light of their particular conception of Global Citizenship. Step 3; each analyst summarized key issues and themes they saw emerging and began to organize them vis-à-vis the other transcripts to develop thematic groupings. Step 4, each analyst again went through their set of key issues and themes to sketch out the 'dimensions of variation' and underlying conceptions of understanding differentiating each student in the sample. Step 5; analysts worked together to create a table in the form of a conceptual map or typology to illustrate in graphic form the various dimensions and conceptions of understanding that emerged from the overall sample. Step 6; researchers again collaborated to select student quotes directly out of the transcripts in order to illustrate and support each distinct conception.

Findings
The typology of student understanding of Global Citizenship is presented here as a structural hierarchical 'outcome space.' The variation in understanding is described in terms of the increasing complexity that differentiates the conceptions from one another as well as the key aspects of variation that constitute the differences between conceptions. However, before proceeding to a description of the structural typology illustrated by student testimonials, we briefly report on two broader findings that emerged: a divergence in how students personally responded to the concept of Global Citizenship, and a convergence in the features they ascribed to it.

Divergence in Personal Responses
Students diverged appreciably in their initial response to the idea of Global Citizenship. Some students saw the concept as a wholly theoretical concept or even as a 'philosophical thought.' Such students often talked about it in terms of theories and approaches within their concentrations of study at the university. Thus, students in Economics often used terms directly

related to economic globalization trends; political science students used terminology related to concepts of the 'nation-state'; anthropology students brought in 'social policy' issues framed around the challenges of unequal distribution of resources, and so on. For example, an Anthropology major and Global Health minor who studied in Uganda explained:

> For me, I'm a social policy major, so I really frame it in terms of politics. And policy and people…. we could just eradicate malaria immediately. Like just get mosquito nets (but)…they're not culturally sensitive. There's a stigma … if you put a malaria net up you have HIV. It's a very interesting stigma. (Jessica)

In contrast, many students responded in very concrete terms, seeing Global Citizenship as a personal, idiosyncratic characteristic that applies to some people but not others due primarily to their socio-economic status and, as one student put it, 'life opportunities.'

> I think that a lot of people don't have the financial and just sort of life opportunities to be a Global Citizen because they don't have the money or whatever resources to really travel and get to know the different countries and different experiences but it doesn't mean that those people wouldn't if they had the opportunity. (Alyssa)

Some students also saw Global Citizenship as either an 'obnoxious' label or an 'unattainable' ideal that while certainly 'noble to strive for' ended up 'bogus in many cases' because of its uneven access to some with means but not others because of their social status or geographic location.

In addition to the emotional responses, students also located the concept of Global Citizenship within their own personal family history and life experience, relating it to where they lived as children or how their parents talked about international issues or foreign cultures.

> I was born in Japan and lived there for six years; moved then to Bahrain, lived there for a year and a half; then New Jersey for four years…. My dad is in finance and was working with [company name] in New York for a while. They moved him to Tokyo and Bahrain. Brought him back to New York and then he joined [company name] when we went to Singapore and then they brought him back to New York. (Aaron)

A Broader Convergence
While students often struggled with their emotional responses and how to provide precise meanings for Global Citizenship, their accounts were remarkably uniform in referring to it as a meaningful, even important idea. This convergence focused on two main features: that Global Citizenship must refer to something that is international, and that it must imply a significant personal relationship to that something international.

The first feature—Global Citizenship as international—meant having the opportunity to be exposed to international experiences and viewpoints different from one's own. The majority of students also felt that this international dimension could only be gained through travel outside of one's own country. For them 'international' meant traveling. However, they felt that travel could not simply be focused on tourism (i.e., vacationing in warm places) or be undertaken simply for

one's occupation (i.e., as a business traveler or as an airline pilot), but also had to be meaningful in and of itself.

> It's not just globe hopping….I think that you have to spend at least some period of time contrasting something with your American culture. (Melissa)

> If someone traveled the world for a year I wouldn't call them a Global Citizen. I'd call them a world traveler. (Fiona)

> I feel like if you go somewhere …for some business…but it's pretty much probably the same people you're going to interact with back in America…I feel like that experience would be much different than somebody who was supposed to go research, or was a professor and that was their job to learn. (Rene)

A smaller number of students, however, also argued that one could, in fact, gain international exposure and the international dimension they attributed to Global Citizenship without physically having to leave one's national boundaries. For these students, having domestic 'international' exposure through reading about other parts of the world, having foreign friends, interacting within international communities, or observing and participating in different lifestyles to gather other points of view—even if within the geographic borders of the United States—was enough to gain the attributes of Global Citizenship. For these students, what was critical was not the travel abroad but the intellectual curiosity to want to learn about others through interacting with them, even if only domestically in diverse communities.

