



Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia Inc

Research and Development in Higher Education: Higher Education in a Globalized World

Volume 37

Refereed papers from the
37th HERDSA Annual International Conference

7 - 10 July 2014
Hong Kong Baptist University
Hong Kong SAR, Peoples Republic of China

Bosanquet, A., Winchester-Seeto, T. & Rowe, A. (2014). Conceptualising global citizenship: Analysing intended curriculum in Australian universities. In A. Kwan, E. Wong, T. Kwong, P. Lau & A. Goody (Eds.), *Research and Development in Higher Education: Higher Education in a Globalized World*, 37 (pp 48 - 60). Hong Kong, 7 – 10 July 2014.

Published 2014 by the
Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia, Inc
PO Box 27, MILPERRA NSW 2214, Australia
www.herdsa.org.au

ISSN 1441 001X
ISBN 978-0-908557-96-7

This research paper was reviewed using a double blind peer review process that meets DIISR requirements. Two reviewers were appointed on the basis of their independence and they reviewed the full paper devoid of the authors' names and institutions in order to ensure objectivity and anonymity. Papers were reviewed according to specified criteria, including relevance to the conference theme and sub-themes, originality, quality and presentation. Following review and acceptance, this full paper was presented at the international conference.

Copyright © 2014 HERDSA and the authors. Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of research or private study, criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright, Designs and Patent Act, 2005, this publication may only be reproduced, stored or transmitted, in any form or by any means, with the prior permission in writing of the publishers, or in the case of reprographic reproduction in accordance with the terms and licenses issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside those terms should be sent to the publishers at the address above.

Conceptualising global citizenship: Analysing intended curriculum in Australian universities

Agnes Bosanquet

Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia
agnes.bosanquet@mq.edu.au

Theresa Winchester-Seeto

Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia
theresa.winchester-seeto@mq.edu.au

Anna Rowe

Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia
anna.rowe@mq.edu.au

This paper emerges from a research study that analyses graduate attributes statements from 39 Australian universities over a 20 year period. Graduate attributes articulate an institution's vision of students they seek to develop and the knowledge, values and dispositions they wish to impart. Specifically, this paper examines graduate attributes from 2011-2014 related to the complex notion of global citizenship, which is now included in some form at 95% of Australian universities. This paper defines and analyses institutional engagement using the framework of passive, active and critical global citizenship education. Two types of analysis are undertaken: a thematic analysis of graduate attribute statements and a word frequency analysis of the high level categories identified in the statements. Key findings include a substantial increase in the categories *global* (graduate attribute statements referring to global or international perspectives only), *citizen* (in which citizenship alone is mentioned) and *global citizen* (wherein the terms are used in conjunction with one another). Of particular interest are the differing foci and responsibilities evident in these categories and the location and level of engagement of attributes such as ethics and leadership.

Keywords: graduate attributes, global citizenship, curriculum

Introduction

This paper is inspired by analysis of graduate attribute statements from 39 Australian universities over a period of 20 years. Graduate attributes articulate an institution's vision of the students they seek to develop, and the knowledge, values and dispositions they wish to impart. Based on Marsh and Willis' (2007) conceptual framework for curriculum, graduate attributes represent what is intended, but may not necessarily reflect the enacted curriculum (what is taught within disciplines) or the experienced curriculum (the capabilities a student develops). The findings discussed here provide a snapshot of the intended curriculum for global citizenship at Australian universities between 2011 and 2014.

Global citizenship is a complex concept with a multiplicity of meanings in the higher education context. University statements of graduate attributes increasingly use it as an umbrella term to encompass concepts including intercultural awareness, cross-cultural competency, inclusivity, social justice, ethical practice, diversity, globalisation, indigenous

knowledge, sustainability, leadership, multiculturalism, internationalisation and community engagement. A synthesis of the graduate attributes literature reveals four broad conceptions of their purpose: employability, lifelong learning, preparing for an uncertain future, and acting for the social good (Bosanquet, Winchester-Seeto & Rowe, 2010). The latter two are closely aligned with global citizenship, with the literature emphasising the importance of students acting to benefit the international community, appreciating and valuing diversity, working in unknown contexts and transforming themselves and society for the better (see, for example, Barnett, 2004; Barrie & Prosser, 2004; Bowden & Marton, 1998; Bowden, Hart, King, Trigwell & Watts, 2002).

