



MONTCLAIR STATE
UNIVERSITY

Montclair State University
**Montclair State University Digital
Commons**

Theses, Dissertations and Culminating Projects

5-2013

Nuturing Global Citizenship Identity and Practice in Middle School Youth Through Development of a Global Citizenship Community

Mark Bennett Hyman
Montclair State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.montclair.edu/etd>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hyman, Mark Bennett, "Nuturing Global Citizenship Identity and Practice in Middle School Youth Through Development of a Global Citizenship Community" (2013). *Theses, Dissertations and Culminating Projects*. 29.

<https://digitalcommons.montclair.edu/etd/29>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Montclair State University Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses, Dissertations and Culminating Projects by an authorized administrator of Montclair State University Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@montclair.edu.

NURTURING GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP IDENTITY AND PRACTICE IN
MIDDLE SCHOOL YOUTH THROUGH DEVELOPMENT OF A
GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP COMMUNITY

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of
Montclair State University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education

by

MARK BENNETT HYMAN

Montclair State University
Upper Montclair, New Jersey

2013

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Kathryn Herr

Copyright © 2013 by *Mark Bennett Hyman*. All rights reserved.

MONTCLAIR STATE UNIVERSITY

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

DISSERTATION APPROVAL

We hereby approve the Dissertation

NURTURING GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP IDENTITY AND PRACTICE IN

MIDDLE SCHOOL YOUTH THROUGH DEVELOPMENT OF A

GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP COMMUNITY

of

Mark Bennett Hyman

Candidate for the Degree:

Doctor of Education

Dissertation Committee:

Department of Educational Foundations


Dr. Kathryn Herr
Dissertation Chair

Certified by:


Dr. Joan C. Ficke
Dean of The Graduate School


Dr. David Keiser

4/15/13
Date


Dr. Jeremy Price

ABSTRACT

NURTURING GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP IDENTITY AND PRACTICE IN
MIDDLE SCHOOL YOUTH THROUGH DEVELOPMENT OF A
GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP COMMUNITY

by Mark Bennett Hyman

This study explored the pedagogical lessons I learned as a global citizenship teacher-facilitator while attempting to cultivate global citizenship identity and practice among middle school youth within the context of a “global citizenship community” and its “action-learning initiative” to educate their local community and raise funds to sponsor construction of a high school in Ethiopia. As necessary background to this study, I introduce my conception of global citizenship and its practice, provide an extensive elaboration of those “global citizenship dispositions” that constitute my global ethic, and critique traditional service-learning methodology and terminology as a means of introducing my reconception of service-learning as “global citizenship action-learning.” This study employed practitioner action research through the use of critical incidents methodology to explore the evolution of this process. Specifically, I applied two “probing questions” to analyze six self-selected “critical incidents” that served as markers of conflict and growth in the evolution of my teacher-students relationship toward an increasing emphasis on nurturing my students’ awareness of global citizenship dispositions, as well as youth voice and empowerment regarding all aspects of our shared initiative. This research methodology spurred me to recognize and address teacher-students power inequity within our global citizenship culture and to transform my

pedagogical priorities to place consummate importance on developing relations of reciprocity, transparency, and partnership. Further, this evolving emphasis on the nurturance of an equitable teacher-students relationship spurred me to recognize the ethical, social, and political necessity of cultivating comparable relations of mutuality and empowerment between our teacher-students global citizenship community and our community-based action-learning partners in Ethiopia. Ultimately, this study strongly supports the notion that it is through acknowledgement of and relations of solidarity with the “face” and “call” of the “suffering/struggling/resisting” other—a global citizenship disposition I call “intersubjective ethical relations”—that one acquires the ethical/social/political sensibilities to become a true “global citizenship practitioner.”

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The successful completion of this dissertation marks the culmination of a nearly ten year process. A commitment of this length and magnitude places extraordinary burdens not only on the student, but on his family. Thus, I first need to acknowledge my wife, Michele, and our wonderful children, Meskerem and Yahalashet, for their uncommon patience, understanding, and support, as well as for the loving sacrifices they have had to endure during this process. We will all enjoy immensely some newfound opportunities for interaction.

I offer my deepest gratitude to my dissertation advisor, Dr. Kathryn Herr, for her consummate guidance, patience, and support during this process. I am especially grateful for her willingness to hear and empower my “voice” as a researcher, and for suggesting the use of critical incidents methodology as an ideal vehicle for its expression. She was the perfect advisor for me.

Of course, I am also grateful for the participation and feedback of the other members of my dissertation committee: Dr. David Keiser and Dr. Jeremy Price. It was in Dr. Keiser’s “Access to Knowledge” course in 2006 that I was encouraged to identify and articulate many of the global citizenship dispositions that comprise my global ethic as outlined in this dissertation. Further, I was deeply moved by Dr. Keiser’s extraordinary efforts to participate in the reading of my final draft and in my dissertation defense while still suffering from an acute physical ailment. While I did not have the honor of attending one of Dr. Price’s courses, as department chair, he offered me

significant support and guidance regarding administrative matters at several key juncture points during this program. I was honored to have Dr. Price on my committee.

I send a special note of gratitude to the program's longstanding administrative assistant, Brenda Sheehan. On numerous occasions over the course of this program, Ms. Sheehan served as an informal advisor in all manner of administrative matters. Most importantly, Ms. Sheehan offered such counsel and practical support with boundless patience, understanding, competency, and good cheer. She is truly a gem as a human being and a professional. Indeed, that is how I feel about each of the Montclair professionals cited here.

I offer my heartfelt appreciation to several special colleagues. Dan, I thank you for being such a wonderful source of personal support throughout this process; your friendship and positive outlook helped to keep me "grounded" during particularly stressful moments. Julie and Maria, your humanity and commitment to our joint efforts at promoting global citizenship serve as a daily source of inspiration. I look forward to our ongoing and future collaboration with great enthusiasm. (Julie, I am also grateful for your generosity in helping me format this document.) In addition, I offer my sincere appreciation to Marc for the conversations we shared regarding my work. In particular, I am grateful for broaching the critical issues of reciprocity and empowerment regarding our community-action partners that spurred some of my most important learnings in this study.

Last, but certainly not least, I would like to offer this dissertation as a kind of token of appreciation to my sister, Susan Hyman, and my parents, Herbert and Marilyn

Hyman, whose unflagging love and support have always provided me with the strength to persevere toward my life goals, and whose ways of “seeing” and being in the world have undoubtedly provided me with the ethical foundation for much of what is expressed in this document.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
PROBLEM STATEMENT	4
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	8
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.....	10
A WORKING DEFINITION OF GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP	11
CHAPTER TWO: MY GLOBAL ETHIC.....	15
GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP IDENTITY (“EXTENSIVITY”) AND RELATIONS WITH THE SUFFERING OTHER.....	16
CLARIFICATIONS	18
ETHICAL AWARENESS OF THE FACE OF THE NON-INTIMATE SUFFERING OTHER AS SIGNIFYING A CALL TO INTERSUBJECTIVE ETHICAL RELATIONSHIP.....	24
GLOBAL ETHICAL INTERDEPENDENCE/INTERCONNECTION	27
DIGNITY	31
EMPATHY	36
EMPATHIC EXTENSION	37
COMPASSION	41
HUMAN CAPABILITIES AND HUMAN NEEDS	47
HUMAN RIGHTS.....	51
JUSTICE	53
CRITICAL CONSCIOUSNESS.....	57
NONVIOLENCE.....	59
GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP PRACTICE	61
SUMMARY	62
CHAPTER THREE: GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP ACTION-LEARNING AS A RECONCEPTION OF SERVICE-LEARNING PEDAGOGY.....	67
CLARIFICATIONS	68
MAJOR COMPONENTS OF SERVICE-LEARNING	69
Preparation (Component One) - Academic	70
Preparation (Component One) - Preparation for Global Citizenship Action	84
Preparation (Component Two) – Global Citizenship Action	86
Preparation (Component Three) – Reflection	88
COMPATIBILITY OF GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP ACTION-LEARNING PEDAGOGY TO THE DEVELOPMENTAL READINESS OF EARLY ADOLESCENTS	90
Early Adolescent Readiness to Encounter Global Problems.....	91

Early Adolescent Readiness to Engage in Service-Learning Pedagogy.....	93
Service-Learning as Compatible with Middle School Philosophy and Organizational Structure.....	95
CRITIQUE OF SERVICE-LEARNING PEDAGOGY AND SUGGESTIONS FOR ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND TERMINOLOGY	96
CHAPTER FOUR: METHODOLOGY	103
RESEARCH QUESTION.....	103
RESEARCH DESIGN METHODOLOGY.....	104
Practitioner Action Research Methodology	104
Critical Incidents Methodology	106
CRITICAL INCIDENTS SELECTION PROCESS	108
OVERVIEW OF SELECTED CRITICAL INCIDENTS.....	110
PROBING QUESTIONS	116
DEFINITIONS.....	118
RESEARCH SETTINGS & CONTEXT.....	120
The Community of Sunrise – Socio-Economic Composition	120
Sunrise Public Schools	121
Sunrise Middle School (SMS).....	122
Grade Six Global Citizenship Classes	123
The Sunrise Middle School Global Care Club	124
Current Global Citizenship Action-Learning Initiative -- Background Context.....	125
YOUTH PARTICIPANTS IN THE ACTION RESEARCH PROJECT.....	127
DATA COLLECTION AND SOURCES	130
Researcher Activity Log.....	130
Club Meeting Log.....	131
Researcher Journal.....	131
Student Online Journals.....	132
Whole-club Dialogues	133
Videoconferencing Sessions.....	134
Critical Friend Conversations.....	135
Archival Data.....	136
DATA ANALYSIS	136
MY POSITIONALITY AS A RESEARCHER	137
CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING VALIDITY	139
Process Validity	139
Outcome Validity	140
Catalytic Validity.....	141

Democratic Validity	141
Dialogic Validity	142
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	142
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	143
CHAPTER FIVE: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	145
CRITICAL INCIDENT ONE: TRADITIONAL/HIERARCHICAL VS. COLLABORATIVE/EQUITABLE TEACHER-STUDENTS RELATIONSHIP IN OUR DECISION- MAKING PROCESS	147
Episode One.....	147
Episode Two	152
Episode Three	155
CRITIQUE OF CRITICAL INCIDENT ONE.....	158
Probing Question One	158
Probing Question Two.....	164
CRITICAL INCIDENT TWO: VALUES CONFLICT BETWEEN YOUTH EMPOWERMENT AND TASK COMPLETION	165
Background.....	165
Episode One.....	168
Episode Two	172
CRITIQUE OF CRITICAL INCIDENT TWO	180
Probing Question One	180
Probing Question Two.....	184
CRITICAL INCIDENT THREE: STUDENT DISEMPOWERMENT, REEXAMINATION OF THE VALUES OF OUR GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP COMMUNITY, AND A COMMITMENT TO FOSTER A MORE COLLABORATIVE AND EQUITABLE TEACHER-STUDENTS RELATIONSHIP	187
Background.....	187
Episode One.....	189
Episode Two	196
Episode Three	198
Probing Question One	200
Probing Question Two.....	206
CRITICAL INCIDENT FOUR: THE ETHICAL PROBLEM OF ATTEMPTING CHANGE AGENCY AS A CULTURAL OUTSIDER: EMPOWERING STUDENTS THROUGH EPISTEMOLOGICAL PARTNERSHIP AND CRITICAL DISCOURSE.....	208
Episode One.....	208
Episode Two	212
CRITIQUE OF CRITICAL INCIDENT FOUR	216

Probing Question One	216
Probing Question Two.....	221
CRITICAL INCIDENT FIVE: STUDENT CRITIQUE OF MY GLOBAL ETHIC	223
Episode One.....	223
CRITIQUE OF CRITICAL INCIDENT FIVE	231
Probing Question One	231
Probing Question Two.....	235
CRITICAL INCIDENT SIX: THE PRIMACY OF INTERSUBJECTIVE ETHICAL RELATIONS ..	236
Episode One.....	236
Episode Two.....	239
CRITIQUE OF CRITICAL INCIDENT SIX	241
Probing Question One	241
Probing Question Two.....	243
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	244
CHAPTER SIX: IMPLICATIONS OF THIS STUDY	249
SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS	250
IMPLICATIONS TO THE FIELD OF SERVICE-LEARNING AND THE EMERGENCE OF A MODEL FOR GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP ACTION-LEARNING.....	255
IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHER-PRACTITIONERS OF GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP ACTION- LEARNING	260
Development of Global Citizenship Dispositions	261
Establishment of Intersubjective Ethical Relations as Foundational.....	261
Commitments to Oneself as Prospective Teacher-Practitioner	262
Commitments to One's Own School-Based Action-Learning Participants	264
Commitments to One's Community-Based Action-Learning Partners	264
AREAS IN NEED OF FURTHER RESEARCH	266
IMPACT OF STUDY AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY ON MY GLOBAL ETHIC AND GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP PRACTICE.....	269
Reconsideration of My Global Ethic	270
A new understanding of the nature and evolution of global citizenship practice....	272
A Commitment to Critical Incidents Methodology as an Ongoing Facilitator of My Professional Growth/Transformation	274
EPILOGUE	275
BIBLIOGRAPHY	284

Chapter One: Introduction

As I stand on the side staircase of the stage, I allow myself a moment to take in the scene and its import. It is December 10, 2008, and the auditorium is filled to capacity with the entire student body of Sunrise Middle School (SMS) and their teachers. The overflow audience of students and faculty gazes fixedly at the stage where members of the SMS Global Care Club take turns reciting excerpts of their reflections about the experience of participating in a global service-learning initiative that had successfully sponsored construction of a K-8 school in Awassa, Ethiopia. Accompanied by a projection of photos and video of our newly built Ethiopian sister school and its students, club members invoke global citizenship, compassion, and youth empowerment as the sources of their inspiration and commitment.

As the teacher-facilitator for this initiative, snapshots of my experiences with these students and with their community of supporters—parents, teacher volunteers, and local citizens—float through my mind. In particular, I recall the situation moments before our initiative’s kickoff event: an African “Gebzha” festival the previous spring...

As the afternoon moved toward dusk, student members of the SMS Global Care Club gathered on the second floor computer room to conduct final preparations for the evening’s major event. Working independently or in small groups, some students revised and printed the final PowerPoint pages for pasting onto their informational tri-boards to be presented as part of a gallery tour about Ethiopia and Sub-Saharan Africa. Members of the poetry reading group gathered in the hallway to practice for their upcoming oral presentation. Several high school students, formerly regular members of the middle

school club, exercised their mentorship roles by assisting the middle school students in a variety of ways: editing poems and presentation boards, modeling and providing feedback regarding presentation style, monitoring and advising students working in the hallway. Concurrently, a teacher-volunteer delivered final instructions to her student set-up committee before guiding it downstairs to the gymnasium where they collaborated with parent volunteers to prepare stations for the festival. Meanwhile, a committee of parents and students worked feverishly in the auditorium to resolve last-minute glitches with the sound system speakers and microphones, while several students and parents tried to understand why the computer was not downloading the disk containing the PowerPoint meant to accompany the student poetry reading.

Somehow, while trying to monitor and supervise these and other vexing last-minute problems, amidst the predictable but constructive middle school “chaos” that invariably accompanies such ambitious events, I believed that the celebratory moment that my students and I enjoyed on the auditorium stage in December 2010 would come. I knew that the countless hours that had been and would be volunteered, both before and after school, by all stakeholders in this global citizenship community to promote the success of this youth-led, global, humanitarian initiative would be vindicated and rewarded...

Yet, even now, several years removed from the celebratory moment alluded to above, I ponder the ethical and pedagogical implications of the commitment offered by the Global Care student members. What was, and continues to be, their motivation for participating in such a time-consuming, multi-year, humanitarian initiative on behalf of

children living halfway around the world, children who they have never met and are not likely to meet? In what ways might youth participation in this initiative foster their self-conceptions as global citizenship practitioners or the development of dispositions of global citizenship? What might prompt middle-schoolers to extend their lens of concern and compassion to children so removed geographically and culturally from their own daily experiences, i.e., for geographically distant, non-intimate others?

To address such questions, it is necessary for me to look closely at the evolving pedagogical relationship between my students and me, as well as the central impact of this relationship on the culture of our global citizenship community. Specifically, it is important to identify and analyze the way in which power and conflict within our teacher-students relationship impacted critical aspects of our action-learning initiative, such as: curriculum and agenda-setting, epistemological process, and decision-making practices. Additionally, I must examine how this relationship with my students impacted my capacity to effectively foster youth voice and empowerment. Further, I must identify and understand the ways in which my teacher-students relationship has impacted my own priorities, values, and objectives as a teacher-facilitator of a global citizenship community.

The questions and topics outlined above regarding ethical and pedagogical aspects of my teacher-students relationship with the members of the SMS Global Care Club conjoin to establish the central research question of this study: How did I, in my role as teacher-facilitator of an extra-curricular service club, facilitate development of a collaborative and equitable teacher-students relationship and culture aimed at nurturing

the voice, empowerment, and global citizenship dispositions of participating students on behalf of distant, non-intimate, suffering others?

Problem Statement

A survey of the most egregious instances of human suffering, whether in the form of global poverty, war, genocide or child exploitation to name a few, suggests that the causes and consequences of such suffering invariably transcend the boundaries of the modern nation-state. The reality of such transnational global problems suggests the need for developing educational mechanisms that raise awareness of the impact of our actions—on both the macro level of governance and commerce and the micro level of the individual human heart and mind—on unknown and unnamed others beyond our immediate circle of concern, as well as of our ethical obligation toward such suffering others. Through such a process of awareness, some of this suffering might assume a “face,” the unmistakable face of a real human “other,” bearing the imprint of vulnerability, pain and despair, but also of muted hope and trapped potential. This face, even if initially experienced as an imposition to our daily mundane concerns and routines, extends a hand in our direction; it remains for us to try either to banish the face of the other from our consciousness or to extend a hand in kind, as a gesture of a message empathically received and responded to.

Our essential ethical challenge as educators, I believe, is to promote pathways—in conjunction with our students—to broaden and deepen the capacity of our students to immerse their lives with a profound curiosity of mind and empathy of spirit. But our ethical mission need not, nor should not, end there. We are further charged with the task

of co-discovering or co-creating with our students concrete pathways for outreach and connection with persons and cultures beyond our daily lives, to unmask and reveal the fullest possible gamut of humanity, to respond empathically to the extended hand of the distant, non-intimate other on a global scale. In other words, we are charged with the task of nurturing the potential for ethical/social/political dispositions of global citizenship that might promote openness to the face of the suffering other—whether she resides in the neighboring village or halfway around the world—in all her human dignity, vulnerability, and potential.

To achieve such an ambitious but important ethical and pedagogical objective within the context of a middle school setting requires an educator to address several overarching issues. First, he must, in conjunction with his students, develop a working conception of global citizenship and its dispositions that will guide their joint practice and culture. Secondly, she must conceive and facilitate pedagogical and cultural practices appropriate to the developmental level and needs of middle school youth to effectively promote the nurturance of global citizenship dispositions, youth voice, and empowerment through their involvement in real-world contexts.

Within the context of this study, I utilized a pedagogy for global citizenship commonly referred to as service-learning or what I will refer to below as “global citizenship action-learning.” Specifically, this pedagogy facilitates the process of discovering the presence and face of suffering others and empowers youth to constructively address this suffering through a process of education, public advocacy, and direct action in response to a selected global problem and on behalf of—or, preferably, in

collaboration with—a population affected by this problem. Participation in a service-learning initiative elevates a pedagogy for global citizenship from primarily learning *about* global citizenship to a potential integration of its concepts and practices into one's ethical, social, and political identity through their implementation in response to an actual global problem.

Practitioners and academicians attribute to service-learning pedagogy a broad range of social, emotional, cognitive, ethical, and political learning outcomes pertinent to this study. Specifically, service-learning has been credited with nurturing the following dispositions and aptitudes: self-conception as a change agent (Pijanowski, 2001); fostering the development of care and empathy for others (Cipolle, 2004; Doyle & Doyle, 2003; Foos, 2004; Rhoads, 2000; Smith, 2004; Terry & Bohnenberger, 2003); compassion (Saltmarsh, 1997); civic empowerment and social responsibility (Boyle-Baise & Binford, 2005; Simons & Cleary, 2006; Terry & Bohnenberger, 2007), including its extension “beyond . . . primary groups to the larger society” (Pritchard & Whitehead, III, 2004); social justice through societal critique (Boyle-Baise & Binford, 2005; Cipolle, 2004; Wade, 2001); multicultural understanding, including awareness and appreciation of diversity in all its forms (Battistoni, 1997; Boyle-Baise & Binford, 2005; Cohen, 2006; Fertman et al., 1996; Sheffield, 2005; Simons & Clearly, 2006), as well as the “skills and abilities for relating to culturally diverse groups” (Pritchard & Whitehead, III, 2004, p. 8); critical consciousness (Beilke, 2005; Boyle-Baise & Binford, 2005; Cipolle, 2004); political skills (Boyle-Baise & Binford, 2005; Simons & Cleary, 2006); democratic citizenship (Battistoni, 1997; Clark et al., 1997; LeSourd, 1997; Rhoads, 2003);

intrapersonal, interpersonal, and social development (Hinck and Brandell, 1999; Simons and Cleary, 2006); cooperative learning skills (Terry & Bohnenberger, 2003); cognitive development (Pritchard & Whitehead, III, 2004; Terry & Bohnenberger, 2007); and academic achievement (Kielsmeier et al., 2004; Pritchard & Whitehead, III, 2004).

However, notwithstanding the preceding research claims about the potential effectiveness of an effective service-learning pedagogy in promoting dispositions supportive of global citizenship, a substantial proportion of systematic research on service-learning has focused on higher education, as opposed to a focus on middle and high school students (Seitsinger, 2005). Indeed, there are significant gaps in the scholarly literature regarding the promotion of global citizenship through service-learning at the middle school level. There are critical topics pertinent to my proposed study for which I could find few if any published articles or texts, including: identification of specific ethical/social/political dispositions of global citizenship; identification of pedagogical practices for promoting global citizenship, including the use of service-learning as an optimal praxis for promoting global citizenship; assessment of the impact of any service-learning initiative with regard to student acquisition of the ethical/social/political dispositions of global citizenship; and meaningful examination of students' "voices" or reflective capacities to determine both their conceptions of global citizenship and the impact of participation in a service-learning initiative on their self-conception as global citizens. In fact, I could not find a single published document that provides a substantial account regarding the process used by a classroom teacher to promote global citizenship identity and practice among middle school youth. Nor could I find any document

focused on the impact of the teacher-students relationship on the culture of one's global citizenship community. In conclusion, what is missing in the research literature is the presentation and examination of the process through which a teacher and her middle school students attempted to form a viable global citizenship community within the context of an action-learning initiative that fostered the development of global citizenship dispositions, voice, and empowerment of participating youth.

Purpose of the Study

To address the significant research deficiencies cited above, my study utilized an action research methodology to examine my ongoing efforts to co-create with my students a global citizenship community within the context of a global citizenship action-learning initiative for the purpose of nurturing the acquisition of global citizenship dispositions, voice, and empowerment among middle school youth. My belief in the ethical imperative of educators to promote global citizenship practice among youth, combined with a glaring absence of pedagogical research regarding effective praxis for such a purpose, provided the motivation and purpose for this dissertation.

Throughout my years as a middle school teacher, I have experimented with, developed and implemented a variety of pedagogical strategies for facilitating the nurturance of the type of ethical/social/political sensibility outlined above. These efforts have included both classroom strategies and service-learning initiatives aimed at promoting awareness among my students of issues of global concern, as well as developing concrete methods for constructive advocacy on behalf of selected "suffering others" in Bosnia, Cambodia, and Ethiopia. My experiences have persuaded me that, for

those of us committed to the exploration and nurturance of humanitarian principles and dispositions in our students, the classroom as a setting for learning is not sufficient; we must help our students reach beyond the arbitrary confinement of our physical classrooms and to redefine the notion of classroom as constituting connection with one's peers, local community, and the world at large. That is, in order to promote the development of global citizenship dispositions, as well as the voices and empowerment of youth, we need to nurture those qualities through real-life engagement with the lives and needs of others.

However, while my work with middle school youth has borne outward fruit in the attainment of the educational, advocacy, and service objectives prescribed within our action-learning initiatives, prior to this dissertation, I had not engaged in a comprehensive or scholarly inquiry regarding the purposes, methods, and impact of our joint pedagogical practice. While my students and I have engaged in action-learning initiatives that have successfully educated, integrated, and involved numerous peers, parents and local communities, and succeeded in sponsoring the demining of a Bosnian village, the rehabilitation of Cambodian landmine survivors and, most recently, the construction of a 12-room Ethiopian schoolhouse, I have not invested sufficient systematic focus in analyzing the pedagogical and cultural processes used within our global citizenship community to promote the growth of global citizenship dispositions, voice, and empowerment among participating youth. Further, as cited above, I could find no such attempt to examine or document such a pedagogical process of global citizenship identity-formation and practice in the educational research on the middle school level.

In conclusion, the purpose of this dissertation is to better understand the culture of the global citizenship community that my middle school students and I have been constructing as a means of nurturing the dispositions of global citizenship, and youth voice and empowerment, within the context of our global citizenship action-learning initiative. In this way, I hope to address some of the major gaps in the research literature outlined above regarding global citizenship pedagogy and middle school youth.

Conceptual Framework

Just as the establishment of a strong foundation is essential for construction of a safe and enduring structure, it is essential to introduce and build a comprehensive and coherent conceptual framework sufficient to explain, analyze, and support the purposes of this study. To this end, after introducing my conception of global citizenship in the next section of this chapter, I will introduce and examine the following conceptual and thematic elements: identification of, and justification for, the dispositions that constitute my global citizenship ethic in Chapter Two; a literature review and critique of service-learning pedagogy—or what I call “global citizenship action-learning pedagogy”—as well as its applicability with early adolescents in Chapter Three; explanation of, and justification regarding, my selection of a critical incidents methodology as the type of action research used for data acquisition and analysis in Chapter Four; description and discussion of the findings of my efforts to nurture global citizenship practice and identity among participating adolescent youth within the context of a global citizenship community in Chapter Five; and an examination of the implications and contributions of this document regarding scholarly research and pedagogical practice with middle school

youth in Chapter Six. With this in mind, I proceed to the next section where I offer my working definition of global citizenship.

A Working Definition of Global Citizenship

The study and application of an ethical/social/political construct such as global citizenship requires the positing of a well-reasoned definition of this concept, subject to revision. Indeed, a lack of consensus regarding a definition of global citizenship (Rapoport, 2009) has undermined its usefulness as both an ethical and prescriptive guide for policy-makers and prospective global citizenship practitioners (*Williams, in Dower & Williams*). The need for such clarification is of particular importance to this text in that my conception of global citizenship has a foundational influence on every aspect of my practice as a classroom teacher and action-learning facilitator. Consequently, the purpose of this section is to posit and justify the conception of global citizenship that guides my pedagogical practice with middle school youth.

For Dower and Williams (2002), global citizenship is constituted by two major components: the ethical component (concerned with the identification of one's grounding principles and dispositions) and the citizenship component (concerned with global citizenship in the social/political arena). I refer to the nexus of these axes—the point at which social/political action embodies the ethical elements of one's global ethic—as “global citizenship practice.” I posit the term “practice” to distinguish between isolated, unplanned acts of global citizenship and a commitment to accept a level of ongoing responsibility for the welfare of some identifiable group of suffering others by addressing a selected global problem through a regular schedule of interventions.

Further, for me, such suffering others must represent individuals or a group with whom one does not possess a prior level of personal intimacy or connection.

It is this juncture point of ethically motivated social/political action in response to the suffering of the other that I conceive of as “global citizenship” and seek to facilitate and nurture in my global citizenship practice as a person and educator. While it is of critical importance to understand and examine this distinction between the ethical and citizenship bases for global citizenship, as well as the relationship between these two components, for me global citizenship practice must ultimately conceive of ethics and action as integrated to make sense at all. Thus, for me, the notion of a global ethic and its expression through tangible social/political action or citizenship is embedded within the concept of global citizenship practice.

Dower (Dower & Williams, 2002) refers to persons who accept a level of responsibility for enacting a global ethic to address some actual problem as “active global citizens.” In addition, Dower (Dower & Williams, 2002) emphasizes the necessity of expressing one’s activism through an identifiable organizational entity or institution within what has been referred to as the “global civil society” (p. 40). Such non-governmental organizations and associations provide tangible vehicles for the implementation and extension of global citizenship practice beyond an individual’s independent or non-associational acts of global citizenship for the purpose of influencing the policies and practices of political/governmental institutions (Dower, 2000; Schattle, 2008) and, I would argue, for addressing global problems. Indeed, for Dower (2000), the

practice of global citizenship through engagement with such organizations represents an ethical requirement for the practice of active global citizenship.

While agreeing wholeheartedly with the importance of practicing global citizenship in association with others, I believe such collaboration does not require membership in an official organization. Rather, I believe global citizenship practice can occur within the context of any community of like-minded others, regardless of whether or not such a community has been officially sanctioned as a member of civil society, as long as the community's mission involves the identification and expression of a global ethic in the public domain for the purpose of addressing global problems. (I refer to such a community as a "global citizenship community" or "community of conscience.") This distinction empowers an entity such as a school class or club with the capacity to serve as a viable social context for practicing global citizenship. Indeed, the account of my work with middle school students elaborated upon in this dissertation attempts to demonstrate the supportive and transformative power that involvement with such a global citizenship community can have upon each of its members.

Based on the preceding discussion, I posit the following working definition of global citizenship or global citizenship practice:

Global citizenship practice involves the development, articulation, and expression of a global ethic through engagement in planned actions within the context of a global citizenship community for the purpose of addressing a global problem(s) impacting non-intimate suffering others.

Having established my conception of global citizenship, I proceed in Chapter Two to introduce and explicate the dispositions and principles of my global ethic that guide my practice with middle school youth.

Chapter Two: My Global Ethic

The global ethic that guides my global citizenship practice is derived to a significant extent from my attempts to deconstruct, discern, and articulate the ethical/social/political dispositions and principles that might motivate an individual, whether acting singly or within the context of a supportive global citizenship community, to take tangible action to support, empower, or save the lives of “non-intimate suffering others” (i.e., an individual or group outside one’s circle of family, friends, and others with whom one already shares a bond of association and/or emotional connection), including those not within one’s geographic proximity, i.e., “distant, non-intimate, suffering others.” Thus, for me, the indispensable elements of a global ethic that articulate global citizenship practice include: ethical and/or caring intent, and purposeful social/political action derived and empowered by this intent, on behalf of the restoration of the dignity, needs, and rights of a non-intimate beneficiary whose suffering has resulted from an identifiable global problem. The specific objectives and nature of one’s global citizenship practice are influenced from one end by a set of grounding ethical dispositions indicative of a kind of “global citizenship identity” and on the other end by the social/ethical/political relationship one establishes with the suffering other and his requirements for dignity. These constructs of identity and relationship, as they connect to global citizenship practice, require further elaboration and clarification before proceeding to a more detailed discussion of the specific elements of my global ethic.

Global Citizenship Identity (“Extensivity”) and Relations with the Suffering Other

In their seminal study of the ethical and caring orientations and identities of Holocaust rescuers, Oliner and Oliner (1988) posit the term “extensivity” to designate the characteristics of “(i)nvolve ment, commitment, care, and responsibility” indicative of such heroic personalities (p. 186). These qualities, in turn, find expression in the ability of such “extensive” individuals to demonstrate a “capacity for extensive relationships” as revealed by “their stronger sense of attachment to others, *including those outside their immediate familial or communal circles* (my italics)” (Oliner & Oliner, 1988, p. 249).

From my perspective as an educator, the nurturance of an extensive identity among one’s students requires identification and articulation of a global ethic supportive of extensivity, as well as development of a pedagogical approach that nurtures and sustains this global ethic by establishing pathways for practicing global citizenship. Golmohamad (2004) supports the linkage of this type of “thick sense of identity” with a conception of citizenship—what I am calling “global citizenship identity”—that fosters the dispositions of empathy and concern on behalf of non-intimate others (p. 134). Thus, global citizenship identity and global citizenship practice are linked inextricably to the identification and articulation of dispositions and principles conducive to nurturing a supportive and effective response to the suffering of non-intimate others.

Yet, this type of response to the suffering of the non-intimate other requires more than mere acknowledgement of her existence; I believe it requires the nurturance of some form of relationship with what Levinas (1998) calls the “face,” i.e., the humanity, of the suffering other. With this acknowledgement of the humanity—the unique particularity—

of the other, this connection between oneself and the other may become transfigured; that is, such “full-faced” acknowledgment of the other promotes a perception of the other as not subordinate or inferior to oneself, but as capable of a relationship of reciprocity through which both participants may be transformed in solidarity with a common humanity.

Thus, while the central purpose of this chapter is to develop and articulate a global ethic supportive of the nurturance of global citizenship identity and practice, it is essential to remain mindful throughout this process that the global citizenship practice engendered by one’s global ethic happens in relation with the face of an actual suffering other, a face whose “call” seeks not only my acknowledgment of his suffering, but my collaboration in the restoration of his dignity. In other words, the development of dispositions and principles befitting one’s global ethic, while necessary, is insufficient by itself to produce “extensivity” or global citizenship identity. Further, Dower (2003) insists that acquisition of knowledge or information about selected humanitarian or global problems is also insufficient to motivate the ethically/socially/politically purposeful action indicative of global citizenship practice. What is needed, according to Dower (2003), is a “motivation” to act upon one’s dispositions and awareness of global problems (p. 20).

The integration of global citizenship knowledge and principles into one’s identity in such a way as to motivate entering into relations with, and assuming responsibility for, a non-intimate suffering other requires, I believe, something deeper and more personal: a cognitive and affective disposition or preparedness not merely to recognize and

determine that another is suffering, but to open up to the suffering of another, and to allow her suffering to deeply penetrate and impact oneself. That is, one must have a capacity to recognize, acknowledge and feel a sense of connection to the pain of the other, i.e., to feel empathy for the pain of the other, and to feel that this pain matters to oneself. Thus, while principles provide necessary ethical, social, and political justification for global citizenship practice, the motivation for acting upon one's global ethic—that is, for experiencing one's dispositions and principles as more than merely an intellectual exercise—necessarily lies within one's capacity and willingness to empathize with the face of the suffering other, and to translate that empathy into collaborative and constructive action on that other's behalf. Further, I believe this motivation to practice global citizenship is strengthened through interaction with fellow global citizenship practitioners in the context of a global citizenship action-learning initiative.

Clarifications

My global ethic consists of twelve ethical/social/political dispositions and principles that I believe, taken collectively, embody the kind of global citizenship identity capable of motivating global citizenship practice for non-intimate suffering others. Before introducing and elaborating upon these dispositions of global citizenship, it is important to clarify several points regarding both my selection of terminology and the interrelationship between dispositions.

One essential clarification involves my conception of the terms ethical, social, and political as they are embedded within my understanding of a disposition. I employ “ethical” to refer to the cognitive aspect of the dispositions, principles, and standards

informing and guiding one's awareness and treatment of, and healthful relations with, other living beings. I prefer the term ethical over the use of "moral" because the latter, for me, has subtle connotations to both religious thought and the sense of a more rigid and pre-ordained system of principles, whereas the former term suggests a more humanistic, less codified orientation that, in turn, is more suggestive of a dispositional perspective in relation to the other.

Whereas my use of the term "ethical" refers to the dispositional orientation that informs one's cognitive perspective of the other, I include the term "social" to remind us of the unavoidable context of sociality and relation with others within which ethical dispositions are enacted, experienced, and navigated. This term also suggests the importance of many key aspects of sociality that influence access to resources and power, such as cultural, ethnic, religious, racial, and gender identity.

Lastly, just as my introduction of the term social above reminds us of our fundamental embeddedness within multiple social contexts, my use of the term "political" is meant to promote recognition of the fact that each of us is born into and embedded within institutional structures of power and culture. These institutions strongly influence one's access to vital resources, conditions, opportunities, and protections that impact the nature, quality, and constraints of one's material well-being, relationships, and capacity to express power; consequently, these same institutions necessarily contribute significantly to conditions of suffering for those persons or groups lacking favorable access to them. Consequently, any conscious attempt to critique and address/transform access to resources, conditions, opportunities, and protections produced or reinforced by

political, cultural, and/or social institutions—whether on the local, national, or transnational level—as well as any effort to empower or join others in this process, necessarily constitutes an activity intended to impact, modify, or transform some aspect of this institutional structure and embeddedness: that is, a political act.

Given my conception of the terms outlined above, the linkage of the ethical, social, cultural, and political aspects of global citizenship dispositions in the context of developing and articulating an ethic for global citizenship practice is obvious. No entrenched suffering or injustice can occur outside of an ethical, social, cultural, and political context. The global problems that concern global citizens cannot be divorced from the ethics, social norms, and politics that produce and sustain them. Therefore, I employ the phrase ethical/social/political to indicate the multiple and interconnected dimensions of my proposed dispositions of global citizenship. In conclusion, my use of the term “dispositions” in isolation should always be considered to incorporate the ethical, social, cultural, and political aspects outlined above.

Secondly, I need to justify my preference of the term disposition over principle. As indicated above, principles provide the cognitive grounding and justification for the ethical, social, cultural, and political positions one adopts, and for that reason are an essential component of a global ethic. However, whereas a principle suggests an ethical stance both uncompromising and prescriptive, a disposition implies a more flexible ethical orientation with which one approaches the particularities of a specific ethically, socially, culturally, and politically charged scenario. That is, while a principle connotes universality and uniformity of both ethical belief and action, a disposition implies an

affective and empathic component, as well as openness to nuance in how one interprets and expresses one's disposition within a particular cultural/social/political milieu.

Further, the notion of a disposition suggests a kind of orientation toward the other that accentuates connection as a necessary aspect of the application of one's global ethic. For these reasons, I have selected the term dispositions to imply a more nuanced approach to global citizenship conception and implementation.

A final clarification concerns the relationships and sequencing of the dispositions contained in my global ethic. I conceive of both the selection and sequential ordering of my selected dispositions as indicative of a kind of narrative portrait of the awakening and maturation process of a burgeoning global citizenship identity and practitioner. While I do not wish to create a rigid or absolute developmental framework applicable to all practicing global citizens, I do intend the sequencing to at least indicate prospective synergistic connections and relationships between the selected dispositions. With this in mind, it might be helpful to classify the dispositions of my global ethic according to the following four interconnected and synergistic processes.

The first process suggests an internal awakening of the cognitively-oriented ethical pathways to development of a global citizenship identity. This process begins with recognition of the face of the suffering other as signifying a call to acknowledge his suffering and to engage in joint "intersubjective ethical relations" towards the restoration of his dignity. This intersubjective ethical relationship, in turn, embodies a type of ethical interdependence and interconnection that transcends geographic proximity to suggest, in

both practical and theoretical terms, the principle of interdependence on a global scale, as well as the dignity and value of all life bonded by this interconnection.

The second process offers a more affective and relational pathway to global citizenship identity I refer to as “deep compassion.” In this process, empathy is conceived of as an integrated affective and cognitive motivational resource that empowers one to experience concern for, and connection with, the suffering other in such a way that her suffering matters to one’s own sense of well-being. Empathy ensures that recognition of one’s intersubjective ethical relationship with the face of the other is “taken to heart.” The growth and development of such empathy enables one to expand the circle of one’s empathic concern to geographically distant, non-intimate, suffering others: a process I call “empathic extension.” This experience of empathy, in turn, provides the foundation for compassion: that is, the acceptance of ethical/social/political responsibility for addressing the welfare of the suffering other through constructive intervention.

However, before compassionate intervention (that is, the action-based component of compassion) can begin, it is necessary to undergo an evaluative process whereby one applies the ethical/social/political standards of human capabilities and human needs, buttressed by their codification in human rights, to assess whether or not one’s identified suffering others are, in fact, suffering an injustice: that is, suffering from inequitable access to the resources, conditions, opportunities, and protections necessary for the realization of their needs, capabilities, and rights, and the sustenance of dignity. Thus, it is at this third stage of my global ethic narrative that political institutions and factors

involved with the attainment of needs, capabilities, rights, and dignity become inextricably linked to the dispositions of global citizenship in determining an assessment of justice or injustice.

The fourth and final synergistic process contains dispositions leading to the consummation of a mature global citizenship identity fully capable of engaging in effective global citizenship practice. The first element of this process involves the application of “critical consciousness” to determine in what ways the other’s unjust suffering might be produced and perpetuated by underlying societal and institutional causes and, hence, to provide guidance regarding the optimal social and political application of deep compassion in response to this injustice. The second aspect imports “nonviolence” as an ethical, social, and political injunction against the unnecessary use of violence as a means of remedying any foundational causes—revealed through the application of critical consciousness—of a global problem impacting one’s identified suffering others. Upon completion of this process, an individual is ready to engage in “global citizenship practice”—optimally through involvement with a community of fellow global citizenship practitioners embodying a global citizenship community—involving the concrete application of the entirety of the global ethic outlined here in the development and implementation of an action plan aimed at relieving the suffering of one’s identified population of interest, addressing the foundational forces perpetuating this suffering, and empowering the affected population to participate in all aspects of the plan.

With these clarifications in mind, I proceed to a fuller examination of each of the following twelve dispositions that encompass my global ethic.

**Ethical Awareness of the Face of the Non-Intimate Suffering Other as Signifying a
Call to Intersubjective Ethical Relationship**

It seems self-evident that a multifaceted, intersubjective ethical awareness—the recognition that one’s connection with the outside world is forged by a type of ethical awareness that promotes connection to, and responsibility for, the suffering other, whether he be a member of one’s intimate network of connections, a non-intimate other within one’s local environs, or a distant, non-intimate other outside geographic proximity—must be an integral grounding disposition for global citizenship. Indeed, in his interviews with self-described “global citizens,” Schattle (2008) supports such ethical awareness as the “clearest identifiable starting point” in developing global citizenship identity (p. 26), as well as an orientation supportive of “responsibility and participation (p. 27). Further, Schattle supports the notion that such an ethical lens of responsibility includes an awareness of the problems and needs of others outside one’s network of intimacy and acquaintance.

However, whereas Schattle (2008) posits self-awareness as the first step in the adoption of a global citizenship identity, Sharp (2006) cites Levinas (1998), who offers a remarkable and, for me, inspiring ethical and ontological assertion: that our recognition of the suffering other and of our ethical bond (or what I call “ethical awareness”) to her both *precedes and enables* self-awareness. Christie (2005) states the transformative implication of this ethical/ontological assertion:

Levinas (1998) provides a profound challenge to self and other. Levinas challenges the idea of the rational, autonomous sovereign subject who acts ethically; instead, he argues that subjectivity is *constituted* by ethical responsibility for the other: I cannot know myself and then the other; I am myself *because* of my relation to the other: Ethics precedes ontology (p. 246-47).

