Education for Interdependence: The University and the Global Citizen

Michael Karlberg, Western Washington University, WA, USA

Abstract: Increasing global interdependence is placing new demands on university educators. Some educators are beginning to respond by taking seriously the concept of global citizenship education. This paper advocates the value of an outcomes-based approach to global citizenship education and suggests a framework of core learning outcomes that can guide and inform the development of global citizenship curricula. This framework – which includes a set of identity outcomes, ethical outcomes, and social practice outcomes – is offered as an invitation to dialogue regarding ways that universities can contribute more effectively to the education of responsible global citizens in an increasingly interdependent world.

WE LIVE IN an age of increasing social and ecological interdependence playing out on a global scale. The pressures associated with this heightened interdependence are placing new demands on liberal arts universities as they struggle to prepare critically engaged citizens for this new reality.[1] To date, many liberal arts universities have responded by adding a few global issues courses to their offerings, creating more opportunities for students to study abroad, and increasing foreign language requirements where they were previously lacking. In addition, the language of "global citizenship education" is beginning to permeate the academy. It is appearing in the mission statements and promotional materials of some universities; it is appearing in curricular discussions and debates within some faculty bodies; and it is being discussed within a growing body of academic literature.[2]

---

[1] Refer, for example, to discussions of this theme in Martha Nussbaum, *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997); Nel Noddings, ed., *Educating Citizens for Global Awareness* (New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press, 2005); Oxfam, *Education for Global Citizenship: A Guide for Schools* (Oxford: Oxfam Development Education Programme, 2006); Joy Pigozzi, "A UNESCO View of Global Citizenship Education," *Educational Review* 58, no. 1 (2006); Michael Karlberg and Cheshmak Farhoumand-Sims, "Global Citizenship and Humanities Scholarship: Toward a Twenty-First Century Agenda," *International Journal of the Humanities* 2, no. 3 (2006); Nigel Dower and John Williams, eds., *Global Citizenship: A Critical Introduction* (New York: Routledge, 2002); J. Michael Adams and Angelo Carfagna, *Coming of Age in a Globalized World: The Next Generation* (Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, 2006).

[2] Refer, for instance, to Sabina Alkire, "Global Citizenship and Common Values," in *Global Citizenship: A Critical Introduction*, ed. Nigel Dower and John Williams (New York: Routledge, 2002); Robin Attfield, "Global Citizenship and the Global Environment," in *Global Citizenship: A Critical Introduction*, ed. Nigel Dower and John Williams (New York: Routledge, 2002); April Carter, *The Political Theory of Global Citizenship* (New York: Routledge, 2001); Lynn Davies, "Global Citizenship: Abstraction or Framework for Action," *Educational Review* 58, no. 1 (2006); Gerard Delanty, *Citizenship in a Global Age: Society, Culture, Politics* (Buckingham, UK: Open University Press, 2000); Nigel Dower, *An Introduction to Global Citizenship* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2003);

These are all valid steps in the right direction. What is still generally lacking, however, is an integrated, coherent, and cross-curricular approach to educating for global citizenship. In other words, the developments alluded to above have not yet translated into a coherent set of core learning outcomes that can guide and inform curriculum development in a substantive and meaningful way across entire institutions. This paper therefore seeks to advance global citizenship education by laying out a clear case for it at the university level, by examining some initial developments in the field, by discussing the value of an outcomes-based approach, and by inviting a dialogue on a proposed framework of core learning outcomes.

Educating Global Citizens

The case for global citizenship education rests on the premise that we, as a species, can no longer afford to ignore our global impact and our global interdependence. Put simply, our technological and reproductive success as a species has transformed the conditions of our existence. Social norms and cultural patterns that may have been well suited to earlier historical periods, when human communities were relatively small and isolated, and when they placed minimal demands upon the earth's ecological systems, are now proving maladaptive. Under conditions of heightened social and ecological interdependence, we now need to learn how to live together on this planet in a peaceful, just, and sustainable manner, as responsible citizens of a global community.[3]

These responsibilities rest especially heavily upon the shoulders of privileged populations who have a disproportionate social and ecological impact in the world. In this context, university educators cannot ignore the exigencies of the age we live in. Educating responsible global citizens should be central to a liberal arts education in the twenty-first century – just as educating responsible national citizens was widely considered central in the twentieth century.