> If you can't study abroad I don't think that has anything to do with making you less of a Global Citizen.…If you're really astute, you have this great friend from whatever country or you read the World section of the *New York Times* or your mom has this woman who works for [company], I think it's just a different path. But, I think the real clincher is the ability to think about issues in the world. (Jessica)

While exposure to international people and issues was a critical feature of Global Citizenship, students did not regard that feature alone as sufficient. All students argued that the relationship with the international also had to be meaningful. While students differed in what they believed was meaningful—indeed, as we shall see, this is critical to their different conceptions of Global Citizenship—they all identified how some international experiences could be characteristic of Global Citizenship while others could not. For example, some students felt that Peace Corps volunteers and people who travel and live abroad primarily to learn about the world and help others truly exemplify Global Citizens.

> You're making change or actually working between countries. As a diplomat, an ambassador… it doesn't even have to be a government position. If you're working in the Peace Corps or Doctors Without Borders or anything like that you're actively participating. (Gabby)

I have a friend applying for the Peace Corps and so, wow!, I don't think I could do that, and I think that she might be more of a Global Citizen than me because she's actively seeking out these different experiences. (Angela).

On the other hand, students did not generally regard people whose work involved a great deal of travel purely for occupational purposes or material and personal fulfillment, such as business travelers, pilots, tourists or globe trekking adventurers, as Global Citizens. Megan, for example, thinks the term has a "cheesy connotation" if it simply applies to world travel: "Is a pilot a Global Citizen because they've been all around the world flying 747's everywhere?"

For some interviewees this distinction was even applied to students who study abroad and the identification of certain types of study abroad experiences facilitating Global Citizenship but not others. For example, some interviewees distinguished between study abroad as a mere desire for fun and escapism versus study abroad for deeper cultural immersion and intellectual enrichment.

For some people who study abroad they just want to travel as much as possible…they want to have a three-month long vacation….But for me it was more like to really understand this other city that I was living in and feel like I was just a normal person living there, having a daily life going to school, having a job, having friends. (Cathy)

Conceptions of Global Citizenship
In the section below we present a typology of five hierarchically distinct ways in which students understand Global Citizenship: Global Existence, Global Acquaintance, Global Openness, Global Participation and Global Commitment (see Table II, below). Each conception is distinguished in two closely related ways: 1) what students see as the key characteristics of the conception of Global Citizenship and 2) how they see these conceptions differing from one another. In the first instance, the analysis revealed five distinct ways that students described what Global Citizenship consists of: living on the earth, having a personal connection to other countries, learning through openness to other countries, participating in the cultural practices of other countries, and recognizing the wider interconnectedness between countries.

In the second instance, the analysis revealed the structural relationship between these conceptions, describing how they differed from one another. This relationship showed that succeeding understandings are distinguished from one another by key 'aspects of variation' in which the more complex conceptions subsume the earlier ones in a hierarchical fashion. In the section below, preceded by Table II that provides an overview of our Global Citizenship Typology, we describe each conception in this hierarchy with respect to student statements on Global Citizenship.

TABLE II. A Typology of Student Conceptions of Global Citizenship (by categories, types and features)

Conceptions of Global Citizenship					
Type	**I** **Global Existence**	**II** **Global Acquain-tance**	**III** **Global Openness**	**IV** **Global Participa-tion**	**V** **Global Commitment**
What makes you a Global Citizen is:	being born on earth	a personal connection with one or more countries	learning about others who live in other countries	actively participating in the lives of those who live in other countries	recognizing the interconnected-ness of one's actions on those who live in other countries
Global Citizen-ship involves:	membership of those living on earth	a connection to one or more countries on earth	having an openness to and interest in learning about other countries, cultures, and peoples	being open to but also actively involved in the cultural practices of other countries	being open to and actively involved with other cultural practices, but also of effecting positive global change through a commitment to action
Aspects of Variation	Living on earth	Another country	Open to learning	Active participation	Commitment to action

Type I: Global Existence
The first conception of Global Citizenship—Global Existence—is the least complex
interpretation. It simply holds that because we are all born as human being on this earth we are
all by default Global Citizens. This way of seeing Global Citizenship was noted by one student
as a precursor to what later in her interview she described as more complex ways of regarding
the concept. But initially, she explained, one could in fact regard all 'humans' as one's brethren
at the most basic level and as a starting point.

> To be a global citizen, you know, if you're willing to be anywhere a part of Earth, I think
> that would make, under that definition, you more of a global citizen….By default.
> (Megan)

This statement reveals that understanding Global Citizenship in its simplest form consists of
simply being born anywhere on the globe and that a connection to a particular place is not the
decisive element.

Type II: Global Citizenship as Global Acquaintance
In the second conception—Global Acquaintance—students view Global Citizenship again in
fairly simple terms, however this time through a status they may have inherited through a family
background in one or more countries or through a career choice that involves frequent
international travel. Even if this connection may be tenuous—i.e., the student's parents grew up
elsewhere but he or she has always lived in the United States—what matters is that the student
can claim contact of some kind with one or more other countries. For example, Dennis sees
merely being of 'international circumstances' —i.e. a parent was a citizen of another country—
as sufficient to be a Global Citizen.