What activates this ethical awareness, for Levinas, is the encounter with the face of the suffering other that calls to the observer of her suffering for assistance in the restoration of her dignity (Sharp, 2006). In other words, the appeal of the face of the suffering other creates an intersubjective ethical relationship (Sharp, 2006) in which one is ethically compelled to respond caringly “prior to any notions of reciprocity and mutual obligation” (Christie, 2005, p. 247). For Levinas, failure to do otherwise—to assume ethical responsibility for the suffering other—denies one’s own status as a “moral subject” and, in turn, represses and distorts one’s own humanity (Sharp, 2006, p. 44). For Christie (2005), the pedagogical implications of the notion of a non-reciprocal ethics of care suggest the need for “building a capacity to face suffering and deal with difficult emotions without denying or rejecting them, and without rationalising them away,” as well as, “in Levinas’s terms, a shattering of our indifference and a willingness to suffer for the suffering of others” (p. 247).

Buber (1947) identifies several perceptual typologies that promote and sustain ethical disengagement with the other, including the lenses of the “observer” and the “onlooker” as well as the posture of avoidance (p. 11 & 19). Indeed, Buber asserts that

“the whole apparatus of our civilization is necessary to preserve men from this attentiveness and its consequences” (p. 19), by which he seems to be referring to societal practices and structures that serve to disable our natural inclination to ethical awareness and its accompanying disposition of empathy and compassion on behalf of the suffering other. The omnipresence of such ethically disabling practices and postures toward the other produce, for Buber, a kind of self-protective “armour” whose “familiarity” reduces or removes it from the level of consciousness such that we “no longer notice” its usage (p. 12).

However, for Buber (1947), these perceptual modes of ethical distance toward the other can be overcome through a disposition of “attentiveness” articulated by the act of “turning towards the other” as a “presence” in “dialogue” (p. 19 & 25). Implied, if unstated, is the notion that such acknowledgement of the other contains the accompanying realization of one’s intersubjective ethical relation to that other. For Buber, then, it appears that ethical relationship with the other requires that one be the recipient of a kind of ethical “call” for which one “feels . . . approached for an answer”: that is, a call for acknowledgement of the other as an ethical subject and a prospective interlocutor (p. 23) or, as Levinas might put it, as a face.

To my view, the foregoing discussion provides a persuasive argument for the necessity of perceiving the suffering other as an ethical subject for whom one should feel connection and responsibility. However, unaddressed in this discussion is the question of whether and how this type of ethical awareness might be used to address the issue of acting on behalf of non-intimate others *outside* one’s immediate sensory experience.

That is, how might one develop an intersubjective ethical lens on behalf of geographically distant, non-intimate, suffering others whose call for ethical intervention is not necessarily addressed to oneself either solely or at all, except in a metaphorical sense? This question is of critical importance to global citizenship, as its resolution may reveal something about the nature and boundaries of ethical responsibility and, hence, of global citizenship practice. Beginning with the next section, a theoretical and practical response to this question will be integrated into the unfolding articulation of my global ethic.

Global Ethical Interdependence/Interconnection

The second aspect of my global ethic—global ethical interdependence and interconnection—seems to follow as a logical corollary of the discussion in the preceding section regarding intersubjective ethical relationship. As described above, the prerequisite for the realization of one's ethical relationship with the suffering other in one's midst is acknowledgement of the face of that other, and she of yours. That is, intersubjective ethical relationship cannot occur in a vacuum; implicit in this relationship is a kind of connection or dialogue between subjects featuring ethical interdependency and interconnection. This ethical connection requires an exchange or dialogue in which both subjects "turn" to respond to the other as a face, each in all his vulnerability. Thus, ethical interdependency and interconnection seems a necessary marker of the disposition of intersubjective ethical relationship.

But, can the same sense of ethical interdependency be claimed with respect to distant non-intimate others? That is, can one extend the claim to ethical interdependence

and interconnection as applying to life in its totality, or at least outside the ken of one's immediate environment? If so, what type of justification might one offer for positing such interdependency/interconnection on a global scale?

Recognition of the biological/environmental interconnection and interdependency of ecosystems and of the Earth as a whole, as well as the theoretical and ethical models this recognition suggests, supplies a compelling response to this question. For Rifkin (2009), such ecological thinking propounds a conception of life as embedded as much within "a multitude of symbiotic and synergistic relationships" as by the "competitive struggle between individual creatures for scarce resources" (p. 596). Thus, for Rifkin, life on our planet consists of intricate and expansive networks of biological relationships that depend for their perpetuation and sustenance upon human recognition of responsibility as the ethical dimension of interdependency inherent in such networks:

If every human life, the species as a whole, and all other life-forms are entwined with one another and with the geochemistry of the planet in a rich and complex choreography that sustains life itself, then we are all dependent on and responsible for the health of the whole organism. Carrying out that responsibility means living out our individual lives in our neighborhoods and communities in ways that promote the general well-being of the larger biosphere within which we dwell (p. 598-99).

This linkage of holistic ecological thinking with global ethical interdependence is suggested as well by Noddings (2005), who asserts that the "basic idea of ecology is interdependence" since such "ecological thinking brings us to consider the effects of life

in one locality on the lives and well-being of distant others” (p. 11). In this way, Noddings posits interdependence as “a basic concept of global citizenship” (p. 11), while Schattle (2008) states that “global interdependence” represents “a key consolidating idea within global citizenship discourse” (p. 44).

Transnational ecological interconnection and ethical interdependence is reinforced by the tangible reality of our globally connected world, a world encumbered by global problems containing environmental, economic, and political dimensions that transcend geographic delineations and overpower the efforts of any single nation to resolve them. Dower (2003) cites the following list as encompassing global problems for which there is nearly universal recognition:

global warming and ozone layer depletion; rapid species loss; soil erosion and desertification; pollution; population growth as a pressure on the environment and a cause of poverty; world poverty, especially hunger and malnutrition and endemic diseases; AIDS; racism and the associated inequalities . . . ; the status of women . . . ; religious and ethnic hatred; violation of human rights . . . ; economic and sexual exploitation; numerous wars; large-scale movement of refugees; international crime; international terrorism(;) . . . weapons of mass destruction; proliferation of arms (p. 18).

While affirming Dower’s inclusion of poverty, hunger, AIDS, environmental sustainability and gender inequity, The United Nations’ Millennium Development Goals website Home Page (“Millennium development goals,” 2010) adds the global problems of child and maternal health/mortality and access to primary education.

Recognition of biological/ecological interdependence, as well as the scope and impact of the types of global problems cited above, necessitate the ethical imperative for discovering and enacting remedies that honor ethical interdependence and the inherent value of all life. The practical dimensions of ethical interdependence and interconnection related to transnational environmental and humanitarian problems have fostered various forms of global ethical consciousness that transcend the need for geographic proximity, and support the notion of an intersubjective ethical lens toward geographically distant, non-intimate, suffering others. For example, Dower (2003) cites “(b)iocentrism” (which “posits all life as inherently valuable”) and “ecocentrism or environmental holism” (which “sees value not just in individual living things but in whole ecosystems”) as examples of such ethical sensibility (p. 89). For Rifkin (2009), the process of attempting to identify, understand, and “harmonize the many relationships that make up the life-sustaining forces of the planet” nurtures what he calls “biosphere consciousness” (p. 600). Schattle (2008) enfoldes both environmental and humanitarian global concerns within a form of “(g)lobal citizenship . . . awareness” or “consciousness” that “involves thinking beyond one’s imagined physical boundaries and recognizing interdependence among countries, cultures, economies, ecosystems, and all life on the planet” (p. 44).

Such pathways to uncovering and developing the ethical lens of global ethical interdependence and interconnection contain the moral imperative to recognize the inherent value of all life as well as our intersubjective ethical responsibility to address the needless suffering of others, be they members of our local community or distant, non-intimate others. As Schattle (2008) asserts, “recognition of global interdependence leads

into the moral vision of bridging divisions in one's mind between one's immediate kin and distant strangers" (p. 30). Ultimately, then, the ethical principle of the interdependency and interconnection of all life, which both emerges from and reinforces the ethical disposition of intersubjective ethical relationship discussed above, serves to support the inherent value of all life, the possibility of empathic concern and compassionate response to distant, non-intimate, suffering others, as well as the ethical principle of dignity that will be introduced and discussed in the ensuing section.

Dignity

I believe the ethical belief in the dignity of human life—and, more broadly, of all life—is seminal to any global ethic. This assertion requires a brief elaboration regarding my conception of dignity.

For me, the notion of dignity is grounded in two distinct yet connected dimensions: the ethical and the material or practical. That is, dignity suggests to me both a belief in the inherent, non-instrumental, value of life and recognition of the need for all living beings to meet their needs and experience their capabilities in the material world.

The practical aspect of dignity contains, I believe, a simple yet overwhelming argument for its necessary inclusion within any global ethic. Specifically, this practical dimension contains four elements that are shared by most, if not all, sentient life: an inborn range of needs and capabilities; the need to have access to certain resources, conditions, opportunities, and/or protections in order to activate these needs and capabilities; fragility resulting from the inevitable demise of loved ones and of one's own capacity to exercise one's capabilities; and the suffering fostered by this inevitable

decline. Thus, acceptance of the principle of dignity suggests the need to understand and support the needs and potentialities of a *particular* life, and to promote the ability of that specific other—as well as all others possessing similar needs and capabilities—to access the resources, conditions, opportunities, and protections needed for their expression.

Within this framework, while a certain level of suffering is unavoidable, “undeserved” suffering is the result of a failure to obtain access to and to utilize the resources, conditions, opportunities, and protections necessary to experience one’s capabilities and meet one’s material needs. Where such deprivation describes the living situation for groups of people or other living beings due to a systematic failure of society—intentional or not—to create conditions for realizing their needs and exercising their capabilities, the resulting suffering is grounded in injustice. This, in turn, supports Nussbaum’s (2001) assertion that societies should assume responsibility for ensuring the conditions necessary for realization of human capabilities. Thus, acceptance of the practical or material dimension of dignity requires one to develop awareness of, and ethical/social/political concern regarding, the basic resources, conditions, opportunities, and protections necessary for the expression of human capabilities and needs (and, to the extent possible, for the capabilities and needs of any sentient being). As Nussbaum (1997) asserts, “We do not properly respect those capacities if we . . . neglect the needs they have for resources, or deny that hardships can deprive human beings of flourishing” (p. 371).

Indeed, it is the individual who is able to exercise the important aspects of her capabilities or potential that we refer to as having dignity or of living a life worthy of her

existence. Such an individual can express herself in such a way that her personality can be known and acknowledged by self and others. That is, a person with dignity is someone with a unique and identifiable face. Consequently, a person with dignity is someone who can engage in intersubjective ethical relation with others; she can make and receive ethical claims regarding suffering caused by the deprivation or inaccessibility of necessary resources and life opportunities. Thus, to experience dignity suggests the possession of a face that can be acknowledged by others; this in turn implies an accompanying voice through which one's needs and desires can be expressed and heard.

Conversely, the failure to have one's face acknowledged or to have one's voice heard regarding this deprivation of one's flourishing, constitutes the condition of being "defaced" and/or "devoiced": a condition which, in turn, denies one the ability to confront with an equal level of dignity those individuals or institutions responsible for the suppression or denial of one's needs or capabilities. This "indignity" of the faceless, voiceless, distant, non-intimate, suffering other is poignantly described by Ruiz and Minguez (2001):

Their suffering is felt as an affront to their dignity, something which should not be. The starting point of morality is the shout, sometimes muffled, of those who suffer, of the oppressed and excluded, who in this condition find themselves outside the institutional framework where others can defend their interests and moral hopes or voice their criticism against the conditions of inequality (p. 168).

In this context, it is the ethical/social/political responsibility of those whose faces and voices have been acknowledged by society to participate in restoring dignity to the suffering other by expanding their awareness of those whose faces remain systematically unacknowledged and whose voices remain systematically unheard in their suffering. Only in this way can the possibility of intersubjective ethical relationship be reclaimed. As Ruiz and Minguez (2001) assert in relation to the “poverty and exploitation” experienced in developing nations, failure to reestablish such intersubjective ethical relationship—that is, failure to perceive and understand the *systemic* suffering of the distant, non-intimate other—“draws into indignity...not only those suffering poverty and dependency, but those who cause it” (p. 161). Put affirmatively, recognition of the problem of indignity as a problem of systemic injustice in which those of us in the developed world are unavoidably complicit provides us with the ethical/social/political responsibility and incentive to practice global citizenship for the purpose of assisting the suffering other in the reclamation of his dignity.

Perhaps it is through this effort to acknowledge and restore the material, social, and political requirements of dignity, i.e., access to the resources, conditions, opportunities, and protections necessary for the expression of one’s capabilities and satisfaction of one’s practical needs, as well as through the realization of the dire consequences a failure of such restoration would have on the suffering other that the active global citizen uncovers its ethical dimension: that is, one’s ethical responsibility to the face and voice of the suffering other. The value of a face and voice cannot be measured or quantified; nor must it be earned through some meritorious exercise of

capability. The disposition of dignity requires the conception of each face, each life, as unique and therefore precious. Perhaps it is this ethical (or perhaps one should say “spiritual”) aspect of dignity, this “irreplaceability of the other,” that appeals most poignantly to our stance of responsibility for the suffering other (Sharp, 2006, p. 45).

Thus, through recognition of the material and ethical aspects and requirements of dignity, the vulnerability of suffering others to the condition of indignity, i.e., the loss of face and voice amidst the inability to claim access to necessary material resources due to societal inequity and the claims of intersubjective ethical relations, we derive our understanding of the foundational importance of working toward the renewal and preservation of the other’s dignity as a seminal responsibility of our global citizenship practice.

Segue to the Second Phase of the Dispositions of Global Citizenship

The primary focus of the global citizenship dispositions of intersubjective ethical relation, interdependence/interconnection and dignity is to offer a cognitive method or pathway for developing awareness of the suffering other, as well as of one’s ethical responsibility for him: that is, a pathway toward global citizenship identity. In the ensuing three sections, I introduce a second pathway to the adoption of global citizenship identity: the disposition of empathy and its extension to distant, non-intimate others, and the compassionate disposition to accept the responsibility to intervene constructively on behalf of the suffering other. This process of empathic awareness, connection, concern, and extension, coupled with compassionate responsibility, I term “deep compassion.”

In brief, I will posit empathy and compassion as partners in a four-step process leading to the practice of global citizenship. First, I regard empathy as designating a

capacity for both cognitive and affective awareness and understanding of the condition and inner experience/state of the suffering other, as well as an accompanying internal experience of connection with, and concern for, the status of that other. Compassion denotes the transformation of empathy into a feeling of responsibility for the suffering other, thereby supplying the internal motive for proactive constructive action expressive of active global citizenship. Indeed, Hoffman (2000) seems to support this linkage between empathy and compassion (with compassion conceived of as caring action): “Empathy and caring principles are . . . independent, mutually supportive, hence congruent dispositions to help others” (p. 225).

Implicit in this conception is the contention that empathy by itself is insufficient to foster active global citizenship. That is, something must occur to transform awareness, connection, and concern into the more active external expression of responsibility for the suffering other. If true—and this is my basic position regarding empathy and compassion—empathy nevertheless embodies an essential and foundational dimension of my global citizenship ethic, as I believe it must be of any such ethic. I will now turn to an explication of empathy and its extension to distant, non-intimate others.

Empathy

My conception of empathy concerns the nature of one’s cognitive and affective experience upon encountering and becoming aware of the face of the suffering other, as well as the internal connection with and concern for the other fostered by this encounter. The cognitive aspect of empathy refers here to the ability of the observer to understand the experience of the other, apart from one’s reaction to or assessment regarding that

experience (Nussbaum, 2001), while the affective dimension of empathy refers to one's solidarity with the predicament of that suffering other (Hoffman, 2000). While Nussbaum's cognitive conception suggests a level of possible emotional detachment or unconcern, as if the observer's primary motivation were to gather information regarding the state of the other, Hoffman's affective orientation suggests connection and concern on behalf of the other.

Ultimately, a conception of empathy as a synthesis of affective and cognitive dimensions (Hoffman, 2000, p. 3; Rifkin, 2009) appears to be necessary to produce the "psychological processes that make a person have feelings that are more congruent with another's situation than with his own situation" (Hoffman, 2000, p. 30). This capacity to enter into psychological congruence or connection, imbued with the affective response of concern, provides the dispositional groundwork for assuming responsibility for, and taking constructive action on behalf of, the suffering other.

Empathic Extension

I use the phrase "empathic extension" to signify one's capacity to experience and express empathy for increasing circles of distant, non-intimate others. Hoffman (2000) provides a comprehensive developmental account of the triggers and modalities of empathy leading from the capacity to experience and demonstrate empathy in direct face-to-face encounters to the possibility of extending one's empathy toward non-present others. For Hoffman, the highest empathic level is attained when one realizes that the plight of a single suffering other serves, in addition to his own suffering, as "an exemplar of a group or category of people who share his plight" (p. 85). Importantly, Hoffman

conceives of this empathic movement from a focus on one suffering other to a recognition of many similar suffering others as sequentially linked: “(I)t is hard to imagine a child being able to empathize with a group before he can empathize with the mental representation of an individual’s life” (p. 85). (Indeed, this need to derive empathy from connection to a singular suffering other motivates my insistence, as a teacher, that students investigating a global problem research stories profiling the way that global problem is experienced by a particular individual.)

With the additional cognitive capacity to “form social concepts and classify people into groups,” Hoffman (2000) asserts that youth can extend their empathic understanding to encompass “the plight not only of an individual but also of an entire group or class of people such as those who are economically impoverished, politically oppressed, social outcasts, victims of war” (p. 85). This cognitive empathic capability activates, in turn, the affective dimension of empathy as one imagines the suffering of the non-present others (Hoffman, 2000). In this way, the reach of empathy, i.e., empathic extension, transcends the need for “the other’s physical presence” to potentially embrace anyone within the realm of one’s empathic or moral imagination (Hoffman, 2000, p. 92).

However, Hoffman (2000) cites two types of “empathic biases” that provide resistance to this potential for such empathic extension, namely “familiarity bias” and “here-and-now bias” (p. 197). By “familiarity bias,” Hoffman refers to the inclination of “most people” to experience a greater degree of empathy for family members, friends, and people with similar needs and concerns (p. 197), while “here-and-now bias” fosters greater empathic concern for people within one’s immediate locale (p. 14). This

propensity to respond with heightened empathy to familiar or present others can, in turn, foster a greater likelihood for constructive action on behalf of these others (Hoffman, 2000).

Fortunately, Hoffman (2000) offers a pathway for mitigating this resistance to empathic extension to distant, non-intimate, suffering others through the developmentally-appropriate introduction of moral principles. That is, the integrated force of empathy and moral principles can—when activated by, for example, witnessing the unjust suffering of a present other—transcend or enlarge the significance of this particular instance of suffering to be representative of “a larger category of injustice or lack of human concern” as outlined above (Hoffman, 2000, p. 221). For Rifkin (2009), the burgeoning political, social, and economic interconnections between diverse individuals, cultures, and organizations, fostered by the capacity of modern technologies to promote and sustain such connections with geographically distant others, provide an additional pathway for overcoming empathic bias and extending empathy on a global scale.

Ultimately, the extension of empathic concern to distant, non-intimate others promoted by the processes outlined above suggests a concomitant expansion of the notion of “family,” i.e., of “membership” in one’s “circle of concern” (Nussbaum, 2001, p. 319). To this end, Hoffman (2000) urges us to assume the task of “imagining strangers as part of one’s family” (p. 213) and appeals for an “empathic moral education that promotes crossing boundaries and empathizing beyond one’s group” (p. 249) in order to “reduce empathic bias and create a sense of human oneness...in our contemporary, increasingly

multicultural society” (p. 23). Indeed, the use of “family” and similar phrases such as “human family” (*Luhmann, cited in Ruiz & Minguez, 2001, p. 158*) and “extended family” (Rifkin, 2009, p. 443) as ethical metaphors for the possibility of global empathic extension are becoming commonplace within global citizenship discourse. Additionally, citing the increasing mobility and migration occurring in our “globalizing world,” Rifkin asserts that the “increasingly multireligious, multicultural, and multiracial” makeup of our modern “family identities” are becoming “in a very real sense...mini diasporas” (p. 463). This “multicultural identity” promotes both openness to diversity and a “richer reservoir of personal experiences and feelings to draw upon in expressing empathy to others” (Rifkin, 2009, p. 438).

The arguments cited above support the notion of empathic extension for non-intimate suffering others, both local and distant, as both a possible and a desirable ethical/social/political goal of global citizenship. Indeed, the disposition of empathy and its capacity to promote widening networks of connection and concern on behalf of distant, non-intimate, suffering others constitutes a foundational aspect of my global ethic and of my pedagogical interaction with children.

Further, mature empathy provides the motivation and foundation for the assumption of responsibility for the welfare of the suffering other through compassionate intervention. According to Hoffman (2000), empathy and the empathic distress that accompanies it can promote “empathy-based helping...to alleviate the victim’s distress” (p. 33). Hoffman cites “countless studies showing that when people witness others in distress, they typically respond empathically or with an overt helpful act” (p. 31).

Further, Hoffman cites an earlier study of his that suggests that “empathic arousal precedes and motivates helping,” thereby suggesting a direct causal link between empathy and compassionate intervention (p. 32). Consequently, I will now turn my attention to an examination of the disposition of compassion, as well as to the interconnection between empathy and compassion.

Compassion

While empathy is essential in forging connection and concern between diverse and distant others, by itself it does not ensure a feeling of ethical and personal responsibility that, in turn, promotes constructive intervention on behalf of the suffering other. Rather, it is the combination of the motive force of ethical/social/political responsibility for the suffering other coupled with constructive action that unleashes the connective power of empathy and defines the essence of compassion. As Oliner and Oliner (1988) assert:

(e)motional empathy for pain . . . does not necessarily result in a helping response. Rather than attempting to alleviate the pain, one may choose to escape it—by physically removing oneself from the problem, denying it, devaluing the victim, or perhaps contenting himself with some slight gesture. When personal responsibility for alleviating pain is assumed, however, action on behalf of the victim is more likely (p. 174).

Thus, As Ruiz and Vallejos (1999) proclaim, compassion is indicative of responsibility for the other as revealed through action on her behalf: “Compassion . . . can be understood as help, commitment and protest . . . founded on the recognition of the

responsibility we feel towards all human beings” (p. 7). Given the clear partnership between the dispositions of empathy and compassion, it is important to explore the possible sources of this feeling of responsibility for the suffering other, which represents, for me, the pivot point or link between empathy and compassion.

Oliner and Oliner (1988) approach this linkage of concern for, and action on behalf of, the non-intimate suffering other by positing three generic motivational catalysts for animating the life-saving actions of Holocaust rescuers; each of these catalysts are indicative of the type of extensive global citizenship identity referred to above.

The “empathic” orientation is grounded in the desire to offer compassion focused on the needs of a specific other with whom one has developed an interpersonal connection (Oliner & Oliner, 1988, p. 189).

By contrast, the “normocentric” orientation prompts compassionate action resulting from identification with and allegiance to the rules, mores, and beliefs of a specific “social reference group,” while failure to abide by the cultural guidelines of this group can produce shame (Oliner & Oliner, 1988, p. 199). The fact that 52 percent of Holocaust rescuers, according to the authors, were normocentrically oriented (Oliner & Oliner, 1988, p. 221) strongly suggests the impact of culture on ethical behavior and norms, as well as the importance of consciously developing and promoting an ethical culture conducive to the dispositions of global citizenship.

Lastly, for a relatively small percentage of rescuers, the catalyst for their compassionate intervention was the development of specific ethical values, principles, or beliefs, the violation of which produced “strong moral indignation” and a “(compulsion)

to act more out of a sense of these principles than empathy for the victims” (Oliner & Oliner, 1988, p. 209). Specifically, persons with this orientation tended to espouse “two kinds of moral principles—the principle of justice (the right of innocent people to be free from persecution) and the principle of care (the obligation to help the needy)” (Oliner & Oliner, 1988, p. 209). Importantly, the principle of caring identified here, as indicated, is rooted in principled obligation or duty, not in the type of interpersonal connection and concern emblematic of empathically oriented persons. That is, whereas the “empathic motivation focuses on specific individuals whose needs assume paramount importance over others, . . . the ethic of care emerges . . . as a concern with minimizing overall harm to all to as large an extent as possible. The interests of individuals may be subordinated to the greater good” (Oliner & Oliner, 1988, p. 217).

For Hoffman (2000), neither moral principles nor empathic distress, operating in isolation, have sufficient motive force to encourage prosocial action (p. 239 & 245). Rather, for Hoffman, the pathway by which the connection and concern fostered by empathy can foster a feeling of responsibility to take action on behalf of the suffering other involves a merging of the affective component of empathy with specific moral principles. That is, Hoffman believes that it is the combination of the empathic and principles-based orientations cited by Oliner and Oliner (1988) above that unleashes the connective power of empathy and defines the essence of compassion.

The foregoing begs the question: What ethical principle(s) are likely, when combined with empathy, to produce a motivation conducive to compassionate intervention on behalf of the suffering other? For Hoffman (2000), the interjection of the

principle of justice—with respect to issues of the equitable distribution of society's valued goods and services, access to and ownership of property, punishment, human rights, and/or entitlements—provides this motivation. More specifically, Hoffman asserts that empathy promotes advocacy for “allocating resources according to people's needs regardless of their productivity” (p. 228).

This conception of justice as grounded in the assessment of human needs—what Hoffman (2000) calls “need-based justice”—places an emphasis on determining what societal resources are truly needed as well as identifying persons lacking these needs as “victim(s) of injustice whose rights have been violated” (p. 229). This needs-based emphasis, in turn, provides one's empathy with the orientation, justification and “motive” to “rectify violations of justice to others” (Hoffman, 2000, p. 229) through active intervention, i.e., compassion. Thus, embedding empathy within the ethical principle of justice, with a focus on rectifying injustice, provides a “motive to help the most vulnerable” through the adoption of responsibility for, and constructive intervention on behalf of, suffering others (Hoffman, 2000, p. 236). Ruiz & Vallejos (1999) support Hoffman's assertion of the need to integrate empathy within the ethical principle of justice.

Thus, an integrated empathy—that is, empathy grounded in both the cognitive and affective dimensions of empathic distress—activated by a needs-based assessment of the deprivation of the dignity of the suffering other, produces a feeling of indignation at this injustice and an accompanying responsibility for the suffering other that finds expression in compassionate action to alleviate such injustice. In this way, “(C)ompassion inevitably

expresses itself in the fight for justice,” with a particular focus on “those whom society condemns to misery and to the status of outcast, those whose dignity has been taken away” (Arteta, cited in Ruiz & Vallejos, 1999, p. 158), i.e., those who suffer from the indignity of lacking a public face and voice.

Indeed, the assessment of indignity produced by systemic injustice violates not only the dignity of the suffering other; it diminishes the dignity of the observer of suffering who recognizes her intersubjective ethical relationship with the suffering other: that is, injustice violates the dignity of both parties of an intersubjective ethical relationship. Thus, to the extent that one adopts the stance of observer or bystander when confronted by unjust suffering, one’s own dignity is diminished as well. Consequently, it is the ethical/social/political mission of compassion to work to restore the dignity of all parties involved in intersubjective ethical relationship with the suffering other through tangible and caring efforts to address the injustice that produces indignity.

From a pedagogical perspective, these conclusions support the need for educators to provide their students with opportunities to understand, experience, and apply their burgeoning empathic and compassionate sensibilities in concrete scenarios, as well as to engage in dialogue and introspection aimed at developing their own ethical principles and dispositions, within the context of a supportive pedagogical environment. This process, in turn, must activate the voice and empowerment of one’s own students, as well as of those others to whom one is engaged in intersubjective ethical relations. This is precisely the purpose of an effective global citizenship community or community of conscience.

Segue to the Third Phase of the Dispositions of Global Citizenship

The preceding analysis offers an explanation for the development of deep compassion: that is, the progression from empathic connection to, and concern for, the suffering other, to a feeling of responsibility and a commitment to undertake compassionate intervention aimed at restoring her dignity by addressing the injustice responsible for her suffering. However, an ethical/social/political standard is still needed to assist one in determining *what* resources, conditions, opportunities, and protections are truly necessary for leading a life of dignity, the lack of which constitutes an injustice. In other words, it is necessary to establish a basis or marker for assessing with reasonable confidence that the dignity of the suffering other has indeed been compromised, suppressed, or violated in such a way as to inspire the necessity for compassionate intervention.

In the next section, I will elaborate upon two principles that, I believe, can act collaboratively to provide the appropriate standards for making this determination: human capabilities and human needs. In the ensuing section of this chapter, I will introduce human rights as representing the codified framework in which access to the resources, conditions, opportunities, and protections necessary for attainment of one's human needs and capabilities, i.e., the material and ethical requirements of human dignity, are guaranteed by society as entitlements. Lastly, I will posit justice as the evaluative principle for assessing the effectiveness of those societal institutions responsible for ensuring the equitable distribution of, and access to, those resources, conditions, opportunities, and protections necessary for human dignity. This combined

application of ethical/social/political standards—human capabilities, human needs, and human rights—necessary for dignity, as well as the evaluative principle of justice for determining whether or not these standards for human dignity have been met, constitutes the third phase of the “narrative” of my global ethic.

Human Capabilities and Human Needs

Nussbaum (2000) proposes the notion of capabilities as the best available ethical benchmark for an assessment of the validity of compassionate action on behalf of the maintenance or restoration of human dignity (p. 69). Nussbaum (2000) seeks to promote societal structures and supports that ensure the resources, conditions, opportunities, and protections necessary to lead a life of dignity: that is, a life “*worthy* of a human being” (p. 73). Consequently, Nussbaum’s capabilities approach requires the identification and development of a list of those human capabilities that are truly indispensable to the promotion of “flourishing” (Nussbaum, 2001), i.e., a dignified life, as well as a notion of what resources, conditions, opportunities, and protections would enable persons to have the realistic potential to experience and develop these capabilities in the material world. To this end, Nussbaum (2001) proposes a list of “central human capabilities”—encompassing areas of capability such as bodily health and security; mental, emotional, and social development and expression; political participation; and ownership rights (p. 416-18)—whose activation, development and expression are imperative for the experience of human dignity or flourishing regardless of the cultural context (Nussbaum, 2000). In this way, the cognitive motivation for what Nussbaum (2001) calls “compassion”—which seems to be closer to my conception of empathy as outlined

above—is the recognition that certain core resources, conditions, opportunities, and protections for the exercise of human capability are being denied to some person or group (p. 374).

For Nussbaum, the capabilities approach places an obligation on society that is not just ethical, but political and educational. That is, if one accepts the connection between dignity and the exercise of human capabilities, then failure to create political, legal and educational structures conducive to and supportive of such capabilities can produce conditions of indignity and injustice (Nussbaum, 2001). This suggests the political obligation to conceive of the development and practice of such capabilities as entitlements or rights, the “deprivation of which” may be thought of as “tragic” (Nussbaum, 2001, p. 418). Consequently, one of the central ethical and educational obligations is to educate all citizens about the theory and practical importance of human capabilities (Nussbaum, 2001). In this way, citizens will not only be aware of their own capabilities and their accompanying right to exercise and develop them, they will be armed with an awareness that can serve as a kind of evaluative lens for identifying conditions in which the suffering of self or others constitutes a genuine violation of dignity, requiring compassionate intervention.

I find Nussbaum’s capabilities argument appealing for a number of reasons. First, Nussbaum’s positing of dignity as a foundational ethical disposition—the absence or violation of which requires compassionate intervention—supports the central positioning of dignity within my own global ethic. Second, I support Nussbaum’s conception of the material aspects of dignity as embedded in access to the resources, conditions,

opportunities, and protections necessary to activate the widest possible range of human capabilities. Third, given this need for tangible resources for activating human potential, I applaud Nussbaum's efforts at identifying and positing an actual list of specific capabilities in support of the concrete/material dimension of her ethical position. Lastly, I thoroughly support Nussbaum's assertion of societal responsibility for introducing and educating one's citizenry regarding such a capabilities list, as long as it remains open to public examination, debate and, if necessary, revision.

Closely related to Nussbaum's capabilities approach to identifying the resources, conditions, opportunities, and protections necessary for the establishment of human dignity is the notion of human needs. As discussed in the previous section of this chapter, Hoffman (2000) provides a persuasive argument for linking justice with the realization of some unspecified list of human needs or what he calls "need-based justice." From the perspective of a Montessori educator, McFarland (2004) supports the linkage of dignity and human needs:

In order for peace to flourish and human dignity to be sustained, people's basic needs for food, clothing, shelter, safety, health care, education, work, and freedom must be met. In our Montessori classrooms we focus on the basic needs of people and encourage the children to develop understanding, empathy, and compassion for others. This work often culminates in various service learning projects where the children become involved in thoughtfully helping others (p. 25).

McFarland's emphasis on the use of school-based service-learning projects to facilitate these ethical/social/political connections suggests the importance of youth engagement and empowerment in confronting the problems of equitable distribution and access regarding the resources, opportunities, conditions, and protections required for people to experience the dignity threshold. This notion of youth empowerment through compassionate intervention on behalf of identifiable suffering others implicitly challenges youth participants to adopt a global ethic grounded in an empathic and justice-based respect for the dignity of others, and supported by the recognition that all people, including children, can act constructively to promote the type of world envisioned by such a global ethic.

Given their mutual emphasis on the material dimension of dignity as the ethical/social/political criteria for determining situations for which compassionate intervention is justified, there must necessarily be significant overlap between the types of items articulated in Nussbaum's central human capabilities list and those likely to be cited in a list of human needs. Both types of lists would necessarily address concerns for satisfaction of the physical, emotional, cognitive, and social dimensions of human capability of each member of society, as well as the importance of having some reasonable level of participation in the political decision-making processes involved in developing and maintaining societal systems and institutions necessary for their attainment. Indeed, one of the key activities that I utilize in my global citizenship pedagogy with middle school youth involves brainstorming the types of resources, conditions, opportunities, and protections that might be necessary to enable the human

needs and capabilities of each person. Thus, my pedagogical efforts and my global ethic support the conjoining of both the capabilities and the human needs approaches as critical in establishing a framework for conceiving of and upholding human dignity, as well as for assessing if suffering is connected to injustice, i.e., to the systemic deprivation, denial, or violation of those resources, conditions, opportunities, and protections essential for dignity, and therefore in need of compassionate remedy.

Human Rights

With the establishment of an ethical/social/political framework for assessing the need for compassionate intervention on behalf of the suffering other, the development of human rights as ethical, social, and political entitlements in support of the realization of human needs and capabilities follows naturally. This direct linkage between needs, capabilities, and rights suggests the universality of human rights and, hence, their deserved status as entitlements. That is, since human needs and capabilities are universal or essentially unvarying for all people and, further, since satisfying and activating them are necessary for dignity, human rights in support of human needs and capabilities must be both necessary for, and applicable to, every person: hence, all people must be entitled to them. Thus, human rights highlight the universality of human needs, capabilities, and dignity. This feature of universality embodied in human rights implies, then, the “equal moral status of all human beings” (Dower, 2003, p. 54), as well as the ethical membership of all people within “one moral sphere or community” (Dower, 2003, p. 56).

Consequently, human rights should be viewed as codified affirmations of the societal obligation to create institutions that provide and foster the resources, conditions,

opportunities, and protections necessary for the realization of human dignity. Thus, in my view, human rights cannot be disentangled from human needs and capabilities; rather, they serve as ethical, social, and political commitments on a societal and global level to strive toward their realization.

In addition to their moral power as outlined above, the existence of actual human rights covenants, declarations, and treaties highlights the political dimension of human rights, in terms of currently existing political freedoms and constraints, as well as political aspirations toward a preferred future global polity. With regard to current human rights documents, Myers (2006) asserts that such documents “provide a basis for the protection of individual and group rights in light of national and international violations” based on “the universal premise that all people hold the same unconditional rights” (p. 375-76). Thus, for Dower (2003), human rights “constitute(s) a legal and institutional framework in which global citizenship is now embodied in the world” (p. 54).

The universal moral applicability of human rights further suggests their potential for an even more extensive political global application in the future. To this end, Dower (2003) cites the “aspirational” capacity of current human rights law to “strengthen the international human rights regime” (p. 54), while Gaudelli and Fernekes (2004) posit human rights as “a core element of the transcendent move toward a global civic culture, establishing a foundation for fairness and justice that is potentially universal” (p.17).

Thus, human rights play a vital dual role on behalf of the conception and practice of global citizenship. From a practical perspective, human rights reinforce and legitimate

the ethical, social, and political obligation of local, national, and international governing bodies to work towards the realization of the capabilities, needs, and dignity of each and every person. This obligation, in turn, supports the ongoing work of “watchdog” organizations to cast an evaluative light on the actual commitment and effectiveness of such governing and institutional bodies in honoring human rights.

From an aspirational perspective, the embodiment of human rights within documents adopted on a global scale supports development of a global framework and ethic with regards to human needs and capabilities, which in turn facilitates the growth of global civil society, along with political and legal institutions and structures to support it. Thus, while the notion of human rights is inseparable from any aspirational conception of global citizenship, it concurrently provides ethical and political backing regarding the importance of providing compassionate intervention to address the violation, denial, or suppression of the human needs and/or capabilities—hence, the dignity—of the suffering other, whether local or distant.

Justice

While the seminal role of justice within my global ethic has been alluded to above, it is at this point in the progression of my global ethic narrative that justice—and its converse, injustice—must be reframed and highlighted. The preceding sections regarding the linkage between capabilities, human needs, dignity, and human rights legitimate the notion of justice as the ethical/social/political principle for evaluating the relative success of societal institutions—including the global community of nations—in developing political, social, and economic conditions that enable the realization of human

dignity. That is, with the identification of specific human capabilities and human needs as integral to dignity, and with the establishment of the political and ethical validity of capabilities and needs through their codification within human rights documents, justice emerges as the ethical/political principle for evaluating the relative success of any given society or the world at large in promoting human dignity. Specifically, a society may be deemed “just” to the extent that its institutions provide access to those resources, conditions, opportunities, and protections necessary to promote human dignity as articulated through lists of human capabilities and needs, as well as the human rights documents that codify them. Conversely, the failure of a society to create the conditions necessary for human dignity creates indignity and injustice.

A central concern in the consideration of justice is the approach one should advocate and, if possible, adopt toward enabling access to the necessary resources, conditions, opportunities, and protections for the attainment of dignity. That is, one must consider the optimal method by which resources are obtained, distributed, or, as necessary, redistributed to ensure the type of access cited above.

Hoffman (2000) cites three major guiding principles one might adopt regarding this issue of resource allocation: equality, merit and needs. From the equality perspective, the equal “intrinsic worth” of each individual suggests that each person should, in turn, “receive the same amount” (Hoffman, 2000, p. 228). By contrast, “(M)erit-based justice calls for allocating resources according to the amount or quality of goods and services an individual contributes: that is, the individual’s productivity, effort, or competence” (Hoffman, 2000, p. 227). Lastly, Hoffman cites a need-based justice, as

mentioned above, that proposes the allocation of resources “according to people’s needs regardless of their productivity” (p. 228).

Of these principles, Hoffman (2000) asserts that “[E]mpathic emotions...are clearly congruent with ‘caring’ and with the ‘need’ version of justice” (p. 250). Hoffman explains this empathic preference for need-based justice by offering the scenario of a bystander observing a suffering other in need of food and shelter. According to Hoffman, the “empathic distress” of the bystander may produce a compassionate response based on the application of a principle of care; however, if the bystander “views food and shelter as everyone’s ‘right,’ then his empathic distress may be transformed in part into a need-based justice response” (p. 229). From this justice orientation, the suffering other “**deserves** (author’s bold) food and shelter,” while “(T)he bystander then not only has empathic feelings for the victim’s personal distress but also sees him or her as a victim of injustice whose rights have been violated” (Hoffman, 2000, p. 229). This recognition of injustice, according to Hoffman, produces the motivation necessary to strive to “rectify the injustice when someone else is treated unjustly” (p. 228), with an emphasis on “the most vulnerable” (p. 236).

Thus, Hoffman provides us with a direct conceptual linkage for the process which produces active compassionate intervention on behalf of the suffering other, as motivated by empathic distress and cognitive recognition of the unjust violation of the other’s human rights to the resources, conditions, opportunities, and protections necessary for sustaining his human needs and capabilities. This process, when activated in the final stage of my global ethic, describes what I refer to as global citizenship practice.

Segue to the Fourth Phase of the Dispositions of Global Citizenship

Before engaging in global citizenship practice to address injustice, there are, in my view, two remaining global citizenship dispositions and principles that require activation. To review briefly, the progression of the dispositions and principles introduced and outlined above suggest an interconnected process through which one may turn with empathic awareness toward the face of the suffering other and find the motivation to respond with active compassion to assist him in restoring his dignity by working to help him obtain the resources, conditions, opportunities, and protections necessary to realize his capabilities and human needs. In addition, I have posited that access to such resources, conditions, opportunities, and protections are codified through human rights documents, the violation of which constitutes injustice, i.e., a condition of indignity that signals the need for compassionate intervention through the restoration of justice and dignity.

However, the foregoing roadmap of my global ethic does not, to this point in my articulation, provide direction regarding the process an active global citizen might or should undergo to uncover the underlying or systemic causes of injustice; nor does it offer ethical, social or political guidelines or constraints regarding the process through which an active global citizen should seek to confront or address these causes. To address these problems, I will introduce critical consciousness and nonviolence as the final dispositions/principles in need of activation and examination prior to the decision to engage in global citizenship practice, the combination of which constitutes the fourth and final phase of my global ethic.

Critical Consciousness

Freire (1970/1997) posits the term “conscientizacao” or critical consciousness to describe the process through which persons suffering injustice arrive, through dialogical examination, at a recognition of themselves as “*Subjects*...who know and act, in contrast to *objects*, which are known and acted upon” (p. 18). Through this process of empowerment, victims of injustice seek to identify and uproot oppressive and unjust societal structures at the root of systemic suffering (Freire, 1970/1997). Ultimately, this process aims at the creation of a new social order “which makes possible the pursuit of a fuller humanity” (Freire, 1970/1997, p. 29).