Skeptics have argued that the analogy between global citizenship education and national citizenship education is misplaced, because the nation-state is a legal and institutional reality while equivalent institutions do not exist at the global level.[4] Global citizenship, according to this line of reasoning, is nothing more than a discursive construct with no legal and insti-

Richard Falk, "The Making of Global Citizenship," in *The Condition of Citizenship*, ed. Bart van Steenbergen (London: Sage, 1994); William Hitt, *The Global Citizen* (Columbus: Battelle Press, 1998); Kimberly Hutchings, "Feminism and Global Citizenship," in *Global Citizenship: A Critical Introduction*, ed. Nigel Dower and John Williams (New York: Routledge, 2002); Mark Imber, "The UN and Global Citizenship," in *Global Citizenship: A Critical Introduction*, ed. Nigel Dower and John Williams (New York: Routledge, 2002); Donella Meadows, *The Global Citizen* (Washington, DC: Island Press, 1991); Darren O'Byrne, *The Dimensions of Global Citizenship: Political Identity Beyond the Nation State* (London: Frank Cass, 2003); Bhikhu Parekh, "Cosmopolitanism and Global Citizenship," *Review of International Studies* 29 (2003); Leslie Roman, "Education and the Contested Meanings of 'Global Citizenship'," *Journal of Educational Change* 4 (2003); Hans Schattle, "Communicating Global Citizenship: Multiple Discourses Beyond the Academy," *Citizenship Studies* 9, no. 2 (2005); Bart van Steenbergen, "Towards a Global Ecological Citizen," in *The Condition of Citizenship*, ed. Bart van Steenbergen (London: Sage, 1994); John Williams, "Good International Citizenship," in *Global Citizenship: A Critical Introduction*, ed. Nigel Dower and John Williams (New York: Routledge, 2002).

[3] Noddings, ed., *Educating Citizens for Global Awareness*, Nussbaum, *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education*; Karlberg and Farhoumand-Sims, "Global Citizenship and Humanities Scholarship: Toward a Twenty-First Century Agenda."; Adams and Carfagna, *Coming of Age in a Globalized World: The Next Generation*.

[4] Regina Lyakhovetska, *Looking into the Future: Views of UBC Students and Alumni on Global Citizenship* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia, 2004).

tutional meaning, and hence no real value. What this skeptical view fails to recognize, however, is that discursive change is often a prerequisite for legal and institutional change.[5] In other words, the ways we think and talk about the world influence the ways we legally and institutionally construct the world. In order to construct effective international institutions and frameworks of law that are capable of addressing the complex global challenges that will increasingly face us, we need to cultivate forms of human consciousness that will enable and support the emergence of such institutions and laws. This is where educators can make a vital contribution.[6]

A small number of universities and university educators in the English speaking world have begun moving in this direction. For instance, in the late 1990s, Nigel Dower directed a project on global citizenship at the University of Aberdeen in the UK which led, among other things, to the production of two valuable textbooks: *Global Citizenship: A Critical Reader* and *An Introduction to Global Citizenship*.[7] In Canada, the University of British Columbia launched a global citizenship project in 2003, resulting, among other things, in the adoption of global citizenship education as a core component of its mission statement; in the launching of a *Global Citizenship Teaching and Learning Initiative* to support faculty members across the curriculum in their efforts to foster global citizenship competencies among their students; and in the introduction of a range of programs, including a *Global Citizenship Seminar Series* and an online *Introduction to Global Citizenship* course.[8] Modest initiatives can also be seen in the United States. These include the *Ethics and Global Citizenship Program* at Tufts University, Lehigh University's *Global Citizenship Program*, and Iowa State University's annual *Global Citizenship Symposium*. In addition, the Association of American Colleges and Universities recently completed a three-year project on *Liberal Education and Global Citizenship* that worked with faculty from ten colleges and universities across the country to promote the concept. Likewise, *The Global State of Washington* initiative is seeking to establish global citizenship curricula within post-secondary institutions across the state of Washington.