> A Global Citizen is like the person of Turkish decent that's grown up in Germany
> who's mother is also Brazilian…being born of international circumstances.
> (Dennis)

Tasha also reveals an acquaintanceship understanding of Global Citizenship, although, in her
case, through spending time in other countries. While working for some length of time in another
country might raise richer understandings of Global Citizenship, Tasha is primarily concerned
here with the simple idea of spending time in multiple countries, although she also believes
acquaintanceship is more than just travelling to those places once a year.

> There's people who work now that work in several countries or several continents
> regularly. So they don't just travel there once a year but they have to divide their
> time between these places and so…I think you develop an identity as a Global
> Citizen because you're so mobile and you have parts of those locales as your
> identity. (Tasha)

Global Citizenship for students with this conception, then, seems to consist primarily of meeting
a simple set of criteria: that of being 'global'—i.e. having contact with multiple countries—and

that of 'citizenship'—i.e., being a descendent of someone who has lived elsewhere. While the acquaintanceship may indeed need to be 'real' in a tangible sense—i.e., travel is not enough, one must also live there for some time—what the person actually does in those places is less important than the mere fact of acquaintanceship. Much like students who may travel to another culture but restrict their engagements to observing rather than participating in it, students with Type II understandings see Global Citizenship as a given attribute that is gained through a parent's citizenship or frequent travel. Their conception does not involve more complexity of understanding.

Type III: Global Citizenship as Global Openness
In the third conception—Global Openness—students not only see a connection to one or more countries but also view Global Citizenship as entailing a personal interest in openness to other countries and to learning about specific cultures, customs and people. A hallmark of this third conception is that students see Global Citizenship as being a way of thinking and behaving in ways that they feel are deliberately not American-centric. Avoiding this bias is very important to them.

> I guess to be a Global Citizen means you aren't only focused on your own country as the most important…but you also have to recognize your own bias and cultural perspective that you'll never be able to shed. (Cathy)

Cathy feels that Global Citizenship especially means not seeing her own country as the centre of the universe. As part of that she also recognizes that her status as an American citizen may compel her to hold certain beliefs and cultural practices that may be hard to shed.

Students with an openness conception want to belong to more than their own country and culture. As Karrie and Yoshi illustrate below, such students view Global Citizenship as including a move away from an "us-versus-them" dichotomy and instead see themselves with the rest of the world in cooperative terms, as a 'functioning unit.'

> If you have a desire to be a part of the world as a functioning unit versus your nation against the world, then I think you can consider yourself a Global Citizen. (Karrie)

> A global citizen should not feel strongly…like they belong in one culture…a global citizen should want or should be open to any other culture that's around them, around the world. (Yoshi)

In addition to rejecting an exceptionalist posture and seeking global cooperation, students with an openness conception also value what they are able to learn from other cultures and viewpoints. These students believe that fundamental shared human commonalities, rather than more surface national and cultural differences, are in fact what bind us. Patrick exemplifies this viewpoint.

15

The recognition that we all have something in common….When people dwell so much on the differences and don't…acknowledge that there is something in common, then it's difficult to make something like a Global Citizenship concept work….I'm a citizen of the globe. (Patrick)

Students with an openness conception regard having an inclusive view of others, searching for common ground on a basic humanitarian level, and seeking mutual understanding as the essential qualifying features of Global Citizenship.

Type IV: Global Citizenship as Global Participation
Students holding the fourth conception—Global Participation—see Global Citizenship as not gained merely by acquaintance with, or openness to learning from, other countries but through the active engagement with the cultural practices of people in those other countries. To these students, a sense of belonging—inclusion and 'connection'—with the other country or culture is critical to what it means to be a Global Citizen. Mary, for example, regards the feelings of 'belonging' that come through participation and forming relations and community belonging as important for Global Citizenship.

I guess it would be the feeling maybe not even like physically I'm a citizen of this country but the feeling of belonging to more than one place in the world or having some sort of connection to that place. (Mary)

To achieve this level of Global Citizenship, students seek to participate in diverse communities wherever they are and to actively engage in the way of life as lived by others. Thus, when these students venture abroad they seek Global Citizenship through participating in the activities of other communities as a way to gain acceptance. Rene exemplifies this viewpoint:

I feel like if I met somebody and they said they were a global citizen I would think they've probably been everywhere, they've probably lived different places and really interacted with other people everywhere and not just visited or had a look around but actually was a part of different communities. I think that living somewhere for a long period of time and just visiting is so different because you get the perspective of an actual citizen…which is so different because people treat you differently, too….Tourists just go to the sites, that's it but to become a part of the community, to actually… learn about the people around you and not just interact in a way that you're an outsider but that you're an insider and you know more about the social issues…you can't really learn a lot about the country if you just come and touch there, you know, you have to actually be a part of it for a while. (Rene)

Students with a Global Participation conception, then, often articulate a purposefulness to their foreign travel that fuses an openness to and an interest in participation with also an emotional and intellectual engagement that leads to personal transformation as critical for Global Citizenship. They seek, thus, to intensely come to know others and then apply that knowledge to how they will lead their lives.