Freire’s conception of critical consciousness contains four elements critical to, and supportive of, my global ethic. First, as cited above, critical consciousness empowers all people to establish and/or assert their identity and agency as dignified, capable, and proactive “subjects” capable of addressing injustice and oppression. Second, such critique requires examination and identification of societal and global institutions, practices, and ethical orientations that perpetuate systematic injustice and indignity and the consequent need to address these foundational causes of human suffering in order to eradicate such suffering. Third, if successful, such critique can reveal the existence and reality of suffering others previously “hidden” behind the “cloak of invisibility” erected by institutions, practices, and ways of understanding the world and perceiving the other. Fourth, the revelation of the ways in which societal institutions, practices, and ethical lenses produce and/or perpetuate injustice and the “invisibility” of suffering others

suggests specific direction and focus for the global citizenship practice and strategies one may adopt in response to one's critique.

Initially, critical consciousness raises one's awareness of "hegemony," i.e., what McLaren defines as "the maintenance of domination not by sheer exercise of force *but primarily through consensual social practices, social forms, and social structures produced in specific sites such as the church, the state, the school, the mass media, the political system and the family*" (p. 177 in McLaren (1998), cited in Cipolle, 2004, p. 13). Through these institutions and processes the invisibility of the suffering other is sanctioned and maintained. However, if some member(s) of these "invisible others" manage—whether through their own courageous efforts, the observer's ethical/social/political awareness and sensibility, or some combination of both—to emerge through this invisibility to shine a public light on their plight, the societal forces, systems, and practices cited above are reinforced by "myths and values which inhibit us from seeing the role of power, privilege, and domination" in preserving the "worldview" of the status quo (Cipolle, 2004, p. 13). Fundamentally, then, the purpose of critical consciousness is to foster dissonance between the "givenness" of the worldview offered to us by our entrenched institutions of power, and the reality revealed through our critical eye regarding the way in which these institutions serve to preserve the power and privilege of the status quo.

Cipolle (2004) cites Allman (2001) and Mayo (1999) to assert that a central mission of the transformative educator is to facilitate the "counter-hegemonic" work of "assist(ing) students in moving from a commonly held view of the world...to a critical

view of reality... through problem-posing and dialectical thinking” (p. 13). Only through such critical examination can one begin to recognize, name, and transform the systemic structures that create and perpetuate the conditions of dehumanizing oppression that reduce individual “Subjects” to “things” (Freire, 1970/1997, p. 46). Further, only through such a process might the invisibility of the faces of suffering others be revealed and brought to light, precipitating the possibility for an ethical relationship between subjects, i.e., an intersubjective ethical relationship aimed at the restoration of dignity and justice through mutual engagement in global citizenship practice.

Nonviolence

Within the context of my global ethic, I employ nonviolence as both a life-affirming commitment to daily intrapersonal and interpersonal practices aimed at cultivating peace within oneself and one’s network of association, and as an ethical/social/political sanction against the use of violence as an antidote for addressing indignity and injustice. In my view, nonviolence is both ethically necessary and logically consistent with the preceding global citizenship dispositions and principles introduced in this chapter. My reasoning follows as an ethical outgrowth of the universal applicability of the second and third dispositions/principles of my global ethic: that is, the interdependence and interconnection amongst all living beings and the dignity inherent in all life. To plan and commit an act of violence would clearly violate these ethical dispositions, since one is required to posit the dignity of all others, even those whom one may deem as the perpetrators of suffering. Such a restriction on the conscious use of

violence to address systemic suffering suggests the need to try to include all others, even suspected perpetrators of violence and injustice, within one's circle of concern.

Thus, I posit three essential outlets for the expression of nonviolence: first, to avoid harm or injury to life, as well as to protect, heal, and preserve life wherever possible; second, to develop and practice ways of thinking, feeling, and acting that promote peace within oneself and nurturing relations with others; and third, as a commitment to use nonviolent strategies to confront courageously those societal institutions and practices deemed through critical consciousness to be the causes of suffering, with hope for the possibility of transformation of the person, group, or societal institution responsible for creating conditions of indignity and injustice. Far from depicting a negative or fear-based posture of avoidance of suffering, each of these interconnected aspects of nonviolence requires and reinforces recognition of dignity and of the sanctity and interconnectedness of life and, in turn, calls one to life-affirming behavior on intrapersonal, interpersonal, and societal levels of focus, as well as to an orientation toward moral courage in the face of injustice. As part of this affirmation, the orientation of nonviolence requires social critique and courageous intervention where societal structures and/or practices are deemed to be the cause of suffering. Thus, nonviolence, as conceived here, represents an ethical/social/political disposition derived from compassionate encounter with, and recognition of, the suffering other and of the injustice that produces it. The same face that awakens intersubjective ethical relations, promotes recognition of interconnectedness and dignity, and inspires deep compassion,

compels nonviolence as an ethical/social/political disposition in relation to all others, be they the victims, perpetrators, collaborators, or passive enablers of suffering.

Before proceeding to the final disposition of my global ethic, it is important to offer a note of qualification regarding nonviolence. It should be clear that certain historical and contemporary contexts display such a level of violence, indifference, and/or callousness to the value of life and its material prerequisites that little, if any, realistic opportunity for successful redress through the practice of nonviolence may be possible—at least not without a predictable sacrifice of life on an enormous scale. I do not believe anyone living safely outside such oppressive conditions can sit in moral judgment of those who may, as a last resort, choose to abandon nonviolence as their method of combating and redressing the systemic suffering of self or others. However, I would suggest that the intentional use of violence disqualifies one from participation in the type of global citizenship ethic offered in this chapter and recasts one's identity and action within a qualitatively different ethical/social/political discourse. Whether or not violent action in the face of injustice can represent a viable alternative global citizenship narrative would be for those who use violence to explain.

Global Citizenship Practice

The consummation of my global ethic finds expression through engagement in active global citizenship or global citizenship practice—preferably within the context of a community of global citizenship practitioners or global citizenship community—through planned action targeted at addressing injustice and indignity in collaboration with and/or on behalf of an identifiable population adversely impacted by such conditions. I will

elaborate more fully upon the forms of global citizenship practice in the literature review about service-learning pedagogy—or what I will refer to as global citizenship action-learning—in Chapter Three and, again, in Chapter Five, where I will examine the efforts of my middle school students and me to practice global citizenship through implementation of a global citizenship action-learning initiative. It suffices for now to reiterate that global citizenship practice, especially as conducted within the context of a global citizenship action-learning initiative, represents the fruition of my global ethic.

Summary

Taken collectively, then, the twelve ethical/social/political dispositions and principles that encompass my global ethic depict an interconnected, four-part “narrative” of the birth and maturation process of a global citizenship identity. This narrative begins with three ethical dispositions that inspire—through recognition of the suffering other—the internal realization that each of us is born into, and remains at all times embedded within, a matrix of interconnected ethical relation with all others. Specifically, awareness of the face of the other promotes recognition that her suffering signifies an ethical call to engage with the other as a subject, i.e., to engage in an intersubjective ethical relationship of responsibility toward and with that other. The interdependent ethical nature of this relationship writ large—as understood through an ecological or biosphere perspective, as well as through awareness of global problems that threaten the fabric of this interwoven network of life—suggests, in turn, the ethical principle of the interdependence and interconnection of all life. Through this principle one recognizes that the suffering of the other—including that of the distant non-intimate other—resonates with and impacts one’s

ethical identity. Further, recognition of the face of the other, as well as of our ethical interconnection with him, fosters awareness of his inherent dignity: that is, awareness of the natural capabilities and needs specific to the other's well-being embedded within the context of the unavoidable fragility and impermanence of those capabilities and of life itself.

The second phase of this global citizenship narrative—what I call deep compassion—reveals and explicates the impact of empathy and compassion in transforming recognition of one's intersubjective relation to the suffering other from concern and connection to a posture of responsibility to work towards the restoration of the other's dignity. Specifically, recognition of the failure of the other to attain or experience the resources, conditions, opportunities, and protections necessary for realizing her dignity inspires an empathic response of distress that infuses concern for, and connection with, the suffering other in one's midst and, with sufficient maturity and direction, empathic extension to the geographically distant, non-intimate other. When conjoined with a conception of dignity as connected to justice as outlined above, empathy prompts an affective and ethical feeling of responsibility for working to restore the dignity of the suffering other through engagement in constructive, remedial action in collaboration with the suffering other or on her behalf through the application of compassion.

Before one can intelligently engage in compassionate intervention, one must be guided by a determination of human capabilities and human needs necessary to lead a dignified life, as well as those resources, conditions, opportunities, and protections that

will promote these capabilities and needs. This emphasis on the material, social, and political requirements of dignity, as well as of the ethical imperative to foster the dignity of all, suggests the need for their official sanction and codification as human rights, i.e., rights to which all people should be entitled at birth and throughout one's life simply by virtue of being human. (Indeed, assessment of capabilities and needs, and their subsequent codification through rights, should be applicable, where possible, to consideration of the dignity of non-human species.) Such societal acknowledgement of the universality of human capabilities and needs, and of their linkage to an ethical and material conception of dignity, suggests justice as the ethical/social/political designation for that condition whereby society and its institutions create conditions conducive to the realization of human dignity; by contrast, injustice denotes a systemic failure to provide an ethical/social/political environment supportive of the conditions of dignity.

However, application of the ethical/social/political principles of human needs, capabilities, human rights, and justice to determine the failure of a given society to create conditions amenable to the realization of human dignity does not uncover the causes for this failure; nor can human rights and justice suggest the appropriate focus and methods of protestation and remedy for the enactment of compassionate intervention. The purpose of the fourth phase of this global citizenship narrative is to address these remaining concerns through the integration of the ethical/social/political dispositions of critical consciousness and nonviolence, culminating in global citizenship practice.

To this end, it is first necessary to apply the analytic lens of critical consciousness whereby one strives to identify the underlying systemic societal/institutional causes for

the existence and perpetuation of the indignity of human suffering. While this investigative process may inevitably produce an incomplete or only partially accurate understanding of the root causes of suffering, it is the ethical obligation of an active global citizen to undergo this process; otherwise, compassionate intervention may merely serve as a temporary balm for the symptoms of suffering, leaving the foundational causes free to perpetuate indignity and injustice. If successful, critical consciousness can suggest the appropriate systemic target to address through one's subsequent global citizenship practice.

However, identification of the root causes for injustice does not suggest any ethical guidelines or constraints regarding the ethical mindset or strategies one might use to combat injustice. The preceding dispositions in my global ethic suggest promotion and utilization of the ethical/social/political disposition of nonviolence, whereby nonviolence reflects three interconnected but distinct ethical lenses consistent with its three ethical and practical functions. First, nonviolence suggests the importance of daily constructive intrapersonal and interpersonal practices for the purpose of fostering a more empathic and caring culture less inclined toward the use of violence. Secondly, I conceive of nonviolence as affirming the interdependence and dignity of all life by providing an ethical threshold for global citizenship practice that denies the legitimacy of the use of intentional acts of violence, even to rectify injustice. Lastly, nonviolence represents a creative and courageous method of confronting systemic injustice through implementation of a type of global citizenship practice that strives to uphold the dignity of all involved parties in the effort to obtain justice. Thus, the collective lenses and

functions of nonviolence, as outlined above, conclude the ethical “journey” of global citizenship identity as articulated in my global ethic and return one anew to an awareness of the subjectivity and preciousness of the face of the other, as well as of one’s primary ethical relation with him.

Finally, one is ready to apply the ethical/social/political dispositions of my global ethic narrative to engage in global citizenship practice to alleviate suffering and, if possible, expose and remedy any institutional forces deemed to be the primary systemic source(s) for this suffering. Ideally, this global citizenship practice will occur in direct participation with a community of global citizenship practitioners, i.e., a global citizenship community or community of conscience, within the context of what I will call a global citizenship action-learning initiative. I proceed directly to a literature review of the practice of global citizenship through this type of pedagogy in Chapter Three.

Chapter Three: Global Citizenship Action-Learning as a Reconception of Service-Learning Pedagogy

The purpose of this chapter is to explicate the role of what I will call “global citizenship action-learning” as an ideal pedagogical process for the cultivation of global citizenship dispositions, identity, and practice in early adolescents, as attempted by my students and me during the present study. The basic pedagogical structure of my conception of global citizenship action-learning derives in large part from what is commonly referred to as “service-learning.” That is, global citizenship action-learning represents a revised form of what is generically referred to as “service-learning” pedagogy. The necessity to reconceive and rebrand the traditional notion of service-learning as “global citizenship action-learning” is the central focus of this chapter.

To better understand the pedagogical orientation grounding my use of global citizenship action-learning within this study, it is essential to explore those aspects of traditional service-learning that I attempted to incorporate, as well as those from which I diverged. To this end, I will organize this chapter into three major parts.

First, in order to provide the reader with a generic frame of reference, I will briefly introduce the major components of the service-learning process. I will focus more closely on three of the four major aspects of service-learning, i.e., preparation, action or service, and reflection. (The fourth component, celebration or demonstration, while important, is not included within the focus of this study, except to the extent that this dissertation is introduced through my description of a major instance of celebration and demonstration.) This closer examination will clarify the points of convergence and

differentiation between traditional service-learning and my conception of global citizenship action-learning.

Secondly, I will provide a literature review in support of the developmental readiness of pre-adolescents to engage effectively in the global citizenship action-learning process, as well as to encounter global problems as a primary source of curricular content within this process.

Lastly, I will critique aspects of service-learning pedagogy and terminology, leading to my final justification and insertion of revised terminology to be embedded within my conception of global citizenship action-learning pedagogy as relevant to my global citizenship practice with middle school youth.

Clarifications

Before proceeding with the above roadmap for this chapter, it is important to clarify three key points. First, as Kaye (2004) asserts, each of the following service-learning components should be conceived of as “part of an interdependent whole (p. 10).” As such, while the forthcoming explications of the service-learning components are examined in isolation for the purpose of clarification, their linkages make this a synergistic and cyclical pedagogical process supportive of global citizenship. Consequently, any of the service-learning components listed above can be highlighted—whether solely or in combination—at any point in the process.

Secondly, as Fertman et al. (1996) insist, youth service-learning practitioners should participate in every aspect of the process. Only in this way, can the promotion of

youth voice, empowerment, and ownership regarding their selected initiative truly be nurtured.

Third, and most pertinent to the reader's understanding of this chapter, I need to explain my respective use of the terms "service-learning" and "global citizenship action-learning" within the context of this chapter. Since global citizenship action-learning represents my personal reconception of traditional service-learning, all scholarly research cited in this chapter necessarily refers solely to service-learning as opposed to my particular derivation. That is, any discussion or critique of service-learning obviously requires referencing of this term as derived from the literature review. Further, I can only distinguish my conception of global citizenship action-learning from service-learning through direct reference to the latter term. Consequently, this chapter will necessarily feature extensive use of the term service-learning. However, if successful, this chapter will provide sufficient explanation and analysis to allow me to clearly justify to the reader my use of global citizenship action-learning in lieu of service-learning by the end of this chapter and throughout the remainder of this dissertation.

Major Components of Service-Learning

A synthesis of my readings suggests the following aspects of the service-learning process for which there appear to be universal consensus: a pre-service preparation phase (Fertman et al., 1996; Kaye, 2004; Terry & Bohnenberger, 2007) consisting of academic or school-based learning leading to selection of a specific community problem, as well as training and planning for the intended service or action to be conducted in collaboration with community-based service organizations on behalf of a selected beneficiary

community; the actual action (Kaye, 2004; Terry & Bohnenberger, 2007) or service (Fertman et al., 1996) conducted to address one's selected community problem; structured reflection (Fertman et al., 1996; Kaye, 2004; Terry & Bohnenberger, 2007) between teacher and youth participants to process and make meaning of the service-learning experience; and a celebration (Fertman et al., 1996; Terry & Bohnenberger, 2007) and/or demonstration phase (Kaye, 2004) aimed at providing a public forum for acknowledging the participation and achievements of the service-learning participants, as well as to offer evidence of student learnings and accomplishments.

I will now proceed to examine the first three elements of the service-learning process more closely. In this way, I will clarify those aspects of service-learning that are consistent with my conception of global citizenship action-learning pedagogy, and those areas in which I adopt a different position or emphasis.

Preparation (Component One) - Academic

As indicated above, one dimension of the preparation component of the service-learning process involves research and investigation aimed at identifying an authentic community problem or need. I am in agreement with this general purpose of this dimension of the preparation component. However, there are three dimensions of central importance to me in this component of the service-learning process that appear to be absent from traditional descriptions of the service-learning process: that is, the optimal teacher-students epistemological relationship supportive of the nurturance of youth voice and empowerment, "problem-posing" as an ideal methodology for identifying curricular content pertinent to the academic stage of preparation, and the use of the theme of "global

problems” to focus the content of student research during this phase of the process. The absence of discussion regarding the epistemological and pedagogical aspects of the academic preparation phase of service-learning strikes me as a major gap in the service-learning process. Indeed, this differentiation between traditional service-learning and my advocacy of global citizenship action-learning compels me to share my arguments for the inclusion of these missing elements as seminal aspects of the academic preparation dimension of the global citizenship action-learning process.

Epistemology for youth voice and empowerment. Regarding epistemology, I refer to the area of knowledge acquisition: that is, on what basis and through what process one can validly claim access to knowledge and assert a knowledge claim. In fact, these two issues of criteria and process are deeply connected. Further, the methods and standards used to evaluate and confirm knowledge claims will have a direct effect on the nature and organization of the learning and practicing environment of one’s global citizenship community with respect to factors such as the teacher-students relationship and the particular ways encouraged and sanctioned for identifying and claiming access to knowledge. Consequently, it is of critical importance to provide a conceptual framework supportive of the type of epistemological and pedagogical inquiry and interaction that should occur within one’s community. To this end, I advocate for the integration of Freire’s notion of “dialogical praxis” with Bruner’s conception of “intersubjective exchange” as comprising an ideal epistemological model for empowering youth global citizenship practitioners within one’s community.

Freire's concept of praxis is a direct response to its antithesis: what he refers to as the "banking" model of education (Freire, 1970/1997, p. 53). Freire describes the latter's dehumanizing pedagogical process as consisting of two parties: the teacher, who plays the part of the "narrating Subject," and the students, who act as "patient, listening objects" (p. 52). Within this form of teacher-student relationship, "(T)he teacher talks about reality as if it were motionless, static, compartmentalized, and predictable" while "expound(ing) on a topic completely alien to the existential experience of the students" in order to "'fill' the students with the contents of his narration" (Freire, 1970/1997, p. 52). This treatment of knowledge as objective, universal, unchangeable and beyond dispute suffocates the potential for student participation in the identification, evaluation, and development of knowledge acquisition. This stultifying pedagogical process turns the students into figurative "containers" or "receptacles" into which unquestioned "knowledge" is deposited by the teacher, with the "scope of action allowed to the students extend(ing) only as far as receiving, filing, and storing the deposits": hence, Freire's "banking" metaphor cited above (Freire, 1970/1997, p. 53).

The end result of this form of pedagogy is a deadening of the potential of the students to recognize their own capacity to engage in, and assume a level of ownership for, epistemological discourse. Lacking such active participation in the discovery, generation, and evaluation of knowledge, students fail to develop the disposition toward critique or critical consciousness—cited in Chapter Two as one of my dispositions of global citizenship—necessary for constructive transformation of self, others, and society (Freire, 1970/1997, p. 54). Indeed, for Freire (1970/ 1997), the humanity of the student

herself is “filed away through lack of creativity, transformation, and knowledge in this (at best) misguided system” (p. 53).

To combat this pedagogy of passivity and subjugation, Freire (1970/1997) proposes the pedagogy of dialogical “praxis”—that is, “reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it”—as an activist dialogical practice aimed at liberating the oppressed from their identification with subjugation and, hence, of their complicity in their own experience of injustice (p. 33). He defines ideal dialogue as “the encounter in which the united reflection and action of the dialoguers are addressed to the world which is to be transformed and humanized” (Freire, 1970/1997, p. 69-70). For Freire, dialogue without the commitment to transformation leads to empty words, while “action for action’s sake . . . makes dialogue impossible” (p. 69-70). Thus, it is solely through dialogical praxis that the faces and voices of both the suffering others and those who participate in supporting the systematic structures that reinforce this suffering—whether directly or indirectly—can heal the distortions to their joint humanity caused by such oppression and begin to reclaim their “vocation to be more fully human” (Freire, 1970/1997, p. 55).

To facilitate the type of pedagogical praxis outlined above first requires a redefining of the teacher-students relationship in a manner that empowers students as co-participants in the epistemological process. That is, “[E]ducation must begin with the solution of the teacher-student contradiction, by reconciling the poles of the contradiction so that both are simultaneously teachers and students” (Freire, 1970/1997, p. 53). Within this new pedagogical relationship, “[T]he teacher is no longer merely the-one-who-

teaches, but one who is himself taught in dialogue with the students, who in turn while being taught also teach” (Freire, 1970/1997, p. 61). Such “co-intentional education” elevates both teacher and students to the status of “Subjects . . . in the task of unveiling . . . reality, and thereby coming to know it critically” (Freire, 1970/1997, p. 51). Thus, for Freire, authentic knowledge—and the transformative power that it engenders—“emerges only through invention and re-invention, through the restless, impatient, continuing, hopeful inquiry human beings pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other” (Freire, 1970/1997, p. 53).

Freire’s appeal for an equitable (or at least more equitable) teacher-students relationship requires two fundamental conditions: a conception of the participants as capable of authentic and serious participation in both reflection and action within a community of “praxis,” as well as a conception of knowledge as contested, i.e., subject to evaluation, reevaluation, and revision by every member of the community. Bruner’s notion of “intersubjective exchange” supports these prerequisites for participation in Freirean dialogical praxis by empowering each participant in a community of inquiry with the capacity for participation as an “epistemologist as well as a learner” (Bruner, 1996, p. 57). That is, the student brings an engaged and active mind to his encounter with and evaluation of knowledge. In stark contrast to the “banking” or transmission model of pedagogy critiqued above by Freire—or what Bruner refers to as the “didactic” model of teaching—such intersubjective exchange posits a contested terrain for healthy, vigorous, and reasoned dialogue and interaction between meaning-making participants. It follows that each participant in such a learning community is capable of changing her

mind, depending upon the nature of the evidence or reasoning presented by another participant in this intersubjective encounter. This, in turn, demonstrates the capacity of each participant for metacognition or thinking about one's own cognitive processing (Bruner, 1996).

This epistemological approach necessarily replaces a notion of knowledge as static with a notion of knowledge as that which is derived through “discourse, collaboration, and negotiation” (Bruner, 1996, p. 57). That is, truth-claims “are the product of evidence, argument, and construction rather than of authority” (ibid). The notion of intersubjective exchange based on vigorous debate and dialogue among competent participants—including both teacher and students—and focused on the discovery and presentation of persuasive evidence and ideas is clearly a necessary feature of the praxis of any global citizenship community.

This conception of dialogue and knowledge acquisition provides a learning environment that promotes youth voice and empowerment as well as the authentic acquisition of the dispositions of global citizenship. Such dialogical praxis requires the positing of persons—regardless of age—capable of creating knowledge and meaning in collaboration with others. This, in turn, suggests the potential for participants in a global citizenship community to derive—through social critique—deeper understanding of the conditions, needs, and sufferings of others, and of creative ways of acting upon the world to heal and transform themselves and others.

By contrast, a pedagogy of the status quo, wherein knowledge and meaning are fixed and reinforced by dominant societal institutions, seeks to cloud the ability of

students to recognize the primacy of their relation with the other. That is, a pedagogy of determinism denies access to the dispositions of global citizenship and nullifies youth voice and empowerment by suppressing the necessary conditions for creating a just and democratic community. Conversely, the pedagogical practices based on dialogue, action, and intersubjectivity espoused by Freire and Bruner promote a relational disposition of responsiveness to the other, according to her unique particularity and potentiality as a face in our midst.

“Problem-posing” pedagogy supportive of youth voice and empowerment.

The epistemological approach described above, which reframes the teacher-students relationship as epistemological subjects and “co-investigators,” is actually the requisite first step in a pedagogical methodology proposed by Freire (1970/1997) called “problem-posing” (p. 61). Within this methodology, the teacher and students work jointly to establish their dialogical content through identification of what Freire calls “generative themes” which comprise “ideas, values, concepts, and hopes, as well as the obstacles which impede the people’s full humanization” (p. 82). The “task of the dialogical teacher” is to “‘re-present’ that generative universe to the people from whom she or he first received it . . . not as a lecture, but as a problem” (Freire, 1970/1997, p. 90). That is, the problems selected by the teacher and students should be those that connect “to themselves in the world and with the world” and, as such, should inspire all participants to “feel increasingly challenged and obliged to respond to that challenge” (Freire, 1970/1997, p. 62). Further, the requisite response to this challenge must occur, for Freire (1970/1997), “not just at the intellectual level, but at the level of action” (p. 76-7). In this

way, selection of one's thematic "universe" should, in turn, precipitate a praxis aimed at investigating the theme through dialogue and action (Freire, 1970/1997).

In summary, for Freire, the critical lens through which participants approach epistemology must be accompanied by an active response to this unveiling of reality in regards to a mutually selected theme and problem; only this synergy of dialogue and action represents a pedagogical praxis capable of transformative power. This methodology is clearly supportive of the ethical/social/political dispositions espoused in my global ethic.

Global problems as the ideal theme for producing curricular content. In his discussion of his problem-posing methodology, Freire (1970/1997) asserts that the content of one's critical analysis cannot be determined before the encounter of teacher-facilitator and students. Rather, curriculum is a natural outgrowth of the concrete situation of the pedagogical community and of the desire of its participants to undergo empowering transformation as a means of redefining and acting upon their own reality.

With this linkage in mind, I introduce global problems as an ideal theme for use in developing curricular content for a pedagogy for global citizenship for several reasons. First, the theme of global problems and the particular problems that can be identified under this rubric require utilization of many of the ethical/social/political dispositions of global citizenship for their effective examination. Second, global problems provide a menu of topics, questions, and curricular content sufficient to satisfy the particular concrete situation and interests of any global citizenship community. Third, once selected by one's global citizenship community, any particular global problem provides a

significant range of thematic content for development of a classroom curriculum pertinent to global citizenship. Fourth, by its very nature, a global problem demands the active intervention of global citizenship practice to address unjust suffering. Indeed, the theme of global problems connects directly with my own current efforts, examined below in Chapter Five, to nurture global citizenship practice among middle school youth through our joint investigation of the global problem of access to quality primary and secondary school education and our effort to sponsor construction of a school in Ethiopia. Thus, a topic derived from the theme of global problems is ideal for the development of the global citizenship dispositions, youth voice, and empowerment necessary for active global citizenship.

I will now use the remainder of this section to consider: the components of a global problem, the types of global problems that a global citizenship community may select for examination, the importance of understanding the impact of a global problem through investigation of the experiences of specific individuals affected by the problem, and the opportunity a focus on global problems provides to identify exemplars of global citizenship.

Components of a global problem. Before proceeding to identify a particular global problem as one's curricular theme, it is necessary to determine what elements must be present to constitute a global problem. This is a challenge that can and should occupy a global citizenship community, since one's conception of a global problem will frame which problems may be considered as "global" in nature and therefore valid for thematic consideration.

There are several contestable areas of consideration necessary for evaluating whether or not a problem should be deemed global, including its causes, the nature and magnitude of its impact, and its geographic reach. For Dower (2003), a global problem is “caused by people (or events and processes) from all parts of the world, . . . requires the coordinated efforts of many actors from all parts of the world, particularly governments of countries, to solve” and “is a problem for significant numbers of people throughout the world” (p. 19-20). In terms of responding to a global problem, Dower (2003) asserts that there should be “widespread consensus amongst state actors and individuals . . . that from a global point of view something out to be done about this evil . . . by actors outside the country or countries within which the evil exists” (p. 20). Such a global consensus regarding the ethical/social/political necessity to offer compassionate intervention to distant, non-intimate, suffering others suggests, in turn, the presence of a “global ethic being appealed to, implicitly or explicitly” (Dower, 2003, p. 20).

Hendrix (1998) cites a set of criteria for determining a global problem suggested by Kniep (1986) which, while supporting Dower’s position that a global problem must transcend multiple national borders and be addressed by nations or actors from outside the affected nations, offers three important additions: that the problem has developed over the course of years, is likely to continue in the foreseeable future, and is linked to other such global problems (p. 307). Kniep’s addendums are crucial for two reasons. First, they clarify the entrenched and longstanding foundation of such a problem, which makes its short-term resolution impossible. Secondly, they reveal the interconnectedness of global problems such that one such problem is likely to exacerbate and be caused by

one or more others. In fact, it is precisely this symbiotic relationship between global problems—as, for example, between child labor and access to quality education—that leads to the development of a Freirean “thematic universe” of topics related to the single global problem selected by a global citizenship community as its overarching theme.

Types of global problems. There is a wide range of problems that merit designation as global problems according to the criteria cited above. I will briefly offer several examples in this section to demonstrate how identification of a global problem can suggest numerous topics for a pedagogy for global citizenship.

One such example is the global problem of war and conflict. For Noddings (2005), the global problem of armed conflict and resolution suggests several areas for curricular investigation, including an examination of “movements for peace and nonviolence” (Noddings, 2005, p. 18), as well as “a full discussion of the personal risks, horrors, and losses of war” on the secondary school level (p. 20). In addition, she insists that “material on the oppression of women, racial minorities, homosexuals, and the various religious sects” are essential “in any adequate curriculum for peace education” (Noddings, 2005, p. 19).

Concern for sustainable development provides another powerful, thematic global problem from which curricular content pertinent to global citizenship can easily be produced. Indeed, Bourn (2005) insists that one “cannot divorce global citizenship from ESD,” i.e., education for sustainable development (p. 236). Rather, for Bourn, “(s)ustainable development is about the interrelationship of environment, economy, and society, . . . including the agendas of citizenship, and social inclusion, combating poverty

at local, national, and at global levels, and addressing general public concerns about the quality of life” (p. 236). This linkage of the global problem of sustainable development to a “thematic universe” spanning a wide range of topics is supported by “The Earth Charter Initiative,” whose “Values and Principles to Foster a Sustainable Future” include: “Respect and Care for the Community of Life; Ecological Integrity; Social and Economic Justice; and Democracy, Nonviolence, and Peace” (“The earth charter,” 2012). Clearly, as with the theme of war and peace, a holistic approach to the global problem of sustainable development promotes a full range of curricular topics for a pedagogy for global citizenship.

Lastly, I introduce briefly the global problem of access to quality primary and secondary school education. This theme is of special importance to me both as an educator committed to the ethical, social, and political imperative of supplying free or affordable global access to education and as the facilitator of a middle school global citizenship community whose commitment to sponsoring construction of a school in Ethiopia will be the focus of the latter portion of this dissertation. By brainstorming and researching the problem of inequity in global education, one discovers a plethora of connected global problems such as poverty, child labor, gender inequity, child marriage, and access to clean water which have a direct impact on the perpetuation of this problem. Again, like the themes introduced above, the global problem of access to quality schooling for youth provides a wealth of content for a pedagogy for global citizenship.

Profiling the experience of specific individuals as embodying a global problem.

While the breadth of the global problems cited above may provide a prospective global

citizenship community with a plethora of themes and topics to select and examine, the magnitude of these problems may overwhelm one's ethical imagination and capacity to empathize with the suffering other. Such empathy requires a more "human" scale—a face and a voice—in which the impact of a particular global problem on a singular life can be imagined, understood, and extrapolated as representative of the similar experiences of the many faceless and voiceless others suffering from one's selected problem. Indeed, Rifkin (2009) cites studies that indicate the propensity of people to empathize with the problems of identifiable individuals greatly increase the likelihood of supporting efforts to alleviate the generic global problem producing this suffering (p. 428). As a teacher I can vouch for the apparent truth of this claim. Consequently, I require my student researchers to identify and share profiles of individuals suffering from their selected global problems—within different geographic, social, economic, and political contexts, if possible—as a means of humanizing the problem under investigation: that is, making it accessible to our capacity for empathic extension to distant, non-intimate, suffering others.

Exemplars of global citizenship practice. An exploration of individuals and organizations that have attempted to address global problems through effective global citizenship practice is a logical outgrowth of the preceding investigation into global problems. Indeed, the introduction of such exemplars of global citizenship practice is a strongly supported strategy for global citizenship education (Fertman et al., 1996; Hoffman, 2000; Miller, 2005; Ruiz & Vallejos, 1999).

There are several desired outcomes that exposure to exemplars may encourage, including: the integration of personal qualities and/or ideals embodied by role models into one's own ethical framework (Fertman et al., 1996, p. 15), promotion of "prosocial behavior" (Hoffman, 2000, p. 288), broadening awareness of the range of global problems that need addressing, and recognition of the wide range of motivations and methods employed by exemplars to practice global citizenship in addressing these problems. Further, Hoffman (2000) believes that the open expression of empathy on behalf of suffering others exhibited by such exemplars, as well as a clear articulation of the causes of their suffering, "should contribute to children's responding empathically rather than making counterempathic attributions such as blaming the victim" (p. 288-89).

As a middle school teacher involved with global citizenship pedagogy and global citizenship action-learning initiatives for a dozen years, I can attest to the powerful impact exposure to global citizenship exemplars can have on middle school youth. Indeed, each of my action-learning initiatives was, to an important degree, initiated and buttressed by the opportunity for my students to meet a global citizenship exemplar within the global problem under investigation.

I offer only one qualification concerning the potential impact of introducing early adolescents to outstanding practitioners of global citizenship: exposure to role models of global citizenship is not likely to produce a significant impact on a wide percentage of students unless this experience is embedded within the larger context of a pedagogy for global citizenship, most notably within an action-learning initiative. That qualification aside, I make sure to provide time for the students in my global citizenship classes to

research and identify a wide range of exemplars of active global citizenship. Further, I make every effort to invite such exemplars to meet my students and deliver presentations regarding their global citizenship practice.

Preparation (Component One) - Preparation for Global Citizenship Action

Preparation for service or action (or what I will call “global citizenship action”) involves any preparatory efforts—research, dialogue, reflection, decision-making, planning, and organizing—necessary for the implementation of action on behalf of an identified group of suffering others. I posit the phrase “global citizenship action” over “action” or “service” to clarify the nature of such action as expressive of one’s dispositions of global citizenship; in addition, the term “service” has connotations of non-mutuality that I will elaborate upon more fully below in my critique of service-learning. I will now briefly outline the types of global citizenship action one may undertake.

Based on my experiences in facilitating global citizenship action-learning initiatives, preparation for global citizenship action involves the following: selection of a specific global problem to address; selection of a specific population or community affected by this global problem; research regarding one’s selected global problem and the affected population in preparation for the creation of an educational presentation regarding this problem and its affected population; establishment of action objectives (education of the public, fundraising, volunteering, etc.) and an action plan to achieve them; identification of an individual or organizational partner, if necessary, capable of implementing or providing direct service to one’s selected population; planning necessary for establishing ongoing connections and communication with one’s selected population

and organizational partner; and planning and organization necessary for hosting school-based and/or public events aimed at educating others about one's selected global problem and affected population and garnering support (donations, volunteering, etc.) for the attainment of one's action-learning objectives.

While each of the activities listed above are essential to successfully prepare for global citizenship action, the first two items—selection of a global problem and of a beneficiary population or community—are foundational. That is, until one's global citizenship community has made decisions about these items, no further preparation is possible. Given the importance of these decisions, I will briefly share some guidelines offered in the research literature for making these determinations.

Regarding the type of global problem that should be selected, there is consensus that the selection should address a real or unmet community need or problem (*Boyle-Baise & Sleeter, 2000, cited in Cipolle, 2004, p. 21; Fertman et al., 1996; Kaye, 2004; Pritchard & George Whitehead, III, 2004; Taylor & Ballengee-Morris, 2004, p. 6*). In addition, prospective service-recipients must play a significant role in identifying the need or problem to be addressed (Kaye, 2004; Taylor & Ballengee-Morris, 2004), while participating youth service-providers must also be involved in the decision-making process (Pritchard & George Whitehead, III, 2004) as a means of promoting student “ownership” (Fertman et al., 1996, p. 30).

Wade (2001), Boyle-Baise and Binford (2005) and Fertman et al. (1996) support the notion that the selection of one's service recipient population should be oriented toward identifying economic, racial, ethnic, or social groups that tend to be hidden from

popular attention and, consequently, burdened by this condition of relative societal invisibility. Additionally, Boyle-Baise and Binford and Fertman et al. assert that connecting youth service-providers with such populations promotes multicultural awareness and understanding.

Ultimately, then, a prospective global citizenship community should seek partnerships with members of a marginalized and/or oppressed economic, racial, ethnic, or social group, with the aim of engaging in material, educational, cultural and/or social exchange for the purpose of addressing a selected global problem adversely impacting the dignity of the affected individuals.

Preparation (Component Two) – Global Citizenship Action

In the second major stage of the service-learning model the action or service for which one's global citizenship community has been preparing is performed or implemented, thereby giving expression to the students' burgeoning ethical, social, and political dispositions, skills, and capacities. I will now briefly outline the types of global citizenship action one may undertake.

According to the research literature, there are four categories of action or service in service-learning pedagogy: direct service (Fertman et al., 1996; Kaye, 2004; Pritchard & Whitehead, III, 2004; Terry & Bohnenberger, 2007; Wade, 1997), indirect service (Fertman et al., 1996; Kaye, 2004; Pritchard & Whitehead, III, 2004; Terry & Bohnenberger, 2007; Wade, 1997), advocacy (Kaye, 2004; Pritchard & Whitehead, III, 2004; Wade, 1997) or civic action (Fertman et al., 1996, p. 31), and research (Kaye, 2004; Wade, 1997). (I would substitute the phrases "direct action" and "indirect action"

for the phrases “direct service” and “indirect service” for the reasons stated above.) Specifically, direct service involves engaging in interpersonal contact with the service beneficiaries, while indirect service, such as fundraising, channels resources to address a selected problem or to promote the direct service offered by an organization seeking to implement the sponsored service (Fertman et al., 1996, p. 30-31). The terms “advocacy” and “civic action” both refer to the effort to elevate public awareness about a selected problem, and encourage public support and action that one believes can alleviate or resolve the problem. Lastly, research refers to the act of gathering data for the purposes of providing an informational report on a selected problem (Kaye, 2004, p. 9). Thus, research focuses on information-gathering and sharing, while advocacy or civic action is concerned with raising awareness and influencing others to constructive action aimed at addressing one’s selected problem.

In addition to the four types of action cited above, I would add “connection with one’s action-learning beneficiaries and implementing organizational partners” as an indispensable form of global citizenship action. Indeed, the importance of this latter form of action—along with my students’ efforts to research and share information about our selected global problem, advocate for school and community support on behalf of our action-learning beneficiaries, and provide indirect service through fundraising—will be profiled in Chapter Five through my description and analysis of the global citizenship action-learning initiative I engaged in with my middle school students during this study.

Preparation (Component Three) – Reflection

Structured reflection is the third critical component of the service-learning pedagogy. There is universal consensus regarding the need to integrate regular opportunities for members of a service-learning community to engage in structured reflection (Cipolle, 2004; Fertman et al, 1996; Kaye, 2004; Pritchard & Whitehead, III, 2004), while Fertman et al. (1996) and Kaye (2004) emphasize the need for structured reflection throughout the service-learning process.

Fertman et al. (1996) posit several key elements as necessary for facilitating “quality reflections” (p. 35). Specifically, reflection should contain a “clear objective,” the reflection method should be “consistent with the desired learning outcome,” and all participating students should be “involved in reflection and in linking the experience to their lives,” as well as “helped in assessing what they have learned, and judging their own progress” (Fertman et al., 1996, p. 35). For Cipolle (2004), the most significant objective of structured reflection is the nurturance of critical reflection and analysis that can promote critical consciousness.

Terry and Bohnenberger (2007) offer a number of written, oral, and project-oriented types of structured reflection, including the composition of ongoing journal reflections and engaging in discussion and debate. Fertman et al. (1996) also propose a wide variety of reflection modalities within the categories of speaking, writing, activities, and multimedia.

Structured reflection can impact youth service-learning participants in a number of important ways. According to Fertman et al. (1996), reflection can promote cognitive

development by facilitating student understanding and meaning-making and by connecting learnings to action. For Kaye (2004), reflecting upon such linkages promotes “personal growth and awareness,” while nurturing the ability of youth participants to “put cognitive, social, and emotional aspects of experience into the larger context of self, the community, and the world” (p. 11). Further, for Kaye (2004), effective reflection promotes the application of newfound “experience, knowledge, and skills” derived through a retrospective review of past actions to influence one’s “future actions” and to guide the direction of subsequent reflective inquiry (p. 11). Ultimately, for Kaye (2004), this proactive use of reflection can facilitate transformative change in service-learning participants. Given the potential enormity of its impact, reflection must be conceived of as “at the core of service learning, creating meaning out of the service experience” (Saltmarsh, 1997, p. 88).

It is also essential to note that ongoing reflection needs to be conducted at the level of the individual and of the community. That is, there should be ongoing intrapersonal reflection and interpersonal dialogue and reflection regarding the learnings, questions, concerns, growth, and global citizenship dispositions of each participating member of a service-learning initiative, as well as with respect to the group as a whole. Such reflection is best nurtured in an environment of trusting relationships and constructive dialogue (Saltmarsh, 1997). That is, meaningful and transformative public reflection requires a global citizenship community that nurtures trust, openness, and honesty through a positive learning and working environment supportive of constructive interpersonal connections.

Ultimately, such an environment promotes a kind of receptivity towards the opinions and feelings of each community member that can presumably be transferred to relations with one's service-recipients (Saltmarsh, 1997). Indeed, this last assertion by Saltmarsh foreshadows one of the seminal insights derived from this study: the ethical obligation to nurture an environment for equitable and open discourse not only between my students and me, but between our global citizenship community and our action-learning community partners.

Compatibility of Global Citizenship Action-Learning Pedagogy to the Developmental Readiness of Early Adolescents

Any teacher attempting to promote the growth of global citizenship dispositions, identity, and practice among early adolescents should be able to justify the use of her pedagogy with respect to the developmental levels, potentialities, and needs of early adolescents—encompassing an age range from about ten to fourteen (Terry & Bohnenberger, 2007, p. 8; Stevenson, 1998, p. 9)—with regard to sociality, affect, cognition, ethical orientation, and political/community activism. Indeed, Carlsson-Paige & Lantieri (2005) consider such knowledge a “critical competency for global educators” (in Noddings, 2005, p. 114), while Cohen (2006) posits the development of children's “social-emotional competencies and ethical dispositions” as one of the main requirements of responsible schools and educators (p. 202).

Specifically, I will explore the developmental readiness of middle school youth to engage in the study of global problems and service-learning pedagogy. In addition, I will

examine the compatibility of middle school structure and philosophy to the implementation of service-learning pedagogy.