Outcomes Assessment

The initiatives alluded to above represent a series of modest first steps. However, in order to advance this agenda in a more substantive and systematic manner, educators who are committed to this agenda will need to acknowledge and embrace the growing trend toward curricular outcomes assessment in higher education. This trend has generated some skepticism and even hostility among university faculty because, at its worst, it has served as an instrument of external control by which powerful interest-groups impose learning outcomes that press systems of public education into their private service. At its best, however, outcomes assess-

[5] Nigel Dower, "Global Citizenship: Yes or No?," in *Global Citizenship: A Critical Introduction*, ed. Nigel Dower and John Williams (New York: Routledge, 2002); Michael Karlberg, "Discourse, Identity, and Global Citizenship," *Peace Review* 20, no. 3 (2008).
[6] Pigozzi, "A UNESCO View of Global Citizenship Education"; Noddings, ed., *Educating Citizens for Global Awareness*; Adams and Carfagna, *Coming of Age in a Globalized World: The Next Generation*; Nussbaum, *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education*.
[7] Dower and Williams, eds., *Global Citizenship: A Critical Introduction*; Dower, *An Introduction to Global Citizenship*.
[8] Lyakhovetska, *Looking into the Future: Views of UBC Students and Alumni on Global Citizenship*; refer also to http://www.internationalization.ubc.ca/globalcitizenship.htm.

ment provides a valuable tool for curriculum development and reform, provided it is directed toward constructive ends, in a proactive manner, by socially responsible faculty.[9] In this regard, forward-looking faculty can articulate clear and compelling global citizenship learning outcomes, as well as effective models for assessing these, that will elevate the profile of global citizenship education among other faculty, administrators, legislators, and the taxpaying public.

To date, however, global citizenship learning outcomes have received little attention among university educators. One exception is an article by Andrzejewski and Alessio entitled "Education for Global Citizenship and Social Responsibility".[10] Andrzejewski and Alessio define global citizenship as knowledge and skills for social and environmental justice, and they advocate a set of learning outcomes rooted in the ideals of civic engagement, political activism, and participatory democracy. Their learning outcomes, however, are borrowed from an earlier set of curricular recommendations on "Citizenship and Democracy" and their attention to the *global* context of citizenship is eclipsed by their emphasis on political citizenship in a national context. Their learning outcomes remain silent, for instance, on the subject of identity, which is arguably the most central, and sensitive, global issue at the dawn of the twenty-first century, and the one issue that most clearly distinguishes global citizenship education from more nationally-focused approaches.

Another exception to the general silence on learning outcomes can be found at the University of British Columbia, where the final report from their global citizenship project outlined a list of values, competencies, and actions that could serve as a basis for learning outcomes across the curriculum. Although a good first step, the list is little more than an inventory of laudable humanitarian ideals, including values such as "respect," "compassion," and "open-mindedness"; competencies such as "self-awareness," "cultural sensitivity," and "knowledge of human rights"; and actions such as "develop linguistic skills," "contribute to poverty reduction," and "fight racial discrimination".[11] What is lacking from the UBC report is a coherent organizing framework that distinguishes the specific imperatives of *global* citizenship from more general humanitarian and civic ideals, and translates these into the language and practice of actual learning outcomes.