[Global Citizenship means] learning about the people, sort of almost psychologically. Like how they live their lives, how they go about things and learning about the different ways that humans are raised and react in different situations and sort of taking little bits of that and incorporating it into what applies to you in life.(Alyssa)

Type V: Global Citizenship as Global Commitment
Students sharing the fifth conception—Global Commitment—make a critical distinction between being open to and learning about other countries and participating in them, and understanding that Global Citizenship requires a commitment to action in order to make the world a better place. These students, thus, are keenly aware of the globe's interconnectedness and of how the problems faced by even the remotest communities are in fact interlinked with the issues all humans sharing the planet need to address. Ann articulates this conception in terms of what she sees as the responsibilities of a Global Citizen:

> [A global citizen is] someone who's responsible enough to take on the acquisition of the most intimate knowledge of the places they visit and who can responsibly communicate that and… improve themselves and use that to educate or help other people in their lives. (Ann)

Students with a commitment conception are often concerned with how their consumer choices may impact those in less developed countries. Gabby invokes this through the example of global trade practices, where she makes reference to sweat shop labor abuses reported in the US media.

> I'm a Global Citizen in the sense that I'm not only interested in my own, like, what's going on in America. I care very strongly about what's going on in other countries and how we relate to other countries….I think that until I've had more experiences abroad I won't consider myself a very good Global Citizen. I think that a Global Citizen is perhaps someone that identifies themselves not only as a member of their country but also as a member of the world as a whole, which I think is something that gets lost often….Our economy interacts with their economy. If you buy something that was made in China you're interacting with China….And choices other people make affect us. (Gabby)

Students with a commitment conception have extended the importance they attach to coming to know one other culture (as may happen during study abroad) to a more generalized sensibility of the importance of taking action to improve the world as a whole.

> Global Citizenship is first understanding your own citizenship in a global context, and everyone is not the same, and then I think it kind of goes it a little further to understand, like…to me, Global Citizenship really is a Jewish value….We have a phrase called the 'Tikkun olam', repairing the world. It is not literally translated as repairing. It's more translated as obligation to first understand the world, and

17

then to find your place in it. So, for me, in order to repair the world, its really like
you've got to start with knowing the world. (Jessica)

Students with this conception regard Global Citizenship, then, as embracing a responsibility and identity that is shaped not only by learning from and active engagement with others but also by taking concrete action to positively impact the planet we all share. This final conception of Global Citizenship is defined essentially by a commitment to civic action.

The typology of student conceptions of Global Citizenship we have illustrated above is characterized by five aspects of variation. These aspects describe the main differences between the conceptions and the hierarchical structure of the typology. Student conceptions that appear later in the typology recognize more aspects of variation and express deeper, more complex understandings than earlier ones. Gabby, who articulates a type V conception, shows this hierarchy best. She understands that by virtue of birth on the planet we are all Global Citizens (first conception), but she also understands that acquaintance with other cultures is important (second conception), that openness (third conception) and interest in active participation (fourth conception) matters but, ultimately, that Global Citizenship entails a commitment to action (fifth conception).

Discussion
The findings presented above indicate that there is considerable variation in the ways that students understand the meaning of Global Citizenship. Some students articulate a straightforward understanding of the notion: we are all Global Citizens because we are human beings born on this planet or because our parents came from different countries. Others express more complex conceptions: we are not Global Citizens unless we are interested in learning beyond our communities, actively participate in the life experiences of others, and collaborate across borders to bring about positive change for all of humanity. The sample did not present a common understanding or one easy definition of Global Citizenship.

Much of the existing theoretical discussion of Global Citizenship remains at an abstract level and does not adequately reflect the wide spectrum of ways that students understand the notion through experiences with international and intercultural exchange. The way the study abroad industry currently uses Global Citizenship assumes a sophisticated understanding of the concept that our data has shown not all students share. In fact, only the higher level conceptions articulated in Conceptions IV and V in our typology bear resemblance to most of the current theoretical discussions around Global Citizenship.

In our arguement we are not seeking to make a judgement about whether or not all five conceptions constitute Global Citizenship, nor if one conception is necessarily a better kind of Global Citizenship than another. Rather, we point out that some conceptions exhibit a more complex articulation of what Global Citizenship entails than do others, and for that reason may be regarded as more sophisticated. Of the empirical studies that have been conducted on study abroad populations, most have concerned themselves with exploring student competency development on various levels. However, these competencies are not in and of themselves constructs of student understanding, although they may be associated with certain levels of understanding. Within our typology, students with lower level conceptions may not yet be

intellectually at the point of developing higher level competencies, particularly if their exposure abroad is of a limited duration of only a summer or semester—the growing trend in study abroad.