The aim of this paper is to extend previous findings by examining graduate attributes data from 2011-2014 related to global citizenship. Previously, the authors performed a comparative analysis of graduate attributes statements at 13 Australian universities from the 1990s to 2010 (Bosanquet *et al.*, 2010) and analysed graduate attributes at 39 Australian universities in relation to social inclusion (Bosanquet, Winchester-Seeto & Rowe, 2012) and student engagement (Winchester-Seeto, Bosanquet & Rowe, 2012). As a whole, the research aims to explore the following questions: What is the intended curriculum at Australia's universities? How has this changed over time? To what extent do graduate attributes align with teaching (enacted curriculum) and learning (experienced curriculum)?

Key findings reported previously demonstrate how statements of graduate attributes have changed over time. In the 1990s, the list is dominated by preparation for professional practice; for example, critical and analytical thinking, effective team membership, communication skills, professional skills and lifelong learning. Professionalism also dominates the statements during the 2000s, but the prevalence decreases slightly and many more attributes and themes are added. Between 2001 and 2005 traditional academic categories are emphasised, including expertise in chosen academic field. Other categories that increase in popularity demonstrate a social inclusion perspective: global perspectives, social/community responsibility, appreciating and valuing diversity, understanding social justice, reflective practice, ethical behaviour and environmental responsibility. Up to 2010, many of these categories further increase, with a shift in emphasis towards community engagement and participation. Other concepts that show growth in this period are: sustainability, the ability to work in culturally and socially diverse environments, and understanding and respect for Indigenous culture.

The definitions of global citizenship in the 2011-2014 data analysed in this paper encompass many of the attributes analysed for previous time periods. In particular, the previously analysed theme of 'global perspectives', which in 2010 was included as an attribute at more than half of Australian universities, is linked to one of the three categories of global citizenship analysed in this paper (*global*, *citizen* and *global citizen*).

Method

Data for this project draws on publicly available sets of graduate attribute statements from 39 Australian universities for the period 2011-2014. The primary aim of the research was to determine how the university sector conceptualises and articulates the categories of *global*, *citizen* and *global citizen* and what differences there might be between them. In particular the research team was looking for the breadth of ideas encapsulated in these concepts across the sector. The data was analysed via:

- a thematic analysis of the sets of graduate attribute (or graduate qualities, or graduate capabilities) statements from the 39 universities; supported by
- a word frequency analysis of these sets of statements.

Thematic analysis

Sets of graduate attribute statements for the period 2011-2014 were collected and scrutinised. Both major headings and accompanying explanatory detail defining each graduate attribute were included in the analysis. Material relevant to the study was isolated and selected, specifically, segments of statements that related to the categories *global* (in which graduate attribute statements related to global or international perspectives only), *citizen* (in which citizenship alone was mentioned) and *global citizen* (wherein the terms were used in conjunction with one another). Overall the total number of words ($N=2,947$) was quite low, and thus care needs to be taken when interpreting the findings. Category totals were: *global* ($n=769$), *citizen* ($n=1268$), and *global citizen* ($n=910$).

Statements contained within each of these three categories were subsequently coded by two independent members of the research team to identify themes within the broader categories. Coding by two members ensured the reliability and robustness of coding themes identified. The process of coding was based on a grounded theory approach, specifically the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1977). Each individual statement was sorted into themes that emerged from the data; an iterative process that groups similar ideas, and identifies similarities as well as major differences. The team then met to come to a consensus about the main themes, which are presented in Table 1.