Early Adolescent Readiness to Encounter Global Problems

Given my focus on early adolescent youth, it is necessary to assess their cognitive, affective, and ethical readiness to encounter maturely global problems such as those listed above. In fact, early adolescence is a developmental stage marked by a burgeoning capacity to understand and address problems and issues affecting the wider society. The increasing capacity of adolescents to engage in sophisticated cognitive and ethical processing enables them to understand the complexity involved with global problems (Myers, 2008; Stevenson, 1998). Indeed, for Myers (2008), “(i)t is educationally valuable for adolescents to learn about the complexity of social issues and to have the opportunity to synthesize the available information to construct personal explanations” (p. 118). Further, according to Myers (2008), this necessity to synthesize an array of disparate and sometimes divergent information and viewpoints to make meaning of a particular social/ethical/political issue or problem disabuses students of the more simplistic explanations of such problems often offered in textbooks.

Davies (2006) cites a 1998 survey of over 4,000 middle and high school students in England and Wales that suggests that, in addition to their cognitive ability to engage with global problems, most adolescents feel a sufficient level of affective preparedness to learn about such topics. When questioned about a variety of global problems such as war, human rights abuses, environmental destruction, and the economic problems of

developing nations, only 12% registered no desire to learn more about such problems (Peaty, 2001, p. 16, in Davies, 2006).

Davies (2006) cites Peaty's evidence as revealing a "clear message" regarding the preparedness of children to confront global problems (p. 20). This is a conclusion that my personal experience with middle school youth strongly confirms.

It is important to acknowledge that gains in cognitive, affective, and ethical development among adolescents do not ensure acceptance of the kind of global ethic espoused in this dissertation; nor do they guarantee a commensurate desire to accept the social, ethical, and political responsibility of global citizenship practice. As Myers (2008) states: "(r)esearch . . . shows that not all students are ready to take on moral responsibility and solidarity at a global scale, which are key elements of global citizenship" (p. 119). This, too, is a conclusion whose validity I can confirm through experience.

This qualification regarding the preparedness of early adolescents for embracing active concern for distant, non-intimate, suffering others hardly invalidates the need for a pedagogy for global citizenship. Rather, it reinforces our obligation as educators to create learning environments conducive to the practice of global citizenship in a variety of venues that can accommodate the wide range of cognitive, affective, and ethical developmental levels one expects to encounter among early adolescents. That is, a pedagogy for global citizenship should offer opportunities to practice global citizenship within the more familiar confines of one's school and local community, while concurrently encouraging and developing experiential pathways for empathic extension

to distant, non-intimate others. As Berman (1997) asserts, “If citizenship is a goal of education, then the practice of citizenship beyond the limited arena of the classroom and school must be a basic element in that education as well” (p. 152).

Early Adolescent Readiness to Engage in Service-Learning Pedagogy

While detailed studies of middle level service-learning initiatives are lacking in the research literature, a number of researchers make positive claims regarding the compatibility and benefits of middle school service-learning pedagogy in fostering the emotional, social, cognitive, and ethical development of youth (Fertman et al., 1996; Hope, 1999; Schukar, 1997; Stott & Jackson, 2005). For example, Fertman et al. (1996) claim that “middle school students developmentally are highly receptive to and motivated by service learning” (p. 46), while Terry and Bohnenberger (2004) cite Schine in positing service-learning pedagogy as “uniquely responsive to the traits of young adolescents: the need to test oneself, to experience adult roles, to experiment with new relationships, to be trusted and to cross the bridge from school and family into the community—the world beyond” (p. 27).

Indeed, service-learning appears to nurture at least four particular aspects of early adolescent development: the desire to make a real-world impact on global problems; idealism regarding the importance of addressing such problems and of having a positive impact regarding them; opportunities to display competence, independence, and leadership regarding increasingly serious responsibilities; and forums for exercising youth voice, choice, and empowerment. Terry and Bohnenberger (2007) proclaim that service-learning pedagogy satisfies the desire of adolescents to have a tangible impact in

the larger community context by “plac(ing) them in a context in which the learning is real, having consequences for both themselves and others” (p. 9). This need to apply social, cognitive, ethical, and/or political knowledge and skills in actual community contexts also nurtures adolescents’ idealism and belief in their capacity to constructively and meaningfully address selected “real world” global problems (Terry & Bohnenberger, 2007, p. 9). In addition, Fertman et al. (1996) claim that service-learning supports the need of adolescents for independence by providing opportunities for leadership roles “as they identify, coordinate, and complete projects that have real significance” (p. 14).

A final aspect of early adolescent development promoted by service-learning involves providing youth with opportunities for voice and choice: that is, meaningful outlets for expression of youth opinions and participation in decision-making. The empowerment that accompanies these opportunities provides a major source of motivation for youth involvement and ownership in service-learning (Terry & Bohnenberger, 2007, p. 63). Terry and Bohnenberger (2007) suggest several concrete methods for incorporating student choice and/or decision-making. These include: facilitating student selection of the theme, global problem, or focus of one’s service-learning initiative; allowing students to conduct research based on their own interests and to select their own working groups (if needed); encouraging students to develop their own presentations; and garnering student input regarding the format in which they share their reflections (Terry & Bohnenberger, 2007, p. 92).

Service-Learning as Compatible with Middle School Philosophy and Organizational Structure

In addition to its compatibility with early adolescent development, implementation of service-learning pedagogy is well-suited to typical middle school philosophy and organization. Fertman et al. (1996) encapsulate the connection between service-learning pedagogy and middle school philosophy:

Middle Schools provide a particularly favorable environment in which to create a culture of service that truly links service and learning. Such a culture evolves from the middle school philosophy that promotes teachers and students working together to meet the educational and developmental needs of students (p. 1).

With respect to middle school organizational compatibility, Fertman et al. (1996), Hope (1999) and Schukar (1997) contend that the organizational structure of middle school settings—teaming, flexible scheduling, and interdisciplinary teaching—is particularly conducive to promoting service learning initiatives. This organizational compatibility and flexibility support a range of learning contexts for the practice of service-learning, including: as a specific class devoted to service-learning (Fertman et al., 1996, p. 43; Hope, 1999); as embedded within a specific subject (Hope, 1999); as an outgrowth of an existing curriculum, disciplinary theme, or school-wide theme (Fertman et al., 1996, p. 43); as an extracurricular activity connected to a service club (Fertman et al., 1996, p. 43; Hope, 1999); or as a special event (Fertman et al., 1996, p. 43). In fact, my ongoing global citizenship action-learning pedagogy is embedded in both the formal

classroom structure of my grade six global citizenship classes and in my extracurricular Global Care Club in which self-selected middle school students invest more deeply in both the academic and service aspects of the pedagogy.

Critique of Service-Learning Pedagogy and Suggestions for Alternative Conceptual Framework and Terminology

Having established in the preceding sections the pedagogical value of service-learning pedagogy in fostering global citizenship dispositions and practice among pre-adolescent and adolescent youth, I am in a position to engage in a critique of this pedagogy in regards to the conceptual lenses and terminology undergirding the designations for the providers and recipients of service, as well as the impact of this terminology on one's conception of the relationship between them. This critique will position me to offer and/or solidify alternative vocabulary pertinent to my notion of global citizenship action-learning and my conception of global citizenship that honors the necessity to conceive of one's relation with the suffering other as rooted in reciprocity, mutuality, and partnership.

Essentially, the conceptual framing for service-learning pedagogy involves choosing between an orientation toward the suffering other as a paternalistic and charitable practice of members of the socially and materially advantaged "giving back to the community" or as a frame that seeks to empower and transform all its participants, especially school-based and community-based action-learners (Cipolle, 2004, p. 18). In her analysis of service-learning conceptual frames, Cipolle cites a number of problematic characteristics indicative of the paternalistic orientation mentioned above, including: a

perspective of charity instead of transformation, exploitation of the suffering other, short-term commitment, absence of critical pedagogy and critical reflection, lack of understanding of diversity, lack of sufficient learning and/or service preparation, and teacher domination vis-à-vis her students (p. 18). These characteristics result in projects that focus exclusively on direct service, but fail to activate the potential for service-learning pedagogy to foster lasting change (Cipolle, 2004, p. 18).

The failure to employ critical consciousness in examining the institutional and systemic sources of suffering leaves the socio-economic positions of those providing the service unchallenged, thereby reducing the possibility that the service provider will either question her role within the wider institutional dynamics that cause the suffering being addressed or risk undergoing any significant personal transformation as a result of her involvement in service-learning pedagogy. This absence of critique provides opportunities for members of the dominant culture to engage in and perpetuate what Freire refers to as “false generosity” (Freire, 1970/1997, p. 26): that is, the offering of kindness to suffering individuals while failing to critique or address the institutional sources of suffering writ large, thereby potentially “reinforce(ing) preconceived stereotypes” regarding the recipients of one’s generosity (Boyle-Baise, 1998, cited in Cipolle, 2004, p. 18). This paternalistic orientation toward the suffering other forestalls or deemphasizes the development of equitable relations with the service recipients based on some form of reciprocity and mutuality, leading service providers to ignore the voices and capabilities of community-based action-learners (Weah et al, cited in Cipolle, 2004, p. 19).

The resolution of these deficiencies in service-learning pedagogy and practice requires heightened focus on the conceptual lenses of connection, critical consciousness, and social justice. While the preparation component of service-learning needs to engage students in critical analysis of the underlying causes of the global problem under investigation as a means of identifying and, if possible, addressing the institutional inequity that perpetuates social injustice, the action component of service-learning should apply this critical analysis as a means of developing a greater understanding of, and connection with, the particular suffering others with whom one is involved. That is, the lenses of connection, critical consciousness, and justice aim to foster a relationship of reciprocity, mutuality, and partnership between service providers and recipients such that the dignity of the suffering others is acknowledged and supported, and the voice and needs of the recipients have a central role in determining both what problems are to be addressed and the manner in which this should occur. Only this type of conceptual orientation for service-learning pedagogy can effectively combat charges of paternalism, charity, and non-reciprocity between service providers and recipients.

Indeed, support can be found for the need to establish such an equitable service-learning relationship (Beilke, 2005; Cipolle, 2004; Kaye, 2004; Rhoads, 2000; Saltmarsh, 1997; Sheffield, 2005; Terry & Bohnenberger, 2007). Further, while terminology descriptive of such equitable relations alternates between “reciprocity” (Kaye, 2004; Terry & Bohnenberger, 2007), “mutuality” (Rhoads, 2000), and “partnership” (Beilke, 2005), the overall thrust of each of these terms is to highlight the capacity of both service providers and recipients to participate in service-learning as “learners and recipients of

the service experience” (Terry & Bohnenberger, 2007, p. 59). Specifically, each participant should be empowered to share and exchange “information, ideas, and skills” (Kaye, 2004, p. 12), as well as to express their priorities and concerns regarding all aspects of the service initiative (Rhoads, 2000, p. 42). Ultimately, then, to the extent possible, all service-learning participants should perceive one another “as equals and...as potential ‘givers’ and receivers,” (Rhoads, 2000, p. 42) embodying a kind of “two-way service ethic” in which the service-providers “benefit at least as much, if not more, than those receiving the actual service” (Sheffield, 2005, p. 48). The type of relationship between participating service-learning organizations and individual service providers and recipients outlined above is indicative of what Beilke (2005) calls a “mutually beneficial partnership” in which all parties are empowered and invited to educate, influence, or transform the other through “the formation of authentic relationships” (p. 6).

For Sheffield (2005) and Cipolle (2004), such partnership, in turn, challenges “the power relationship that exists between student and stranger,” i.e., between youth service-providers and service-recipients (Sheffield, 2005, p. 52). To this end, Sheffield advocates providing youth service-providers and service-recipients ongoing opportunities to meet and interact as a way of demystifying the experience of one another as “stranger” and replacing this perception with an authentic feeling of mutual connection (p. 51-2). Cipolle (2004) stresses the need to involve students in critical reflection and analysis regarding institutional injustice, the lack of which, in her view, leads to the replication of inequitable relations between service providers and recipients.

In order to facilitate the ethos of connection outlined above, it is essential for youth service providers to educate themselves about their selected beneficiary population. To this end, Sheffield (2005) points out the necessity of researching and learning about the intended service-recipient population through a variety of media prior to engaging in actual action/service as a means of preparing for the ““strangers”” they will encounter (p. 52). Further, Sheffield urges such preparation to “continue throughout the service work and bring an increasing depth of understanding, as the stranger becomes the familiar” (p. 52).

If taken to heart, the notions of reciprocity, mutuality, and partnership described above should raise unease about the use of service-learning terminology such as “service-provider” and “service-recipient” that creates a hierarchical role demarcation among service-learning participants. Cipolle (2004) cites Rosenberger who expresses concern that the term “service” suggests an “inequality” in relationship in which one party, the service provider, actively performs a service for a passive beneficiary, the service recipient (Rosenberger, 2000, cited in Cipolle, 2004, p. 19).

To address this problem, Cipolle (2004) cites Maybach’s suggestion of the term “service learners” to designate the providers and recipients of service, as well as the term “partners in service” to highlight “the cooperative relation of both parties” (Cipolle, 2004, p. 19). As an alternative, Kaye (2004) appears to address discomfort with the connotations of inequality regarding the term “service” by substituting for it the term “action” to designate the second component of the service-learning process.

I stand in agreement with those who express concern about the connotations involved with the service-learning terminology cited above. However, I am not convinced that the suggestions for alternative terminology fully address these concerns. First, Maybach's suggestion of the phrase "service-learners" to apply to all parties involved in the service-learning process ignores the descriptive need to have terminology that distinguishes between school-based youth participants and members of the community with whom these youth have chosen to engage. Secondly, Kaye's use of "action" in lieu of "service" fails to sufficiently address the type of action being conducted or the pedagogical foundation of this action. What is needed is a term that connotes activity indicative of global citizenship practice while distinguishing between the vantage point of a school-based youth and their community-based participants.

For these reasons, I have coined the phrase "global citizenship action-learning" as my preferred umbrella concept in lieu of "service-learning" pedagogy. Consequently, I will refer to student participants in global citizenship action-learning as "school-based action-learning participants" and their communal partners as "community-based action-learning participants." However, given the nearly universal usage of the term "service-learning" in scholarly research and writings to designate this pedagogy, I will use the designation service-learning when referring to scholarly research, while I will use my original terminology stated above in reference to my personal pedagogical experiences with middle school youth.

Segue to Chapter Four

The evidence in this chapter supports the notion that global citizenship action-learning provides an ideal pedagogy for nurturance of global citizenship dispositions, identity, and practice in early adolescents, especially within a middle school context. The ensuing chapter provides an overview of my research methodology as well as the context in which I worked during this study in my efforts to nurture a global citizenship community and global citizenship practice among middle school youth during the 2009-10 academic year.

Chapter Four: Methodology

Research Question

My overriding research interests focus on the impact of the teacher-students relationship and the cultivation of global citizenship dispositions, such as those examined in Chapter Two, in the nurturance of an effective global citizenship community culture among middle school youth.

Regarding the teacher-students relationship, I examine the role of power and conflict as triggers for promoting the evolution of this relationship in the areas of curriculum and agenda-setting, epistemological process, decision-making practices, and teacher transparency. Additionally, I explore how the nature and evolution of this relationship impacts my resolution of the valuation conflict between striving to attain the concrete objectives of our initiative, while attempting to foster youth voice and empowerment.

Another central element of inquiry involves an assessment of the extent to which the participating students were able to express motivations for their participation in our action-learning initiative indicative of global citizenship dispositions or principles as grounding their global citizenship identity and practice. In particular, I examine evidence of the students' capacity to understand, discuss, and internalize aspects of my own global ethic elaborated upon at length in Chapter Two. Among these dispositions, I am especially interested in exploring whether my pre-adolescent participants were able to develop empathic extension and/or compassion for distant, non-intimate, suffering others,

as embodied by Ethiopian students attending the school whose construction our global citizenship community has attempted to sponsor.

These aspects of my inquiry coalesce to form the following overarching research question guiding this study: How did I, in my role as teacher-facilitator of an extra-curricular service club, facilitate development of a collaborative and equitable teacher-students relationship and culture aimed at nurturing the voice, empowerment, and global citizenship dispositions of participating students on behalf of distant, non-intimate, suffering others?

Research Design Methodology

In this study, I combined and applied practitioner action research and critical incidents methodologies in order to examine my efforts to facilitate the development of effective global citizenship practice among the middle school students participating in this study. I will now offer an overview regarding each of these research methodologies and a rationale for their selection for this study.

Practitioner Action Research Methodology

In their educator's guide on developing and implementing action research, Anderson, Herr and Nihlen (2007) propose a "third way of knowing" or conducting educational research, besides the use of quantitative or qualitative prescriptions: practitioner action research or action research done by the practitioner in his/her own site for purposes of improving practices and/or the site. (p. xix). The authors list several important ways in which action research differs from the more traditional use of qualitative research methods. Specifically, they assert that action research produces

knowledge for both the academic community and the “broader community . . . of school practitioners,” and seeks the “transformation” of the setting under study through praxis, i.e., through an ongoing cycle of action and reflection (Anderson, Herr and Nihlen, 2007, p. xix). Given the activist nature of this form of inquiry, action research implies “research done by practitioners using their own site . . . as the focus of their study” (Anderson, Herr and Nihlen, 2007, p. 2).

Such “insider” research conforms perfectly with my ongoing role as both a middle school teacher of global citizenship and facilitator of my Global Care Club. Further, the transformative purposes of my study are in accordance with the educational mission of action research as a “vehicle for the empowerment of practitioners, students, and communities toward a goal of institutional and social change from the inside” (Anderson, Herr and Nihlen, 2007, p. 47).

The epistemological stance of action research conforms, as well, to my support of Freire’s dialogical praxis and Bruner’s intersubjective exchange—as outlined in the preceding chapter—as representing the optimal means of co-creating knowledge. Indeed, according to Anderson, Herr and Nihlen (2007), action research empowers teacher-practitioners to conceive of themselves as “knowledge creators in their own right” (p. 7) in opposition to the prevailing notion of teachers as “passive recipients of knowledge created in universities” (p. 5). The authors describe this stance of assertion and defiance as “part of a larger social movement that challenges dominant research and development approaches that emphasize an outside-in, top-down approach to educational change” (Anderson, Herr and Nihlen, 2007, p. 7).

Lastly, the conception of action research as embodying “an ongoing series of cycles that involve moments of planning actions, acting, observing the effects, and reflecting on one’s observations” aligns directly with the pedagogical structure of service-learning outlined in Chapter Three (Anderson, Herr and Nihlen, 2007, p. 3). Such cycles or “spirals” provide the “data” and reflection necessary for “refinements of research questions, resolutions of problems, and transformations in the perspectives of researchers and participants” (Anderson, Herr and Nihlen, 2007, p. 3).

Critical Incidents Methodology

The literature offers a handful of definitions for the phrase “critical incident.” Halquist and Musanti (2010) cite the following variations: “an everyday event that stands out (Martin, 1996); vivid happenings that are considered significant or memorable (Brookfield, 1995; Woods, 1993); a problematic situation that presents itself as a unique case and promotes reflection (Schön, 1987); or ‘highly charged moments and episodes that have enormous consequences for personal change and development’” (Sikes, Measor & Woods, 1985, p. 432).

Tripp (1993) offers a conception of critical incident most closely aligned both theoretically and practically with the focus of this dissertation. First, like Martin above, Tripp seeks critical incidents within the domain of everyday events. However, for Tripp, the “criticality” of such an event is not inherent in the event itself; rather, a critical incident is derived or “created” by the human capacity to interpret a given event as meaningful (p. 8). This evaluative process, in turn, promotes the type of reflective inquiry that can expose teacher-practitioners to the ways in which larger cultural, social, and

political forces help to establish the pattern of routines and events typically deemed as commonplace and beyond reproach, prompting us to “confront our professional values and judgements” (Tripp, 1993, p. 17).

Implemented properly, such critique can produce, for Tripp (1993), a kind of “radical professional consciousness” (p. 17) comparable to Freire’s global citizenship disposition of critical consciousness as described in Chapter Two. For Tripp, as for Freire, the natural focus and aim of such radicalized consciousness is social justice. As Tripp asserts:

Socially critical analysis in education is informed by principles of social justice. . . It involves strategic pedagogic action on the part of classroom teachers aimed at emancipation from overt and covert forms of domination. . . . (I)t is not simply a matter of challenging the existing practices of the system, but of seeking to understand what makes the system be the way it is and challenging that, whilst remaining conscious that one’s own sense of justice and equality is itself open to question (p. 114).

In addition to the conceptual justifications for the application of critical incidents methodology outlined above, there is a compelling practical argument for its use in the context of this dissertation: this methodology aligns with the purposes and needs of teacher-practitioners operating within the domain of practitioner action research. Indeed, Tripp (1993) makes precisely this claim. That is, the “grounded theory” approach advocated by Tripp, which encourages and empowers teachers to identify areas of practice in need of deeper examination and possible revision or transformation through

the application of critical incidents methodology, compels teacher-practitioners to engage in the action research cycle as a means of applying and analyzing one's revisions in practice and values (p. 149-50). Thus, Tripp concludes, "(t)he coupling of these two frameworks for thought and action . . . provide a potent tool for critique and change of the autopilot routines which so often pass for successful practice (p. 22)."

Critical Incidents Selection Process

My selection/creation of critical incidents is derived from the review of my data for the purpose of identifying and categorizing themes of particular relevance to my research question. Consequently, my search for pertinent critical incidents led me to identify incidents that amplified or offered insights into my two overarching research categories: the impact of the teacher-students relationship and culture on the nurturance of youth voice and empowerment, and the students' capacity to identify and articulate the role of global citizenship dispositions on their sense of themselves as capable global citizenship practitioners.

In order to establish which incidents that occurred during this study merited the categorization as "critical," it was necessary to first conduct a thorough review of each of my data sources. These included: logs chronicling both the pertinent activities and teacher-students exchanges and conflicts that occurred at our club meetings, as well as a comprehensive collection of all communications and activities involved with the club's action-learning initiative; a researcher's journal for identifying, elaborating upon, and developing insights and meaning regarding incidents that I deemed at the time as potentially or definitively critical; student online journals in which student participants

posted research findings and periodic reflections regarding the impact and meaning of global citizenship and of our action-learning initiative; audiotaped and transcribed whole-club dialogues regarding topics, issues, and concepts pertinent to our particular initiative and to the overall practice of global citizenship; videoconferencing exchanges with an American visiting professor in Kenya addressing factors impacting the capacity of children in Kenya and Ethiopia to obtain quality education; and archival data regarding the history, conflicts, and accomplishments derived from my experiences in conducting previous service/action learning initiatives within the same school setting.

As I conducted a series of ongoing reviews of this data, certain conceptual patterns began to emerge. The derivation of these themes, in turn, produced the following analytical lenses through which I examined my data: a programmatic lens focused on the practical components, procedures and pedagogy involved with promoting a successful action-learning initiative; a conceptual lens concerned primarily with discovering evidence of the growth of global citizenship dispositions within the students during the course of our action-learning initiative; a relationship lens which identified and considered the nature and development of my relationship with my students and the impact of this relationship on the voices and empowerment of the student participants, as well as on the overall culture of our global citizenship community; and a pedagogical lens which identified and made meaning of the ways in which my own values and practices as a teacher-facilitator evolved during this experience.

After spending significant time thinking and writing through each of these analytical lenses, I decided that the programmatic focus on the optimal ways of

organizing and implementing an action-learning initiative, while of immense practical importance to global citizenship teacher-facilitators like me, ultimately interested me less than the remaining analytical lenses cited above. Consequently, while pertinent aspects of the programmatic dimension of our action-learning initiative are imbedded within this study as needed, I have primarily incorporated the analytical lenses exploring global citizenship dispositions, teacher-students relations and empowerment, global citizenship culture, and intrapersonal impact to assist me in identifying and selecting the six critical incidents selected for this study, as well as in crafting the probing questions through which these critical incidents are examined.

Overview of Selected Critical Incidents

In this section I offer a brief overview of the conflicts, themes, and/or conceptual categories driving each of the six critical incidents selected for this study. A complete description of these incidents, as well as an analysis of the findings derived from them, will be offered in Chapter Five below.

Critical Incident One – Traditional/Hierarchical vs. Collaborative/Equitable Teacher-Students Relationship in Our Decision-Making Process

Critical Incident One exposes my intrapersonal conflict occurring at the beginning of this study regarding the degree of voice and power I was willing to encourage in my students regarding a decision of immense importance to the programmatic direction of our global citizenship community: that is, whether to continue our current multi-year Ethiopian School Construction Initiative or to attempt to develop a new action-learning initiative. While providing my students with ample opportunities to express their

opinions and positions on a number of aspects of global citizenship practice, this critical incident reveals how my strong desire to continue our current initiative impacted my pedagogy in ways that were indicative of a traditional/hierarchical approach to teacher-students relations.

Critical Incident Two – Values Conflict Between Youth Empowerment and Task Completion

Critical Incident Two analyzes my efforts to navigate two potentially opposing values within a middle school global citizenship community: my burgeoning desire to accentuate youth voice and empowerment and the need to ensure that my students were prepared to deliver educational presentations regarding our action-learning initiative to live audiences by a specific timetable. Specifically, my club needed to be ready to deliver multiple presentations to their SMS student-peers on January 15, 2010, as well as at a major community-wide fundraising event nine days later. However, as the pace of the students' research proceeded too slowly to meet these deadlines, my students and I were challenged to consider alternative data-gathering strategies as well as to reconsider the content and format of our presentation. The unavoidable stress associated with these upheavals in our process caused me to bluntly challenge the task commitment of my students, as well as my own commitment to persevere in promoting more collaborative pedagogical practices.

Critical Incident Three – Student Disempowerment, Reexamination of the Values of our Global Citizenship Community, and a Commitment to Foster a More Collaborative and Equitable Teacher-Students Relationship

Critical Incident Three charts the evolution of my eventual commitment to prioritize the cultivation of collaborative and equitable teacher-students relations as the students and I, along with an event planning committee consisting of parents and local citizens, attempted to resolve an unanticipated dilemma: what percentage of our anticipated donations to be derived from our upcoming fundraising event should be offered to a relief fund on behalf of Haitian earthquake victims. Specifically, this critical incident reveals the major impact that another interest group in our global citizenship community—in this case, parents and local citizens involved in planning, organizing, and implementing a fundraising event on behalf of our action-learning initiative—had on our teacher-students relationship and culture. The dynamic that unfolded between the parents and me regarding ownership and decision-making protocol for this event provided me with firsthand experience in feeling the minimization of my own voice and power and, in turn, that of my students. As such, this parents-teacher relationship—while essential in helping us achieve our fundraising objectives—provided me with painful yet important lessons regarding the ease with which voice and power can be ceded and diminished.

Critical Incident Four – The Ethical Problem of Attempting Change Agency as a Cultural Outsider: Empowering Students Through Epistemological Partnership and Critical Discourse

Critical Incident Four is extremely important for two reasons. First, it depicts a pedagogical breakthrough on my part in promoting youth voice and empowerment through the use of a transparent, collaborative, and equitable pedagogical process to conduct a whole-club conversation that promoted epistemological partnership between

the students and me. Indeed, the success of this “Quaker Share” dialogical format led to its usage on at least six additional occasions through the remainder of this study.

Additionally, the topic addressed in this conversation—the ethical justification, if any, for attempting intercultural change agency regarding the issue of gender inequity and, more broadly, regarding any global problem occurring outside one’s personal cultural venue—engaged students in a level of critique of social institutions not previously attempted by our community. Recognizing this issue as linked directly to the ethical justification for the practice of global citizenship writ large, I seized the opportunity to re-present the idea of such intercultural intervention to my students not as an ethical given, but as a problem requiring our thoughtful critique and discourse. Indeed, my effort to involve my students in problematizing something they seemed to view uncritically as ethically appropriate drove development of this critical incident.

Critical Incident Five – Student Critique of My Global Ethic

Critical Incident Five stands out as a unique marker in the growth of a more equitable teacher-students relationship and of my efforts to promote the capacity of my students to identify a handful of global citizenship dispositions influencing our collective work as global citizenship practitioners. Indeed, this incident represented the first time I had attempted to share, elaborate upon, and explain to my students the importance of my global citizenship dispositions to my practice as a global citizen. Prior to this incident, the notion that our global citizenship practice, as expressed through our action-learning initiative, embodied some set of ethical ideals or dispositions, while implicit, was never formally broached. Thus, this sharing of aspects of my global ethic elevated the

importance of identifying and understanding global citizenship dispositions to a conscious conceptual level.

Additionally, unlike our club's examination of the question of change agency as a cultural outsider in the previous critical incident—wherein I simply posed the issue as one of generic importance to global citizenship practitioners—in this instance I was asking my students to subject my own deeply held global citizenship dispositions to student examination. In addition to encouraging epistemological partnership with my students, this opportunity for student critique delivered a powerful, if implicit, message that no one's ethical views—even those of one's teachers— should be accepted without scrutiny: that is, without engaging in critical consciousness.

This heightened level of teacher transparency in terms of my own global citizenship dispositions and my openness to student critique modeled, I believe, the type of equitable teacher-students relationship to which I aspired. My faith in the students' capabilities for integrity in their critical examination represented a further growth marker in my efforts to actualize in my pedagogical practice my newfound convictions regarding the promotion of youth voice and empowerment.

Critical Incident Six – Development of a Culture of Partnership as Foundational to the Practice of Global Citizenship

The insight derived from this final critical incident represents a kind of two-way marker: a culminating insight based on the experiences encompassing the entire study and an ideal to carry forward into future action-learning initiatives. Specifically, Critical Incident Six describes how a brief conversation with my “critical friend” for this study

triggered a powerful realization regarding the need to apply my commitment to cultivating collaborative, equitable, and empowering teacher-students relations with my own students to the relationship my students and I had thus far established with our action-learning community partners in Ethiopia. This meant fostering in my students and me a conception of our relationship with the beneficiaries of our action-learning initiatives that emphasized partnership and solidarity, recognition of the capacity of one's partners, if sufficiently empowered, to express their own interests and voice and to participate in global citizenship practice, as well as the ethical obligation to facilitate this type of relationship.

From a practical standpoint, this would mean utilizing ways of connecting with one's community partners—through videoconferencing, pen-pal letters, e-mail, website blogs, and online forums—that invite them, like my own students at SMS, to have meaningful voice and empowerment in any of the decisions of the action-learning initiative that affect them. Conceptually, such a commitment to connect with and cultivate the voice and empowerment of one's community-based, action-learning partners would mean recalibrating the emphasis placed on establishing such connections from desirable, but inessential, to a mandatory first step in embarking on one's global citizenship practice. Put in terms of my global citizenship dispositions, such an emphasis would highlight the necessity of prioritizing intersubjective ethical relations with the suffering other as a means of ensuring that their voices and faces are acknowledged and valued.

Probing Questions

After identifying the critical incidents one intends to select and probe more deeply, it is necessary to apply an analytical mechanism for conducting such an examination. In order to guide the process of analyzing such incidents, I have adopted and modified for my particular pedagogical context what Halquist (Halquist & Musanti, 2010)—drawing on several researchers including Tripp (1993)—refers to as “probing questions” (p. 451).

In the case of this study, I initially articulated a handful of prospective probing questions and proceeded to apply these questions to analysis of my selected critical incidents. These initial questions were chosen to examine one of the following areas crucial to the nurturance of a global citizenship community: the degree to which youth interests and voice were fostered; the nature of the power relationship between me as the teacher-facilitator and my student participants, with particular emphasis on whether or not, and to what degree, my students were empowered by their participation to practice global citizenship; the evolving nature of the culture of our global citizenship community, including identification of cultural values that were confirmed or challenged by the critical incident under consideration; and, lastly, the global citizenship dispositions or principles that were directly or implicitly cited and promoted. The following probing questions were then applied to each of the selected critical incidents:

1. Whose interests were served or denied by the actions of this critical incident and through what process?

2. What power relationships between me, my participating students, and any other stakeholders in our global citizenship action-learning initiative were expressed by this critical incident? To what extent were the students empowered by these relationships?
3. What does this critical incident reveal about the status of the culture of our global citizenship community? What cultural values were upheld or challenged by this critical incident?
4. What global citizenship dispositions were expressed by this critical incident?

However, after engaging in this process, I realized that there was significant overlap and interplay between the major concepts—youth interests and voice, the role of power and empowerment in our teacher-students relationship, and the culture of our global citizenship community—examined by my first three probing questions above. Consequently, I decided to merge probing questions one, two and three cited above into one single question, while retaining the probing question regarding global citizenship dispositions. In this way, I derived the following two probing questions that I used to analyze the six selected critical incidents for this study:

1. What did the actions of this critical incident reveal about the nature of our teacher-students pedagogical relationship and culture? To what extent, if any, did the pedagogical relationship/culture showcase youth voice and/or empowerment?
2. What global citizenship dispositions were expressed by this critical incident?

Definitions

For the sake of clarification, it is necessary to provide several working definitions of key terms/concepts to be utilized in my presentation of findings in the ensuing chapter.

I posit the term “stakeholder” within the context of participation in a global citizenship action-learning initiative as referring to any individual or group with a clearly identifiable positionality and set of interests. In this study the stakeholders are: me as teacher-facilitator of the SMS Global Care Club, each individual student-member of the SMS Global Care Club, the group of student members of the SMS Global Care Club, parent and community volunteers, and the students attending the Ethio-American Friendship School (EAFS). (Note: Within the context of my responses to the above probing questions, I conceive of my students as a collective or group stakeholder.)

I posit my notion of “interests” pertaining to the context of a participating stakeholder in a global citizenship action-learning initiative as:

The ability to identify for oneself or one’s stakeholder group positions, preferences, values, and conditions regarding important issues and decisions affecting oneself, one’s global citizenship community, and its action-learning initiative, accompanied by opportunities to articulate or voice these preferences within a meaningful public context.

I use the word “voice” in the above definition and throughout this study as containing the following two dimensions: the actual act of expressing one’s opinions and the sense in which these opinions are expressed with emphasis or power.

I posit my notion of “empowerment” regarding stakeholders in a global citizenship action–learning initiative as:

The power—consisting of status, choice, control, and impact—to express voice and interests regarding important issues and decisions impacting oneself, one’s global citizenship community, and its action-learning initiative, and for this input to be regarded as critical and necessary input.

It follows from this conception of power relations that empowerment is achieved by a stakeholder group when the following two conditions are met. First, the stakeholder group must be provided with a meaningful public context in which to express its views on matters of significance to its own group, the wider global citizenship community, and its action-learning initiative. Secondly, the views offered by this stakeholder must be regarded as critical and necessary input prior to any decision regarding matters of importance to that stakeholder, the wider global citizenship community, and its action-learning initiative.

I use the term “culture” to allude to those beliefs, values, practices, and norms that characterize an identifiable community. Of course, the community in question for our purposes is our global citizenship community.

Lastly, in the context of a global citizenship community, a stakeholder can claim to have some level of “ownership” when the following two conditions are met. First, the stakeholder must have a satisfactory level of voice and empowerment. Having attained this level of power, the stakeholder must accept a measure of responsibility for the focus, direction, and success of one’s global citizenship community in terms of pedagogy and

action. Thus, it is possible for a stakeholder with the power to ensure that its interests and voice are heard and considered to shirk this latter responsibility and fall short of true ownership.

Research Settings & Context

The proceeding will provide a brief overview regarding the community in which this study was undertaken, the quality and reputation of the school system and the particular school in which I was employed during this study, and the two pedagogical contexts in which I resided as an “insider”: that is, as a sixth grade teacher of global citizenship and the faculty advisor of the SMS Global Care Club. While it is important to briefly overview my role as a classroom teacher and to highlight the connection to my work as facilitator of Global Care, as well as the role of parents and colleagues in support of this community, the primary focus of this dissertation is the students who self-selected to participate in the Global Care Club, as well as our joint teacher-student efforts to form a community of conscience for the practice of global citizenship.

It is important to note that the following data regarding the community of Sunrise, Sunrise Public Schools, and Sunrise Middle School were derived from recent online demographic sources. However, in order to preserve the confidentiality of the participants in this study, I refrain from sharing specific citation information either in the body of the text or in the bibliography.

The Community of Sunrise – Socio-Economic Composition

Sunrise is an affluent, highly educated, ethnically diverse, low crime, suburban community of about 15,000 residents located about ten miles outside a major

northeastern city. As of 2009, the year in which my study began, the estimated median household income was approximately \$115,000, and the estimated median house or condo value was about \$710,000, while unemployment was below 8%. Regarding educational status, 62% of residents 25 years and over have at least a Bachelor's degree, and 33% have a graduate or professional degree. The town's racial makeup consists primarily of "whites" (63%) and "Asians" (26%), with "Hispanics" representing the next highest percentage at 7%. The "Black" or "African-American" population includes about 250 residents or fewer than 2% of the total population.

Foreign-born residents make up 29% of the population of Sunrise: 17% from Asia, 7% from Europe, and 3% from Latin America. Regarding law-enforcement and safety issues, violent crime is virtually non-existent, while burglaries and thefts represent the bulk of the criminal activity. Further, 75% of its residents are affiliated with a religious congregation, well above the national average of about 50%, with 72% adherents of the Catholic Church. By comparison to the state average, Sunrise is classified as "significantly above" the state average in: median household income, median house value, percentage of the population with a Bachelor's degree or higher, and the percentage of Hispanic and foreign born residents; even its relatively tiny percentage of African-American residents ranks above the state average.

Sunrise Public Schools

As the preceding data about Sunrise suggests, education is a highly regarded value of its residents and probably one of the central reasons why its families move there. With roughly 3,200 students attending six schools, the Sunrise Public School system

offers an outstanding educational experience, as evidenced by its exceedingly high annual statewide rankings. For example, a prominent statewide magazine ranked Sunrise High School among the top several districts in their state for both 2008 and 2010, while according to an online rating site, the Sunrise school district is rated better than 96% of statewide districts and 98% of districts nationwide. About 95% of its students, including those attending ELL classes in which English is not their native language, score at the level of “proficient” in statewide math and reading tests. This data, as well as the information about the Sunrise population supplied above, strongly suggests that the majority of students attending the Sunrise school district are well-prepared for academic success.

Sunrise Middle School (SMS)

Sunrise Middle School contains grades six to eight, with a total student population of 802 and a full-time teaching staff of 70 for the 2009-10 school year, resulting in an 11.4 students per teacher ratio. While this ratio is distorted by the fact that some full-time teachers offer specialized instruction for a handful of students, from my observations, there are typically about 20 or so students in the academic classes, a ratio I consider quite conducive to quality teaching and learning, and which makes it possible to develop a better understanding of each of one’s students.

SMS is organized by academic teams consisting of language arts, math, science and social studies teachers that solely teach the student members of their team. Global citizenship classes are not considered part of a particular academic team; rather, these

classes are integrated into the school's "integrated arts" team, consisting of classes in art, music, physical education, family life, and technology.

Grade Six Global Citizenship Classes

At the time of this action research project in 2009-10, I was employed as a teacher of global citizenship for sixth graders. (My schedule was revised to include grades seven and eight for the 2010-11 academic year.) During 2009-10, I taught 14 classes in total, spanning each of three sixth grade academic teams for the entire academic year, by teaching each team of classes every third day; in this way, I taught global citizenship to every sixth grade student with the exception of students in the special education and ELL programs. In total, I taught approximately 55 lessons with each of the students in my global citizenship classes. Given an average of between 18-20 students per class, I taught about 250 students during the 2009-2010 academic year of my study. Prior to this assignment, I was a sixth grade teacher of both language arts and reading in the Sunrise school district from 1994 through 2008.

Given the opportunity to interact with the majority of sixth grade students, my global citizenship course has had the effect of serving as a kind of conceptual orientation for participation in my Global Care extracurricular club. Thus, while my sixth grade classes provided a solid academic introduction to concepts and knowledge related to global citizenship, the Global Care Club provided the venue in which self-selecting students could participate with me in developing a community of conscience for the purpose of practicing global citizenship.

The Sunrise Middle School Global Care Club

The SMS Global Care Club is the founding student chapter of a nonprofit organization I started in February 2000 called “Global Care Unlimited, Inc.” for the purpose of promoting global citizenship in middle school youth through participation in global citizenship action-learning initiatives. At its founding, the SMS chapter was called the “Landmine Awareness Club,” based on our initial focus on the global landmine problem. Since then, the renamed “Global Care Club” has conducted multi-year, humanitarian initiatives in support of communities in Cambodia and Ethiopia.

Students from grades six to eight self-select to participate in the club, which meets in my classroom three times per week on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday mornings before school from 7:30 – 8:15 a.m., and after school as needed. Meetings take place in my classroom or a computer room, both of which are located on the second floor. Students are not required to attend all meetings; rather, they are encouraged to attend as many as possible, given their other extracurricular commitments. After-school meetings usually consist of student workshops related to the development and presentation of their educational products or organizational/planning meetings for upcoming events and presentations.

Ongoing activities and areas of focus include: engagement in educational experiences and research to select a global problem or theme and a geographic focus; establishment of partnerships with individuals, communities and non-governmental organizations capable of co-planning and implementing the on-the-ground direct services sponsored by the club; creation and delivery of educational presentations in a range of

contexts involving students, parents, and the local community; and planning, organization, and implementation of educational and/or fundraising events in support of our action or service objectives. I also typically form a Global Care Parents' Committee which provides advice and practical support regarding our major annual events, as well as outreach into the local community.

Roughly fifteen students remained committed to the club during its founding year. Since then, a range of fifteen to twenty students have maintained membership in the club for at least one academic year. Each year the previous year's eighth grade students graduate to Sunrise High School, while a new roster of sixth graders enters Sunrise Middle School. For the 2009-10 academic year, there were 17 club members who sustained regular attendance for the entire year.

Current Global Citizenship Action-Learning Initiative -- Background Context

During the academic year of this study, the focus of the SMS Global Care Club was to continue support for our ongoing global citizenship action-learning initiative dubbed, "The Ethiopian School Construction Initiative" or ESCI. This focus was established following intensive student-teacher research and discussion within the SMS Global Care Club during the 2006-2007 school year to determine a global problem and geographic focus. Eventually, our club decided to focus on the problem of access to quality education within the region of Sub-Saharan Africa. By spring 2007, the students and I developed a partnership with Ethiopian literacy advocate, Tessema Alemu, to sponsor construction of a Pre-K to Grade 10 school (Ethiopian students receive their high

school diploma following tenth grade) in Awassa, Ethiopia, to be called, “The Ethio-American Friendship School: A Global Care Partner” or EAFS.