The development of Global Citizenship competencies also requires the development of higher-order levels of conceptions; the one cannot develop in isolation from the other. If a student only believes that Global Citizenship consists of being born on the face of the earth, then he or she is not likely to see the need to develop higher-level competencies. While students are not necessarily expected to make the kind of deep commitment illustrated by the fifth conception after only a short period, it is important to help students recognize that attaining Global Citizenship involves a developmental process with further experiences over time.

The fallacy that some of the current study abroad promotion has operated under, then, is the assumption that students completing a study abroad programme will possess higher-level conceptions when, as our data show, many do not. Such assumptions undermine the development of these competencies because they sidestep the critical need to prepare students adequately for study abroad and then guide them to engage with a focus and seriousness of purpose. When programmers claim to be providing students with experiences that will lead to Global Citizenship, they should be aware that they are raising multiple, different understandings of the concept in the minds of their students. In fact, they are even likely to tacitly be working with different understandings of the concept themselves.

While we are not making value judgements about what conceptions of Global Citizenship development a particular study abroad programme should focus on—that choice depends on the general goals of the programme, the nature of the population it serves, the programme's duration and location, and its slate of offerings and activities, among other things—we urge programmers to give some thought to how the conceptions presented here could help them in their future planning. Seeking closer alignment with student understandings of Global Citizenship are likely to positively affect the levels at which programmes a) formulate their goals and learning outcomes; b) design and implement their activities; c) assess their students' learning outcomes; and d) evaluate their programme's effectiveness.

Finally, we believe that the practical value of our typology is that it offers programmers a set of guideposts that indicate how students think about a core competency that intercultural learning experts have identified as important but are still grappling with to fully understand (Deardorff, 2009; Hovland 2006; 2009). If programmers accept the complexity of the concept they will be better suited to construct the core competencies they wish to develop in students and thus contextualize what they can offer in line with their outcome goals. For example, a music programme in Vienna may seek to offer students exposure to and participation in the musical culture of Austria, while an immersion programme in Uganda may seek to develop in students a heightened sense of civic responsibility by involving them in a community development initiative. Both goals are worthy but strikingly different; both offer meaningful engagement and both strive to develop in students valuable learning outcomes, but both cannot necessarily claim to be developing the same idea of Global Citizenship.

Conclusion
Study abroad is continuing to grow at a rapid pace. This expansion has been accompanied by a promise that study abroad will develop Global Citizenship. This easy claim has been criticised as being an empty marketing gimmick. Global Citizenship is a complex concept that remains contested not only among scholars but, as our data indicates, also among students who experience and seek out different things from international education. To date, empirical studies have been lacking that provide an understanding of Global Citizenship from the perspective of students. Our study has presented five distinct ways that students articulate understanding Global Citizenship in the broadest sense. We believe that by providing some level of clarity on the idea from the students' perspective we may be able to help study abroad providers address some of the critiques that have been leveled at them.

While we do not suggest that study abroad promoters discontinue talking about Global Citizenship, we urge them to more carefully think how they use the idea to promote international education. We believe abandoning the term would not only be unrealistic given its currency in lay discourse but also unfortunate since it is such a worthy ideal for international education. Most intercultural learning experts agree that global engagement is an important intercultural competency. However there continues to be divergence of opinion on what precisely defines this competency. We urge study abroad programmers to reflect on the full complexity of a Global Citizenship ideal and, as such, account for how they are utilizing it to their ends. If the industry of study abroad continues to ubiquitously use an overly broad concept with the erroneous assumption that it is universally understood, it runs the risk that students will continue to expect one thing from their programme choice when they may potentially get quite another (Zemach-Bersin, 2008).

In the future, if more specific terminology can be used to attract students to specific types of programme, both students and the faculty, administrators and professionals who develop programme will gain. The Forum on Education Abroad—arguably one of the flagship organizations promoting study abroad practice and scholarship in the United States—stated in its 2008 *Code of Ethics for Education Abroad* that ethical best practice in study abroad included 'truthfulness and transparency' of 'marketing, advertising and promotional materials…[that] should clearly set out the programme's limitations, as well as its strengths (p. 6).' Lewin (2009) argued that it is the educational experts in the field who must define terms so that marketing firms will not do this work for them. Rather than relying on an ill-defined, contested, and vague term du jour to continue attracting students to study abroad, its promoters have an intellectual responsibility to problematize, particularly for learning purposes, a specific and empirically derived terminology to attract students—one that is *both* informed by scholarly reflection but also the voices of the student stakeholders.