Word frequency analysis

The second part of the analysis involved analysing the sets of graduate attribute statements in the three categories (*global*, *citizen* and *global citizen*) via the word frequency query in QSR NVivo Version 9. This analysis presented the 100 most frequently used words in each category, and their relative frequency. Stop words were removed and the number of letters in the word frequency query was limited to six or more, as this yielded the most information.

The team has previously used the 100 most frequent words as an alternate way of indicating the relative importance of ideas based on the language used (Winchester-Seeto *et al.*, 2012). Word frequency analysis is a useful adjunct approach to understanding text-based data, and it is a helpful way of teasing out some of the similarities and differences between categories.

Table 2 lists the words in common across the three categories, signifying similarities between the categories. Table 3 on the other hand lists words unique to particular categories thereby highlighting both major and some subtle differences.

Findings

Of the 39 universities in Australia, 95% (or 37 universities) have sets of graduate attribute statements that incorporate *global*, *citizen* or *global citizen*. One university has no graduate attributes and one has graduate attributes that do not address these concepts. This is a significant increase on previous periods (Winchester-Seeto *et al.*, 2012) where the concepts were found in only about half of the sets of attribute statements. Thus these ideas are now a dominant area in universities' conceptions of the attributes that they expect to engender in

their students by the time they graduate. Approximately 60% of universities use notions of being a *citizen*, 47% include *global*, whilst ideas of *global citizen* can be found in 34%. Graduate attribute statements from some universities fit into both the *global* and *citizen* categories, but no university has all three. Note that in the following description of the findings, the categories *global*, *citizen* and *global citizen* are italicised; the themes from the thematic analysis are rendered in single quotation marks; and the words from the word frequency analysis are indicated by small capitals.

Thematic analysis

Several themes are common across all three categories of *global*, *citizen* and *global citizen*, namely: scale and perspective; discipline; profession or professional; diversity; Indigenous Australians; and environment and sustainability. The statements all refer to ideas of scale, with 'local', 'national', 'global' (or 'international') occurring either singly or in various combinations. There is an implication in many statements that local, national and global are variously connected. The concept of scale is most often married to 'perspectives', but also to 'outlook' and 'context'.

Woven throughout the attribute statements are the themes of 'discipline' and 'profession' or 'professional'. There is an imperative to apply disciplinary knowledge and skills to understand local, national and international issues, and also the converse of viewing the discipline from global perspectives. The dominance of the theme of 'profession' or 'professional' seems to have an underlying implication that all the attributes in these three categories (*global*, *citizen* and *global citizen*) are important in preparing students for their professional lives and/or working as a professional. This reflects an enduring emphasis in graduate attribute statements on preparing students to be professionals that can be found from the earliest statements in the late 1990s through to the present (Winchester-Seeto *et al.*, 2012).

Finding the theme of 'Indigenous Australians' in the categories *global* and *global citizen* may initially seem counterintuitive. These categories, however, also incorporate conceptions of 'local' and the connectedness between the levels, which may explain the association. Furthermore, all of the attribute statements highlight 'diversity' and associated ideas, which would also account for including the theme of Indigenous Australians in these categories. Diversity covers a range of aspects including: people, culture, language, social, gender, customs and individuals.

Statements that touch on 'environment' and 'sustainability' feature across all three categories. This seems logical, given that the full range of scales included, from the local to the global. It would also seem to fit into conceptions of what citizens and global citizens should be concerned about.

Although there are many themes in common, there are also major differences between the categories. There is a discernible shift between *global* and the other two categories in terms of expectations related to engagement with some global issues. In the *global* category, the attribute statements imply a focus and understanding of areas such as: legal, political, social, cultural, ethical, and human rights. This contrasts with *citizen* and *global citizen* where there is a greater expectation of having or taking 'responsibility'. The list of things for which some degree of responsibility may be expected is quite extensive, and covers such things as disadvantage, social justice, reconciliation, human rights, equity, the common good,

community, social change, mutual obligation and ethical matters, although not all elements of this list are included in every related attribute statement.