Within the context of this focus, students developed and delivered educational presentations both within and outside SMS based on their original reflections and poems as well as their research into self-selected topics of cultural and humanitarian importance pertaining to Sub-Saharan Africa and Ethiopia. In addition to developing an educational initiative, the students and I planned and organized—with notable guidance and assistance from the Global Care Parents’ Committee—public fundraising events for the 2007-2008 school year. Ultimately, through the efforts of the Global Care student chapters and parent committees of the Sunrise and Eastwood middle schools, Global Care raised \$65,000 in one school year toward construction of a 12-room (Pre-K to Grade 8) sister school in Awassa, Ethiopia.

Despite the enormous success of our initiative, heading into the year of this study there was more work needed to support construction and other needs of our Ethiopian sister school (EAFS). In addition, the Global Care students and I expressed the determination to initiate and forge ongoing connections with students from EAFS via pen-pal letters, ultimately leading, we hope, to a trip to Ethiopia and EAFS.

It is within the context of this unfolding narrative of youth engagement in an ongoing global citizenship action-learning initiative that I conducted action research to document and assess the effectiveness of my pedagogical practices to nurture a global citizenship community at Sunrise Middle School for the cultivation of global citizenship dispositions, identity, and practice among participating youth.

Youth Participants in the Action Research Project

Student research participants included any members of the SMS Global Care Club from grades six to eight who signed assent forms and whose parents signed assent and consent forms approving of their child's participation. Student participants were expected to remain as active club participants for the entire academic year under review. "Active participation" was defined as attendance at an average of two morning meetings per week, plus participation in research, planning, and preparation for Global Care's educational and fundraising events. Action research participants were also required to keep an online reflection journal that I had access to, subject to student consent.

Before introducing the club's student members to the purpose and requirements of my study and providing them with the assent and consent forms, I decided it was necessary to provide club members with an understanding and experience of our club's history, mission, past and current initiatives, and pedagogical processes; I felt this would provide students, especially incoming sixth graders, with some basis for determining their prospective interest in participating. Given the fact, as explained above, that not every student attended every meeting, it was necessary to use significant portions of each of our club meetings during the week of October 19th to ensure that each student had the opportunity to learn about my dissertation research and my invitation for their participation.

By the time students were presented with this opportunity for participation, 17 of the 48 sixth graders and eight of the twenty two seventh and eighth graders who had attended at least one club meeting to that point had stopped attending. (An additional

seven students did not attend any of the meetings held during the week of October 19th, but did attend one or more meetings after that week. However, each of these latter students soon stopped attending the club as well.) This meant that a total of 38 club members were informed of the opportunity to participate in my action research dissertation.

Of that number, 20 students returned the necessary assent and consent forms to participate. Of these students, an additional five discontinued participation: four eventually stopped attending club meetings and one moved to another town. Consequently, a total of 15 students participated in my action research for the duration of the school year: ten sixth graders (Kevon, Gillian, Lan, Malka, Cynthia, Xavier, Sam, Rachel, Martin, and Zain), two seventh graders (Anandani and Vanessa), and three eighth graders (Bethany, Huan, and Sean). The preceding names are pseudonyms to protect the privacy of the student participants. Each of the seventh and eighth grade participants had been Global Care Club members the previous school year, while the three eighth graders had been members since sixth grade. Further, six of the participants were boys and nine were girls.

To the best of my knowledge, each of the participants experience lives of social, cultural, educational, and economic privilege reflective of the relative level of affluence of the Sunrise community outlined above. However, this privilege among adolescent youth does not necessarily translate into a predisposition or values orientation conducive to the nurturance of global citizenship dispositions. Indeed, in her focus on the affective and ethical lives of affluent adolescent youth, Levine (2008) declares that “(A)ffluent

communities excessively emphasize individualism, perfection, accomplishment, competition, and materialism, while giving short shrift to more prosocial values such as cooperation, altruism, and philanthropy” (p. 178). Further, Levine states that “preteens and teens from affluent, well-educated families . . . experience among the highest rates of depression, substance abuse, anxiety disorders, somatic complaints, and unhappiness of any group of children in this country” (p. 17). I cite Levine’s assertions not to suggest personal knowledge regarding whether or not any of my student participants had entered this study with resistance to prosocial values or mental health issues such as those listed above. However, I believe it is important to understand the types of competing pressures and social-psychological challenges with which my student participants were likely confronted.

From the standpoint of cultural, ethnic, religious, and racial identity, there was a fair degree of diversity among the student participants. For example, of the fifteen students who fulfilled the requirements for participation for the entire academic year, six had parents who were born outside of the United States (Ghana, Israel, Vietnam, and India), while five—Malka (Israel), Lan (Vietnam), Xavier (Argentina), Anandani (India), and Huan (China)—were themselves born abroad. Additionally, while I am not aware of the degree to which any of these students or their parents may have actively practiced religion, the religious heritage from which they derived included Christianity, Judaism, Hinduism (Anandani), and Buddhism (Lan). Regarding the racial makeup of the student participants, eleven were Caucasian, three were Asian (Lan, Anandani and Huan), and one was African-American (Kevon).

Data Collection and Sources

Broadly speaking, my research focus requires methods for documenting and understanding the experiences and meaning-making of a number of stakeholders, including the participating students and me, teaching colleagues, administrators, parents, and community members. However, since the central focus of my research involved the ongoing work conducted between consenting student members of the Global Care Club and me, it was of particular importance to develop collection gathering and analysis methods targeted to this focus. That is, I needed to utilize research methods that most effectively garnered and represented the efforts of the students and me to reflect upon, make meaning of, and assess our efforts to facilitate our individual growth as global citizenship practitioners and our collective growth as a global citizenship community. To this end, I employed the following data gathering methods: researcher activity log, club meeting log, researcher journal, student online journals, whole-club dialogues, videoconferences, “critical friend” conversations, and archival data regarding the history and accomplishments—past and present—of Global Care’s global citizenship action-learning initiatives. I will proceed with a brief elaboration regarding each of these methods of data gathering.

Researcher Activity Log

Throughout this study I maintained an activity log to record chronological documentation of literally every aspect of my daily experience as the teacher-facilitator of the SMS Global Care Club and coordinator for Global Care’s Ethiopian School Construction Initiative. Specifically, this log provided an accurate and comprehensive

collection and organization of the daily e-mails, phone calls, activities, conflicts, and decisions pertinent to this research, which in turn suggested topics for reflection in my researcher journal.

Club Meeting Log

Along with the activity log cited above, I maintained a log of student attendance, my meeting/lesson plans, and brief anecdotal reflections, as warranted, regarding each of my morning meetings with the SMS Global Care Club. In addition, I recorded every word students recorded on the chalkboard and white board in response to my teacher prompts or “splashes” in which students would simultaneously record their reflections. This data proved invaluable in accurately documenting the teaching strategies, student reactions, topics, problems, direction, and timeframe of our yearlong effort to nurture our community of conscience while engaging in an ongoing global citizenship action-learning initiative.

Researcher Journal

My researcher journal was the site for my more extended descriptions, reflections, and assessments regarding the major concepts, themes, and questions framing this study, with particular attention to pedagogy, process, experiences, communication, interactions, problems, decisions, and outcomes regarding my joint efforts with the student members of the SMS Global Care to form an effective global citizenship community and successful global citizenship action-learning initiative. As such, my researcher journal contained qualitative data essential for understanding and interpreting the significance and meaning of this action research.

I had no set schedule for recording my reflections. Rather, I posted reflections when compelled to do so in response to pertinent scenarios, conflicts, decisions, topics, themes, and questions. My reflections varied in length from one paragraph to multiple pages. Specifically, I posted a total of 52 reflections covering over 100 pages over the course of this 10 month study, spanning September 2009 through June 2010.

Student Online Journals

In addition to my researcher journal, my intention was for each participating student to maintain an online journal documenting his/her ongoing participation in our global citizenship action-learning initiative, as well as his/her own reflections, insights, and meaning-making efforts inspired by self and teacher prompts. I, in turn, planned on reviewing each student journal and providing written and/or oral feedback where appropriate, thereby ensuring my ongoing awareness of the issues, challenges, and topics most compelling and pertinent to the students.

Unfortunately, one shortcoming of each of the participants was their resistance to using their journal pages for this purpose on their own initiatives. In reality, the students posted four significant reflections over the course of this study. Two of these postings came in response to my teacher prompts or questions given to the students at strategic points in our global citizenship action-learning initiative during the weeks of January 13th and June 4th respectively. The other two postings resulted from student responses to club activities we had conducted between November 2009 and January 2010. The former activity involved student responses to our whole-club and independent viewing of the *Time for School* video series chronicling the experiences of children attending school for

the first time in different regions of the world. The latter reflection opportunity was in response to the students' research of global problems as members of research working groups. In each of the latter reflection scenarios, the students did not respond to a specific set of teacher questions; rather, they posted observations and reflections they deemed important.

My first teacher prompt was given to the students on January 13, 2010. My pedagogical purpose was to encourage the students to consider the importance and meaning of their participation as youth practitioners of global citizenship in our action-learning initiative on behalf of non-intimate others. To this end, I posted six prompt questions on my website and asked the students to respond to at least two of these questions. (Most students posted responses to several of the prompts.)

I posted my second and final set of eight prompt questions for the students the week of June 4, 2010. This set of questions was triggered in response to the concept of "global citizenship community" that I had broached at the end of a videoconference the Global Care Club had participated in on May 28th. The timing of this set of prompts indirectly served as a means of obtaining a year-ending reflection that provided a window into the students' understandings about the meaning of their experiences and the personal and communal growth they had experienced during the course of this study.

Whole-club Dialogues

In addition to their online journals, students were given opportunities to share and explore their reflections in the context of periodic whole-club discussions about a range of topics and issues related to our global citizenship action-learning initiative and to

major concepts of global citizenship. These dialogues differed from the online reflection journals in three basic ways. First, I introduced the topics for our dialogues and participated in the conversations as needed. Secondly, student comments were made orally and publicly, as opposed to in the privacy of their online journals. Lastly, each student's comments had the potential to directly influence the thinking and reflections of their peers.

I facilitated a total of eight whole-club dialogues during the months of February through June 2010. Each of these conversations was audiotaped and transcribed verbatim and ranged in duration from 20 to 30 minutes. I drew extensively on these conversations in two of the critical incidents selected above. In particular, whole-club dialogues provided significant content for Critical Incident Four involving change agency as a cultural outsider and Critical Incident Five regarding my sharing and my students' critique of my global ethic.

Videoconferencing Sessions

On two occasions during this study, I was able to arrange for my club members to participate in videoconferences. Each of these videoconferences was audiotaped and transcribed verbatim and lasted approximately 90 minutes.

The first conference occurred on March 26, 2010, with Dr. Caroline Malloy, who was spending the 2009-10 academic year training teachers at Kigali University in Rwanda. This conference provided my students with an extraordinary window into the culture and challenges confronting educators and students in a region of the world—Sub-

Saharan Africa—with similar problems and living conditions as those for the students and families being serviced at our Ethiopian sister school (EAFS).

The second videoconference on May 28, 2010, featured both Dr. Malloy and Tessema Alemu. This conference was made especially unique by its circumstances: Dr. Malloy, speaking from Rwanda, shared her recent experiences traveling in Ethiopia and visiting EAFS, while Mr. Alemu joined my Global Care students for the conference at SMS, where he had just arrived for a visit. These remarkable circumstances enabled my students to ask questions of both Dr. Malloy and Mr. Alemu, as well as to listen to each of them engage in direct dialogue about EAFS and Ethiopia. Both of these videoconferencing experiences provided unique forums for student expression and learning, which in turn offered me important data regarding my students and our Ethiopian sister school.

Critical Friend Conversations

In order to assist me in my ongoing evaluation of my global citizenship practice with my students during this study, I selected my academic Social Studies supervisor, Mr. Tom Gordon, to serve as my “critical friend” in this process. The selection of Mr. Gordon as my critical friend for this study was based on my high regard for his capacity to provide constructive critical feedback regarding my pedagogical practice. We conducted several such conversations during this study. The importance of one of these conversations, in particular, in prompting my growth as a global citizenship facilitator is documented in my description of Critical Incident Six in the ensuing chapter.

Archival Data

My last source of data for this action research study involved my access to a wide range of communication and documents related to all aspects of my past and present global citizenship work with the SMS Global Care Club, including mission statements, promotional materials for club events, media articles, previous students writings (reflections, stories, poems), my own published articles and writings, website documentation, and e-mail correspondence. All of this information enabled me to provide an accurate account of the history, development, and accomplishments of the global citizenship action-learning initiatives conducted by the SMS Global Care Club and its parent organization, Global Care Unlimited, Inc.

Data Analysis

In this study I apply what Tripp (1993) refers to as “socially critical analysis” to analyze the critical incidents selected for this study (p. 120). Such analysis seeks to uncover the underlying values and “social relations” occurring between participants in a particular scenario in order to derive wider implications regarding “access, autonomy and power” (Tripp, 1993, p. 120): that is, the areas of concern investigated by the probing questions I have selected to apply to my critical incidents analysis. Thus, from the perspective of socially critical analysis, the form and meaning of seemingly routine practical daily interactions occurring within socially and culturally constructed systems such as schools and classrooms are necessarily informed by sets of assumptions, values, and cultural/historical precedent so embedded within daily practice as to be rendered “invisible” even—or especially—to those who spend their days immersed within the

systems. In this way, such analysis works by recognizing or making visible those social, political, and cultural practices that create such invisibility, as well as by acknowledging the specific ways in which such embeddedness and invisibility has impacted one's own practice.

If successful, such analysis should have the effect of producing practitioner reflection and self-criticism that, in turn, can promote meaningful changes and revisions in one's own practice. Such an outcome of one's analysis aligns perfectly with the purposes of practitioner action research outlined above.

My efforts to apply socially critical analysis led me to posit a number of prospective thematic and topical approaches to my data as well as to search for connections between them. Ultimately, this cyclical and interactive dialogue between my data and the thematic concepts they presented led me to adopt an analytic focus on the overarching themes of my teacher-students pedagogical relationship, youth voice and empowerment, our global citizenship culture, and global citizenship dispositions as expressed through the probing questions cited above. In this way, I concluded that the linkage of critical incident methodology with socially critical analysis best served my analytical purposes.

My Positionality as a Researcher

Since practitioner action research and critical incidents methodology are focused so intimately upon the evolving values, perspectives, and insights of the particular practitioner conducting the data collection and analysis, it is imperative that he share whatever information about himself that may be deemed as orienting or providing a

subjective element to the lens by which he derives his insights and conclusions. With this responsibility in mind, it is necessary to remind the reader of such particular aspects of my personal and professional experiences and outlook that could influence my practitioner research lens.

Regarding personal/biographical influences, I am a white male of approximately fifty years of age. I am a husband and a father of two children adopted from Ethiopia. As a child, I was raised and attended public school in a middle-class, suburban community in the same county as the school in which this present study was conducted. Both of my parents can be described as educational professionals, with my father having attained the status of full professor at a public college in the local major city. My undergraduate degree was in Philosophy, and I have carried with me a keen interest in ethical issues throughout my adulthood, with a special emphasis on problems of social justice.

At the time of this study, I had taught for approximately 20 years in public school settings. My first four years I taught language arts at a primary school in an extremely underprivileged section of the nearby major city. My last 15 years have been spent teaching language arts and, most recently, global citizenship, at the middle school which served as the site of this study. In addition to these classroom experiences, I founded a middle school club in 1996 called Heroes of Conscience that evolved several years later into the Landmine Awareness Club and, in turn, into the Global Care Club. Each of these incarnations is connected by the common mission of promoting opportunities to nurture global citizenship in middle school youth. I have been facilitating educational and/or

action-learning initiatives since the 1997-98 school year. To provide organization and support to these efforts, I formed the non-profit organization called Global Care Unlimited, Inc.

Criteria for Determining Validity

Herr and Anderson (2005) offer five criteria for determining the quality or “validity” of an action research study: “the generation of new knowledge, the achievement of action-oriented outcomes, the education of both researcher and participants, results that are relevant to the local settings, and a sound and appropriate research methodology” (p. 54). I will now briefly list and outline the authors’ five criteria for evaluating the success of a given action research study and attempt to explicate in what ways their criteria may be useful in evaluating the trustworthiness of my own action research.

Process Validity

Herr and Anderson (2005) posit dialogic or “process validity” to indicate the need for data to be derived from a “series of reflective cycles that include the ongoing problematization of the practices under study” (p. 55). As part of this process, the authors assert that such reflection “should include looping back to reexamine underlying assumptions behind problem definition” (Herr and Anderson, 2005, p. 55). In addition to ensuring the ongoing use of reflective cycles, the authors suggest the use of “triangulation”: that is, “the inclusion of multiple perspectives” as a means of guarding against the tendency to view data through a single favorable lens (Herr and Anderson,

2005, p. 56). Such safeguards, the authors believe, can ensure the production of truly authentic knowledge.

In this study, my researcher journal provided the major site where I posted my efforts to understand, problematize, and analyze the ways in which my personal and professional values and assumptions as an educator, researcher, and aspiring global citizen may have influenced my practice with students. The accuracy of my data was ensured through maintenance of my researcher activity log (which notated all daily activities related to our action-learning initiative) as well as by my club meeting log, which described the purpose, procedures, and activities of each of the ninety club meetings held during this study. To ensure that the perspectives and voices of the participating students were documented accurately and fully, I developed both written and oral systems for collecting such data, including the creation of an online journal page on our club website for each participating student, as well as by audiotaping and transcribing eight whole-club dialogues and two videoconferences. Taken collectively, this range of data collection methods satisfied, in my view, the authors' requirements of the continual reexamination of data, and the need for multiple perspectives and multiple methods of deriving them.

Outcome Validity

The authors posit the notion of "outcome validity" to determine whether or not an action research study fostered and achieved action pertinent to the question or problem of the study (Herr and Anderson, 2005, p. 55). From the authors' perspective, successful outcomes are achieved not by whether or not a problem has been resolved, but by the

extent to which the ongoing cycle of research “forces the researcher to reframe the problem in a more complex way, often leading to a new set of questions or problems,” which, in turn, promotes “the spiraling dynamic that characterizes the process of most action research over a sustained period of inquiry” (Herr and Anderson, 2005, p. 55). The use of reflective journals by the teacher-researcher and the students, as well as ongoing teacher-students conversations regarding both the process and outcomes of the global citizenship action-learning initiative documented in this dissertation, provided excellent resources for encouraging development of new and evolving sets of questions and problems, requiring, in turn, new instantiations or cycles of proactive inquiry.

Catalytic Validity

For Herr and Anderson (2005), “catalytic validity” profiles the “transformative potential of action research” by mapping the extent to which all research participants, including the researcher herself, “deepen their understanding of the social reality under study and (are) moved to some action to change it (or to reaffirm their support of it)” (p. 56). The authors cite journaling as a central means of chronicling these anticipated insights, awakenings, and/or transformations of thought and perspective (Herr and Anderson, 2005, p. 56-7). I believe such personal and group transformations were well-documented in this study by journaling, whole-club discussions, and the breadth of other data-gathering methodologies cited above.

Democratic Validity

“Democratic validity” seeks to examine “the extent to which research is done in collaboration with all parties who have a stake in the problem under investigation” as

well as the depth and breadth of this collaboration (Herr and Anderson, 2005, p. 56). The point of this checkpoint is to ensure that the “multiple perspectives and material interests” of all stakeholders and those impacted by a given study are given voice and duly considered in evaluating the study’s success (Herr and Anderson, 2005, p. 56). This criterion also requires that the focus of the study be on those local participants impacted directly by it. As with process validity, the use of a wide range of methods for obtaining the reflections of all stakeholders supported the democratic and multi-voiced nature of my study.

Dialogic Validity

Lastly, Herr and Anderson (2005) posit “dialogic validity” to capture the importance of the researcher engaging in some form of informal accreditation process that provides a degree of professional assessment or “peer review” regarding his study. The authors list several methods for engaging in ongoing evaluation, such as participation “in critical and reflective dialogue with other action researchers or work with a critical friend who is familiar with the setting and can serve as devil’s advocate for alternative explanations of research data” (Herr and Anderson, 2005, p. 57). For the purpose of engaging in such analysis, I identified a site-based critical friend, as noted above, to support the ongoing critique of my doctoral committee.

Limitations of the Study

The uniqueness of the process and research methodology employed in this study contains inherent limitations on the capacity to generalize my conclusions to other sites. This notion of uniqueness encompasses the contextual particularities of the setting, the

relationship between the student participants and me as the practitioner-researcher, as well as those attributes of personality and experience unique to all people. However, it is both my hope and belief that my efforts to provide thick description and meaningful analysis can enable, to some degree, the transfer of important aspects of the knowledge, conclusions, and insights derived from my study to the sites of fellow educators.

Significance of the Study

This study is significant in that it attempts to address a number of gaps in the scholarly literature regarding service-learning—or what I refer to as global citizenship action-learning—and pedagogical practices aimed at nurturing global citizenship awareness and practice among early adolescents. Indeed, my research could find no study that offered a comprehensive examination of any aspect of global citizenship pedagogy and practice among middle school youth. This study provides a constructive step toward filling this research gap by providing rich description and analysis regarding my joint efforts with my students to create a global citizenship community and culture within the context of an action-learning initiative.

Further, much of this description is dominated by the presence and voices of my student participants, as derived through the range of data sources cited above. This emphasis on obtaining and sharing youth voice addresses another glaring gap in the scholarly research regarding service-learning and global citizenship pedagogy: the virtual absence of any serious description of the experiences of youth—in particular, of early adolescents—as understood and articulated by the participating youth themselves.

Finally, this study also offers valuable suggestions and insights to prospective global citizenship action-learning facilitators regarding some of the pitfalls, conflicts and tension-points that practitioners can expect to encounter while working with early adolescents on developing a global citizenship community. In conclusion, I believe my study offers a unique experiential and conceptual window into the daunting yet rewarding pedagogical and interpersonal challenges likely to confront any teacher-facilitator who embraces the mission of nurturing global citizenship identity and practice among middle school youth.

Chapter Five: Findings and Discussion

The purpose of this chapter is to share my findings related to the data derived from those critical incidents outlined in the preceding chapter. The major overarching categories I selected for analysis are the nature of my teacher-students pedagogical relationship and culture, and global citizenship dispositions connected to global citizenship practice. Within the category involving my teacher-students relationship and culture, I have included the following topics: control over the epistemological process, curriculum and agenda, decision-making protocol, teacher transparency or visibility, values, voice, and empowerment.

This analysis is organized using critical incidents methodology in the following manner. First, for each critical incident, I will offer descriptions of the micro-incidents or *episodes* that constitute the critical incident. Then I will present my analysis of each critical incident using the two probing questions discussed in the preceding chapter.

Before beginning this process, I would like to foreshadow three linked and overarching thematic directions that will be addressed in my analysis of the foregoing critical incidents. First, these incidents trace an evolutionary arc in my values and priorities as a teacher-facilitator, as I navigated the tension between my initial emphasis on the programmatic aspects of our action-learning initiative—as revealed by my insistence on our following a particular process for conducting our action-learning initiative and my focus on achievement of our initiative’s tangible, quantifiable objectives regarding fundraising, public presentations, etc.—and of my emerging emphasis on the

need to promote the voice and empowerment of the students within the pedagogical and action-learning process.

A second connecting theme of my analysis, linked inextricably to the theme cited above, involved the evolving nature of my relationship with my students. Initially, my lack of familiarity with the personalities, capabilities, and commitment levels of the students promoted my propensity to practice a more traditional teacher-students relational dynamic in which important decisions regarding pedagogy and decision-making resided within my purview. This hierarchical type of relationship tended to reinforce my valuation of the programmatic aspects of the action-learning initiative.

Conversely, as my relationship with my students gained in understanding and trust, I demonstrated a capacity to minimize or even sacrifice my valuation of the programmatic elements of our initiative in lieu of my efforts to nurture a more collaborative and equitable teacher-students relationship emphasizing students' voice, empowerment, and ownership regarding all aspects of our initiative. Indeed, the type of collaborative and empowering pedagogical relationship that my students and I were moving toward by the completion of this study undoubtedly prepared me to internalize the culminating personal insight of the study: the necessity to establish an equitable and empowering relationship between all participating parties—grounded in the global citizenship disposition of intersubjective ethical relations discussed in Chapter Two—as the starting foundation for any global citizenship action-learning initiative aimed at connecting to the face and voice of the distant, non-intimate other. Essentially, the findings contained in this chapter use my selected critical incidents to document the joint

relational journey my students and I undertook to develop such intersubjective ethical relations between each other.

A third thematic thread follows directly from my foregoing analysis: that is, the ethical responsibility of a teacher to attempt to make visible or transparent to his students the existence of a culture of power traditionally favoring teachers, the teacher's own beliefs and positions, and the ways in which these factors impact the students' capacity for expressing voice and empowerment. Indeed, given the predominant pedagogical experience of children as the more passive recipients of choices made by teachers and administrators on their behalf, it would be difficult for both teachers and students to be able to see beyond the entrenched normalcy of such a daily cultural practice. Thus, a major conceptual lens through which this study can be understood is through identifying and charting the ways in which teacher power and transparency are recognized, acknowledged, and negotiated between the students and me.

With these overriding thematic threads in mind, I proceed to describe and analyze my six selected critical incidents.

Critical Incident One: Traditional/Hierarchical vs. Collaborative/Equitable

Teacher-Students Relationship in Our Decision-Making Process

Episode One

9/21/09 – Phone Conversation with Colleague – Considerations for Facilitation of a Culture for Global Citizenship Community

Eleven days prior to my first meeting of the 2009-10 academic year with the SMS Global Care Club, I received a thought-provoking phone call from a teacher colleague

working in another district, Frank Logan. (The previous year, with my assistance, Mr. Logan had organized his own Global Care chapter for the purpose of helping us raise funds towards construction of the Ethio-American Friendship School or EAFS.) Mr. Logan explained that he had spent the first three weeks of the school year with his problem-solving class reading *Three Cups of Tea* about the remarkable efforts of an American, Greg Mortenson, to construct public schools in Pakistan and Afghanistan; the students, in turn, had expressed an interest in organizing a fundraiser for Mortensen's organization. Given Mr. Logan's commitment to assisting our club in raising funds for EAFS, he expressed unease about how to—and whether he should—redirect the students' authentic energy regarding Mortenson's school-building project to our Ethiopian School Construction Initiative.

In responding, I offered what I deemed to be an appropriate level of objective detachment. That is, I tried to work with him to consider what would be best for Mr. Logan and his students, apart from my interest in his support of our action-learning initiative. Regarding the issue of connecting his problem solving class to his Global Care chapter, I stated that he needed to consider the culture of his class. How did he want decisions in his class to be made regarding matters such as the potential beneficiaries of action/service? Did he see this decision as separate from or connected to his own Global Care club? Certainly, I told him, he could make the connection between learning about Mortensen's work in building schools for girls in Pakistan and Afghanistan and Global Care's current Ethiopian school-building initiative.

However, my efforts to assist Mr. Logan in his own dilemma served to highlight a similar conflict I had been feeling about the culture of my own global citizenship community at SMS, specifically in regards to our club's decision-making processes. A number of questions leapt to mind. To what extent should youth—in particular, early adolescents—be empowered to voice their opinions and participate in decision-making regarding the above? Should some decisions of this nature necessarily be the teacher's alone? In a multi-year initiative such as ours, should certain decisions lay exclusively with the teacher and any students who have been part of the process from its inception?

These questions, in turn, suggested additional concerns touching upon related but wider aspects of our global citizenship community and the nature of the teacher-students relationship that grounds it. Whose interests should be served and how? Under what conditions and to what extent should a teacher attempt to assert her own interests or agenda? How should a global citizenship community determine its shared values, dispositions, mission, norms, and practices? How should the power that necessarily devolves onto the lone adult member of such a community, the teacher-facilitator, be mediated to maximize the voice and power of participating youth?

The conversation and questions cited above also tapped into my growing conviction that the core values and beliefs adopted by people to motivate and justify their ethical, social, economic, and political actions are fostered to a significant degree by the beliefs, values, practices, and norms of the culture in which these views are formed and nurtured. This, in turn, led to my belief that culture plays a central role—perhaps the central role—in the formation of ethical, social, and political sensibilities and

dispositions. This analysis suggested to me that one of my primary responsibilities as the teacher-facilitator for a global citizenship action-learning initiative conducted with middle school youth is to develop and articulate, in collaboration with my students, the values, dispositions, norms, and practices best conducive to the promotion of an effective global citizenship community.

Taken collectively, the preceding reflection and questions helped to crystallize an overarching analytical focus for this dissertation: What type of teacher-students relationship and culture would best nurture the development of global citizenship dispositions, youth voice, and empowerment within the context of our global citizenship community?

My resolution of the preceding questions did not represent merely an academic exercise; rather, these issues tied directly to the first major decision our global citizenship community—the SMS Global Care Club—would have to make: whether or not to continue our action-learning focus on supporting and sponsoring EAFS. A strong part of me felt that while we had accomplished a great deal over the previous two years of this initiative—having raised roughly \$80,000 to sponsor construction of a 12-classroom block for Pre-K to Grade eight, as well as the purchase of a school bus—we needed to do more. Based on ongoing discussions with our Ethiopian action-learning partner, Tessema Alemu, I had internalized a goal of sponsoring construction of one more wing of four to six rooms to enable students attending EAFS to complete Grade 10 and obtain the Ethiopian equivalent of a high school diploma. Wouldn't failure to persevere towards completion of this objective represent abandonment of an implicit commitment the

students and I had made to empower the EAFS students to complete their secondary school education?

However, if I merely imposed or announced this objective for the new academic year, without consultation with the current club members—most of whom were new to the club—what would this indicate about the culture of the global citizenship community I was trying to cultivate? What would such an action reveal about the level of student voice and ownership I hoped to encourage or about the students' role in the decision-making processes within our global citizenship community?

To highlight this dilemma, none of the current middle school club members had been present during the 2006-07 academic year when the club had decided, after a full year of research and debate, to partner with Mr. Alemu on our Ethiopian school construction project. Further, only our three eighth graders (Bethany, Huan, and Sean) had been club members during our project kickoff year in 2007-2008. By sharp contrast, as of the third meeting of the current academic year, 53 students—44 sixth graders and nine seventh graders—were currently involved in the club for the first time. (That number would drop significantly, as expected, once the upcoming research phase was initiated.)

In summary, the question of whether or not to continue our focus on school construction in Ethiopia distilled, for me, into the following questions. First, would it be fair to require or mandate that students involved with the Global Care club this year—in particular, new club members—participate in an initiative or address a global problem (access to quality primary and secondary school education) not of their choosing? To

what extent should a teacher be guided by the momentum and interests of his current student members as opposed to promoting or defending an agenda developed by and inherited from previous students? Further, what would be a way of resolving this issue that embodied the type of global citizenship culture and community I wished to cultivate?

Episode Two

10/12/09 – “The Seed That Grows Throughout Life” - Students’ Views of the Value of Education

My recognition of the complexity of the issues and questions surrounding the impending decision of whether or not to continue our current action-learning initiative had a direct impact on the agenda of our fourth club meeting on October 12th. After using the first three meetings to engage the students in activities and discussion aimed at introducing them broadly to the concept of global citizenship, I used the fourth club meeting to introduce an “essential” question aimed at eliciting student brainstorming and reflection regarding the critical importance of education in empowering all people to recognize and achieve their potential.

Specifically, I posted on the white board the following question: “What is the value of education in enabling people to thrive?” I justified the introduction of this question by placing it within the larger context of our current research focus on access to education in Sub-Saharan Africa embedded in our current Ethiopian School Construction Initiative. In this way, I hoped students would be able to draw upon these reflections when I did decide to broach the issue of project focus and decision-making.

The attending students provided a number of thoughtful written “splash” responses to my focus question that suggested a wide range of motivations and benefits of school attendance. (I use the term “splash” to refer to having students share their opinions by writing simultaneously on my chalkboard and white board.) Among these responses, the practical application of knowledge for professional self-advancement and the other-focused use of knowledge to practice global citizenship vied for supremacy.

Self-oriented responses focused on obtaining the practical knowledge and skills necessary for future employment, economic security, and expansion of one’s own life opportunities. Statements such as, “(G)etting education makes more options of jobs in the future” and “(E)ducation enables you to survive by yourself” articulated the emphasis on future employment and security, while the broadening of opportunities was captured by statements such as, “(E)ducation gives you more life options.”

The other-focused orientation emerged, as well, through postings that conceived of education as a pathway for making a positive difference in the world by helping and educating others. Interestingly, these students did not distinguish between such self-focused and other-focused interests in education; rather, they asserted that the former enabled the latter. For one student, this linkage followed a linear path: “Education helps you have a job . . . then you can help others. . . . Doctors save lives.” By contrast, the handful of other students who shared this perspective articulated this linkage in ways that were not sequential, but concurrent. Thus, for one sixth grader, “Education allows people, like us, (to) educate others and ourselves about world problems.” Or, as another sixth grader, Malka, wrote, “Education gives us the power to help ourselves and others.”

This conception of education as cultivating the voice and empowerment of both self and, by extension, others—potentially including distant, non-intimate others—throughout the educative process, as well as the notion that, for global citizens, education constitutes a lifelong commitment apart from the external demands of coursework and degrees, reflects the conception of education that I hoped to nurture and cultivate within my students. Thus, in a real sense, the denial of access to quality education restricts not only the voice and empowerment of the deprived child, but the capacity of that child to participate in the global citizenship practice of empowering others.

This sense that education, like dignity or life itself, holds within it both potentiality and vulnerability was poignantly addressed by Anandani, a seventh grade student who had been a club member the previous year: “Education is the seed that grows throughout life. You are born with the seed(.) and if you water it and take care of it, it grows, but if you don’t, it remains a seed and just a seed.” Or, put succinctly by Huan, “Education gives people hope.”

Thus, a systemic denial of education, i.e., the failure to create sustainable societal institutions supportive of universal education, is the nursery of the de-voiced, the de-faced, the disempowered and the hopeless. Global citizens must find this condition ethically, socially, and politically intolerable; it appeared from their comments that my students shared that sense of moral outrage. Consequently, this affirmation by my students of the importance of education to human dignity and potential established the ethical legitimacy for my proceeding to introduce the question regarding the continuance of our current action-learning initiative.

Episode Three

10/16/09 – “We’re Not Done in Ethiopia” – The Decision to Continue with Our Current Action-Learning Initiative

After using the fifth club meeting to share my experiences and photos from my visit to Ethiopia and our sponsored school, EAFS, in December 2008/January 2009, I felt the students would be sufficiently knowledgeable regarding our action-learning initiative to use the ensuing club meeting to participate in the decision-making process regarding its continuance. I hoped that the preceding couple of meetings had provided my students with sufficient awareness and understanding of our current initiative to offer their enthusiastic support for its continuance. Indeed, their responses to our discussion about the value of education as described in Episode Two and my subsequent sharing of my visit to Ethiopia and EAFS, gave me confidence regarding the outcome of our decision. But, from a standpoint of promoting youth voice and empowerment, I felt it was critical that I broach this issue as a question requiring student feedback, reflection, and approval to justify proceeding with this initiative, as opposed to initiating a new one. However, I was not clear how I would react if the students surprised me and expressed a desire to begin an alternative project.

Before addressing this issue, I wanted the students to hear their responses regarding the value of education as outlined in Episode Two. So, I projected the students’ splash reflections on the overhead television screen under several headings—Nurturing Human Potential, Awareness of Global Problems, Making a Difference, Knowledge & Decision-Making, Future Employment/Success, Expands Life

Choices/Options, Helping Others, and Hope—and read their reflections aloud. I then stated the decision that had to be made, explained my reasons for wanting to continue our focus on EAFS, and told the students I needed them to splash their opinions on the matter.

Specifically, I offered three central arguments for its continuance. First, I reinforced my staunch agreement with the students' own stance regarding the critical value of education, as indicated by their own splash comments from the club's fourth meeting. Secondly, I reminded the students of the implicit commitment our club had made over the course of the preceding two years of this initiative to try to sponsor the construction of classrooms through the high school level in order to provide the attending Ethiopian students with a single site at which they could obtain their high school diploma. Lastly, I stated that one of the core benefits of sponsoring this school was that it enabled the students from both SMS and EAFS to develop connections via pen-pal correspondence and, hopefully, via videoconferencing.

Ultimately, then, my pedagogical decisions framed the decision to my students as one in which I carried a strong vested interest in its continuance. Therefore, in reality, I was asking my students whether or not they supported my stance of wanting to continue this initiative.

The students' splash responses were universally enthusiastic and insistent regarding their wish to continue our focus. In expressing their perspective, the students cited three core reasons that mirrored those I had offered just before they had posted their responses: the desire to encourage the capabilities and potential of the EAFS students,

the ethical obligation to honor our commitment to complete the task of supporting construction of a high school at EAFS, and the importance of sustaining and promoting our student-to-student connection.

The importance of nurturing the capabilities of the EAFS students was implied by a student who proclaimed that “(i)t seems a shame that students have to stop learning in Grade 8.” Another student cited the importance of supporting the aspirations of the EAFS students more concretely by asserting, “(i)f some of the kids want to go to college, we should help them all the way.”

The students expressed their sense of ethical obligation and commitment through their use of linguistic imperatives such as: “We still *need* to continue”; “We made a commitment to them (the students of EAFS) and we *can’t* let them down”; “We can’t just stop out of nowhere”; and “We are not done!” For Anandani, the author of this latter assertion, the need to continue encompassed more than the sponsorship of the physical structure of the classrooms: “(w)e still need to get them better supplies and better ways to study. We need . . . computers, more textbooks, art paper, markers. We also need good lights (electricity) in the school.”

Lastly, sixth grader, Rachel, reminded us that our perceived obligation and commitment to complete our goal of sponsoring a high school wing and, through this, to cultivate the potential of the EAFS students, was grounded in our burgeoning relationship with these students, as initiated by the previous year’s pen-pal exchange. Rachel asserted this position by insisting that “(W)e *must* keep our connection with the Ethiopian kids.”

The students' clarity and passion in voicing their unqualified and unanimous support for continuing our Ethiopian School Construction Initiative, based on their sense of ethical obligation and interpersonal connection toward the EAFS students, alleviated my lingering concerns about the issue of our action/service focus and the process by which we had selected it. I was particularly heartened by the sense of project ownership for this multi-year initiative expressed by students who had only begun attending our club for the first time during the prior two weeks. Indeed, if one accepted the students' support as authentic and not unduly influenced by my own statement of preference, one could discern a hint of their recognition of the primacy of establishing intersubjective ethical relations in response to the call of the other, as embodied in the students of EAFS.

Critique of Critical Incident One

Probing Question One

What did the actions of this critical incident reveal about the nature of our teacher-students pedagogical relationship and culture? To what extent, if any, did the pedagogical relationship/culture showcase youth voice and/or empowerment?

This critical incident revealed a clear tension within me between the practice of a traditional/hierarchical teacher-students relationship and my desire to nurture a more collaborative and empowering relationship featuring teacher transparency and emphasizing opportunities for the authentic expression of youth interests, voice, and empowerment in the areas of curriculum, agenda-setting, epistemology, and decision-making. In retrospect, it appears that my resolution to this quandary was to foster active youth participation and ownership in the epistemological process in which we conducted

our search for knowledge and “truth” within our club discussions, while maintaining my complete grip on the curriculum and agenda, i.e., the issues, questions, and content to be discussed and processed. A review of the six club meetings used to reach a decision regarding the continuation of our current initiative reveals that students were given ample opportunity to derive and articulate their own views and positions regarding the topics I had introduced at each meeting—including the decision to continue our current initiative—through the use of the splash technique described above and through teacher-students dialogue. However, control of the content of our curriculum and agenda, as well as the order in which this content was introduced from meeting to meeting, was within my strict purview. Indeed, these areas of teacher power and control were reinforced unconsciously at each meeting in which I inhabited my role as teacher in the way described above, with the implicit permission of my students. Thus, the wider societal norms and conditions that promote teacher power vis-à-vis one’s students were reenacted as part of the cultural practice of our global citizenship community.

The pedagogical process described above highlights the importance of examining the notion of teacher transparency or visibility regarding both one’s relative power advantage in relation to one’s students, as well as the degree to which one feels compelled to share or withhold from one’s students significant areas of personal perspective, opinion, or stance regarding matters that impact the community’s shared pedagogy and action-learning initiative. In this case, my decision to hide my inner conflict and my assumed power over curricular and agenda choices, as well as to refrain from sharing my strong preference for continuation of our current action-learning

initiative until the meeting at which the students were asked to offer their stance regarding this decision, deprived my students of *authentic* participation in a major decision impacting their experience in our global citizenship community. Indeed, it is highly unlikely that I would have accepted a decision by the students to demand the initiation of a new action-learning initiative without offering an intense challenge to the wisdom of such a preference. Thus, while student feedback affirming my stance was accepted by me with gratitude and relief, an opposing student decision might not have been accepted as a decision at all; more likely, it would have initiated one or more follow-up discussions before I might even consider abandoning the current initiative.

Within the context of this critical incident, the complete control I maintained regarding the curriculum, agenda, and decision-making process, coupled with my lack of transparency regarding my interiority, revealed a clear traditional/hierarchical approach to my relationship with the students at this beginning stage of our connection. What accounts for my adoption of such a traditional teacher-students pedagogical relationship, especially given my desire to encourage youth participation in our global citizenship community? Several explanations seem likely.

Perhaps the most overriding explanation involves the depth of the personal commitment I had developed to achieving the programmatic objective of sponsoring construction of a high school wing at EAFS, as well as my linkage of the attainment of this objective with the strengthening of the student-to-student relationship between our club and EAFS. In one sense, I can argue that my commitment to the ethical responsibility and relational connection between our global citizenship community and

EAFS foreshadowed the conviction I derived by the end of this study regarding the foundational primacy of establishing intersubjective ethical relations between the participants in an action-learning initiative. However, the strength of my desire to succeed at sponsoring this last wing of classrooms testifies to the higher level of valuation in which I held achievement of the practical objectives of our initiative over the less tangible objectives of improving the collaborative aspects of our teacher-students relationship.

Another incentive for maintaining teacher control over the curriculum and agenda involved the lack of a strong teacher-students relationship at this beginning portion of the school year. While it is true that there were a handful of returnees from the preceding academic year, as well as three eighth grade students who had been involved in the club since sixth grade, the bulk of the students attending the initial club meetings were sixth grade newcomers. Additionally, as any middle school teacher can attest, the developmental growth and changes that can occur within an early adolescent over the summer separating academic years can influence a student's priorities, attitudes, and values from one year to the next. Consequently, for a middle school teacher-facilitator, each new academic year always requires adjustments in the teacher-student relationship. Thus, despite the presence of student-returnees to the club, a sense of mutual trust and connection was still necessary to develop.