Limitations
This research is based on a relatively small sample made up of students from only one university in one country. While a robust effort was made to maximize variation, as a sample these students represent a relatively socio-economically privileged and highly educated group vis-à-vis young people in much of the rest of the world and all were already interested in international issues. Therefore, the backgrounds and perspectives held by this sample have been shaped, whether

20

intentional or not, by their particular status and interests, which must be accounted for in interpreting the findings.

Future Research
The question of students' perceptions of Global Citizenship is part of a larger funded study currently ongoing at Northwestern University. The SCIE Study has been funded by two research centres at Northwestern University that seek to understand more fully how students approach and choose to engage in study abroad opportunity (Streitwieser et al. 2009). Although the SCIE study is currently only made up of a sample of Northwestern students, in future research it will be fruitful to compare student views at diverse institutions and perhaps even across students in educational systems in different countries to discover how a broader sample of students understands and engages in international educational learning opportunities. (The first author is currently funded by a Fulbright Senior Research Fellowship to collect these additional data from a sample of European university students who are studying in the EU-funded Erasmus Mundus Mobility Programme at the Humboldt Universität zu Berlin in Germany.) Also, because the focus in this phenomenographic study was on identifying variation within the sample as a whole, we have not explored the nature of the exact link between students' views of Global Citizenship and the specific types of international experience offered by different study abroad programmes. Thus, we cannot draw causal inferences from this study and only suggest that there are connections between student conception and the type of study abroad programme that they experienced. A next stage of this study is constructing a survey based on our categories in order to highlight more specifically the links that exist between conceptions and specific experiences.

References

Åkerlind, G. S. 2005a. Learning about phenomenography: Interviewing, data analysis and the qualitative research paradigm, Chapter 6 in J. Bowden and P. Green (Eds), *Doing Developmental Phenomenography*, RMIT Press: Melbourne Australia, pp. 63-73.

Akerlind, G. 2005b. Phenomenographic methods: A case illustration. In *Doing Developmental Phenomenography*, J. Bowden and P. Green (Eds). Qualitative Research Methods Series. Melbourne, Victoria: RMIT University Press.

Altbach, P., and Teicher, U. 2001.Internationalization and exchanges in a globalized university. *Journal of Studies in International Education 5, no.*5: 5-25.

Altbach, P., Reisberg, L., and Rumbley, L.E. 2009.Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution. Executive Summary. *A Report prepared for the UNESCO 2009 World Conference on Higher Education*. Paris: UNESCO.

Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). 2007. *College Learning for a New Global Century.* A Report by the National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America's Promise. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges and Universities.

American Council on Education (ACE). 2008. *College-Bound Students' Interests in Study Abroad and Other International Learning Activities*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, Art and Science Group, LLC, and the College Board http://www.acenet.edu/Content/NavigationMenu/ProgramServices/cii/pubs/ace/StudentPoll.pdf http://www.acenet.edu/Content/NavigationMenu/ProgrammemesServices/cii/pubs/ace/College_Bound_Stude.htm

Barber, B. 1996. Constitutional Faith. In Joshua Cohen (Ed.) *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Bennett, J. M. 2008. Transformative training: Designing programmes for culture learning. In M. A. Moodian (Ed.), *Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Understanding and utilizing cultural diversity to build successful organizations* (pp. 95-110). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.)

Bennett, J.M. and Bennett, M.J. 2004. Developing intercultural sensitivity: An integrative approach to global and domestic diversity. In D. Landis, J.M. Bennett, and M.J. Bennett (Eds), *Handbook of intercultural training* (3rd ed.), pp. 147-165. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bennett, M.J. 1993. Towards Ethnorelativism: A Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity. In R.M. Paige (Ed.) *Education for the Intercultural Experience* (pp. 22-71). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Bhawuk, D. P. S. and Brislin, R. 1992. The measurement of intercultural sensitivity: Using the concepts of individualism and collectivism. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 16*(4), 413-436.

Bowden, J. and Marton, F. 1998. The university of learning. London: Kogan Page.

Bowden, J. A. 2000. Experience of phenomenographic research: a personal account. In J. A. Bowden & E. Walsh (Eds.), *Phenomenography.* Melbourne: RMIT Publishing.

Burnouf, L. 2004. Global awareness and perspectives in global education. *Canadian Social Studies. 38*(3). http://www.quasar.ualberta.ca/css/Css_38_3/index38_3.htm

Carter, A. (2001). *The political theory of Global Citizenship*. New York: NY: Routledge.

Clark, P. B. 1996. *Deep Citizenship*. London: Pluto Press.

Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Programme. 2005. *Global competence and national needs: one million Americans studying abroad.* http://www.forumea.org/documents/lincoln_commission_report.pdf

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

Deardorff, D. 2006). Identification and Assessment of Intercultural Competence as a Student Outcome of Internationalization; *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(3), 241-266.