What is needed at this time is a systematic effort to clarify and articulate a framework of learning outcomes that specifically pertain to the exigencies of global interdependence. Such a framework will need to address the issue of identity that lies at the heart of the current global problematique and that distinguishes the concept of global citizenship from other levels of citizenship. In this context, the following framework is offered as an invitation to dialogue. The framework is organized according to three broad categories: identity outcomes, ethical outcomes, and social practice outcomes. These broad categories by no means exhaust

---

[9] T. Banta, *Building a Scholarship of Assessment* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2002); J. Green and P. Castelli, *Outcomes Assessment in Higher Education* (Overland Park, KS: International Assembly for Collegiate Business Education, 2002); J. W. Pellegrino, N. Chudowsky, and R. Glaser, eds., *Knowing What Students Know: The Science and Design of Educational Assessment* (Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 2001); B. Walvoord, *Assessment Clear and Simple: A Practical Guide for Institutions, Departments, and General Education* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004).

[10] Julie Andrzejewski and John Alessio, "Education for Global Citizenship and Social Responsibility," *Progressive Perspectives* 1, no. 2 (1999).

[11] Lyakhovetska, *Looking into the Future: Views of UBC Students and Alumni on Global Citizenship*, 18-20.

the possibilities, but they provide an initial schema for discussing what might uniquely define global citizenship education.

Identity Outcomes

In an increasingly interdependent global community, inherited identity constructs based on race, nationality, ideology, religious sectarianism, and other socially constructed categories can become obstacles to a just and sustainable future if they are understood in conflictual and mutually antagonistic ways.[12] Identity constructs lie at the core of human perception, motivation, and action. They also shape the ways we interpret our individual and collective interests. As long as people understand the world primarily in terms of "us" and "them" – whatever the basis of those distinctions – human beings will be unable to realize their common interests by coordinating their collective actions.

Meanwhile, the pressures for global coordination are mounting. We face trans-national ecological crises and health pandemics; we face the rise of international terrorism, a growing international arms market, and the proliferation of nuclear weapons; we face unprecedented human suffering, exploitation, displacements, and refugee migrations across the globe; we face a growing international drug trade and the rise of global crime syndicates; and we face a market system that has escaped the envelope of responsible democratic governance, resulting in an abysmal gap between the world's richest and poorest peoples that is becoming an acute source of social and political instability.[13]

Adapting to the conditions of global interdependence, and responding to the challenges that arise from these conditions, requires a critical re-appraisal of inherited identity constructs. In this regard, the cornerstone of a responsive global citizenship curriculum should be a re-cognition of our essential unity as a species – a consciousness of the oneness of humanity.[14] This recognition does not imply the obliteration of diversity. On the contrary, it implies the need to value human diversity as a collective source of richness, beauty, resilience and strength. Nor does it imply projecting or imposing any historically dominant identity upon others. On the contrary, it implies reconciling those aspects of our humanity that we all share in common, with those expressions of cultural and biological diversity that make us unique. In this context, the following are suggested as an initial set of core identity-based outcomes within global citizenship curricula:

---

[12] Kenneth Hoover, *The Power of Identity: Politics in a New Key* (Chatham, NJ: Chatham House Publishers, 1997); Karlberg, "Discourse, Identity, and Global Citizenship."

[13] Refer, for example, to discussions in David Held and Anthony McGrew, eds., *The Global Transformations Reader* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000); David Held et al., *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics, and Culture* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999); Gregory Dahl, *One World, One People: How Globalization Is Shaping Our Future* (Wilmette, IL: Bahá'í Publishing Trust, 2007); Frank Lechner and John Boli, eds., *The Globalization Reader*, 2 ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004).

[14] Kristen Monroe, *The Heart of Altruism: Perceptions of a Common Humanity* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998); Nussbaum, *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education*; Michael Karlberg, *Beyond the Culture of Contest: From Adversarialism to Mutualism in an Age of Interdependence* (Oxford: George Ronald, 2004); Dahl, *One World, One People: How Globalization Is Shaping Our Future*.

Students will be able to...