To review, it would appear that the real tension I faced in this critical incident involved how to foster development of a culture indicative of a global citizenship community, while concurrently controlling the curriculum and agenda of our club

meetings to such a degree as to virtually assure the concurrence of my students with my own preference towards continuation of the Ethiopian initiative. I seemed to have two parallel objectives that did not allow for intersection; I could either nurture youth interests, voice, and empowerment, and risk that they might use their empowerment to nix my preferred resolution to the issue of continuing our current initiative, or I could maintain sufficient control over the curriculum to foster the high likelihood of my students' concurrence with my position.

This “either/or” perspective on my part forestalled my capacity to recognize alternative ways of addressing this conflict in a more transparent way that might have honored both my desire to continue our initiative and my presumed belief in nurturing the voice and empowerment of my students. In retrospect, the following alternative scenarios may have accomplished a more “both/and” approach to this dilemma.

One approach might have involved sharing the above conflict and asking my students to consider the following two questions: “Who should rightfully participate in making the decision of whether or not to continue our current initiative?” and “What process should we use to make this decision?” These questions would have encouraged an airing out of our respective views and concerns, while concurrently inviting shared responsibility regarding both the decision-making process and the consequences of that decision. Of course, a significant role and opportunity for youth voice and empowerment in such a process would be assumed. This type of process would truly honor a commitment to nurturing youth voice and empowerment that I believe is foundational to

the nurturance of global citizenship dispositions in youth participants and of a constructive global citizenship community culture.

Alternatively, I could have handled this conflict by being open with my students regarding this conflict and informing them of my decision to continue this initiative, as well as the supporting reasons for this decision. My ethical rationale for making this unilateral decision would revolve around the access I had—given my intimate involvement in the formation and implementation of this initiative since its inception in spring 2006—to a deeper and wider understanding of the background, purposes, and direction of our current initiative and that my unique role as teacher, facilitator, and guardian of this initiative warranted my ethical power to make this decision. While such an approach would deny the voice and empowerment of my students to influence my decision, it would presumably open up a dialogue regarding the critical issue of the appropriate uses of power regarding all aspects of our global citizenship community. Further, I would hope that sharing my inner conflict and rationale for my decision would model a level of teacher transparency vis-à-vis my students that would lead to a greater sense of mutual understanding and trust.

In conclusion, my analysis of Critical Incident One reveals an inner conflict between the values that I claimed to believe regarding the promotion of student voice and empowerment as prospective global citizenship practitioners and my desire to achieve a particular result: in this case, student support for continuation of the Ethiopian School Construction Initiative. In fact, it would appear that, at the time of Critical Incident One, I valued attainment of a particular objective—funding a high school wing for EAFS—

over facilitation of a truly empowering pedagogical process for my students. As described above, the power inequity I enjoyed vis-à-vis my students enabled me to achieve my desired outcome without external conflict. However, as I became more aware of the potentially corrosive nature of such implicit teacher-student power relations, I eventually began to find ways of challenging the nature of this relationship: ways that would use my status and power in a more collaborative and equitable manner with the students.

Probing Question Two

What global citizenship dispositions were promoted and/or expressed by this critical incident?

Encompassing aspects of the first six club meetings of the academic year, this critical incident occurs too early in the study to facilitate the development of significant understanding or linkages between the types of global citizenship dispositions discussed in Chapter Two above. Consequently, regarding global citizenship dispositions, these meetings served primarily to raise and elicit an initial suggestion of such dispositions. Nevertheless, the opportunities for student voice during the splash activities and follow-up discussions provided evidence of the students' awareness of a range of global citizenship dispositions.

The most obvious dispositions articulated by my students included the promotion of human capabilities and their desire to offer compassionate intervention to address the human needs of suffering others: in this case, the educational needs of the EAFS students. My students' concern for nurturing the educational capabilities of the EAFS

students also infers an awareness of education as a fundamental human need, the denial of which violates the sufferer's dignity and right to justice, thereby triggering empathy and empathic extension for those suffering from this denial. In addition, as stated above, several students linked the attainment of satisfactory education as a necessary source of empowerment for promoting the future global citizenship practice of the EAFS students.

Further, Rachel's assertion above regarding the importance of connecting with the EAFS students suggests at least a tacit recognition that such interconnections contained an implicit ethical responsibility between the parties. That is, the burgeoning interdependence and interconnection fostered by promoting ongoing awareness of the subjectivity of both sets of students, i.e., awareness of the unique cultural, racial, ethnic, and experiential components of each of the student groups, as well as of their individual preferences, needs, and personalities, necessarily elevates the ethical component of the parties towards one another—a global citizenship disposition and process I refer to as intersubjective ethical relations in my discussion of my global ethic above.

Critical Incident Two: Values Conflict Between Youth Empowerment and Task Completion

Background

After making the decision to continue with the Ethiopian School Construction Initiative as our action-learning focus, the next task of our community was to enhance the students' awareness and understanding of the central global problem addressed by our initiative: the lack of access to quality education faced by millions of school age children. To this end, in early November I had introduced a documentary video series

called *Time for School* which profiled the obstacles encountered by children from different countries and continents attending school over a six year time period. I had also introduced the students to the “Citizens of the World” website I had just created that they would be using to post their research findings and reflections.

After several weeks of this task, I deemed the students ready to engage in research regarding topics related to the above global problem. Our collective goal—agreed upon through collaborative discussion in earlier meetings—was to create an educational presentation about the global problem of access to education and our own action-learning initiative to audiences both in school and in the local community. The intended format for our presentation would be a “gallery tour,” whereby attendees toured each of the students’ educational products simultaneously. At this initial stage, this commitment to research meant that each member, independently or with partners, needed to identify a research topic, conduct sufficient research on that topic, and develop an educational product as a way of sharing this newfound global citizenship knowledge with others.

Given this new focus on research, the format and purpose of the club meetings took on a new pedagogical structure that conformed to the students’ needs. This involved providing mini-lessons as well as brief whole-club meetings, chats, and pep-talks as needed; but primarily, this workshop structure involved students conducting research and product creation, while I conducted ongoing teacher-student conferencing.

I knew that the tasks outlined above would require a substantial commitment of time and effort on the part of the students to ensure completion of quality educational products in a timely fashion. Indeed, the pressure to succeed at this task was significantly

heightened by a commitment I had made on behalf of the club to deliver six educational presentations over the course of a single school day encompassing the entire student body. Since this event would occur on January 15th, the club and I had about two months to complete our research, create educational products, and organize these into a presentation.

Unfortunately, over the next three plus weeks, the students and I came to realize that not enough of the students would be ready to present completed educational products by the January 15th presentation date that I had arranged. Compounding the urgency of this situation, our club had been given a truly extraordinary opportunity to profile our campaign and achieve our funding objectives: thanks to the remarkable efforts of a local Sunrise citizen, the global sports icon, Earvin “Magic” Johnson, had agreed to visit Sunrise on January 24th—a mere nine days after our January 15th school presentation date—to support our action-learning initiative. Clearly, it was imperative that our club be prepared with its presentation for use on each of these dates.

To resolve this problem, the students and I had collaborated over several club meetings to clarify and revise the manner of our research, as well as the format and content of our educational presentation. Ultimately, we decided to create a whole-club multimedia presentation format including statistics, children’s rights articles, and student reflections. This format would enable my club to present to audiences of any size. Further, since the presentation would be scripted and uniform for each delivery, it would not be necessary for every club member to participate in each of the presentations; as

long as we had at least a handful of club members attending a given presentation, we could deliver it.

Regarding content, we decided to broaden the scope of our research to encompass a handful of global problems impacting children's capacity to attend school, with particular attention to the following global problems: war, child exploitation, access to education, health/disease, and poverty.

To support this research, we also agreed to organize working groups whose responsibilities would be to collectively research one of the global problems listed above and to post their findings and reflections on our website. Student feedback universally supported the idea of forming such working groups, as it helped to streamline and focus their research and added an extra cushion of support from peers within their groups.

Episode One

(12/18/09 – “I need you to demonstrate a commitment here!” – Teacher Appeal

For the fourth time in the past month—and in the sternest terms yet—I challenged and admonished the club members to recognize their responsibility to engage in research and writing to assist in the development of our whole-club presentation. This challenge was not planned; it emerged organically after I had provided the students with the official news of the January 24th “Magic” Johnson event and the rough event outline (including a benefit fundraiser and a basketball game) and told them of their opportunity to do a presentation for Mr. Johnson.

Initially, I introduced the presentation topic as a “golden opportunity” to tell Mr. Johnson about our initiative and to communicate the capacity of youth to be global citizens. I stated:

You are going to have the opportunity to meet with “Magic” as a group.

I consider this the most important part of the entire evening. We need to share a presentation with him that inspires him to recognize the power of your voices as evolving youth global citizens. If you can do that, Magic will be able to communicate your passion to the whole assembled audience when he addresses them at the basketball event and the benefit fundraiser.

But, we have to do more than just say, ‘we want to help people.’ We need to exhibit real knowledge about global citizenship topics.

Then, I reviewed the steps we had taken as club to that point to organize a presentation as outlined above and asked the students what they wanted to do with this opportunity. Huan suggested we create a simplified version of our whole-club multimedia presentation—a reading of student reflections accompanied by a photographic slide show—like the one she had participated in at a club event the previous year. While her idea was reasonable given the limited time now available, I was upset by her justification for this idea—that “it would not be too hard”—and used this to segue to addressing my increasing concerns regarding my perception of the students’ overall lack of task commitment.

I immediately responded, “Yes, we should include student reflections, but we should not be doing something because it is not too hard! We should be willing to do some hard work.” I then proceeded:

It’s not enough to have a talent or to have knowledge about something.

To make a difference, to be a global citizen, you have to find a way to summon your talent or knowledge, to create something, to share something, to express something to someone else. It’s that outward act of connecting and sharing that makes you a global citizen. And I have to admit that I have been frustrated with the lack of work that you guys have put in outside of club meeting time. I know there are a few of you that have made this effort. But you have to understand that the time we spend at meetings is not enough to do what we are talking about. You can’t just come to one or two meetings a week and say to yourself, “I’ve done my part; I’m a global citizen.” This is not that type of club. Now don’t get me wrong; I honor the time you invest to meet with this bald guy (student laughter) on your own time. But to be a global citizen, to make a difference, a greater investment is required. You know I’ll be there every step of the way!

I then went to my computer, clicked on our website, and stated, “I need you guys to really do something between now and the next time we meet!” I then reviewed the various links on my website to help them in their research.

However, as the meeting time wound down, and I reviewed what each of the working groups had done or, in most cases, failed to do, my tone and words became even more challenging, pleading, and personal:

“Huan! You’re an 8th grader. You’ve been in the club for 3 years! You said you would do some research on health and children. Come on! Let’s kick some ‘you know what’ and get you and your group moving! Sean, come on! I don’t see any writing on your working group page! You’ve got strong people in your group! Come on! Let’s go! Lan, Rachel, let’s go! Anandani, you’re like a one woman wrecking crew! You’re doing great. But where are the contributions from your partners!”

At this point, I realized that I was losing some control: that the students were seeing a raw side of me. So, I tried to reign myself in and conclude on a more positive note:

Guys, this is actually the opposite of what I intended to do today! Here we have incredible news about Magic Johnson coming to Sunrise, and I’m scolding you guys. I am feeling a little raw right now. I’ve been working hard on the club. I love it, but it is time-consuming. I need you guys to come through! I need you to show “Magic” Johnson the power of middle school youth. You see, non-teachers don’t understand the power of youth voices, your power to understand important global issues and problems. I need you to demonstrate a commitment here! Can you do it! Will you invest some time between this moment and next Monday or Wednesday? The next time I see you I need

you to come in having researched and written something! Can you do it?

Will you do it?

The students seemed to take my appeal and scolding in the heartfelt, blunt, but constructive vein I had intended. It remained to see which students, if any, would come through. As always, I entered this latest round of “tough love” with hopeful optimism.

Episode Two

1/13/10 – “We have been *voiced!*” - Student Reflections about Global Citizenship and Youth Empowerment

Whether it was my “tough love” appeals described above, the reality of our impending presentation dates, or some combination of the two, over the next several weeks, the students’ began to post information and reflections regarding their global problems working group research. However, by Wednesday, January 11th—just four days removed from our whole-club presentations to the entire SMS student body—I realized that insufficient time remained to cull the most pertinent information and student reflections from within their working groups and to organize that data into a coherent student presentation.

The need for an urgent remedy to this problem caused me to present the students with a final, last-ditch presentation format that I hoped would resolve the issue while accentuating the power of my students’ voices as global citizenship practitioners. Specifically, I proposed incorporating the club members’ more generic reflections about global citizenship—that is, their sense of deep compassion for distant, non-intimate others and their belief in their voices and capacity to change the world—alongside

excerpted passages from the letters of EAFS students with whom we had engaged in pen-pal exchanges the previous year. The plan was for my students to stand on two lines delivering excerpts from these two sources of youth voice—reflections and letters—while accompanied by a video montage showcasing Ethiopia, the construction of the first block of classrooms at EAFS, and images of its students. To this end, I posted four questions on my website for the students to reflect upon in their online journal pages and urged the students to respond to as many of them as possible, while I reviewed the EAFS pen-pal letters to identify useful excerpts for their presentation.

Each of my questions was intended to elicit a different aspect of global citizenship practice about which I hoped my students could articulate some connections. The first question—“What is a global citizen?”—encouraged an exploration of the global ethic, practices, and character traits emblematic of a practicing global citizen. My second reflection question—“Why are you committed to helping children halfway around the world?”—required the club members to consider and justify their capacity to engage in deep compassion for distant, non-intimate others and their motivations for doing so. The third prompt question—“Why should people take your commitment seriously?”—intended to focus the respondents primarily on responding to the anticipated skepticism of non-club members with regards to their status as aspiring youth global citizens. Lastly, my fourth prompt question regarding youth empowerment—“Do youth have the power to change or improve the world?”—aimed at eliciting the students’ self-conceptions regarding their capabilities as global citizen practitioners.

My students' responses revealed a strong capacity for introspection and conceptual thinking. Especially pertinent to my study, their responses revealed powerful feelings and thoughts regarding their own sense of empowerment as global citizens, as well as a capacity to identify specific global citizenship dispositions motivating their global citizenship practice.

The students' self-perception as empowered global citizenship practitioners, including their capacity to effectively advocate for constructive intervention regarding global problems, was evident in their written responses to the above reflection prompts. For example, Both Huan and Anandani flatly dismissed the notion that effective global citizenship practice can only be conducted by adults. For Huan, the evaluative tool for global citizenship practice was sincerity of motive and dedication: "(A)nyone who makes the effort can benefit the world. You don't have to be an adult. All you have to do is purely want to help and to give your time." Anandani clearly supported Huan's conviction by asserting that "(I)t doesn(')t really matter what age you are, you can always help the world." However, Anandani added an important proviso that pointed to her realization of the necessity of engaging in global citizenship practice via participation in a global citizenship community of like-minded youth:

Sometimes youth may have to work together to get something done because they can't always work alone. But that's pretty much what GCU (Global Care Unlimited) is, right? GCU is made up of many children/people working together to accomplish something. Right now, we are trying to raise money for the Ethiopian school so that the children and teachers there can have

electricity, transportation, etc. We are helping the world, and we are children.

Vanessa offered the most extensive articulation of the capacity of youth for self-education and their subsequent ability to utilize this education to effectively raise public awareness and inspire action to address global problems: “We have fresh new minds ready to be filled with knowledge and wisdom. We are more open to new information and are ready to be inspired by the amazing other people in this world.” Vanessa encapsulated the connection between education, advocacy, and action as follows:

We are in the process of being educated on a topic that relates to children around the world. We then educate others . . . and spread the word. By doing this simple act, we are changing the world as we know it. I bet that we have inspired at least 1 person to care about what we were teaching them about or that 1 person would think differently. That's how we change the world.

Lastly, several students cited the power of their global citizenship voices and their desire to express them as the source of their capacity to inspire action. This connection was expressed both in the unadorned language of Huan—“We all have voices and we want to change the world”—and the effusive tone of a six grade club member—“(w)e have a powerful voice...and we want everyone to hear it.” Perhaps the most joyous expression of the power of youth voice was expressed in the following way by one of my seventh grade club members:

(w)e're really, actually making a difference in someone else's life. I never thought that I could be apart (sic) of something this huge. It's exhilarating...

Us (We) kids who have grown together are part of something across the ocean.

We have been *voiced* (!)

The students' written responses to the above prompt questions also provided surprising and, for me, uplifting evidence of the degree to which they claimed to have been influenced by many of the global citizenship dispositions I discussed in Chapter Two. Among the dispositions either directly cited or strongly implied by my students were: the dispositions of deep compassion (empathy, empathic extension and compassion) for distant, non-intimate, suffering others; human capabilities; human needs; human rights; justice; and interconnection/interdependence.

The experience of empathy or caring for distant, non-intimate others expressed by a handful of students suggested a capacity for empathic extension and deep compassion. For Lan, the motivation of caring was stated in straightforward, affective language: "I really care for these people who are out there." Malka expressed this view implicitly by writing that global citizens "care for everyone" and "help as many people as they can," while Gillian posited this view explicitly by asserting that global citizens "(help) people, not just people they know." Rachel's empathic extension was couched in a cognitive assessment of the consequences of refusing to care: "If we do not care for each other, then we can count the human race finished." Gillian further explained her caring and commitment to distant, non-intimate others as grounded in an integration of both affective and cognitive motivations linked to empathy and anticipatory guilt such as that cited by Hoffman (2000) above: "(t)he thought of how I would feel if I knew something was going on, informed myself about it, thought about helping out, and decided against it

would be too hard. I couldn't do it, especially if other people around me were. Really, you just care.”

In addition, several students specifically posited a sense of global community for which global citizens should feel responsible. Thus, for Huan, a global citizen “tries to help the world as a community.” Xavier was explicit about the expansion of his own conception of his lens of concern since the beginning of the school year from his geographic community to a broader global community:

When I started school in September my definition of a global citizen was a Lot smaller(.) (i) thought it meant being a good citizen but just in your own community (.) I didn't realize how broad it was and that you can also be a good citizen to people you have never met.

It is important to note that, for these students, caring for others included concern and action taken on behalf of people in our immediate or local communities. Thus, for Cynthia and Anandani, assisting one's classmate or friends constituted one form of global citizenship practice. Additionally, such assistance need not address enormous problems; rather, as Cynthia asserted, they can involve interventions “as simple as helping a classmate with books” or, for Anandani, “mak(ing) a change in the world...in the smallest way.”

Expression of the linked global citizenship dispositions of human capabilities, needs, rights, and justice was also featured among the students' reflections. For example, Xavier connected his burgeoning awareness of global problems with the necessity to empower the human potential to practice global citizenship in addressing these problems:

When I heard about Global Care it was like a magnet and I was drawn to it(.) I didn't know what you do there but I knew it was to help people.

When I came I learned all about the school in Ethiopia and the history of Global Care, about all the situations around the world(.) about H.I.V., land-mines, hunger, malnutrition, wars, child slavery, etc. That's why I want to help(.) (s)o if a kid halfway around the world wants to be a doctor he can overcome those barriers and follow his dreams(.) (s)o he can reach his full potential.

Vanessa articulated her concerns about promoting human capabilities and potential with the metaphoric language of hope and possibility:

Being in Global Care isn't just about raising some money for the school(.) (i)t(')s about giving these kids the ability to dream(.) (T)he chance to be able to think the things they may not have been able to do before. I'm not just helping a school in Ethiopia(;) I'm helping build a dream.

Addressing human needs was cited by several students as a motivator for global citizenship practice. For example, Lan declared, "I am committed (sic) to help the people who do not have what they need, like for example, an education." For Gillian, "help(ing) someone in need" produces an "amazing" inner feeling, presumably akin to the empathic component of deep compassion cited above.

Some students articulated the conceptual link between human needs and rights. Thus, for Xavier, global citizens "have to be able to address all human rights and needs."

Cynthia offered an implied argument for justice by linking human capabilities, human needs, and human rights as ethical prerequisites for human dignity:

I feel very compelled to care about these kids halfway around the world.

Because of the fact that I have full access (sic) to an education, I feel very strongly about getting it to other children. When you listen to their thoughts and goals, they are no different from ours(:) (P)ilots, leaders, and all the other things that we have in mind for our future. So why should we have access (sic) to these goals and not them? By getting them an education, they have as much of a chance as we do. That(')s where we come in. We need to help these kids have exactly (sic) what they need, so they can fulfill (sic) these goals.

Lastly, two students offered reflections that supported the disposition of global interdependence and interconnection. First, Rachel connected human needs to global interdependence and interconnection:

One cannot exist in this world without existing with others...When one is in need, we must help them. Then, when we ourselves are in need, they will help us. This way, we will always have a shoulder to lean on.

Rachel's use of the imagery of friendship connects directly to Malka's assertion that making a "friendship between people who have never met" was an important motivator for her global citizenship practice. Indeed, these allusions to connection made by Rachel and Malka indicate a burgeoning awareness of the disposition of inter-subjective ethical relations that foreshadows the emphasis the students and I would come

to place on establishing relations of collaboration and reciprocity between our global citizenship community and the teachers and students of EAFS.

Critique of Critical Incident Two

Probing Question One

What did the actions of this critical incident reveal about the nature of our teacher-students pedagogical relationship and culture? To what extent, if any, did the pedagogical relationship/culture showcase youth voice and/or empowerment?

In some important ways, this critical incident reveals evidence of conscious efforts on my part to address problems I had discerned in our teacher-students relationship in the first critical incident. I attempted to make my conflicts, my reactions, and my positions as transparent as possible. I also displayed flexibility through my willingness to discuss and collaborate with my students regarding issues for which a traditional teacher might well have assumed complete responsibility. For example, after establishing the overarching research themes, I provided my students with a great deal of latitude to select topics of interest within the context of these themes. Later, when circumstances revealed the need for us to reconsider the research methods and presentation format and content for our club presentation, I engaged the students in extensive dialogue that lead to a revamping of each of these aspects of our research and presentation, as outlined in Episode One. Finally, when it became imperative to once again reconsider the format and content of our presentation, I offered the students a revised suggestion that met with their approval, as shown in Episode Two.

This teacher visibility and flexibility in my relationship with my students significantly diminished any aspects of hiddenness regarding curriculum, agenda, or decision-making. All my positions and justifications were freely offered. While my enthusiasm regarding some of my opinions may have caused some of my students to refrain from offering rebuttals to them, the amount of discussion in which I engaged the students on all matters of importance to our initiative testified to the sincerity of my efforts to combat the tendency towards non-transparency I had shown in the first critical incident.

It must be acknowledged, however, that accompanying my decision to be more visible towards my students and open to their suggestions regarding areas directly impacting their work as global citizenship practitioners was a level of bluntness on my part that bordered on excessive. While I believe I offered positive or uplifting aspects to my speeches/statements to the students, I clearly was not reluctant to express my disappointment in the quality of their work and their overall commitment, as profiled in Episode One.

This tension point regarding youth empowerment and commitment was counterpoised against the programmatic necessity of meeting tangible deadlines for the completion of our club's presentation. Indeed, the exigencies surrounding the club's preparations for its presentations on January 15th to the entire SMS student body and on January 24th at the "Magic" Johnson event created a necessary emphasis on meeting the educational and fundraising aspects of our initiative. As preparation time ebbed away and my realization of the students' non-preparedness regarding their research became

obvious, the pressure to develop a viable alternative format for creation of our presentation by the above deadlines co-mingled with my authentic desire to promote youth empowerment to produce a perfect environment for blunt critique of student progress.

Nevertheless, my critique of the students' task commitment and sense of ownership regarding the whole-club presentation apparently did not injure their self-conceptions as empowered and capable global citizenship practitioners, as revealed through their written reflections outlined in Episode Two. Indeed, in addition to proudly proclaiming their capacity to "change the world" and asserting that they had been "voiced," several students specifically defended their task commitment. For example, Vanessa described herself and her fellow club members as "extremely dedicated students," while Gillian cited the list of club accomplishments, past and present, as evidence of their commitment.

Each of the preceding student quotes suggests a possible underlying reason for this apparent discrepancy in perception between the students and me regarding their capacities as global citizenship practitioners at this point in the study. One reason may have involved a sincere difference of opinion or orientation regarding the level of responsibility the students should share to ensure the completion of tasks necessary for our presentation. For me, as I stated to the students emphatically in Episode One, commitment and ownership was inextricably linked to task completion. Consequently, I expected each student to offer as much time and energy as necessary to complete their research and develop their educational products by the assigned due dates.

Conversely, it became apparent to me that, unlike with some of my previous groups of Global Care Club students, these students almost universally defined the limits of their commitment of time and energy strictly within the parameters of our morning meeting times. Thus, my students likely defined dedication primarily in terms of their attendance at the required club meetings. If so, this would account for the students' seeming lack of a strong sense of ownership or responsibility for any tasks that could not be completed within that time frame.

Alternatively, Gillian's reference to the club's tangible accomplishments in terms of funds raised and people impacted by our action-learning initiatives suggests a possible developmental need of early adolescents for a concrete or externally quantifiable yardstick for measuring the impact of their accomplishments. However, such presumed evidence of the students' task commitment as global citizenship practitioners profiles a growing tension that I began to feel regarding my own priorities and values as teacher-facilitator of our global citizenship community. Whereas prior to this study I had placed extraordinary value on the attainment of the tangible objectives of our action-learning initiatives, the introspection and self-reflection required by this study had begun a process of values reorientation regarding the emphasis I had hitherto placed on such concrete measures to evaluate the relative success of our global citizenship community.

Indeed, this process of values reorientation on my part coincided with my burgeoning awareness of the ways in which the relatively traditional pedagogical process I had developed and utilized had oriented my students to adopt such a tangible, concrete means of self-assessment regarding their status as global citizenship practitioners. Thus,

as I began to critique and revise my pedagogical orientation in the direction of a more collaborative and equitable relationship with my students, student responsibility, ownership, voice, and empowerment regarding both the process and outcomes of our collective work increasingly became my new forms of assessing the quality of our global citizenship community. That is, I was beginning to look for ways of integrating the values involved in both pedagogical process and the fulfillment of tangible and measurable outcomes related to our action-learning initiatives. However, at this point in the study, I had not sufficiently reached a point of articulating such evolving expectations and values to myself to be able to share them with the students.

Probing Question Two

What global citizenship dispositions were expressed by this critical incident?

The students' written responses to my prompt questions in Episode Two revealed an implicit level of awareness of a handful of ethical dispositions and principles underlying our global citizenship practice. However, the language the students used to articulate this awareness indicated that, for most of them, such awareness was still relatively undeveloped. Consequently, as a reader and interpreter of the students' reflections, it was often necessary for me to extrapolate those principles and dispositions from certain commonly used words or phrases.

For example, I phrases that included a reference to "caring" or "helping" suggested to me an implicit if inchoate awareness or sensibility regarding my global citizenship dispositions of empathy and compassion. Thus, Malka's assertion that global citizens should "care for everyone" and Gillian's statement that caring should extend

beyond “just people they know” implies, for me, the disposition of empathic extension toward distant, non-intimate, suffering others. Likewise, Rachel’s declaration that “(O)ne cannot exist in this world without existing with others” suggests an implicit awareness of the disposition of interdependence and interconnection; her assertion also implies a type of ethical interdependence suggestive of the disposition of intersubjective ethical relations between our community and the students at EAFS.

Similarly, the students’ awareness of possible linkages between global citizenship dispositions or principles was often articulated in ways that required my interpretive intervention. For example, Rachel’s insistence that a failure on the part of human beings to “care for each other” would lead to our elimination as a species suggests a linkage between the dispositions associated with deep compassion—empathy, empathic extension, and compassion—and recognition of the interdependence of all life.

In some such instances, conceptual linkages included fairly obvious references to global citizenship dispositions as well as more suggestive and implicit phrasing. For example, Cynthia’s implicit linkage above of empathic extension, capabilities, human needs, and human rights offers language that is explicit regarding global citizenship dispositions, as well as phrasing that requires an interpretive reach on my part. Her awareness of empathic extension is quite transparent through her assertion that she felt “compelled to care about these kids halfway around the world.” Likewise, Cynthia’s observation that the “thoughts and goals” of the EAFS students are “no different” than those of herself and her peers strongly suggests the disposition of human capabilities. However, Cynthia’s rhetorical question above regarding unequal access to the conditions

necessary for children to obtain an education and, in turn, to realize their goals, draws a clear, if tacit, connection to the principles of human needs and human rights. Similarly, Xavier's reference to helping children "halfway around the world" to "realize (their) potential" clearly indicates the global citizenship dispositions of empathic extension and human capabilities.

Finally, some of the students' responses used language sufficiently developed to suggest an even clearer linkage to the type of articulation of global citizenship dispositions I proposed in Chapter Two. Thus, Huan's statement that global citizens try to "help the world as a community" or Xavier's realization "you can also be a good citizen to people you have never met" reveals a more explicit awareness of the disposition of empathic extension for which little interpretation on the reader's part is necessary. Likewise, Lan's declaration of her commitment to "help the people who do not have what they need," Gillian's reference to "help(ing) someone in need," or Rachel's insistence that "when someone is in need we must help them" all speak directly to the principle of human needs.

Viewed collectively, then, the students' responses to my prompt questions revealed a continuum of awareness and sensibility regarding global citizenship dispositions ranging from incipient to fairly well-developed. Further, a handful of students demonstrated a burgeoning capacity to draw conceptual linkages between such dispositions.

**Critical Incident Three: Student Disempowerment, Reexamination of the Values of
our Global Citizenship Community, and a Commitment to Foster a More
Collaborative and Equitable Teacher-Students Relationship**

Background

To understand how the episodes in this critical incident unfolded, it is necessary here to provide contextual background. These episodes were precipitated by the opportunity cited above for a global celebrity icon, Earvin “Magic” Johnson, to make an appearance in Sunrise on January 24th in support of our action-learning initiative. Informed of Mr. Johnson’s imminent arrival via e-mail on December 15th by a local Sunrise parent, Dana (who had sponsored and obtained Mr. Johnson’s availability), I met with Dana and another local parent, Sandra, in my classroom on December 17th to begin brainstorming the best possible use of Mr. Johnson’s visit. Following this meeting, I informed the Global Care Club the next day of Mr. Johnson’s imminent arrival and of the unprecedented opportunity this event posed for fundraising and promotion of our initiative.

Once all the stakeholders involved in organizing for Mr. Johnson’s visit had been notified, a series of planning meetings was arranged that included Dana, Sandra, and a group of about 10 local parents and citizens. Hosted at the homes of Dana and Sandra, the event planning committee met the evenings of December 22nd, January 5th, and January 7th; a final planning meeting was held the evening of January 21st at the Sunrise High School gymnasium where we ultimately decided to host the first major event: an

Ethiopian festival, youth basketball drills, an appearance and speech by Mr. Johnson, and a faculty-students basketball game with Mr. Johnson serving as the student coach.

Of importance to understanding this critical incident, no Global Care student was invited by the parent committee or me to attend any of these meetings. While the setting (off-school site requiring transportation) and timing (meetings began at 7:30 p.m.) of these meetings were clearly not conducive to youth participation, I soon sensed that their non-participation was preferred by the other planning participants. Indeed, when I privately asked one of the key members of the committee about the possibility of including a student representative, this idea was dismissed without qualification as an imposition to the speed at which organizational decisions had to be made. Not wanting to risk derailing the focus of the parent planning committee through the introduction of a potentially divisive issue, I refrained from making a formal petition requesting student participation.

Therefore, of necessity, I served as the students' voice within the planning process. However, the limitations of my influence were made painfully clear to me during debate regarding several issues of importance to me and/or my students. (Fortunately, after much struggle, I was able to win for my students the opportunity to participate in the youth-teachers basketball game and, most importantly, to deliver their presentation at the benefit dinner with Mr. Johnson present. The success of this presentation proved absolutely critical in motivating the support of the donors and of Mr. Johnson.) Indeed, it was the tumultuous process involved in deciding Global Care's response to a completely unpredictable and tragic natural disaster that most powerfully

instilled in me the necessity of promoting and featuring youth and teacher voice and empowerment at the onset and throughout the planning and decision-making process of any future event connected to our global citizenship action-learning initiative.

On January 12th, a cataclysmic earthquake devastated Haiti, producing thousands of deaths and immeasurable suffering. Given Global Care’s mission as an advocate for global citizenship, it was appropriate for all interested parties—including the Global Care students—to participate in a discussion regarding how to respond to this disaster.

However, the timing of the disaster placed extraordinary strain on the already limited time available to prepare for the upcoming major student presentations at our school on January 15th and at our major fundraising event featuring Earvin “Magic” Johnson on January 24th. The lack of sufficient time to devote to this important ethical matter, combined with the increasingly tense environment surrounding event ownership and decision-making protocol, led to the chaotic and disempowering decision-making process described in the episodes below.

Episode One

1/19/10 – “An Emergency in Slow Motion” – A Personal Reexamination of the Mission and Culture of Global Care’s Action-Learning Initiatives Triggered by the Haitian Earthquake

On Tuesday, January 19th, I was accompanying several of my Global Care Club members in the school cafeteria in an effort to sell tickets to the Ethiopian festival/basketball portion of our two-part Magic Johnson event when I was approached by Dana with a request. She had received a phone call from a “prominent” Sunrise

resident sharing her belief that Global Care's Haiti donation should be raised to 50% of our earnings at the upcoming benefit dinner from the 10% agreed upon several days earlier during a brief conversation between Dana and me. In addition to promoting ticket sales to the dinner, Dana believed we should do this because of the enormity and urgency of the emergency faced by Haiti. She also believed that such an action of responsiveness would further improve Global Care's reputation in the local community and, ultimately, lead to even more support for our initiatives now and in the future.

My immediate internal reaction was to resist such a significant raise in the percentage for Haiti, but I had no time to process my reasons for this. Probably, my first instinct was to protect this precious opportunity to utilize the presence of an iconic celebrity to help Global Care achieve its ambitious goal of sponsoring a K-10 school in Ethiopia. Of course, I also recognized that the situation in Haiti represented a true emergency. However, instead of telling Dana that I needed to think about her suggestion, I had assented to it after a relatively short conversation. I promptly returned to my classroom and e-mailed the parent overseeing event publicity to indicate this change in the percentage of our Haiti donation to 50% of donations.

However, once I had my next preparation period alone in my classroom, I felt misgivings regarding this decision and shared them with Dana. She argued that Global Care's generosity to Haiti would ultimately position Global Care to "do more because it has shown a willingness to focus on the greater good." Further, Dana informed me that she had already begun informing community members of our decision and that it would look badly to change it now. While expressing understanding of Dana's position, I

nevertheless stated my desire to get input from the parent committee via e-mail regarding this decision.

The feedback revealed a split within the parent committee. Among those who argued against raising the donation to 50%, one parent argued that such a jump from the 10% announced through a press release would suggest that the motivation was to increase sales to the benefit dinner, as opposed to a genuine response to the urgency of the needs in Haiti. Another parent asserted that Global Care needed to remain focused on its school-building initiative and not be reactive to humanitarian emergencies. Importantly, she also indicated that such a raise in the donation to Haiti would not be “fair to the students, their mission and all the effort that went into this event to get the school finished.” Incredibly, during this exchange, no one, including me, suggested the idea of actually asking the Global Care Club students for their input on this matter.

Conversely, for Dana, the issue was about prioritizing the urgent lifesaving needs in Haiti vs. the important long-term but less pressing educational needs in Ethiopia. As she put it, “(e)ducation is very important but food, water and medical care are necessities without which people will die. I want to see our school built very much, but can't do it at the expense of another life.” Dana found support from several parents, one of whom asserted that a failure to respond robustly to the crisis in Haiti “would make Global Care look as if it's in its own bubble, without a world view. To respond to those in immediate and dire need shows the kids what real charity, caring and responsiveness looks like...and shows our community that as well.”

Following this heartfelt exchange of perspectives, one of the parents against raising our contribution to 50% e-mailed to state that “US entities” had already committed \$200,000,000 to Haiti. Another parent used this information to reinforce her appeal not to raise the Global Care donation above 10%:

I also heard the staggering amount of money already donated. Realistically, I don't think our small donation to Haiti will make as much (of) an impact as it would for the students in Ethiopia. And for anyone to think that people would not come to our event because we didn't donate a larger fraction of our profits is disillusioned. We made a good gesture as soon as we heard of the devastation. Again, I believe we should stay focused and stick with our mission.

It was evident that both sides of this argument had validity. However, this conflict had exposed the consequences of not having clarified a decision-making protocol among the planning committee. Clearly, a decision had to be made as soon as possible so that we could definitively inform people regarding the percentage that would be donated to Haiti and re-commit our focus to urgent event planning. Essentially, this conflict was sent back to Dana and me to resolve.

As day turned to night, I found myself agonizing over how to make this decision. I wanted Dana to feel satisfied with our decision, especially due to her extraordinary generosity in sponsoring and arranging Magic Johnson's visit in support of Global Care. But I also needed to make my best effort to determine and articulate my authentic position, apart from any feelings of pressure or gratitude. This compelled me to undergo

a review of the evolution of Global Care's mission, objectives, and methods of global citizenship practice that had sustained my work with middle school youth since its founding in 2000.

By late that evening, I had been able to articulate to myself and then to Dana via e-mail the reasons for my position that Global Care's donation to Haiti should not exceed 10%. This conclusion was drawn from an examination of: the extremely limited financial and human resources Global Care had at its disposal; the intensive, multi-year process involved in crafting and implementing an effective action-learning initiative; the unique relationships we had developed with the beneficiaries of our initiatives and with our organizational partners, who we relied on to implement our action-learning objectives and who, in turn, relied on Global Care for the sponsorship of this implementation; and the importance of recognizing and honoring the urgency and value that our action-learning initiatives represented regarding the promotion of viable long-term futures for our beneficiaries.

First, as a grassroots, school-based, non-profit organization, run entirely by me, my students and parent volunteers, Global Care did not have the time, resources, or organizational structure to simultaneously conduct global citizenship action-learning initiatives and pursue grant or "seed" money to fund our initiatives, never mind to address natural disasters as they occurred. Our only funding came from school-based fundraising events and occasional ad hoc donations. Consequently, Global Care lacked the organizational or financial resources to fund disaster relief. Indeed, over the course of

Global Care's existence, there had been several extraordinary natural disasters, and we had not been able to respond to any of them.

Secondly, each of Global Care's action-learning initiatives—demining in Bosnia, landmine survivor rehabilitation and cultural renewal in Cambodia, and school construction in Ethiopia—had been the product of methodical and, at times, painstaking multi-year processes involving research, selection of a global problem, identification of a beneficiary population and organizational partner(s), and development and implementation of extensive educational and fundraising initiatives for both school and local community. Accordingly, a particular Global Care culture of global citizenship practice and expectations had evolved around this process. The multi-year nature of these initiatives meant that the current Global Care club members and I carried an implicit ethical obligation to honor—or at least strongly consider—the choices and action objectives made by club members who had preceded them in selecting and initiating the current initiative.

Third, the global citizenship culture outlined above revolved around addressing the suffering of a specific, targeted community or population through sponsorship of a carefully selected course of action to be implemented by a hand-picked “grassroots” organization or individual. Consequently, our action-learning initiatives had always involved intensive one-to-one partnerships with implementing organizations that, in turn, placed a special obligation on Global Care. Indeed, in the case of our sponsorship of demining in Bosnia and of school construction for EAFS, Global Care had been the sole organization involved in fundraising on behalf of our identified population. In such

cases, there might not have been any other sponsorship organizations that could have filled the void immediately, if ever, should we have failed to achieve our funding objectives. By contrast, given the tremendous outpouring of international support offered by governments and nonprofit organizations for Haiti, our donation to Haitian relief would represent only a microscopic percentage of the overall quantity of global donations. Thus, our Ethiopian School Construction Initiative represented a type of targeted, one-to-one caring relationship—mirroring the global citizenship disposition of intersubjective ethical relations in response to the urgent call of the other—that could not be fostered by donating to the general fund of an international humanitarian organization.

Lastly, as I considered the irreplaceable role of formal education in cultivating all aspects of human development, including the dispositions of global citizenship, I realized that Global Care’s massive investment of time, energy, and resources was aimed not just at addressing present needs, but promoting economically and politically sustainable futures for our student beneficiaries. Seen through this lens, I realized that, while the lifesaving work being done to address the manifold needs of the victims of natural disasters absolutely required the urgent attention of all governments and organizations positioned to offer it, the work of sponsoring a school in a developing nation should not be undercut or diminished in relation to such an emergency. Indeed, the problem of access to quality primary and secondary education in developing nations such as Ethiopia could easily be classified as an “emergency in slow motion.”

Upon completing this articulation of the mission and culture of our global citizenship community and its action-learning initiatives, I felt sufficiently strengthened

by the rationale of my newfound position to return our Haitian donation to 10%.

However, I still carried unease due to the ongoing conflict with Dana regarding this issue.

I also realized that throughout this conflict I had not taken the opportunity to consult the Global Care students. I resolved to rectify this oversight by making this the central topic of discussion at the following morning's meeting.

Episode Two

1/20/10 - "We only can give real commitment to one at a time" - The Global Care Club students have their say about the Haiti donation

After most of the twenty three attending students had arrived in my classroom for our morning meeting on Wednesday, January 20th, I told them that I needed their feedback on an important matter that had been causing me personal turmoil. After introducing the issue about donating to Haiti and stating the practical and ethical arguments supporting each side of the dilemma, I asked for their response. I was well aware that this was our first morning meeting since the previous Friday when we had successfully delivered our January 15th school-wide presentations and that our urgent priority was to briefly celebrate this accomplishment and direct our focus immediately to preparation for the "Magic" Johnson events that coming Sunday. However, I felt a personal, ethical, and political need to gather and take into consideration the students' opinions, albeit quite belatedly, on this crucial matter.

As the students shared their thoughts, I tried not to influence their positions with the use of words, tone, or body language. I silently called on every student and recorded their thoughts, only occasionally offering necessary clarifications or summarizing student

positions. With the exception of two students, who advocated donating between 25% and 35% of our donations, every other student initially staked out a position of between 10% and 20%, while offering alternative ideas such as placing donation boxes for Haiti at our event to add to the percentage donated directly by Global Care. Two students even offered arguments against Global Care responding to disaster relief at all.