Paralleling the notion of ‘responsibility’ is that of ‘active engagement and contribution to the community’ which similarly occurs only in the categories of *citizen* and *global citizen*. There are obvious synergies between these two ideas, as active engagement and community contribution might logically result from accepting responsibility.

The theme of ‘cultural literacy or cultural competence’ is found in the categories of *global* and *global citizen*. These ideas link quite naturally as global citizens are thought to need a degree of cultural competence to function in the globalised world. Somewhat surprising is the omission of this theme in the category of *citizen*.

Unique to the category of *citizen* is the theme of ‘leadership and collaboration’, and the theme of ‘future’ is limited to the category of *global citizen*. These differences show quite distinct emphases and foci of these categories.

Word frequency analysis

Although this technique can provide important insights, there are some limitations that need to be considered. Overall there are relatively few words in the combined lists of graduate attribute statements. However, it is also important to take into account that attribute statements are generally very condensed descriptions and thus may contain more ideas expressed in a small number of words than is usual in discursive writing. Nonetheless, care needs to be taken in interpreting this data, and particularly where there are small differences.

The concentration of word frequency reveals some patterns. In the category of *citizen* a small number of words show a very high frequency showing consistency in the words used to express ideas of being a citizen, and perhaps a matured understanding. Word frequency for the *global* category is similarly quite consistent. This contrasts markedly with the words used in association with *global citizen* where there are many words that vie for most frequent. This seems to imply that there is much less consensus around conceptualisation of global citizen than for either global or citizen.

The following discussion is based on a combination of the actual frequency of the 100 most frequent words in each category and the words that are unique to each (Table 2). Reinforcing findings from the thematic analysis, the word PROFESSIONAL occurs prominently across all three categories, as does AUSTRALIA and NATIONAL. The latter highlights the idea that the focus can be at all levels.

The most frequent words outline the main conception of the *global* category, with an emphasis on CULTURAL and GLOBAL, followed by DIVERSITY. The idea of a professional with INTERNATIONAL and GLOBAL perspectives and with some SOCIAL AWARENESS and UNDERSTANDING also features. Words unique to this category also reveal an emphasis on OUTLOOK, SETTINGS and SITUATIONS, as well as MULTICULTURAL and PROBLEMS.

Conceptualisation of the category of *citizen* is dominated by the words SOCIAL and RESPONSIBILITY, with ETHICAL, CULTURAL and COMMUNITY concerns. Prominent also is the notion of ACTIVE ENGAGEMENT. Words in the top 100 most frequent that are unique to the *citizen* category include: EQUALITY, EQUITY and COMMON; INTEGRITY and JUSTICE;

LEADERSHIP and SERVICE; and POLITICAL. This category shares the words ENVIRONMENT, INDIVIDUAL, RIGHTS, SKILLS and OTHERS with the *global* category, and SUSTAINABLE or SUSTAINABILITY with *global citizen*. In previous studies (Winchester-Seeto *et al.*, 2012), the concept of the individual was relatively common in the sets of attribute statements of the early 2000s, and declined thereafter. Given the similarity of words used by different universities to describe the category *citizen*, and the incorporation of the increasing outmoded emphasis on the individual, it is possible that the category of *citizen* may decline in popularity in the future, or morph into a new ideation.

Articulation of the idea of a *global citizen* is dominated by the term GLOBAL, closely followed by CULTURAL and COMMUNITIES. Trailing slightly behind are PERSPECTIVES, PROFESSIONAL and RESPONSIBILITIES. Unique to this category, at least in the 100 most frequent words, are FUTURE, CHALLENGES, and RECONCILIATION.

Overview of results

The word frequency analysis captures the flavour of how universities think and talk about the ideas of *global*, *citizen* and *global citizen*. When considered in tandem with the thematic analysis, these two threads of evidence provide insight. The three categories show a great deal in common, sharing both foci and words. There are, however, slight and not so slight differences in emphasis.