1. recognize their common humanity with others throughout the planet
2. reconcile multiple, diverse, nested identities with the imperatives of global interdependence and the emergence of a common human identity
3. explain the socially constructed nature of national identities and
    a. value the heritage and contributions of diverse nationalities
    b. evaluate the costs and consequences of xenophobia and excessive nationalism
    c. subordinate national self-interests to collective human interests when necessary
4. explain the socially constructed nature of ethnic or racial identities and
    a. value the heritage and contributions of ethnically or racially diverse people
    b. evaluate the costs and consequences of racism and ethnocentrism
    c. subordinate the self-interests of one's own ethnic or racial group to collective human interests when necessary
5. explain the historically contingent nature of sectarian religious identities and
    a. value the contributions of diverse systems of religious thought and practice
    b. evaluate the costs and consequences of sectarian religious conflict
    c. reflect on and refine one's own beliefs in light of the imperatives of global interdependence and the emergence of a common human identity

Ethical Outcomes

Ethics denotes a theory or system of right action. The major question that most ethical systems attempt to deal with is how to reconcile individual actions and interests with the greatest common good. The exigencies of global interdependence have now expanded the boundaries of this question to include all of humanity.[15] This has clear implications for any global citizenship curriculum.

Codes of ethics that developed under earlier historical conditions, when human communities were limited in scope and the common good was thus a relatively circumscribed concept, need now to be expanded and refined in recognition of the unity and interdependence of humankind. Like the genetic codes through which species either adapt to their environment or perish, ethical codes must be similarly adaptive. Unlike genetic codes, however, our ethical codes can be consciously and intentionally cultivated through processes of socialization and education – including higher education.

The subject of ethical codes, as higher educational learning outcomes, may invite some controversy. Many faculty are more comfortable comparing different ethical theories, and contrasting different traditions of ethical reasoning, than they are fostering commitments to specific ethical principles or codes. When pressed, however, faculty will admit that they are

---

[15] Kwame Anthony Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers* (New York: W.W.Norton & Co, 2006); Nigel Dower, *World Ethics: The New Agenda* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998); ———, "Global Ethics and Global Citizenship," in *Global Citizenship: A Critical Introduction*, ed. Nigel Dower and John Williams (New York: Routledge, 2002); Suheil Bushrui, *The Ethics of Globalization: A Bahá'í Perspective* (Brussels: Librairie Baha'ie 2003); William Hitt, *A Global Ethic* (Columbus, OH: Battelle Press, 1996); Hans Kung, "A Global Ethic for a New Global Order," in *Global Citizenship: A Critical Introduction*, ed. Nigel Dower and John Williams (New York: Routledge, 2002); Brian D. Lepard, *Hope for a Global Ethic in a Despairing World* (Wilmette, IL: Bahá'í Publishing 2007); Peter Singer, *One World: The Ethics of Globalization* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002).

already engaged in the cultivation of ethical principles such as *academic honesty* within their classrooms. Moreover, ethical codes govern various university relationships among and between faculty, students, and surrounding communities. Universities therefore do commit to, and cultivate, ethical codes – even if they are sometimes contested and revised or refined over time.

In order to navigate the challenge of articulating ethical learning outcomes that can be consensually supported, universities might focus primarily on two sets of ethical principles that are highly relevant to global citizenship. The first of these are the closely related principles of *justice* and *equity*. Justice and equity, as the terms are used here, refer to expressions of fairness, and the refusal of double standards, in human relations. At the individual level, humans are endowed with the capacity to learn fair-mindedness, which enables each of us to distinguish justice and equity in our interactions and relationships with others. Likewise, at the group level, communities, organizations, and decision-making bodies can learn to apply the principles of justice and equity as criteria for collective decision making. Indeed, this is the only way that unity of thought and coordinated action can be achieved and sustained among diverse people within an increasingly global context.