The reasons offered for keeping the donation at or just above the 10% mark reinforced many of those articulated by me in Episode One. Martin reiterated a reason offered by several students by stating that “(T)here are a lot of organizations already going” to Haiti. He also recognized the limitations of Global Care’s ability to address emergencies in any substantive way by stating that “(W)e’re not the Red Cross.” Another student cited past precedent by reminding us that “we didn’t respond to Katrina (Hurricane Katrina).” For Bethany, the fact that Global Care “still . . . need(s) the money” to complete school construction for EAFS was sufficient to support no more than a 10% donation. Several students found the reality of Global Care’s status as the sole sponsor of EAFS sufficiently persuasive. Speaking for this position, Sam declared, “We’re the only people helping our school. If we don’t help them, no one will.” Lastly, Huan framed her position that Global Care should donate no more than 15% to Haiti within the context of an ethical obligation: “There will always be natural disasters and poverty places, but we only can give real commitment to one at a time.”

Once I had given every student an opportunity to state their opinion, I asked the members to raise their hands when I stated a donation percentage that they would support. With the exception of two students, every student voted for a 10% donation to

Haiti; the other two students advocated a 15% donation. Given the opportunity, the club had voiced a clear mandate in support of the perspective I had circuitously and painstakingly arrived at the previous evening.

Episode Three

1/20/10 – The Haitian Conflict Resolved to Nobody’s Satisfaction

Buttressed by the students’ ringing endorsement of my position regarding the appropriate donation level for Haiti, I sent an e-mail to Dana explaining the reasons for my position that Global Care should keep its donation to Haiti at the 10% level originally agreed upon—including the consensus of the students—and asked for her consent to this position, to which I received no reply. However, events on the ground—a second earthquake hitting Haiti and the fact that a number of local people had purchased their benefit tickets with the new understanding that 50% of proceeds would be going for Haitian relief—made support for my position untenable. One parent who had previously supported giving 10% switched her position, stating that “(S)plitting the proceeds seems equitable and sensitive.” Meanwhile, the event publicist urged us to make a decision so that she could proceed.

By early afternoon, I felt compelled to share the position established by the students and me by sending an e-mail to the entire planning committee in which I offered my complete rationale for urging everyone to accept the 10% decision, while insisting that Global Care and its supporters should feel positively about this donation level. I closed by “respectfully but strongly urg(ing) everyone involved in this event to redirect all their attention” to the “Magic” Johnson event organizing and stating that “(U)nless I

hear from one of you, I will proceed with this understanding, and with the assumption that Global Care will be generously donating 10% of the entire event proceeds for Haitian disaster relief.”

This desperate final attempt to assert a level of decision-making authority was greeted by understandable anger on the part of Dana, who asserted via e-mail that my decision would jeopardize her ability to continue planning this event, as well as her standing with those to whom she had already shared the revised 50% donation level. I then called Dana with the suggestion that Global Care offer to refund the donations for dinner tickets offered by anyone who might feel slighted by the switch of our Haiti donation back to 10%. However, Dana insisted that my decision would cause ill-will and irreparable damage to Global Care within the Sunrise community and to herself as the event organizer if we announced a willingness to refund donations, especially after community members had been informed to the contrary. She then suggested that we could resolve this conflict by giving benefit dinner attendees a choice about the level of the Haiti donation they wished to offer. Recognizing the validity of Dana’s concerns about the impact my decision might have on Global Care as an organization and on her personal reputation (and mine) within the community, I decided to relent from my stance and agreed to her idea of giving donors at each table the choice regarding the level of their donation that should go to Haiti.

Critique of Critical Incident Three

Probing Question One

What did the actions of this critical incident reveal about the nature of our teacher-students pedagogical relationship and culture? To what extent, if any, did the pedagogical relationship/culture showcase youth voice and/or empowerment?

This critical incident showcases three different aspects of the narrative of my teacher-students relationship and culture, which in turn profiles the impending transformation from a hierarchical/traditional pedagogical approach through personal values reexamination to a heartfelt commitment to nurture collaboration, teacher-students equity, and youth voice and empowerment.

The first aspect of this relationship, which emerges primarily through my background description above of the “Magic” Johnson event planning process, reveals my ultimate complicity with the parents’ planning committee in completely suppressing and sidelining the voice and empowerment of my students through their complete non-participation in planning, agenda-setting, organization, and decision-making. This suppression was accomplished by my adoption of an approach of avoidance and non-inclusion. That is, I simply used my teacher status to avoid posing the issue of student participation in the planning process as a question for serious consideration by the parent planning committee. Indeed, the only opportunity my students had to express their opinion on any matter of importance occurred as described in Episode Two. Ultimately, even this opportunity for student voice proved of no practical consequence in the decision to sponsor Haitian disaster relief.

In retrospect, there are several probable explanations for my complicity in promoting the invisibility of my students in this process. First, the fact that “Magic” Johnson had been obtained by a local parent, Dana, not through the efforts of the students or me, implicitly transferred a heightened level of voice and empowerment regarding event planning for his visit to Dana. In others words, in this case a natural feeling of ownership devolved from Dana out to me and the students, as opposed to the reverse. This deference to Dana was reinforced by the actions she took to assume the tacit leadership position in the planning process, as well as my natural sentiment of extreme gratitude for having selected our club’s initiative as the beneficiary of Mr. Johnson’s visit.

A second key factor was the limited notice we were given—less than six weeks—to plan an event that would make full use of Mr. Johnson’s presence. This lack of time led to an implicit understanding among the event planning committee of the absolute need for efficiency in decision-making and implementation of our plans. In retrospect, I realize that accompanying this unspoken need for efficiency was the corollary concern that involving middle school youth directly in the planning process would likely disrupt this needed efficiency. The possible conflicts that might have emerged between the students’ expressed interests and the perspectives of the parents and/or me would have necessitated that more time be spent on negotiating those differences, leaving less time for the establishment and implementation of our ultimate plans. In simplest terms, I must have felt, along with the parents, that planning for this event would be made far less complicated by the exclusion of the students as an active stakeholder.

However, in retrospect, had I made any efforts to ensure at least the representative presence of the Global Care Club student members, it is likely that student voice and empowerment would have—at least to some degree—been honored. For example, I could have insisted on the presence of one or two of my eighth grade club members at the first informal planning meeting I had on December 17th in my classroom with Dana and Sandra. Likewise, I could have negotiated a more student-friendly time (afternoon or early evening) and centralized location (my SMS classroom instead of a parent's home at the edge of town) to enable more of the club members to attend. Alternatively, I could have required weekly or bi-monthly meetings, either after or before school, at which available parents from the planning committee could have shared and subjected their planning ideas to feedback from attending members of the Global Care Club. Further, selected club members could have been invited to join the e-mail group formed by the parent committee in order to receive and provide feedback regarding planning ideas and updates.

In addition, given the extended conflicts that preoccupied the parents committee and me regarding student inclusion in the basketball game and the opportunity for my club members to deliver their presentation to “Magic” Johnson, there is no way to know if the addition of the students’ voices on these matters would have further complicated these conflicts. In fact, I suspect that had a mechanism for student voice been embedded within the planning and organizational process from its inception, the students’ opinions may have led more quickly to the same resolution the parents and I ultimately reached.

It is clear, then, that an honest assessment of the failure to create pathways for active youth involvement in the event planning process must entail an examination of the assumptions, priorities, and values that I brought with me to the planning process from its inception with the first meeting with Dana and Sandra in my classroom. First, my failure to insist upon student representation from the beginning of this process strongly suggests that I did not, in fact, trust my students' capacity to contribute constructively and thoughtfully to the planning process. That is, like the parents, I must have assumed that, at best, the student contribution would be superficial and, at worst, it might slow the necessary rapidity with which the planning had to occur. Indeed, in retrospect, my unthinking acquiescence in failing to invite youth participation was likely grounded in fear that the students' presence in the planning process might have actually derailed it. Thus, my distrust regarding the students' capacities as event planners fostered a condescending mindset toward my students: precisely the opposite relationship that I had told myself I wanted to nurture within my own global citizenship community.

Ultimately, then, my distancing of the Global Care Club students from the event planning process demonstrated that, at this point in the study, my supreme priority and value involved achieving what I viewed as a successful outcome related to the objectives of our action-learning objectives, regardless of whether my own students were actually involved in achieving these objectives. Since I viewed the ability of the students to offer constructive contributions to the planning process with apparent distrust, their participation, i.e., their interests and voice, was not risked.

The second major aspect of my relationship with my students profiled by this critical incident was outlined above in the reexamination section of Episode One. As I struggled within myself to understand and justify my position of offering a 10% donation of our fundraising to Haitian earthquake relief as opposed to the 50% demanded by Dana, I was able to articulate grounding values that supported my perspective of the mission of our global citizenship community in relation to distant, suffering others. Among these values, I came closer to the realization that the establishment of a kind of intersubjective ethical relationship between our global citizenship community and the students and staff of EAFS was foundational. As with our previous action-learning initiatives, it was our ethical obligation to this relationship that truly defined us.

Following the above reasoning, I came to recognize more clearly than I had previously that the intersubjective ethical relationship we shared with EAFS reflected a similar underlying bond that I shared—or needed to share—with my own students. That is, I came to realize that, in order for me to truly serve as an effective global citizenship teacher-facilitator among middle school youth, I needed to find pedagogical pathways that truly promoted the capacities of my students to participate in an increasingly collaborative and equitable teacher-students relationship. Put more succinctly, I needed to find a way to restore the voice and power of my students.

I knew the first step in the process of re-voicing and re-empowering my students was to provide them with the opportunity to express their opinions regarding a matter that directly affected their action-learning initiative. This effort on my part is described above in Episode Two. Indeed, I introduced my conflict regarding the issue of what percentage

of our funds we should donate to Haiti and my desire to hear my students' opinions on this matter with a level of respect, sincerity, and personal vulnerability that I had never felt before in working with students. The tone that I believe was set throughout this interaction was one in which the reality of our respective status and roles as teacher and students receded, to be replaced by as close to an equitable exchange as I could foster. These feelings were reinforced by my insistence on giving each student an opportunity to share his/her opinion, as well as by my intentional decision to listen without offering any verbal feedback besides restating their positions.

While it is true—as described in Episode Three—that my students' feedback had no practical bearing on the outcome of the decision regarding the Haiti donation, the teacher-students exchange that occurred in Episode Two marked, in my mind, a pivotal juncture point in my commitment to transform our teacher-students relationship toward authentic collaboration and mutuality. Thus, despite the obvious negative aspects of this experience for me, it also served to jolt my awareness, as never before, to the importance of establishing clarity regarding the need for the interests and voices of the students and me to be paramount in the planning and decision-making process adopted for any future events involving the input of parents and/or local citizens.

For the first time, I had experienced what it felt like to feel some level of disenfranchisement from my own global citizenship action-learning initiative. This experience enabled me to more easily empathize with the ways in which my students may have felt—or had the right to feel—about the ways in which I had effectively disempowered them from important planning and decision-making processes. This

empathic connection, in turn, served to recommit me to encouraging youth participation in all aspects of our pedagogical, planning, and decision-making processes as a staple of our global citizenship culture. Moving forward, I would hold myself fully responsible for any future failure to uphold the values of promoting youth interests, voice, participation, and empowerment. This commitment, in turn, meant that I had to ensure that the voices of my students and me would never again be suppressed or diminished for the purpose of efficiency or of obtaining a desired tangible outcome related to our action-learning initiative.

Probing Question Two

What global citizenship dispositions were expressed by this critical incident?

Despite the unsatisfying level of voice and power experienced by me, as well as the almost total denial of voice and power afforded to my students, the first two episodes described above provided significant and meaningful opportunities for the students and me to reflect seriously on the core motivations for our commitment to this exhausting, multi-year, action-learning initiative on behalf of the students of EAFS. Emerging from my personal reflection in Episode One and the follow-up discussion with the Global Care Club members regarding the issue of Haitian earthquake relief in Episode Two was a clear commitment to our partnership and ethical relationship with EAFS based on many of the global citizenship dispositions derived from my global ethic. Specifically, I refer here to the following dispositions discussed at length in Chapter Two: acknowledgment of the (implicit) call of the suffering other (in this case, the needs of the EAFS students) to engage in an intersubjective ethical relationship; recognition of the ethical

interdependence/interconnection produced by our response to this call (elaborated upon at length in the first two episodes above); awareness of the dignity or fundamental value of the other (the EAFS students) with whom one is ethically engaged; an empathic response to the seriousness of the needs of the other (i.e., of the educational needs of the EAFS students) as well as a capacity for the extension of empathy to non-intimate others (i.e., empathic extension); acceptance of the responsibility to address the needs and suffering of the other (compassion), accompanied by an assessment that the human needs to be addressed are critical to the exercise of the others' capabilities and dignity, i.e., that the other has a clear human right to obtain these needs—and that the indignity resulting from the denial of this human need/right would constitute an injustice. Each of these dispositions coalesced, in turn, to form our intersubjective ethical commitment to practice global citizenship on behalf of the EAFS students by sponsoring construction of their high school wing.

What made this connection to and affirmation of global citizenship dispositions particularly interesting and important was the context within which these dispositions were invoked in response to the life-threatening needs of the Haitian earthquake survivors. The need to derive and apply such global citizenship dispositions in the face of the ultimate comparative test—the emergency physical needs of non-intimate others in another part of the globe—offered the students and me proof of the sincerity, depth, and primacy of our intersubjective ethical relationship to the students of EAFS and of our commitment to the attainment of their human needs and dignity. Thus, this critical incident provided a “real-world” test and application of global citizenship dispositions; in

doing so, it enabled my students to continue to move toward making explicit dispositions that had been largely or completely implicit prior to their participation in our global citizenship action-learning initiative.

Critical Incident Four: The Ethical Problem of Attempting Change Agency as a Cultural Outsider: Empowering Students Through Epistemological Partnership and Critical Discourse

Episode One

2/3/10 - “A house, a cow, a wife” – A Peace Corps Volunteer Shares Her Experiences in Promoting Gender Equality & Change Agency in Kenya

Sometime during the frenetic pre-“Magic” event planning stage, I had been approached by a colleague who suggested that her sister, Kathy, who had just finished a two-year Peace Corps stint teaching at a Kenyan high school, would like to deliver a presentation to our club. Given the connections regarding geography and education between Kathy’s experiences and our Ethiopian School Construction Initiative, I felt confident that, when the dust of the “Magic” event had settled, such a presentation would be very beneficial.

Kathy introduced her experience by showing some photos and providing brief background about her residence near Mt. Kenya and the school where she taught. She showed two photos of students sitting at their desks and pointed out that it is hard to distinguish between boys and girls because all students are required to shave their hair and wear uniforms. Kathy then showed a photo of the high school teaching staff which included only one other woman, who eventually left her job, leaving Kathy as the lone

female teacher. She further indicated that girls/women had very distinct and different role expectations from boys/men which she, as a feminist, found ethically problematic. As an instance of this gender divide, she observed that the male teachers would typically converse in their “tribal” tongue in the teachers’ lounge, thereby having the effect of excluding her from their conversation.

When I asked Kathy how she dealt with that situation, she stated that she mainly “ostracized” herself from the men. Kathy then provided a concrete example to illustrate how women were treated differently through the following anecdote. One of Kathy’s male colleagues asked her for the correct English word for “property.” When she asked for a clarification of how he meant to use the word, the colleague shared examples of property, including “a house, a cow, a wife.” This offended Kathy deeply, who responded by delivering a blunt “lecture” to her colleague regarding his offense. This interaction further solidified the chasm between Kathy and the male teachers.

Since the global problem of gender inequity was such a prominent aspect of her presentation, I proceeded to ask Kathy a range of questions to help the students and me better understand the different cultural expectations regarding gender and how these gender roles presented serious obstacles to the developmental needs—and, in particular, the educational needs—of females in such a society. Kathy’s responses revealed four overarching issues adversely impacting the success of girls at schools such as the one at which she volunteered: the teachers’ low expectations for girls’ academic achievement; extensive, time-consuming, and gender-specific daily chores such as cooking, farming, and fetching water and firewood; the lack of privacy and sanitary facilities for girls

experiencing puberty, leading to the loss of one week of school per month; and the girls' own culturally learned disempowerment.

In order to address this latter dimension of gender inequity, Kathy formed a Girls Club aimed at empowering girls to think and act in ways outside those reinforced daily by their cultural practices and norms by “get(ting) the girls to do things the boys were doing.” Kathy then shared an anecdote involving a delivery of seedlings for plantings around the school to reveal the resistance she encountered among the girls themselves to putting such empowerment into practice. According to Kathy, initially only the boys removed the seedlings from the truck and carried them to their locations. Kathy then prodded the girls to join in this task, telling them that doing the things that boys and men do will compel males to perceive of females as “equal.” However, Kathy was only able to get two girls to remove seedlings one time from the truck.

At the end of our interaction, Kathy mentioned another topic that would lead our club and me to engage in the conversation documented in Episode Three below at our next morning meeting: the issue of justifying one's efforts to reform the cultural practices of a population to whom one comes as a foreigner and cultural outsider. Kathy indicated that, as a Peace Corps volunteer, she was educated to see herself as a change agent within the society that she was sent to live. She stated that the grounding principle of the Peace Corps is to “create sustainable change.” When I asked Kathy to explain “sustainability,” she defined it as “changing people's way of thinking and acting in a permanent way.”

At that point, I turned to my students and encouraged them to feel the type of ethical tension that, I believe, should be associated with attempting to dramatically alter the norms and practices of a cultural group in accordance with the ethical orientation or values of a cultural outsider:

This raises an important moral question. Now, you and I may agree with Kathy that gender should not be a factor in providing opportunities for people. But Kathy is describing a philosophy in which she and other Peace Corps volunteers bring their values and experiences to different cultural settings in order to change the way people in these cultures think and act. We have to think about how we decide which of our values we believe should be offered to other cultures and how this should be done. Also, we have to realize that it would take a tremendous amount of courage on the part of anyone—for example, a girl in Kenya—to be willing to act counter to the way her culture has raised her to think, feel, and act.

I then asked Kathy to elaborate on this idea of importing one's own values into a different cultural setting. She said, "You know there's a better way of doing things." I followed up by asking, "Do you feel you made a change? I mean, do you feel you made a fundamental change for maybe one or two of the girls you taught?" Kathy's expression more than her verbal response indicated that she did not feel that she had succeeded in her mission. In referring to the ways in which she tried to model a level of independence and initiative not typically found among girls in Kenya, Kathy stated, "They wrote it off as something the American woman did."

Episode Two

2/5/10 - “Change doesn’t come that fast” – An Equitable Teacher-Students Whole-club Dialogue Regarding Gender Inequity and Intercultural Change Agency

The ethical dilemmas connected to the act of attempting to promote one’s global ethic in the role of a cultural outsider had not previously occupied a significant portion of my mindset as a global citizenship practitioner. Perhaps the above episode tied into my burgeoning awareness of and concern regarding the importance of process in my own global citizenship practice with my students. Perhaps it was the seemingly undisturbed ease with which Kathy posited her mission and, in turn, the mission of the Peace Corps, of “creating sustainable change” that caused me to pause and consider these issues. Nevertheless, it was with these questions in mind that I decided to use our next Global Care morning meeting to introduce and discuss this conflict between a global citizenship mindset promoting change agency based on the application of universal ethical/social/political dispositions and principles and the importance of trying to understand and respect the beliefs, norms, and practices of different cultures that run counter to one’s global citizenship dispositions.

Consequently, on February 5th I told the fourteen attending students (four of whom had not attended Kathy’s presentation) at the Global Care morning meeting that the presentation by Kathy at our previous meeting had raised my awareness regarding the issue of gender inequity and provoked my thinking about how one can ethically justify acting as an intentional change agent within another culture. What unfolded was a remarkable 30-minute dialogue that coalesced both of these topics.

The students offered five major suggestions for addressing gender inequity in a culturally foreign setting such as the one Kathy encountered in Kenya: educating boys and girls about the concept and benefits of gender equality (Xavier), introducing aspects of our culture that might provoke other cultures to “rethink their own beliefs and practices” (Cynthia), empowering girls to develop their own voices (Malka), educating people about the needs of girls during their menstrual cycles (Bethany), and the health and pregnancy risks resulting from unprotected sexual activity (Bethany). Of these strategies, those introduced by Bethany inspired the most commentary.

Regarding the issue of girls’ menstrual cycles, Bethany stated that girls should not feel “embarrassed” about such a “natural” bodily function; nor should this force them to miss school. If the proper facilities were not available, asserted Xavier, girls should at least be “home-schooled during that time.”

Bethany introduced the serious medical issues regarding unprotected intercourse by declaring that “sex protection is not a bad thing” and that we should “(E)ducate about AIDS, STDs and pregnancies.” Indeed, in cultures that continue to permit child marriage—which typically involves the marriage of a teenage or pre-teen girl to an adult male—and discourage the use of contraceptive devices, a girl’s risk of acquiring a sexually transmitted disease or becoming pregnant before her body can safely engage in childbearing and delivery skyrockets.

Then Sean raised a point that would encompass much of the remainder of our conversation: the conflict between the educative measures advocated by Bethany and the entrenched religious doctrines and cultural practices in some nations that restrict or forbid

the distribution, use, and encouragement of contraception. Sean's interjection led students to acknowledge the difficulty of addressing this conflict, while offering ways of doing just that.

Regarding the source of this conflict, Xavier stated that "(Y)ou can't really change someone's beliefs so easily. They've been brought up this way." Sean added that often "schools are sponsored by the Church," thereby negating the possibility of garnering support for education about the use of contraception within those settings. Bethany concurred that such education is not possible in countries in which "religion is very tied into everything."

Nevertheless, several students attempted to posit ways of encountering or circumventing this specific problem of educating about contraception, as well as the broader issue of gender inequity. Bethany asserted that "(I)f we could just expose them to these ideas . . . (S)ex protection can help with gender equality." Another student suggested introducing such new ideas by emphasizing the practical improvements they would engender: "If you want to create any change, you don't tell them, 'You have to change your culture.' You tell them what good will happen, how much more successful their culture may become with equal rights." For Xavier, it was not possible to directly confront people or societies who held conservative religious views. Rather, he suggested the strategy of somehow bypassing such conflict by "find(ing) a way to go around it." To this end, Xavier offered a grassroots approach: "The whole gender equality thing, first try to change it in the homes, not the Church. Then work up to the higher levels." Sean

seemed to support this approach by asserting that “(I)f you have older girls believing in equality, the boys will have no choice but to follow them.”

Amidst this exchange, Sean shared two points that placed a check on any enthusiasm for seeking the rapid transformation of a culture. First, Sean insisted that the pace of such efforts at cultural change agency must be “slow because you might mess up the whole fabric of the culture.” Further, he questioned the ethical legitimacy of the entire enterprise of change agency by asserting the right of all cultures to establish their own social and moral norms. Asserting that “all cultures are equal,” Sean shared his ethical concerns about attempting to address an issue such as gender inequity: “In your mind, you know it’s wrong (gender inequity). But who are you to say what’s wrong?” This question encapsulated my tension regarding the ethical justification for practicing global citizenship as a cultural outsider as provoked by Kathy’s presentation.

As the meeting came to a close, I needed to get a gauge regarding the value that the students assigned to this extended conversation, so I simply asked, “Was this conversation worth having?” The students’ responses to this question were affirming, while they also revealed several lessons derived from this experience. Articulating a point made by several of the students, Bethany claimed that this dialogue had raised her awareness regarding the “possible roadblocks and risks” associated with attempting change agency. Other students stated the value this discussion had in raising their awareness of the problem of gender inequity. While stating that “(T)his was an important theoretical discussion for all of us,” Sean reinforced his practical and ethical concerns about attempting to influence cultural norms as cited above. The final comment of the

discussion, offered by a sixth grade girl, summed up the “take-away” from this conversation: “I learned that change doesn’t come that fast.”

Critique of Critical Incident Four

Probing Question One

What did the actions of this critical incident reveal about the nature of our teacher-students pedagogical relationship and culture? To what extent, if any, did the pedagogical relationship/culture showcase youth voice and/or empowerment?

Critical Incident Four represented a notable turning point confirming my redoubled efforts to create and facilitate pedagogical structures supportive of a more collaborative and equitable teacher-students relationship featuring youth voice and empowerment. Further, this critical incident evolved as a spontaneous response to important ethical issues emerging from Kathy’s presentation of her Peace Corps experiences above, not as some pre-planned teacher strategy regarding curriculum or agenda. This level of teacher authenticity, my openness and sincerity in sharing my ethical questions provoked by Kathy’s presentation, and the recasting of my status vis-à-vis my students as epistemological partners in dialogue regarding the topics under critical review contributed greatly to the power of this overall experience.

Additionally, this critical incident marked my students’ most overt and comprehensive use to that point of the global citizenship disposition of critical consciousness within the context of our action-learning initiative. While it is true that the students had been involved early on in researching the causes of a wide array of global problems, I had not previously challenged my students to identify in a sustained way the

institutional sources of such problems. Nor had I previously broached the complicated ethical and practical issues resulting from attempts to influence cultural and institutional practices as a cultural outsider.

While it was my initiative and voice that broached the conceptual thread underlying this critical incident, I believe that in doing so I was facilitating dialogue about a topic of fundamental importance to our whole joint endeavor of global citizenship practice. Student receptivity to the topic of intercultural change agency as applied to the global problem of gender inequity was clearly demonstrated by their cognitive and affective investment in the ensuing whole-club conversation described in Episode Two.

Additionally—and perhaps of greater importance than the content of the topic of discussion—I had made critical changes in my facilitation of pedagogical processes in the hopes of constructively addressing some of the covert and overt methods I had utilized to suppress or reduce the significance of youth voice, interests, and power as described in the earlier critical incidents. First, I had eliminated any sense of teacher manipulation in the process by publicly articulating the topic of intercultural change agency at the end of Kathy's Peace Corps presentation, then reintroducing this issue to my students at the following meeting as a topic about which I believe all prospective global citizens—of course, including me—needed to grapple. By modeling my personal cognitive process and sharing my own uncertainty regarding the ethical resolution of this problem, I had implicitly posited the students of our shared status as authentic and equal interlocutors with the joint desire for improved clarity regarding the topics and questions under examination. Further, this shift toward a more equitable teacher-students status within

this discussion meant that I could not arbitrarily reposition my status and claim some heightened understanding or resolution regarding the issues under review without offering a reasoned explanation of my newfound clarity. That is, by reducing or eliminating power inequality among the dialogical participants, the only recourse for legitimately establishing a stance regarding any issue under discussion would be through reference to evidence or arguments open to public scrutiny.

Further, this power equity dispersed the burden for resolving the issues at hand or deriving viewpoints amongst all the participants of our global citizenship community. Consequently, this level of co-ownership contained the added implication that much of the learning fostered by this conversation would result directly from student decisions regarding the nature and direction of the content. That is, the assumption of heightened ownership regarding the quality of the whole-club conversation carried with it an unavoidable responsibility regarding the knowledge and understanding the students derived from this discourse.

In addition, the evidentiary requirement for asserting the legitimacy of one's epistemological truth claims virtually ensured the introduction of multiple ethical viewpoints regarding any issue or problem introduced to our community. This, in turn, unavoidably introduced the experience of doubt or unease regarding the ethical positions of the participants. Thus, the prioritization of democratic discourse, open to public scrutiny by equal epistemological partners, requires development of the ability to accept and occupy a kind of "gray" area of uncertainty pertaining to the resolution of controversial or important ethical issues regarding global citizenship practice. That is, the

movement of our global citizenship community in the direction of a more equitable pedagogical process concurrently prodded its participants to dwell in a continual state of critique regarding the institutional causes of global problems, as well as those dispositions, principles, and values deemed foundational to one's own global citizenship practice. Additionally, by placing myself under the obligation to offer reasons for any opinion I might adopt at this conversation, I was concurrently, if implicitly, opening my opinions to critique by any of the student participants in the dialogue. Indeed, this initial willingness to share with my students my authentic uncertainty regarding an ethical issue of importance to the practice of global citizenship and to open my tentative views to their potential critique foreshadowed the next major movement in my growth as a global citizenship teacher-facilitator, as described in the ensuing critical incident.

The pedagogical method I utilized to facilitate the whole-club conversation documented in Episode Two also represented an important contribution to the promotion of youth voice and empowerment. Once I had reintroduced and framed the question/topic for discussion, I invited the attending students to assume control over the content and direction of the conversation in several concrete ways. Specifically, I tried to balance my role as co-interlocutor with that of an impartial facilitator, whose primary functions were threefold: to foster student control over the dialogue by inviting students to speak without the need to seek my permission to do so; to stress the need to offer reasons or evidence for one's opinions for the purpose of opening them to public scrutiny; and to create an environment emphasizing mutual understanding, sharing of ideas, and openness to being influenced by the ideas of others, as opposed to a

competitive format in which participants attempted to “win” an argument or persuade others to concur with one’s own opinion.

(Within the context of my classroom teaching, I had for much of my career utilized a variant of this conversational format whereby students were invited to read excerpts of their written reflections while I listened quietly and non-judgmentally, and recorded key words or phrases from the students’ reflections which I would read or “mirror” back to the students following their sharing. Periodically, I had tried to expand this format by also allowing the students’ spontaneous oral reflections to be included in such sharing. I referred to this type of sharing as either a “Quaker Share” (when it involved only student written reflections) or a “Quaker Talk” (when spontaneous student thoughts were permitted as well) in honor of the method of authentic and spontaneous oral sharing used at Quaker meetings.

In conclusion, this critical incident marked a potentially transformative juncture point in my efforts to revise the pedagogical and cultural values, norms, and practices of our global citizenship community in the direction of youth voice and empowerment. I initiated this transformation through teacher openness with my students regarding a significant problem at the ethical core of global citizenship practice: the ethical justification for attempts to intercede with global problems linked to longstanding cultural practices, norms, and beliefs occurring outside one’s own culture. Further, I introduced my students to a pedagogical practice that ensured a high level of youth voice, empowerment, and ownership by providing conversational procedures accentuating

youth choice and control, while raising youth status to the level of epistemological partnership.

Ultimately, the introduction and future use of the type of democratic pedagogical practices discussed in this critical incident to our global citizenship community entailed commitment to two core values: the importance of cultivating a more equitable teacher-students relationship accentuating youth interests, voice, empowerment, and ownership in all matters impacting their participation in our community and its action-learning initiative, and an emphasis on the use of critique and evidence in deriving tentative positions regarding issues of importance to our global citizenship community. A commitment to these values meant commitment to personal transparency regarding my stances in regards to such matters of communal import. This, in turn, would mean prioritizing pedagogical process and the teacher-students relationship as of greater value than some pre-determined outcome of that process.

Probing Question Two

What global citizenship dispositions were expressed by this critical incident?

The challenge posed by the overarching topics of gender inequity and intercultural change agency necessarily focused the students on the use of ethical/social/political critique. As the students identified some of the religious institutions and historical and cultural practices within which gender inequity is embedded in regions of the world like Kenya, this whole-club conversation provided the students with a powerful experience in critical consciousness. Further, as the students and I explored the institutional beliefs, norms, and practices that promoted gender

inequity, we placed this critique within an even wider context regarding the type of ethical/social/political response that might be appropriate for a prospective global citizen and cultural outsider to engage in to address such culturally grounded inequity. Thus, the conversation outlined in this critical incident challenged the ethical legitimacy of articulating and utilizing a universal or global ethic to address transnational global problems, thereby casting doubts regarding the ethical legitimacy of the entire enterprise of global citizenship practice.

In my view, one of the powerful outcomes of engaging in this public critique was the way in which each of us left the conversation with heightened clarity regarding some of the ethical problems involved in trying to practice global citizenship as a cultural outsider, yet without a sense of having comfortably resolved these issues. This experience of having to hold onto and grapple with multiple, vying, unresolved ethical perspectives regarding a common ethical issue or global problem is, I believe, an unavoidable requirement of a thoughtful and open-minded global citizen.

While the exercise of critical consciousness was clearly the most prominent global citizenship disposition addressed by this whole-club conversation, several other dispositions were invoked by our inquiry into the global problem of gender inequity. In particular, the dispositions of dignity, human needs, human rights, human capabilities, and justice were cited or implied by the students through their use of terms such as “equal rights” and “gender equality.” Further, I would argue that, throughout this conversation, the students and I were in touch with a generic experience of empathy and empathic extension for the girls/women living in Kenya or anywhere, including the U.S., required

by their native cultures to internalize the power inequity and diminishment of their voices regarding important ethical/social/cultural/political/economic issues vis-à-vis males in their societies.

Critical Incident Five: Student Critique of My Global Ethic

Episode One

3/12/10 - “This has *everything* to do with global citizenship” - A Whole-club

Conversation Regarding My Global Ethic

As I prepared to talk, I felt a noticeable level of excitement coupled with anxiety. With the exception of occasional meetings in which I had felt the need to motivate or challenge the students to a higher level of commitment, it was not my style to lecture or to speak at great length. Yet, I had decided to provide a fairly detailed account of aspects of my global ethic and to encourage subsequent critique of it by my students.

The decision to offer such an unprecedented window into my global ethic was taken for several reasons. First, I felt a kind of ethical obligation to reinforce my burgeoning teacher transparency by sharing with my students my ethical foundation for practicing global citizenship. That is, I felt the students had a right to know something about the ethical foundation that motivated the person they were entrusting with facilitating their growth as global citizenship practitioners.

Secondly, building off the success of my first effort to facilitate a Quaker talk with the club members as described at length in the preceding critical incident, as well as the overall maturity of my students’ written reflections about their own ethical motivations for participating in our global citizenship community, I felt confident that my

students were developmentally ready to benefit from such an elaboration regarding my own global ethic. Connected to this assessment of the students' developmental readiness, I hoped that the experience of learning about and critiquing aspects of my global citizenship dispositions would motivate my students to begin or continue their own efforts to articulate and adopt their own set of global citizenship dispositions and principles.

Lastly, I must have felt that our teacher-students relationship had grown sufficiently to trust my students to interpret my willingness to share my global ethic as an opportunity for them to engage in the type of thoughtful critique that they had conducted in the fourth critical incident.

Thus, backed by each of these justifications, I began the meeting with a lecture format and proceeded, upon its completion, to open the last half of the meeting for discussion and critique. After briefly explaining the purpose and format of this meeting, I offered a rationale for my belief in the interconnection and interdependence of life. After simply asserting that we "rely on one another," I clarified that I was using this terminology not as a metaphor, but as a literal statement of fact. To make this point, I drew the students' attention to the ways in which human beings are dependent on non-human life for our own existence and how easy it can be for those of us living in the "developed" world to forget this:

The truth is that in our modern world we're always enclosed . . . like in this building. I can turn the heat on and off at will, right? You're cold, I'll put the heat on. But, outside this artificial human space . . . there are

trees, there's grass, there are little insects . . . that are doing things that are absolutely essential to our existence. You take away trees, you take away human beings, correct? And stop and think (about) the elements that go into just the existence of trees that we need and you'll find . . . soil and roots, rain and all kinds of elements, all of which we need. In a sense we are dependent on those things for our whole life (*note*: I should have added that we, in turn, are responsible for being stewards of all life). So the first thing I would say is that if you believe in global citizenship, you have to believe . . . that . . . in some real way -- as real as touching this desk -- we are interdependent with all life.

Having explained interconnection/interdependence to my satisfaction, I introduced and unpacked the notion of dignity as linked to three core concepts: preciousness, fragility, and capabilities. I justified the preciousness of life as a logical and actual outgrowth of the belief in interdependence:

First of all, all life has an inherent value. By virtue of being a living thing, by virtue of participating in the interdependence that I've just talked about, you have value. See, you don't have to earn value. When you are born, you have value. I mean, an ant, a tree, a seed, have value.

Next, I posited the notion of fragility as indicative of the reality of the finiteness of all life, and the accompanying vulnerability humans must feel as a result of our awareness of this fact. Thus, the fragility of life reinforces its preciousness.

Lastly, I cited the notion of capabilities inherent in all life, whether that means the potential for a seed to become a tree or a person to become a global citizen practitioner. I

then linked such capabilities to both the fragility inherent in being alive—and, hence, of the possibility of not adequately experiencing or exercising one’s capabilities—and the accompanying ethical obligation to play one’s part in nurturing that potential in self and others within the context of this fragility:

When you look at a life form, I would argue you have to be simultaneously aware of two things: . . . that that life form is vulnerable, fragile, and what . . . I (can) do to promote that life form’s full potential. How can I protect it? . . . How can I nurture it?

After further elaboration upon my multidimensional conception of dignity, I completed my statement by sharing a modified version of a quote from a Jewish text, the Talmud, that I believe most eloquently articulates the idea of the dignity and interconnection of life. In the text, this quote is interpreted as, “He who saves one human life, it is as if he has saved the world entire.” I then explained that, to avoid gender bias and to expand the scope of this saying to include *all* life, I preferred to say, “*He or she* who saves one *life*, it is as if he/she has saved the world entire.” To illustrate this more expansive conception, I shared how this precept can apply even to insects:

The quote does not say, “He (or she) who saves one person.” It does not say what “saving” means. . . . I interpret that in the following way. If I see in my house an ant crawling along, I have a choice. I can step on it, ignoring its fragility. I can ignore it. Or I can be more proactive; I can say, “Okay, come here little guy. Okay, here we go.” (I act out placing a tissue on the floor and having the ant crawl onto it.) Then I can gently open the door and—“Out you

go”—giving it its opportunity to (experience its potential as an ant) with no guarantee that it won’t die three seconds later if something decides to kill it, right? But that’s saving a life.

After concluding this final portion of my statement, I sought to invite the club members into discussion and critique. To facilitate this process, I asked, “Do you . . . feel this has anything to do with global citizenship and, if so, what?” From this point, the remainder of the conversation consisted almost entirely of student input.

Bethany initiated the conversation by affirmatively and eloquently recapitulating the concepts I had introduced:

I don’t think this has *something* (her emphasis) to do with global citizenship.

I think this has *everything* (her emphasis) to do with global citizenship.

Because if we don’t respect those points, how can we care for others? If we don’t see the fragility, we won’t be able to acknowledge that we only have one life to do what we need to do. If we don’t see that life is fragile, how can we help someone? If we don’t see value, why would we care? If we don’t see the dignity in a person, again, why would we possibly care? If we don’t see that we’re interdependent, why would we come out of our little comfort zone.

After I complemented her for her contribution, Bethany connected my more “expansive” version of the Talmudic quote cited above to our club’s efforts to support access to education for the students of EAfS:

(I)ike with the . . . proverb—I feel like we saved a whole school’s lives

because without that (construction of EAFS) we really don't know if they would have gone to school at all or how their lives would have been. . . .

So, I feel like, maybe we saved the world all over. Who knows what they'll get to be!

Connecting to Bethany's linkage between "saving" a life and enabling capabilities, Huan "agree(d) that by making the Ethiopian-American Friendship School, we've just raised all the kids' potential." Huan also applied this point to the *Time for School* video series I had shown to the club earlier in the year in that "we talked about each country and each kid and about how much potential they had and how much opportunity they had to go to school, and what they could do with their potential."

While supporting Huan's point, Xavier insisted that engaging in global citizenship practice required positing both the dignity and equal capabilities of the suffering other:

(i)f you donated a million dollars, (but) you don't have any dignity or if you don't see the potential in someone, it doesn't really count as being a global citizen, 'cause you have to treat them like an equal and see that everyone has potential.

One of our sixth graders, James, then reminded the group that our discussion of capabilities needed to be inclusive of, and linked to, the "vulnerability and global potential of *everything* (his emphasis), not just people." James referred to this as "the cycle of life." (This metaphor of a "life cycle" inspired several of the ensuing contributions.) Martin then made the important point arising from interdependence that promoting the capabilities of the EAFS students should, in turn, encourage each of these

students to positively impact others in their lives, thereby perpetuating a “cycle of empathy and compassion.”

In his support of the connection between interdependence and of a “cycle” of “lifesaving” global citizenship practice, Zain posited the linkage in the natural world between bees, pollination, decomposition, and fertility that could lead to the production of some important “edible plant.” In this way, Zain asserted, “Little things add up, like the saving of just one thing (life).”

Zain’s reference to the natural world to help us understand and visualize—mirroring a technique I had used in my opening statement above—found support from several peers. Nancy, a sixth grader, reinforced the applicability of Zain’s line of reasoning: “Like what Zain said, if you save one thing, it continues and saves more.” For Nancy, this notion embodied the meaning of the Talmudic quote above. Sean also used Zain’s imagery to draw connections between capabilities and interdependence:

The point of global citizenship is to make people, and to make (you) reach your full potential . . . because life is interconnected. If you believe that, you can do the smallest things, and that will help the bees reach their potential, and that will help the flowers reach their potential.

With just a few minutes remaining in our meeting time, Cynthia applied the notion of interconnection to our entire dialogue: “I think what everyone’s saying is true, and I think all our points are interconnected.”

After I spanned the room to ensure that every student had the opportunity to speak, Bethany offered an argument connecting interdependence, dignity, and capabilities with our club's ethical responsibility to sponsor construction of EAFS:

(w)ith the interconnection, in Ethiopia, what if one kid becomes a doctor now that he or she has an education? Maybe they'll be the one to find the cure for cancer. Maybe they'll be a second Gandhi. We don't know. It's all about . . . potential and dignity and everything. I think it's almost necessary for us to do this (build EAFS) because without it, what's the world going to be like? Who else is going to do it?

Returning to Cynthia's comment above, James offered the final substantive thought of the conversation: "I agree with what she said, how . . . everything is interwoven. . . . But, . . . (N)ot everything gets to reach its potential...So, with the school in Ethiopia, we helped..."

"...Stitch it?" I interjected?

"Yeah, we helped stitch it in this little spot," confirmed James. At that precise moment, the bell rang for homeroom. I asked, "It sounds like this was a worthwhile activity. Was it?" Following a chorus of assent, Bethany concluded, "Better than writing, I think."

Critique of Critical Incident Five

Probing Question One

What did the actions of this critical incident reveal about the nature of our teacher-students pedagogical relationship and culture? To what extent, if any, did the pedagogical relationship/culture showcase youth voice and/or empowerment?

The whole-club dialogue described in this critical incident shared many of the positive attributes discussed in Critical Incident Four: in particular, use of an epistemological process highly conducive to promoting youth voice and empowerment over the content and process of our learning process, and the nurturance of collaborative and equitable relations between all participants. However, several dimensions of this critical incident marked it as a landmark experience in my teaching career and in my growth as an effective middle school teacher-facilitator of a global citizenship community.

While I had undoubtedly shared aspects of my global ethic with former students when I had deemed it pertinent to some class lesson, this critical incident represented the first time that I had methodically elaborated upon significant aspects of my global ethic with middle school students, as well as elicited student critique regarding it. As such, Critical Incident Five represents the most comprehensive teacher-students discussion regarding the notion of a global ethic and its accompanying ethical dispositions and principles conducted in this study.