The primary emphasis of *global* is around global perspectives and outlook, including settings and situations. There is a concentration on problems, but with a more academic focus than the other two categories, e.g. debate and analyse. Cultural competence is important here, but there is less of an emphasis on responsibility than for *citizen* or *global citizen*.

In contrast the stress of *citizen* is centred on leadership and service, but also features a focus on equality, equity, integrity, justice and the political. These foci are backed up by highlighting initiation (of activity) and reflection as ways of operationalising the leadership and service. This is coupled with an emphasis on active engagement and contribution to the community, as well as having and taking responsibility, both ideas which are shared with *global citizen*.

Although there is some overlap of concerns with the other categories, *global citizen* is not a mere melding of these two categories, but rather is a new concept that is future focused around challenges. The term advocate features here uniquely in the most frequent words, and associated with the responsibilities of a citizen and with active engagement and contribution to the community.

Discussion

Our findings demonstrate that there is much commonality, but also distinct differences between the categories *global*, *citizen* and *global citizenship*. For instance, a *global* graduate attribute is described in an exemplar statement as:

Global in outlook and competence: Graduates of [the] University will have had opportunities to acquire professional, cultural skills that enable them to engage thoughtfully and effectively with the great diversity of people and situations they encounter at work and socially.

Table 1: Presence and absence of themes across the three attribute categories

Themes	Examples	Graduate Attributes [#]		
		Global	Citizen	Global Citizen
Scale and perspectives	local, national, global/international; outlook, context,			
Discipline or field of study				
Professions or professional				
Diversity	cultural, people, language, social, gender, customs, individual; cultural awareness			
Cultural literacy or competence	intercultural, cross cultural, multicultural; cultural literacy, competence, understanding			
Indigenous Australians				
Environment and sustainability				
Focus or issues	legal, political, social, cultural, ethical, human rights			
Responsibility/ies	of global citizen; disadvantage, social justice, reconciliation, human rights, equity; for common good, to community; social change; mutual obligation; ethical responsibility;			
Ethical behaviour	behaviour, legal and moral; professional and personal ethics; academic integrity			
Economic	effects or impact; imperatives of business			
Active engagement and contribution to the community	social and/or economic			
Leadership and collaboration				
Future				

[#] Grey areas indicate the presence of a theme in that category

Table 2: Common and unique words across three categories - citizen, global and global citizen

Words common across all three categories	Words unique to 'citizen' category	Words unique to 'global' category	Words unique to 'global citizen' category
<p>Levels of engagement: [passive]: appreciate/appreciation, awareness, commitment/committed, respect, understanding/understands [active]: connect, engage/engagement, responsible/responsibilities, contribute/contribution, demonstrate, develop/development</p> <p>Foci: Australian, national environment/s ethical, cultural, social community/communities values indigenous international issues professional context/s diversity economic/economies</p> <p>Academic: knowledge, university, discipline/disciplinary</p> <p>Other: ability, actions attribute/attributes, graduates, effective/effectively, relation/s/relating, relevant/relevance, capacity, decision/s, difference/different</p>	<p>Levels of engagement: [passive]: acknowledge, informed recognise [active]: conduct, identify, initiate, making, provide [critical]: reflect</p> <p>Foci: business, enterprise equality, equity common impact, implications integrity, justice leaders, service, principles political</p> <p>Academic: curriculum</p> <p>Other: behaviour, consistent, construction, encouraging, evolving, generally, groups, learning, participants particular, potential, islander</p>	<p>Levels of engagement: [passive]: account, encounter [active]: address, discuss, enhance [critical]: analyse, debate</p> <p>Foci: biological border, boundaries cooperation multicultural problems settings, situations outlook</p> <p>Academic: education, standards</p> <p>Other: access, across, affect, appropriately, choices/chosen, coherent, complete, comprehensive, confidently, employ, function, produce, variety</p>	<p>Levels of engagement: [passive]: accept, aspire, attuned desire, embrace [active]: acting, adaptable, advocates, applying, create, demand, exhibit, promote [critical]: critical</p> <p>Foci: accountability challenges customs future literacy reconciliation locally</p> <p>Academic: academic</p> <p>Other: accuracy, approaches, belongs, better brighter, capable, creativity, genuine, intellectual intent, meaningful, prepares, stance, towards</p>