The other ethical principle that might be focused on is the principle of *collective trusteeship* that underlies most human rights discourses as well as many discourses of environmental stewardship. Since the human species is one, and our individual fates are increasingly inter-dependent, it is reasonable to conceive that every human being is born into the world as a trust of the collective social body. This understanding constitutes the implicit or explicit ethical foundation of many approaches to human rights. Human rights, after all, are constructs that are intended to ensure that all individual members of the social body have the maximum opportunity to realize their potential. The principle of collective trusteeship also constitutes the ethical foundation of many approaches to environmental stewardship. Responsible environmental stewardship, after all, is another precondition for ensuring that all human beings – local, distant, and yet-unborn – have the maximum opportunity to realize their potential. In this context, the following are suggested as an initial set of core ethical outcomes within global citizenship curricula:

Students will be able to...

1. articulate a rationale for justice and equity in the context of global relationships
2. apply the principles of justice and equity by
    a. identifying double-standards in interpersonal, inter-group, and international relationships
    b. assessing the costs and consequences of double-standards in interpersonal, inter-group, and international relationships
    c. imbuing social action with a sense of justice, equity, and fair-mindedness
    d. replacing relationships based on conflict, dominance, and exploitation with relationships based on cooperation, reciprocity, and mutual empowerment
3. articulate a rationale for the principle of collective trusteeship on a global scale
4. apply the principle of collective trusteeship by
    a. recognizing that the well-being of individuals and distinct social groups depends upon the well-being of the global social body

b. promoting the collective responsibility to ensure social and environmental conditions that permit the realization of the full potential of every individual and group
c. articulating a set of basic human rights and responsibilities that permit the realization of the full potential of every individual and group
d. analyzing a global social issue or problem through the lens of basic human rights and responsibilities
e. reflecting upon the social costs and ecological consequences of consumer choices and economic policies
f. modifying consumer choices and habits by taking into account social costs and ecological consequences
g. explaining the public policy dimension of a global environmental issue or problem
h. making social and environmental decisions that take into account the interests and needs of geographically distant and yet-unborn peoples

Social Practice Outcomes

Shared social practices constitute a large part of what it means to be human. According to May, *practices* are normatively governed regularities of behavior that are generally goal-directed.[16] Examples range from the practice of dating to the practice of litigation to the practice of democratic deliberation. Such practices develop in specific cultural and historical contexts and they change over time. We can thus recognize diverse and evolving communities of practice, including distinct communities of scientific practice, or of educational practice, or of religious practice.

Some sets of practices are specifically associated with the exercise of power and authority within social groups. Such practices include, for instance, those associated with the acquisition and control of knowledge, or with the definition of what constitutes legitimate forms of knowledge and authority. Closely related to these are various practices associated with governance and decision making. Many inherited practices of these kinds are now being questioned by historically marginalized groups who recognize the structural inequalities that are often embedded in practices associated with the control of knowledge and the exercise of power and authority. In an increasingly interdependent global society, where the welfare of every social group depends on the well-being of the entire social body, such practices need to be critically re-examined and, when necessary, modified according to the principles of justice, equity, and collective trusteeship discussed above. If social practices that lead to domination, oppression, and exploitation are not superceded by practices that promote mutual empowerment and collective advancement, it will be impossible to marshal the unified thought and coordinated action needed to respond to the myriad global challenges that face us.[17] Again, educators can play a vital role in this regard.

In this context, special attention also needs to be paid to practices associated with collective inquiry and collective decision making, which are central to the exercise of power and authority in contemporary societies. Such practices are learned within family systems, small groups and organizations, schools and universities, and other local settings – in ways that

---

[16] Todd May, *Our Practices, Our Selves, or, What It Means to Be Human* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001).
[17] Michael Karlberg, *Beyond the Culture of Contest*.

often have a gendered bias and that perpetuate the privileges of dominant social groups. Once established, such practices tend to be carried forward into the arena of national governance and international relationships. The following are therefore suggested as an initial set of core social practice outcomes within global citizenship curricula:

Students will be able to...