Deardorff, D. 2009. Understanding the Challenges of Assessing Global Citizenship. In R. Lewin (Ed.) *The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad: Higher Education and the Quest for Global Citizenship*. New York: Routledge. Pp. 346-364.

de Wit, H. 2009. Global Citizenship and Study Abroad: A European Comparative Perspective. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad: Higher Education and the Quest for Global Citizenship*. New York: Routledge. Pp. 212-229.

Dodds, A. 2008. How does globalization interact with higher education? The continuing lack of consensus. *Comparative Education, 44*(4), 505-517.

Dolby, N. 2004. Encountering an American Self: Study Abroad and National Identity. *Comparative Education Review, 48*(2), 150-173.

Dwyer, M.M., and Peters, C.K. 2004. The Benefits of Study Abroad. *Transitions Abroad: The Guide to Learning, Living, and Working Overseas, March-April, 37*(5), 56-58.

Engle, L., and Engle, J. 2003. Study abroad levels: Toward a classification of programme types. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, *9*, 1–20.

Engle, L. and Engle, J. 2004. Assessing Language Acquisition and Intercultural Sensitivity Development in Relation to Study Abroad Programme Design. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 10*, 219-236.

Entwistle, N. and Entwistle, A. 1992. Experiences of understanding in revising for degree examinations. *Learning and Instruction 2*(1), 1-22.

Fairbrother, G. P. 2005. Comparison to what end? Maximizing the potential of comparative education research. *Comparative Education*, 41(1), 5-24.

Falk, R. 1994. The Making of Global Citizenship. In B. van Steenbergen (Ed.), *The Condition of Citizenship* (pp. 127-139). London: Sage.

Falk, R. 1996. Revisioning Cosmopolitanism. In Joshua Cohen (Ed). *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Streitwieser, 2009. Chapter in *The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad: Higher Education and the Quest for Global Citizenship.* Lewin, Ross (ed.).

Streitwieser, Light, and Wang, S. Roundtable presentation at the American Educational Research Association (AERA) Annual Conference, San Diego, CA, April 12-18, 2009.

Streitwieser and Wang, S. Paper presented at the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) Annual Meeting, Charleston, SC, .March 22-26, 2009.

Forum on Education Abroad (FEA). 2008. *Code of Ethics for Education Abroad*. Carlisle, PA: Forum on Education Abroad. http://www.forumea.org/documents/ForumonEducationAbroadCodeofEthics.pdf

Forum on Education Abroad (FEA). 2009. *Education Abroad Glossary*. Carlisle PA: Forum on Education Abroad.

Hammer, M. R., Bennett, M. J., and Wiseman, R. 2003. Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The intercultural development inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 27(4).

Habermas, J. 1994. Citizenship and National Identity. In B. van Steenbergen (Ed.), *The Condition of Citizenship* (pp. 10-19). London: Sage.

Hoffa, W.W. 2007. *A History of US Study Abroad: Beginnings to 1965*. Carlisle, PA: Frontiers Journal.

Hovland, K. 2009. Global Learning: What is it? Who is responsible for it? Peer Review, 11(4). http://www.aacu.org/peerreview/pr-fa09/hovland.cfm

Hovland, K. 2006. *Shared Futures: Global Learning and Liberal Education*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Institute of International Education (IIE). 2008. *Open Doors 2008: Report on International Educational Change.* Washington, DC: Office of Global Educational Programmes, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the U.S. Department of State. http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/?p=131555.

Kant, I. 1795. *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch.* http://www.constitution.org/kant/perpeace.htm

Lagos, Taso G. 2001 *Global Citizenship — Towards a Definition*: depts.washington.edu/gcp/pdf/globalcitizenship.pdf Accessed December 16, 2009.

Lewin, R. 2009. Introduction: The Quest for Global Citizenship through Study Abroad. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad: Higher Education and the Quest for Global Citizenship*. New York: Routledge. Pp. xiii-xxii.

Linklater, A. 1998. Cosmopolitan Citizenship. *Citizenship Studies 2*(1), 23-41.

Maddux, W.W. and Galinsky, A.D. 2009. Cultural Borders and Mental Barriers: The Relationship Between Living Abroad and Creativity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology (Vol. 96):* 1047-1061.

Marton, F. 1981. Phenomenography: Describing conceptions of the world around us. *Instructional Science, 10*, 177-200.

Marton, F. 1986. Phenomenography: A research approach investigating different understandings of reality. *Journal of Thought, 21*(2), 28-49.

Marton, F. 1994. Phenomenography. In T. Husen and N. Postlethwaite (Eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of Education*. 2nd ed., Vol. 8, Oxford, UK: Pergamon, 4424-4429.

Marton, F., and Booth, S. 1997. *Learning and Awareness*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Marton, F., Runesson, U., and Tsui A.B.M. 2004. The Space of Learning. Chapter 1, pp. 1-44. In Marton, F., Runesson, U. och Tsue, A.B.M. (Eds.). *Classroom discourse and the space of learning.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

McLeod M. and Wainright, P. 2009. Researching the Study Abroad Experience. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 13*(1), 66-71.