Table 3: Comparison of words unique to two categories

Words unique to 'citizen' AND 'global' categories	Words unique to 'global' AND global citizen' categories	Words unique to 'citizen AND 'global citizen' categories
<p>Levels of engagement: [passive]: articulate, recognise</p> <p>Foci: aboriginal environmental individual/s others, people/s research rights skills positive</p> <p>Other: change, experience/s, importance, opportunity/s</p>	<p>Levels of engagement: [passive]: acquire, consider</p> <p>Foci: competence contemporary global perspectives</p> <p>Academic: students</p> <p>Other: between, beyond, category, complex, constructive/ constructively, enable</p>	<p>Levels of engagement: [active]: active</p> <p>Foci: attitude/s citizen/citizenship practice society sustainable/sustainability</p> <p>Other: expected, following, members, personal, specific</p>

A *citizenship* statement reads:

[The University] aims to prepare its graduates to be leaders in their fields by being socially responsible and engaged in their communities:

- Ethical awareness (professional and personal) and academic integrity;
- Capacity to apply disciplinary knowledge to solving real life problems in relevant communities;
- Understanding of social and civic responsibilities, human rights and sustainability;
- Understanding the value of further learning and professional development.

Students with *global citizenship* capability are:

Engaged and Ethical Local and Global citizens: As local citizens our graduates will be aware of indigenous perspectives and of the nation's historical context. They will be engaged with the challenges of contemporary society and with knowledge and ideas. We want our graduates to have respect for diversity, to be open-minded, sensitive to others and inclusive, and to be open to other cultures and perspectives: they should have a level of cultural literacy. Our graduates should be aware of disadvantage and social justice, and be willing to participate to help create a wiser and better society.

Evident in these examples are the different foci identified in our findings: *global* refers explicitly to outlook and competence with mention of skills rather than responsibilities. *Citizen* identifies leadership and community engagement with an emphasis on social responsibility. *Global citizen* is distinguished by a focus on creating a better society. These distinct categories are confirmed in the scholarly literature. Broadly speaking, education for citizenship, internationalising the curriculum and developing students as global citizens are discussed differently. Citizenship education is focused at the school level and aims to prepare students to make meaningful contributions to democratic society (Johnson & Morris, 2010). Internationalising the curriculum is defined by Clifford and Joseph (2005) as building intercultural competence, gaining skills in critical and reflective thinking and developing values and ethics of equity and social justice in a global context. Bourn (2011) reframes internationalisation in higher education as *global perspectives*—terminology that is consistent with many graduate attributes statements—aimed at challenging orthodox thinking about internationalisation and globalisation.

As our findings confirm, global citizenship encompasses aspects of both citizenship education and internationalised curriculum but emerges with a distinct educational focus. Jorgenson and Shultz (2012) describe global citizenship as a means for students “to engage in relevant, meaningful activities that enhance ... global perspectives and help them to contribute to a more peaceful, environmentally secure and just world” (p. 1). Shiel (2009) reports students' conceptions of global citizenship as including kindness, diversity, making things better and local/global connections. A student conception of global citizenship reported by Hanson (2010) is similar to a typical graduate attribute statement:

A good global citizen is involved locally, nationally and internationally; is conscientious, informed and educated about issues; exhibits environmental and

social responsibility; advocates alongside of the oppressed; or lives by the dictum, 'Be the change you want to see in the world' (p. 80).