1. use methods of collective inquiry and collective decision making that are inclusive, collaborative, unifying, and mutually empowering
2. recognize the complex and multifaceted nature of many social and ecological issues
3. approach complex issues with epistemological humility and open-mindedness
4. solicit and value diverse perspectives on complex multifaceted issues
5. involve people who will be affected by decisions in the formulation of those decisions
6. foster an atmosphere that gives voice to, and promotes dignity and respect among, all people involved in decision making processes
7. apply ethical principles as primary criteria within the solution of complex social and environmental problems
8. treat geographically distant and yet-unborn people according to the same ethical standards you would, yourself, want to be treated
9. support processes that lead to solidarity of purpose, thought, and action among diverse people in the implementation of responsible and responsive decisions
10. maintain a posture of learning and assessment in the implementation of collective decisions
11. adopt a systematic approach to refining decisions, following implementation, based on the experience and feedback of those most affected

Conclusion

University educators who recognize the imperative of educating for global interdependence now need to take the next steps and begin articulating clear, coherent, and meaningful learning outcomes that can guide and inform curriculum development while raising the status of global citizenship education among faculty, administrators, legislators, tax payers, and donors. The framework articulated above represents an invitation to dialogue among those who are committed to this goal. This framework is not meant to be the last word on the subject, nor is it meant to imply a one-size-fits-all approach. Global citizenship learning outcomes will undoubtedly vary according to the institutional culture and commitments of different universities, and they will surely evolve over time. However, if some initial, general consensus on a few socially responsible outcomes can be reached, this will significantly reinforce efforts to advance global citizenship education while preventing the cooptation of the term by groups inside and outside the academy who are motivated by narrowly conceived self-interests.

As the dialogue on core learning outcomes unfolds, it will also be important to recognize both the strengths and the limitations of measurement-based approaches to student learning outcomes. Outcomes assessment is not a panacea for higher education. Nor is it an effective way to advance every educational objective. There is often an inverse relationship between how meaningful a learning outcome is and how measurable it is, and the most meaningful

learning outcomes can perhaps never be measured. Nevertheless, the pro-active articulation of learning outcomes and the curricular discourse it generates is proving to be a highly productive exercise that can have a substantial positive impact on educational content and processes.[18] Even when specific learning outcomes cannot easily be measured or assessed, the process of thinking and talking them through, writing them down, and committing to them can have a transformative effect on both curricula and pedagogy.

In this context, today's university educators can play their part in laying the foundations for a more just and sustainable global community. Since the concept of global citizenship does not have the legal and institutional status that the concept of national citizenship currently enjoys, now is the time to begin constructing the internal architecture of meaning that may eventually support those external legal and institutional forms. Only when these internal and external structures are built will the majority of the earth's people stop being the mere *subjects* of political and economic forces beyond their control, and instead become empowered *citizens* who assume the rights and responsibilities associated with membership in a global community.

About the Author

Dr. Michael Karlberg
Michael Karlberg is an Associate Professor of Communication at Western Washington University. He is the author of a book entitled *Beyond the Culture of Contest: From Adversarialism to Mutualism in an Age of Interdependence* (Oxford: George Ronald, 2004), as well as various peer-reviewed articles in the field of peace and conflict studies. He has also written several peer-reviewed articles on the topic of global citizenship, including *Discourse, Identity, and Global Citizenship* (Peace Review) and *Global Citizenship and Humanities Scholarship: Toward a Twenty-First Century Agenda* (International Journal of Humanities).

---

[18] T. Angelo, "Assessment," *American Association for Higher Education Bulletin, November* 79 (1995); M. Mentkowski et al., *Learning That Lasts: Integrating Learning, Development, and Performance in College and Beyond* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000); Walvoord, *Assessment Clear and Simple: A Practical Guide for Institutions, Departments, and General Education*.