Medina–López–Portillo, A. 2004. Intercultural learning assessment: The link between programme duration and the development of intercultural sensitivity. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 10*, 179-200.

Micari, M., Light, G., Calkins, S., and Streitwieser, B. 2007. Article title. *American Journal of Evaluation,* journal information.

Musil, C. M. 2006. *Assessing Global Learning: Matching Good Intentions with Good Practice.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

NAFSA: Association of International Educators. 2008. *Strengthening Study Abroad: Recommendations for Effective Institutional Management for Presidents, Senior Administrators, and Study Abroad Professionals.* Report of NAFSA's Task Force on Institutional management of Study Abroad. Washington, DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). 2007. *Experiences that Matter: Enhancing Student Learning and Success.* Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research.

Nussbaum, M. 1996. Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism. In Joshua Cohen (Ed.) *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Ogden, A. 2007-2008. The View from the Veranda: Understanding Today's Colonial Student. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, XV,* 35-56.

Olsen, C., Green, M. and Hill, B. (2006). *A Handbook for Advancing Comprehensive Internationalization: What Institutions Can Do and What Students Should Learn.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education (ACE).

Paige, R.M., Fry, G., Stallman, E., Jon, J., and Josic, J. (in press). Study abroad for global engagement: The long-term impact of mobility experiences. *Intercultural Education.*

Parekh, B. 2003. Cosmopolitanism and Global Citizenship. *Review of International Studies, 29*, 3-17.

Pang, M.F. and Marton, F. 2005. Learning Theory as Teaching Resource: Another Example of Radical Enhancement of Students' Understanding of Economic Aspects of the World around them. *Instructional Science,* 33, 159-191.

Patton, M. Q. (Ed.). 2002. *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods.* (3rd ed.). Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA.

Poole, D. L., and Davis, T. S. 2006. Concept Mapping to Measure Outcomes in Study Abroad Programmes. *Social Work Education, 25*(1), 61-77.

Rayman, J., Trooboff, S. and Vande Berg, M. 2007-2008. Employer Attitudes toward Study Abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, XV*: 17-33.

Reid, A., & Petocz, P. (2002). Students' Conceptions of Statistics: A Phenomenographic Study. *Journal of Statistics Education, 10*(2).

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

Savicki, V., Downing-Burnette, R., Heller, L., Binder, F., and Suntinger, W. (2004). Contrasts, changes, and correlates in actual and potential intercultural adjustment. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations. 28*, 311–329.

Schattle, H. 2008. *The practices of Global Citizenship.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Light, G. (2002). From the personal to the public: Conceptions of creating writing in higher education. *Higher Education*, 43, 257-276.

Sen, A. 1996. Humanity and Citizenship. In Joshua Cohen (Ed). *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation Act of 2007. 2007. H.R. 1469. http://www.govtrack.us/congress/billtext.xpd?bill=h110-1469

Spring, J. 2008. Research on globalization and education. *Review of Educational Research, 78*(2), 330-363.

Stearns, P. 2009. *Educating Global Citizens in Colleges and Universities: Challenges and Opportunities.* New York: Routledge.

Stimpfel, J. R., and Engberg, D. 1997. What to Know Before You Go: Creating a Basis of Comparison for Research on Study Abroad Programmes. *International Education Forum, 17*(1), 7-21.

Svensson, L. 1997. Theoretical foundations of phenomenography. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 16(2): 159-171.

Trigwell, K. (2000). Phenomenography: Variation and Discernment. In C. Rust (Ed.), Improving student learning. Proceedings of the 1999 7th International Symposium, Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development: Oxford, pp. 75–85.

University of Minnesota and the Forum on Education Abroad. 2009. *Beyond Immediate Impact: Study Abroad for Global Engagement.*
.http://www.cehd.umn.edu/projects/sage/default.html

Urry, J. 2000. *Sociology beyond societies: Mobilities for the twenty first century*. London: Routledge.

van Rossum, E. J. and Schenk, S. M. 1984. The relationship between learning conception, study strategy and learning outcome. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 54(1), 73-85.

Walzer, M. 1996. Spheres of Affection. In Joshua Cohen (Ed.) *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Woolf, M. 2007. Impossible Things Before Breakfast: Myths in Education Abroad. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3/4), 496-509.

Woolf, M. 2009. *Study Abroad Changed My Life and Other Problems*. Paper presented at the Annual Forum on Education Abroad Meeting, Portland, OR, February 18-20, 2009.

Zemach-Bersin, T. 2009. Selling the World: Study Abroad Marketing and the Privatization of Global Citizenship. In R. Lewin (Ed.) *The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad: Higher Education and the Quest for Global Citizenship*. New York: Routledge. Pp. 303-320.

Zemach-Bersin, T. 2008. American Students Abroad Can't be 'Global Citizens.' *Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 7, Commentary section.