This confirms global citizenship as an active engagement with and responsibility for resolving problems, as it is defined at the intended curriculum level in Australian universities. The extent to which this operates in enacted and experienced is a more complex question. The literature frequently calls for the major reviews of curriculum to develop student capability as global citizens. Shiel's (2009) study is in the context of curriculum change to "prepare students for global employability and to enhance awareness of global issues, such as poverty and social justice and the need for sustainable development" (p. 689). Hanson's (2010) research is a response to the "need for radical reform of curricula to foster engaged global citizenship" (p. 70). Similarly Leask (2008), writing in the context of internationalising the curriculum, states the requirement for "radical, rather than incremental, innovation—that is, new ways of conceptualising knowledge and the curriculum" (p. 13).

In response to the rhetoric evident in institutional statements and much of the literature, Andreotti (2006) cautions the necessity of unpacking the complexity of global citizenship education, noting that it risks reinforcing inequitable power relations. In our findings, institutions identify varying levels of engagement. At one end there are requirements of low levels of engagement such as *awareness of* and *understanding* and at the other *engage, take action* and *appraise and critique*. Andreotti (2006) contrasts "soft" global citizenship education with a more "critical" approach. On the one hand, soft strategies include "raising awareness of global issues", whereas the "critical" end promotes "engagement with global issues and perspectives" (p. 49). Similarly the benefits of global citizenship education range from "greater awareness of problems" at the soft end to "independent/critical thinking and more informed, responsible and ethical action" at the critical end (pp. 49-50). Andreotti (2006) offers this as a useful evaluative framework intended to provoke discussion; here, we adapt her approach to evaluate passive, active and critical approaches to global citizenship. Tables 2 and 3 identify the levels of engagement (passive, active or critical) evident in the three categories. Examples of passive global citizenship from graduate attributes statements in this study include:

[Graduates] recognise their responsibility to the common good, the environment and society.

[Graduates] demonstrate an awareness of the global context of their discipline and professional area.

An example of active global citizenship is:

Graduates will be Global Citizens who are:

- capable of applying their discipline in local, national and international contexts;
- culturally aware and capable of respecting diversity and acting in socially just/responsible ways;
- capable of environmental responsibility.

In contrast, statements at the critical end of the continuum include:

[Graduates] consider the relationship between the construction of power and privilege and the ability of discipline knowledge to perpetuate or dismantle social inequality with respect to Indigenous groups.

[Graduates] appraise and critique the potentially powerful social and economic effects of enterprise and business activities on particular groups and individuals.

As Shulz and Jorgenson (2008) note, passive global citizenship is easier to implement in policy and requires limited embedding in practice. Caruana (2010) argues that passive global citizenship is a “politically neutral if not banal concept” (p. 61). However, global citizenship can be understood as an ongoing process, with awareness raising a starting point which can evolve into a more critical approach. As Andreotti (2006) notes, passive global citizenship “can already represent a major step” (p. 49). Indeed, the combination of global and citizenship, rather than a focus on global perspectives alone, as Davies (2006) asserts, points to a more active engagement. Jorgenson and Shultz (2012) map approaches to global citizenship as a graduate attribute which lies along a continuum of passive, active and critical engagement.

Conclusion

The concept of global citizenship is now a major theme in university graduate attribute statements and policies. While some similarities exist between notions of global, citizenship and global citizenship, there are also quite distinct differences. Our findings suggest that global citizenship is a new discrete category, rather than an amalgamation of pre-existing ones. Although perhaps not as well defined as other concepts, its emphasis appears to be on active engagement and contribution to the community with a forward looking focus. Our research has centred on the intended curriculum, and further studies are needed to explore the enacted and experienced curriculum, specifically to determine the extent to which the promotion of global citizenship as a graduate attribute, aligns with current teaching practices and student learning.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to the LTC Writing Group who gave feedback on a draft of this paper.

References

- Andreotti, V. (2006). Soft versus critical global citizenship education. *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review*, 3, Autumn, 40-51.
- Barnett, R. (2004). Learning for an unknown future. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 23(3), 247-260.
- Barrie, S. C., & Prosser, M. (2004). Generic graduate attributes: Citizens for an uncertain future. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 23(3), 243-246.
- Bosanquet, A., Winchester-Seeto, T. & Rowe, A. (2010). Changing perceptions underpinning graduate attributes: A pilot study. In M. Devlin, J. Nagy and A. Lichtenberg (Eds.) *Research and Development in Higher Education: Reshaping Higher Education*, 33 (pp. 105-117). Melbourne, 6-9 July, 2010. http://www.herdsa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/conference/2010/papers/HERDSA2010_Bosanquet_A.pdf
- Bosanquet, A., Winchester-Seeto, T. & Rowe, A. (2012). Social inclusion, graduate attributes and higher education curriculum. *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, 6 (2), 73-87. <http://journal.aall.org.au/index.php/jall/issue/current>

- Bourn, D. (2011). From internationalisation to global perspectives. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 30(5), 559-571.
- Bowden, J., & Marton, F. (1998). *University of learning: Beyond quality and competence in higher education*. London: Kogan Page.
- Bowden, J., Hart, G., King, B., Trigwell, K., & Watts, O. (2002). *Generic capabilities of ATN university graduates* (Teaching and Learning Committee, Australian Technology Network). Retrieved February 21, 2012 from <http://www.clt.uts.edu.au/ATN.grad.cap.project.index.html>
- Caruana, V. (2010). Global citizenship for all: Putting the 'higher' back into UK higher education? In F. Maringe & N. Foskett (Eds.), *Globalization and internationalization in higher education: Theoretical, strategic and management perspectives* (pp. 51-64). London: Continuum.
- Clifford, V., & Joseph, C. (2005). *Internationalisation of the curriculum: An investigation of the pedagogical practices at Monash University*. Melbourne: Monash University.
- Davies, L. (2006). Global citizenship: Abstraction or framework for action? *Educational Review*, 58(1), 5-25.
- Glaser, B. G. and Strauss, A. L. (1977) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Hanson, L. (2010). Global citizenship, global health, and the internationalization of curriculum: A study of transformative potential. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 14(1), 70-88.
- Johnson, L. & Morris, P. (2010). Towards a framework for critical citizenship education. *The Curriculum Journal*, 21, 1, 77-96.
- Jorgenson, S., & Shultz, L. (2012). Global citizenship education (GCE) in post-secondary institutions: What is protected and what is hidden under the umbrella of GCE? *Journal of Global Citizenship & Equity Education*, 2(1). Retrieved February 4, 2014, from <http://journals.sfu.ca/jgcee/index.php/jgcee/article/view/Article/52/26>
- Leask, B. (2008). Internationalisation, globalisation and curriculum innovation. In M. Hellsten & A. Reid (Eds.), *Researching international pedagogies: Sustainable practice for teaching and learning in higher education* (pp. 9-26). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Marsh, C. J., & Willis, G. (2007). *Curriculum: Alternative approaches, ongoing issues*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Shiel, C. (2009). Global perspectives and global citizenship: Understanding the views of our learners. *International Journal of Learning*, 16(6), 689-719.
- Shulz, L., & Jorgenson, S. *Global citizenship in post-secondary institutions: A review of the literature*. Retrieved from http://www.uofaweb.ualberta.ca/uai_gloaleducation/pdfs/GCE_lit_review.pdf
- Winchester-Seeto, T., Bosanquet, A., & Rowe, A. (2012). Smoke and Mirrors: graduate attributes and the implications for student engagement in higher education. In I. Solomonides, A. Reid and P. Petocz (eds), *Engaging with Learning in Higher Education*. Faringdon: Libri Publishing.

Copyright © 2014 Agnes Bosanquet, Theresa Winchester-Seeto and Anna Rowe. The authors assign to HERDSA and educational non-profit institutions a non-exclusive license to use this document for personal use and in courses of instruction provided that the article is used in full and this copyright statement is reproduced. The authors also grant a non-exclusive license to HERDSA to publish this document in full on the World Wide Web (prime site and mirrors) and within the portable electronic format HERDSA 2014 conference proceedings. Any other usage is prohibited without the express permission of the authors.