My previous reluctance to sharing my global ethic and seeking student feedback regarding it was grounded in several factors, the most important of which were my

ethical concerns about indoctrinating youth to accept my global ethic and, perhaps less consciously, the vulnerability associated with subjecting my global dispositions to public criticism. Ultimately, however, these concerns were superseded by my judgment that the Global Care students were capable, both cognitively and affectively, of evaluating and critiquing my global ethic, as long as I provided them with a convincing assurance that their critique would be welcomed as a step in the development of their own global ethics, not as a means of reassuring me of mine. That is, the growth in the collaborative and equitable features of our teacher-students relationship encouraged my unprecedented level of intellectual transparency and openness/vulnerability to student scrutiny. In this way, I both modeled the experience of subjecting important personal convictions to public critique and signaled to my students that I had reached a sufficient trust level with them to proceed with this level of sharing.

My affirmative determination of the growth of our teacher-students relationship and of the maturation of my students' capabilities as dialogical interlocutors was proven to be well-founded. My students responded very favorably and capably to this opportunity, demonstrating an increased comfort level with the reintroduction of this new form of collaborative and equitable dialogical practice and with the heightened expectations of their status as epistemological co-investigators with me. Indeed, my perception of the effectiveness and depth of my students' feedback strongly alleviated my concerns about the possibility that the introduction of my personal global ethic might have unduly influenced or indoctrinated them.

However, within the context of all the positive and affirming aspects demonstrated by this critical incident, I realize in retrospect that I had still retained a level of status, choice, and control that had an important impact on the topics and direction of this whole-club conversation. First, I had not prepared the attending club members for the topic of my global ethic prior to the meeting. Thus, not only had I retained total control regarding the topic to be discussed, but I had denied my students any opportunity of preparation for a topic as cognitively challenging as that of global citizenship dispositions/principles.

Secondly, while the format featured a balance in time and voice between the students and me, I had granted only myself the power to introduce my global ethic; the role of the students, as I framed it, was to respond to ideas presented by me. Thus, the students were placed in the position of having to respond to my remarks; they were not given an opportunity to formulate their own global citizenship dispositions.

My failure to involve my students in follow-up discussion and written reflections regarding their own global ethic represented a missed opportunity to facilitate the development of their own dispositions and principles: a process which would have greatly solidified their self-conception as competent global citizenship epistemologists and practitioners. I can only hope that this initial experience in hearing and critiquing my global ethic served as a catalyst in prompting my students to continue to work on making their own global citizenship dispositions more explicit to themselves.

My failure to provide a formal pedagogical mechanism in any ensuing club meetings for prodding my students to undertake such a formal examination of their own

global citizenship dispositions exposed a conflict I felt throughout this study: that is, establishment of a proper balance within our culture between investing time to nurture the students' ethical and philosophical inquiry into the concept of global citizenship and related topics, and the time needed to develop, plan, and implement the programmatic aspects of our action-learning initiative. While over the latter half of this study I had intentionally moved strongly in the direction of encouraging my students' joint ethical inquiry as central to my commitment to establish more collaborative and equitable teacher-student relations, the need to attend to practical matters connected to conducting an action-learning initiative, such as research, planning, organization, and decision-making, remained ongoing. Consequently, I learned that the tension associated with this conflict between the programmatic, tangible aspects of our initiative and my burgeoning desire to promote youth voice and empowerment through equitable inquiry into pertinent global citizenship topics and themes could not necessarily be resolved; rather, it was necessary to learn to live with it, while becoming more mindful of the tradeoffs accompanying our pedagogical decisions and priorities.

This self-critique of my pedagogical choices awakened me to ways in which I could continue to combat my propensity for control vis-à-vis my students. Specifically, I realized that youth voice, power, and ownership would be enhanced by incorporating into our culture the expectation that, from time to time—or perhaps on a regular basis—the students should be held responsible for determining the topics for whole-club dialogue, as well as the ways in which such dialogue should occur. Similar expectations of my students should also be promoted regarding their participation and ownership involving

the practical dimensions of our community's action-learning initiative, such as planning, decision-making, and event implementation.

Probing Question Two

What global citizenship dispositions were expressed by this critical incident?

As described above, the global citizenship dispositions I focused on in my opening statement included interdependence/interconnection, dignity, and capabilities. The dispositions of intersubjective ethical relations, empathy, empathic extension, and compassion were also strongly implied, if not directly cited.

Perhaps the most important aspect of the students' whole-club discussion in response to my sharing of several of my global citizenship dispositions was the multidimensional and creative ways in which they expressed understanding of and support for these dispositions, as well as their ability to draw linkages between them as described in the above episode. For example, in the first student remarks following my opening statement, Bethany linked fragility, dignity, and interdependence as motivations for extending compassion. She also connected the Talmudic saying I had introduced about the value of trying to save life with the metaphorical notion that our action-learning initiative had "saved" the lives and capabilities of the EAFS students. Xavier drew connections between the dispositions of dignity and the equal capabilities of all people. Martin referenced James's allusion to the "cycle of life" to argue that our support of the capabilities of the EAFS students would lead to a "cycle" of "empathy and compassion": that is, of global citizenship practice. Ultimately, Cynthia brought our discussion full circle by demonstrating how the interconnection of the students' thoughts mirrored the

ethical disposition of interdependency and interconnection broached in my introductory statement.

In conclusion, the students' enthusiastic embracement and apparent understanding of the global citizenship dispositions I had introduced at this club meeting relieved me of any fear that I may have indoctrinated or unduly influenced them regarding their own prospective global citizenship dispositions. Within the limitations to voice and power outlined above, the participating students had, indeed, enjoyed an extensive and liberating opportunity in which to critique these dispositions or to adopt them as their own. By providing my students with this opportunity for critique, I had tacitly reinforced my belief in their capacity to participate as co-epistemologists: that is, to adopt, reject, or modify my ethical positions as they proceeded in the development of their own global ethics.

Lastly, I had reaffirmed my commitment to establishing teacher-students relations based on collaboration, equity, and mutual trust. Indeed, I believe it was this nurturance of our teacher-students relationship that, over the course of the latter half of this study, prepared my psyche for perhaps my most important realization, i.e., the need to ground the relationship between our global citizenship community and our action-learning community partners in Ethiopia within the same dispositional orientation of intersubjective ethical relations that my students and I had been striving to attain.

Critical Incident Six: The Primacy of Intersubjective Ethical Relations

Episode One

6/4/10 - "Something that anyone can practice" – A Conversation Spurs Me to Reexamine the Primacy of Our Intersubjective Ethical Relations with EAFS

Perhaps my most important realization of this study occurred during a meeting with my critical friend for this study, my Social Studies supervisor, Tom Gordon. After beginning our meeting by sharing my excitement about the recent visit by Tessema Alemu to SMS that had culminated with a highly successful videoconference with a professor in Rwanda and our Global Care Club—an event which Mr. Gordon had attended and about which he had offered extremely supportive feedback—Mr. Gordon expressed his conviction that global citizenship should be “something that anyone can practice,” not simply materially advantaged people like our SMS students and community, who can raise funds as a way of making themselves “feel good.” In a way that I could not have anticipated, Mr. Gordon’s simple, straightforward observation served as a kind of conceptual vortex, coalescing the entirety of my efforts, discussed at length above, to cultivate relations of collaboration and equity with my own students into an even wider relational domain encompassing the relationship of my own global citizenship community with the students and faculty at EAFS.

This is not to suggest that my students and I had not made concerted efforts to develop connections with the EAFS student body. To this end, I had facilitated a pen-pal exchange for two years which had produced a definitive impact in bringing the faces and voices of the EAFS students into greater “focus.” Global Care had also purchased a video camera which enabled Mr. Alemu to arrange for the videotaping of EAFS students arriving at school, playing in the field in front of the school building, and being taught in their classrooms. Photographs of scenes such as these as well as of individual EAFS students and teachers had also been sent to us. Videos, photos and student interviews

from my trip to Ethiopia and EAFS further enhanced my students' burgeoning understanding of the culture, living conditions, and educational experiences in Ethiopia generally, and of the EAFS students in particular. Additionally, I had been working with Mr. Alemu for two years to sponsor electricity for EAFS which, in turn, would hopefully enable us to engage in future videoconferencing.

Indeed, these efforts at connection clearly raised the sensibility of my students regarding the unique personalities—the faces and voices—of the EAFS students, as well as their heartfelt desire to practice global citizenship. Our heightened awareness regarding the need to nurture the voices and global citizenship capacities of the EAFS students was demonstrated by the inclusion of excerpts from their letters and interviews within our whole-club presentation in which they proclaimed their desire to practice global citizenship in Ethiopia. This responsibility to promote the development of the EAFS students as global citizenship practitioners was affirmed by Rachel through her advocacy for the founding of a Global Care Club at EAFS. For Xavier, the desire of EAFS students to practice global citizenship qualified them as members of our global citizenship community.

However, despite my commitment to these efforts at fostering a feeling of reciprocity through student-to-student connections, the slowness of our current mode of communication through “snail mail,” the practical constraints involved in waiting for EAFS to obtain electricity, as well as the constant logistical and programmatic demands regarding our educational and fundraising events, had too often caused this crucial aspect of global citizenship practice to recede to the background of our daily activities and

consciousness. Thus, while realizing that our academic year was rapidly drawing to a close, I was excited to introduce and facilitate my students' exploration of reciprocity with the students of EAFS moving forward, as well as ways to empower their potential for global citizenship practice, at our next meeting.

Episode Two

6/7/10 - “(They) have so much to teach us” – Taking the First Step with My Students

On Monday, June 7th, I opened our club meeting by providing a brief overview of my conversation with Mr. Gordon the previous Friday, as outlined above. After citing our pen-pal exchange with EAFS as an example of reciprocity, I asked the fifteen attending students to brainstorm ways to enable the EAFS students to educate us about their cultural practices and beliefs or any other relevant topic.

The ensuing dialogue established the students' interest in exploring the idea of using the video camera provided to EAFS as a means of educating us about their culture, home, and school lives. As one student recalled from a previous discussion of this idea, the video itself could then be transferred to and used by the Global Care members to share their own cultural, home, and school experiences; in this way, a video exchange could assume the format of an unfolding narrative as each group shared more about their own lives, cultures, experiences, classes, and global citizenship aspirations and activities, and responded to the other group's video sharing.

Several other ideas were offered. Bethany suggested that, along with mailing us a videotape, the EAFS students could include a scrapbook collection of their writings and drawings about EAFS, Ethiopia, or other pertinent topics. Sean reminded us that, once

EAFS had finally received electricity, we would be in a position to try to engage in videoconferencing, an idea that Mr. Alemu and I had already taken to heart as one of our goals for the ensuing academic year.

Following this discussion, I reiterated the idea of encouraging the active global citizenship of the EAFS students by inviting them to join our “youth coalition.” While mindful of the fact that the EAFS students would ultimately need to decide upon the nature of their own global citizenship practice, much of the remaining dialogue was devoted to trying to determine the expectations and/or requirements of a prospective Global Care chapter, as well as a generic list of the types of action/service that might constitute global citizenship practice. To this end, Bethany suggested that we should create and send EAFS a kind of certificate of membership in Global Care, while Sean proposed several creative educational ideas, including having someone like Mr. Alemu teach global citizenship at EAFS, and having EAFS students provide peer tutoring and assistance in educating adults in their community.

As our meeting time came to a close, I made an appeal for any interested students to meet with me after school to follow-up on the ideas cited at this meeting. I also reinforced the need to recognize that the EAFS students “have so much to teach us.” While I realized that the several remaining Global Care club meetings would be insufficient this year to formalize any of the ideas broached in our conversation, I felt confident that a kind of conceptual foundation and implicit commitment had been laid at this meeting that would eventually lead to a more active relationship of collaboration and mutuality between the students of Global Care and EAFS for years to come.

Critique of Critical Incident Six

Probing Question One

What did the actions of this critical incident reveal about the nature of our teacher-students pedagogical relationship and culture? To what extent, if any, did the pedagogical relationship/culture showcase youth voice and/or empowerment?

In a practical sense, my efforts in this critical incident to reemphasize connection and reciprocity in the relationship between the Global Care and EAFS communities were relatively inconsequential and untenable for the short term. Simply put, there was no time available within the course of this study/school year for the practical implementation of any of the creative ideas brainstormed by my students for promoting this renewed emphasis.

However, in another sense, this critical incident represented, for me, the culminating epiphany of this entire study: an ethical commitment that will have a transformative impact on the way I facilitate future global citizenship communities, the conceptual model I use to organize future action-learning initiatives, and the ethical primacy I place on the need to nurture voice and empowerment between all participating members of one's action-learning initiatives. This emphasis on fostering equitable and empowering relations between all persons impacted by our action-learning initiatives will, I believe, cultivate the type of egalitarian conceptions of, and relations with, the other necessary to ensure that the more materially privileged participants—such as the students of the SMS Global Care Club and me—will conceive of their global citizenship practice not as a way of benefiting the “less fortunate,” but as a way of confirming the

ethical and political solidarity upon which the first disposition of my global ethic is based, i.e., intersubjective ethical relations with the face and voice of the other.

Another insight derived from this renewed focus on establishing collaborative and equitable relations with the students and faculty of EAFS—or of any future community partner—is the need for a radical reemphasis in the action-learning model used by our global citizenship community. Whereas historically our global citizenship practice has been dominated by an emphasis on clarifying, establishing, and attaining the programmatic tangible objectives of our action-learning initiatives, this reprioritization of developing an equitable partnership with our action-learning beneficiaries would require conceiving of the development of intersubjective ethical relations featuring reciprocity, mutuality, and equity in power relations as the founding social/ethical/political requirement of our current and future initiatives. That is, the objectives of our future action-learning initiatives would necessarily *emerge* from an initial relationship of partnership, equality, and discourse.

The implications of this emphasis on intersubjective ethical relations on the students' conceptions of the meaning and nature of global citizenship practice, as well as on the practical aspects of this practice will, I believe, be transformative of the culture and relationships within our global citizenship community. While I cannot know definitively the nature or size of the impact this transformation will take in the context of my continuing efforts to foster global citizenship communities and their action-learning initiatives, I will offer my forecast—as well as some initial data—regarding these changes in the final chapter of this dissertation. What I can be sure of is my commitment

to undertake the task of trying to successfully facilitate this cultural and relational transformation.

Probing Question Two

What global citizenship dispositions were expressed by this critical incident?

The entirety of this critical incident highlighted with strengthened power the global citizenship disposition of awareness of the face and voice of the suffering other as indicating a call to recognize and engage in an intersubjective ethical relationship with that other. In fact, relations grounded in collaboration, equity, reciprocity, and mutuality are foundational to achieving a state of intersubjectivity in which the voices, interests, needs, and empowerment of all involved parties are taken to heart in the context of dialogue, decision-making, and community formation. Further, reciprocity and mutuality necessitate elevation of an awareness of the faces and voices—the visibility—of the other, not as someone about whom one learns *about*, but *with* whom one interacts and engages in the formation of a social/ethical/political relationship and community.

Thus, nurturance of an understanding of the personality and humanity of the other increasingly clarifies her face and voice, thereby producing the conditions for social, ethical, and political exchange based on intersubjectivity. Further, given the foundational nature of ethical intersubjectivity to the entire enterprise of global citizenship practice, one can argue that the effort to nurture reciprocity and mutuality between all stakeholders in a global citizenship community and its action-learning initiative represents the most important foundational component of global citizenship practice. Indeed, from this

global citizenship disposition of intersubjective ethical relations emerge all the remaining dispositions of my global ethic.

Summary of Findings

As I read across the critical incidents introduced above, three interwoven thematic threads pertinent to my overall research question emerged: the foundational importance of relationships, in particular, my relationship with my students; my values conflict regarding the relative import of product vs. process and the resolution of that conflict; and the burgeoning importance of the global citizenship disposition of intersubjective ethical relations. I will use this summary to explore these overarching conceptual categories.

The impact of relationships cut across each of the selected critical incidents, embodying several different forms and influencing each of the other themes explored in this study. While the importance of this theme of relationships as a catalyzing force for change and growth was apparent in my interactions with the parents' committee for the "Magic" Johnson event, in my connection with my critical friend—as alluded to in the pivotal first episode of the sixth critical incident above—and in the relationship between our global citizenship community and the students of EAFS, the most important form of this concept involved the teacher-students relationship with my SMS Global Care Club members. The above critical incidents reveal several persistent conflicts that defined this relationship. The most prominent of these was the ongoing struggle regarding our relative degree of voice and power with respect to the pedagogical and epistemological processes we used at our meetings, the important decisions affecting our action-learning

initiative, and the values that informed the exercise of voice and power in each of these areas.

As documented throughout this chapter, each of these dimensions of our teacher-students relationship underwent a notable transformation commensurate with the degree to which efforts were made by my students and me to move away from traditional hierarchical modes of interaction toward fostering and practicing more collaborative and equitable methods of interaction. The success of this transformation inspired in me a level of trust in my students' burgeoning capacity for effective collaboration in our joint global citizenship practice. Concurrently, this trust reinforced my willingness to make my own experiences, values, and opinions more visible to my students and, therefore, open to their respectful critique. Such critique, in turn, began a movement toward positioning the students and me as co-epistemologists with the joint capacity and responsibility for engaging in reasoned and evidentiary dialogue as the means toward better understanding of pertinent global citizenship topics—as evidenced in Critical Incidents Four and Five above—and of making important decisions about our action-learning initiative. This potent combination of trust, transparency, and critical consciousness strengthened and renewed my efforts and commitment toward promoting youth participation and empowerment in each of the dimensions of our relationship cited above.

This unfolding movement toward establishing a more collaborative and equitable teacher-students relationship problematized two important and interwoven values I had always brought to my role as teacher-facilitator of a global citizenship community:

firstly, my insistence on achieving the tangible objectives of our action-learning initiatives; and secondly, my use of these programmatic objectives as barometers for measuring the relative success of the practice of our global citizenship community. These values were apparent through analysis of my pedagogical actions and choices in the first three critical incidents, in which the strength of these personal values ultimately overrode my increasing concerns regarding the importance of encouraging and ensuring the authentic participation of my students in the pedagogical, planning, and decision-making processes utilized to fulfill these objectives. Thus, historically, my students and I would point to our success with fundraising and educating our school and community as our proof of the success of our global citizenship practice.

However, as my self-reflection increasingly revealed the ways in which the voice and empowerment of my students was being neglected or suppressed through both covert and overt pedagogical choices on my part, this strong accentuation of the value of tangible and measurable accomplishment over the pedagogical process used to obtain these results became increasingly untenable, for me, as a viable global citizenship marker of success. What was needed, I came to realize over the course of this study, was a balance between the values of product and process. While our tangible action-learning objectives should not be ignored, they should not be achieved without the active and ongoing participation of the participating students in all aspects of the process through which these objectives are reached. Indeed, any effort to assess the effectiveness or success of any future action-learning initiative must take strongly into account the degree

to which the pedagogical, planning, and decision-making processes promote such youth participation and relevancy within these processes.

Ultimately, each of the dimensions of our teacher-students relationship intertwined around the grounding aspiration and global citizenship disposition of intersubjective ethical relations. That is, my budding realization of the seminal importance of nurturing a more collaborative and equitable teacher-students relationship eventually connected with the recognition—as described in the final critical incident above—that such a relationship actually constitutes, and is grounded in, mutual ethical responsibility between the relational participants as genuine ethical subjects capable of expressing and acting upon their individual opinions, needs, and values, as well as of responding to the ethical needs and call of the other as global citizenship practitioners.

This realization of the foundational and primary role of intersubjective ethical relations in the formation of a global citizenship community, in turn, prompted my recognition of the need to apply this disposition to our relations with the EAFS student-body. More broadly, this realization pointed toward the ethical requirement of making every effort to actualize the voices and capabilities of any future community-based action-learning partners to practice global citizenship as a means of fostering their participation with us in an authentic ethical relationship. Thus, I came to recognize that only through the nurturance of such intersubjective ethical relations between all participants in our global citizenship community can it be possible to truly practice deep compassion in solidarity with the geographically or culturally different other. That is,

only the achievement of intersubjective ethical relations can make possible the practice of global citizenship.

Chapter Six: Implications of This Study

The central purpose of this chapter is to identify and explore the implications of the findings derived from this study of my efforts, in conjunction with middle school youth, to nurture the development of global citizenship dispositions and youth voice and empowerment within the context of a global citizenship community engaged in a revised version of a service-learning process that I call global citizenship action-learning. To this end, this chapter will be structured into the following sections. First, I will briefly reiterate the major findings of this study as described and examined above. Next, I will suggest the major implications of this study for the field of service-learning and global citizenship education and for practitioners of global citizenship action-learning. Additionally, I will suggest areas in need of further research for the purpose of expanding the level of academic knowledge and practice of global citizenship action-learning with pre-adolescent youth. Lastly, I will explore the impact of this study and its research methodology on my global ethic and on my pedagogical practice as a global citizenship facilitator through my current focus on developing an international network of school-based global citizenship communities. Through this final section of my dissertation, I will provide brief accounts of two “critical incidents” that have served to reinforce my current perspective of the foundational importance of promoting intersubjective ethical relations, as well as to remind me of the need to be ever mindful of the iconic “turning” of the face of the suffering other in ethical appeal for acknowledgement and empowerment.

Summary of Major Findings

My study of my interactions with my middle school students as a teacher-facilitator of a global citizenship action-learning initiative utilized a critical incidents methodology within the broader framework of practitioner research that enabled me to select six significant markers or juncture points for mapping the evolution and implications of that relationship. The findings derived from these incidents lent themselves to important learnings and insights regarding a handful of key aspects of this process of nurturing a global citizenship community. These included: the evolution of our teacher-students relationship from one based on a more traditional, hierarchical culture of power toward one characterized by increasing collaboration and partnership; the transformation and increased visibility of my pedagogical values and positions as a teacher-facilitator in accordance with my burgeoning movement toward a more equitable teacher-students relationship and culture; evidence of the capacity of pre-adolescent youth to understand and articulate global citizenship dispositions, including deep compassion for distant, non-intimate, suffering others; and the recognition of intersubjective ethical relations as the foundational global citizenship disposition necessary for the promotion of a collaborative and equitable teacher-students relationship as well as between all participants in one's global citizenship action-learning initiative. I proceed here to touch on some the aspects of each of these seminal findings of my study as a means of preparing the reader for a more detailed presentation of the implications of these findings in the ensuing sections of this chapter.

A close examination of the critical incidents selected for this study reveal a clear, if uneven, movement in the nature of my teacher-facilitator relationship with my participating students. As displayed by my decision-making conflict in Critical Incident One regarding whether or not to continue our multi-year action-learning initiative in Ethiopia, despite my desire to promote a sense of voice, empowerment, and ownership among my students, I initiated this study with a healthy dose of traditional and hierarchical values and perspectives towards my students. While I facilitated meetings that did, in fact, provide substantive opportunities for student expression and participation in the decision-making process, upon review I recognized that I had retained control over the epistemological, curricular, and decision-making aspects of our agenda. Further, I was not forthcoming to my students regarding my power in these matters of common importance to the students; nor was I transparent regarding the inner conflict I had experienced regarding my handling of this decision-making process.

However, as I had the opportunity to reflect further upon this conflict, as well as those described at length in the ensuing critical incidents above, I eventually was able to successfully begin to address this power inequity and move toward the type of collaborative and equitable teacher-students relationship to which I had aspired. This newfound relationship included a public effort on my part to be intellectually transparent regarding my values, positions, and conflicts in matters pertinent to our joint action-learning initiative. Such teacher visibility, in turn, invited the students to enter into negotiation with me regarding the priorities and objectives of the programmatic aspects of our initiative, as well as to engage me as epistemological co-interlocutors with the

common evidentiary requirement to support one's positions. This fundamental shift in our positions vis-à-vis one another cast me more securely in the roles of teacher-facilitator and learner among my students, while concurrently elevating the voice, empowerment, and ownership of my students regarding all aspects of our action-learning initiative.

As indicated above, this transformative reorientation regarding my power and status in my teacher-students relationship propelled a concurrent review and shift with respect to my pedagogical values, positions, objectives, and evaluation methods within the context of our global citizenship community. Perhaps most significantly, as the critical incidents above reveal, over the course of this study I increasingly prioritized process over product. While initially—as evidenced quite blatantly in the first three critical incidents—I placed a significantly greater value on the achievement of those quantifiable objectives that we had established as markers of our success, by the fourth critical incident above, I had begun to make tangible pedagogical decisions indicative of my newfound emphasis on the pedagogical process involved in nurturing youth voice, empowerment, and ownership as embodied by my introduction and facilitation of the Quaker Talk discussion format introduced in the fourth critical incident.

The findings of this study further suggest that the participating pre-adolescent youth were capable of understanding and discussing a wide range of global citizenship dispositions, including the capacity to feel what I call “deep compassion,” i.e., empathic extension and compassion for geographically distant, non-intimate, suffering others. Indeed, as documented by their written feedback during the “splash” activity documented

in the first episode of Critical Incident One above, the students were already beginning to identify—albeit through the use of more implicit language at this point—global citizenship dispositions such as empathic extension, human capabilities, dignity, and justice as motivations for their participation in our global citizenship community. The students’ written responses to my four prompt questions, as described in Critical Incident Two, further linked their awareness of global citizenship dispositions such as those listed above—as well as human needs, human rights, and interconnection/interdependence—to their burgeoning self-conceptions as global citizenship practitioners. By Critical Incident Four, the students had demonstrated the ability to apply the disposition of critical consciousness to examine and challenge the ethical viability of attempting to practice change agency to transform cultural practices and norms as a cultural outsider: an inquiry which required the students to tolerate a terrain of ethical uncertainty and multiple ethical orientations indicative of more mature global citizens. The students’ increasing ability and willingness to identify, discuss, and critique a range of global citizenship dispositions was further demonstrated by my invitation in Critical Incident Five to critique elements of my own global ethic which I shared with them during this incident. My trust in the students’ capabilities in this regard was richly rewarded by a student-led conversation featuring an increasingly sophisticated understanding of global citizenship dispositions, as well as an awareness of some of the conceptual linkages they shared. In conclusion, while the students’ efforts to articulate global citizenship dispositions revealed a fairly wide range of awareness and understanding, the overriding impact of the students’ participation in our global citizenship discourse suggested at least

a baseline grasp of the importance of grounding and linking their global citizenship practice to the development of a global ethic.

Of all the global citizenship dispositions identified and described by me in Chapter Two and by the students in the critical incidents cited above, the disposition of intersubjective ethical relations emerged, for me, as the most foundational disposition for the development and implementation of a successful global citizenship community and action-learning initiative. While this disposition was implicit in the comments recorded by the students in the first episode of Critical Incident One, it was not until the sixth and final critical incident that—through conversation with my “critical friend”—I derived a personal epiphany regarding the seminal nature of this disposition for my global citizenship work. Specifically, I realized with a suddenness, power, and urgency that I associate with conviction, that the disposition of intersubjective ethical relations encapsulated the nature of the teacher-students relationship to which I had been striving throughout this study.

However, this insight did not end with my relationship with my students. Extending this disposition to relations between the global citizenship community developed by my students and me to our connection with the Ethiopian recipients of our action-learning initiative, I realized that the disposition of intersubjective ethical relations must also apply in this latter relationship. That is, I came to feel that true recognition of the face and voice of the suffering other—whether distant or local, intimate or non-intimate—required a powerful effort to recognize and understand the “subjectivity” or uniqueness of the other, as well as her capacity for voice, empowerment, and co-

participation in one's joint global citizenship practice. Only in this way, might the equitable ethical status and power of all participants in an action-learning initiative, as well as the joint ethical responsibility toward the suffering other accompanying this type of connection, be affirmed. This, in turn, meant that the nature of any relationship occurring within the context of a global citizenship action-learning initiative—whether between a teacher and her students or a global citizenship community and its community-based participants—must be grounded in the type of equitable and collaborative relations necessary for the flourishing of intersubjective ethical relations. Thus, while all global citizenship dispositions may be in operation concurrently, the disposition of intersubjective ethical relations between and among all participants in a global citizenship action-learning initiative must be conceived of as integral to any global ethic. Indeed, the transformative implications of intersubjective ethical relations upon service-learning pedagogy follow naturally in the following section.

Implications to the Field of Service-Learning and the Emergence of a Model for Global Citizenship Action-Learning

As described in Chapter Three, the traditional conception and practice of service-learning as a vehicle for promoting ethical dispositions of care suffers from terminology that militates against the disposition of intersubjective ethical relations. Indeed, the term “service-learning” itself connotes the notion of a two-tiered relationship in which those who are engaged in learning and action use their knowledge, voices, and power to provide the necessary “service” to needy and passive “beneficiaries.” Unless subjected to critique, such a hierarchical relationship between “service-provider” and “beneficiary” is

likely to reproduce such paternalistic, non-reciprocal, and inequitable relations between teacher and students, and between them and their selected beneficiaries. Indeed, as cited above in Chapter Three, a number of scholars and service-learning activists (Beilke, 2005; Cipolle, 2004; Kaye, 2004; Rhoads, 2000; Saltmarsh, 1997; Sheffield, 2005) have begun to apply such critical consciousness to challenge and reconceptualize the service-learning terminology and service ethic.

While this study contributes to this critical effort, I believe the implications of the joint efforts of my students and me to develop a successful global citizenship community and action-learning initiative expands this critique in two significant ways. First, this study documents the process through which my students and I evolved from a more traditional, service-oriented perspective into a global citizenship community based on the kind of reciprocal and equitable teacher-students relations envisioned by the above critique of service-learning. Secondly, my subsequent analysis of this process suggests a new service-learning model and accompanying terminology appropriate for addressing the problems of inequity and non-reciprocity identified by this critique of service-learning. I proceed in the ensuing passage to outline this emergent model with more specificity.

First, to resolve the problem of the paternalistic, charitable, and service-oriented mindset inherent in service-learning, I propose several important revisions in terminology. Specifically, in lieu of the phrase “service-learning” I propose “action-learning.” The substitution of “action” for “service” eliminates the connotation of a hierarchical and, therefore, charitable arrangement between active students and their

passive “beneficiaries.” Conversely, the notion of “action” strongly suggests that important activities can and will be performed by all participants in the action-learning process: both school-based and community-based participants. This expectation, in turn, opens the door to the type of equitable and collaborative relationship between all participants that should be the hallmark of the action-learning process. Further, I attach the phrase “global citizenship” before “action-learning” to clarify the specific content of the learning and the reciprocal nature of any subsequent activities. For these reasons, I have used the term “global citizenship action-learning” in lieu of service-learning in this study, and I recommend its use for future excursions into global citizenship practice with youth.

Similarly, it is necessary to reconsider the use of terms commonly used in traditional service-learning that distinguish between “service-providers” and “service-recipients.” Such designations simply reinforce the stereotyped assumptions that accompany such a hierarchical conception of service-learning. To address this concern, I refer to both the student and community participants as “action-learning participants.” I add the phrases “school-based” and “community-based” before “action-learning participants” simply to denote the setting of the respective participant groups, i.e., “school-based action-learning participants” and “community-based action-learning participants” respectively. In this way, the terminology I suggest above incorporates the notions of reciprocity, collaboration, partnership, and equity that the culture of global citizenship action-learning requires.

There are several powerful implications of my reconceptualization of service-learning as global citizenship action-learning. First and foremost, the revised terminology cited above is meant to reflect the ethos and culture embodied by the disposition of intersubjective ethical relations. That is, all participants in a global citizenship action-learning process must come to view their relations as grounded in the notion that each participant be viewed as an ethical subject of equal status, which recognition requires a collaborative and equitable form of engagement and regard toward the other. In my model, the centrality of this disposition requires that all participants in an action-learning initiative first strive to establish its precepts through the nurturance of two types of global citizenship relationships, i.e., that between the teacher-practitioner and her students and that between the global citizenship community of teacher and students (the school-based action-learning participants) and the community with which they form an action-learning relationship (the community-based action-learning participants.)

As stated above, the disposition of intersubjective ethical relations requires a commitment to apply a specific set of interpersonal, social, cultural, and political values—collaboration, reciprocity, partnership, and equity—as a means of ensuring awareness and promotion of the faces, voices, and empowerment of all participants in a global citizenship action-learning initiative. Applied to the teacher-students relationship, this necessitates a commitment by the teacher to assume the role of teacher-facilitator and learner with his students for the purpose of nurturing the capacity of these students to engage as partners in assuming the responsibilities of establishing the epistemology,

curriculum, agenda, and action objectives that will occupy that particular global citizenship community. Similarly, the facilitators of both the school-based and community-based settings should strive to activate youth voice and empowerment in determining the epistemology, curriculum, agenda, and objectives of their interactions between one another.

Further, in order to move successfully toward the level of teacher-students partnership required by the application of intersubjective ethical relations, it is necessary to facilitate ongoing opportunities for the practice of critical consciousness or the structured critique of all aspects of the community's action-learning initiative. Only in this way, can a global citizenship community identify and attempt to rectify ongoing areas of power inequity between teacher and students or between school and community-based action-learning participants and to determine ways to progress toward the ideal of partnership.

As a consequence of this emphasis on nurturing intersubjective ethical relationships, my suggested model requires placing constant emphasis on the pedagogical process involved in nurturing youth voice and empowerment over the attainment of concrete objectives or products. The idea here is not to undermine the importance of achieving tangible objectives in the programmatic aspect of one's action-learning initiative; rather, this emphasis is necessary to ensure that such objectives are not obtained through the de-emphasis or neglect of the process involved in nurturing intersubjective ethical relations. As a further consequence of this emphasis on process, it is necessary for teachers and students to develop methods for determining or assessing

the relative success of one's global citizenship community to nurture youth voice, empowerment, ownership, and participation as global citizenship practitioners.

Lastly, it follows that the type of action-learning pedagogy I am advocating for requires sufficient investment of time to nurture the kind of intersubjective ethical relationship outlined above. As chronicled in this study, it took me months to begin to understand and implement the kinds of pedagogical processes that might foster collaborative and equitable teacher-students relations. Indeed, I suspect this type of timeframe—several months or longer—is necessary for any prospective teacher-practitioner to counter, undo, and transform the traditional hierarchical teacher-students relationship to which both teacher and students have been unconsciously trained to adhere and to adopt. Thus, short-term structures sometimes implemented at schools to accommodate service-learning will be incapable of nurturing intersubjective ethical relations between the teacher-facilitator and students or between school-based and community-based action-learning participants. The type of action-learning model I support requires a sustained commitment of meetings over at least a span of months or, ideally, an entire school year.

Implications for Teacher-Practitioners of Global Citizenship Action-Learning

My pedagogical experiences within this study suggest two primary recommendations for fellow teacher-practitioners interested in facilitating a global citizenship community and an action-learning initiative modeled on the pedagogical philosophy and process of global citizenship action-learning propounded by this study. These recommendations revolve around the need to establish and publicly articulate

one's global ethic, as well as a series of commitments necessary to actualize the disposition of intersubjective ethical relations so vital to the formation of collaborative and equitable global citizenship relationships with one's students and community-based action-learning partners.

Development of Global Citizenship Dispositions

First, I believe it is essential that a prospective teacher-facilitator of a global citizenship community strive to identify, develop, and clarify those ethical dispositions and principles that comprise his global ethic and that serve as the intellectual and ethical foundation for his global citizenship practice. Further, I believe it is important to facilitate a similar process of dispositions development among one's students. Indeed, as I have begun to do since the completion of this study, I believe in the value of inviting one's community-based action-learning participants into this process of identifying their global ethics. Lastly, as demonstrated in Critical Incident Five in this study, I advocate for the public sharing and critique of the teacher's global ethic and then, ideally, of one's students.

Establishment of Intersubjective Ethical Relations as Foundational

For reasons already presented at length above, I believe the nurturance of the disposition of intersubjective ethical relations—first between the teacher-facilitator and her students, and then between one's school-based and community-based action-learning participants—is foundational to the successful nurturance of the voice and empowerment of all participants in one's global citizenship community and its accompanying action-learning initiative. This is not meant to minimize the importance of the other global

citizenship dispositions of my global ethic as discussed in Chapter Two; rather, my emphasis on intersubjective ethical relations seeks to acknowledge the primary focus on the nurturance of empowering relationships within one's circle of fellow global citizenship practitioners.

For me, acceptance of the foundational nature of the disposition of intersubjective ethical relations involve a series of commitments regarding pedagogical values and practices that a prospective teacher-facilitator must make to himself, his students, and the community-based action-learning participants with whom he and his students are involved in one's action-learning initiative. Consequently, the following three sections address the specific nature of these commitments within each of these domains.

Commitments to Oneself as Prospective Teacher-Practitioner

In my view, there are certain foundational commitments that a teacher-facilitator must make to herself in order to uphold intersubjective ethical relations as a foundational value of her global citizenship practice. These include: development and articulation of one's global ethic, including the disposition toward intersubjective ethical relations; the valuing of pedagogical process over product; establishment of youth voice, empowerment, and partnership; teacher transparency regarding one's values and positions; and ongoing critique of one's values, pedagogy, and power relations with one's students. Since the commitment to develop one's global ethic and its accompanying dispositions, as well as the foundational nature of intersubjective ethical relations, has

already been discussed in the preceding sections, the ensuing subsections will focus on the remaining commitments on this list.

Process over product. For its successful activation, a commitment to intersubjective ethical relations requires a practitioner to value the pedagogical process more highly than any quantifiable objectives established for one's action-learning initiative. This heightened emphasis on process over product should only be modified in situations where failure to complete some necessary task may jeopardize achievement of a crucial objective and have a direct impact on one's community-based action-learning partners. This greater emphasis on process is necessary for the nurturance of youth voice, empowerment, ownership, and epistemological partnership, each of which represent values that emerge naturally from a commitment to intersubjective ethical relations.

Teacher transparency and public critique. To ensure that he remains true to these commitments, it is also necessary for a teacher-practitioner to value and demonstrate visibility regarding any of his values, opinions, or perspectives that may influence pedagogy or the culture of the teacher-students relationship, as well as any decision-making regarding their joint action-learning initiative. Such transparency regarding one's own values and positions, in turn, requires a commitment to subjecting one's values and positions to both self and public critique. For self-critique, I recommend use of a teacher's journal, such as the one I used for this study, as an ongoing practice. For public critique, I recommend conducting periodic conversations with one's students and, if possible, one's "critical friend(s)" regarding one's pedagogical values and

practices, as well as regarding concerns related to specific aspects of one's action-learning initiative.

Commitments to One's Own School-Based Action-Learning Participants

The commitments that a prospective teacher-facilitator should make regarding his students follow directly from adoption of the commitments and value system advocated for above. Specifically, a teacher-facilitator should: facilitate the development of her students' global citizenship dispositions; emphasize process over product by promoting youth voice, empowerment, and partnership in all the pedagogical and programmatic aspects of the community's action-learning initiative; offer teacher transparency regarding her values and positions with respect to all aspects of the action-learning process; and facilitate ongoing critique of her values, pedagogy, and power relations vis-à-vis her students. In essence, a teacher-practitioner of a global citizenship action-learning initiative must commit to fostering the pedagogical and social conditions and values necessary to promote an increasing level of intersubjective ethical relations between teacher and students. Achievement of such a teacher-students relationship would mark a kind of pedagogical and cultural transformation necessary for the success of the community's global citizenship endeavors.

Commitments to One's Community-Based Action-Learning Partners

Lastly, as stated in the last critical incident of this study, I believe strongly that a prospective teacher-practitioner must seek from the outset to nurture and apply this same disposition of intersubjective ethical relations between teacher and students to the relationship between his school-based action-learning participants and their community-

based action-learning partners. Fostering such relations should entail promotion of a similar set of commitments and values as the grounding framework for the teacher-students relationship outlined above. That is, the teacher-students global citizenship community should provide forums for the expression of the voice and perspectives of their community-based action-learning partners regarding all pertinent pedagogical and programmatic aspects of their joint action-learning initiative; in fact, community-based participants should be empowered to assume a partnership status in ways that mirror the teacher-students relationship. To support such a collaborative and equitable relationship, a prospective teacher-practitioner must model and offer a similar level of transparency regarding his values and reasoned preferences to one's community-based partners as he would to his own students. Further, as with the teacher-students relationship, forums should be provided that embolden one's community-based participants to critique the values and positions of their school-based participants, as well as the power relations between the two participant groups.

In conclusion, I would argue that the entire thrust of the joint efforts of a teacher-practitioner and her students can reach its fruition only through the successful development of intersubjective ethical relations with their community-based action-learning participants. Only the nurturance of intersubjective ethical relations can produce in our school-based students a conception of their community-based others as equitable and empowered co-practitioners of global citizenship. Only through such relations can our students respond to the face and the call of the suffering other with a truly empathic

solidarity that nurtures not appreciative beneficiaries but empowering and enduring global citizenship partnerships.

Areas In Need of Further Research

This study suggests a number of areas for future research, in particular regarding my attempt to reconceive of service-learning as global citizenship action-learning, as well as regarding each element of this latter pedagogy.

First, since no single action research study can be viewed as generalizable, it will be necessary for teacher-practitioners to attempt to nurture the formation of global citizenship communities and action-learning initiatives among middle school youth in settings that cover a wide spectrum of socio-economic, cultural, racial, and religious diversity. Only by conducting research in such diverse communal settings can practitioners begin to determine how such community descriptors might impact the efforts of a teacher-practitioner to promote a successful global citizenship community and its action-learning initiative. For example, the high socio-economic level experienced by the majority of the participating students in this study undoubtedly favorably influenced the capacity of our global citizenship community to engage in an action-learning initiative involving a significant fundraising component. This leads to questions regarding whether or not a global citizenship community formed in a middle or low-income setting might favor a different set of action-learning objectives less focused on such fundraising. Further studies in diverse populations will also help us to determine potential correlations between types of communities and the types of conflicts that a

teacher-practitioner and his students are most likely to encounter as they strive to achieve a collaborative relationship.

Studies in diverse community settings are also necessary to yield information regarding the best pedagogical practices for nurturing youth voice and empowerment among pre-adolescent youth. This, in turn, requires a sustained effort to focus on the experiences of youth global citizenship practitioners as shared through their own spoken and written words; we cannot hope to promote youth voice without making their words a prominent feature of our studies.

Additional studies are also needed to better understand the capacity of pre-adolescent youth to grasp, articulate, and integrate global citizenship dispositions into their global citizenship practice, as well as the optimal pedagogical processes involved in promoting these aptitudes. In particular, I believe research that focuses on the nurturance of deep compassion for distant, non-intimate, suffering others, as well as the promotion of critical consciousness among middle school youth, is essential for the understanding and promotion of global citizenship practice within this population. In addition, future studies should investigate the ways in which the students' development of their own global ethics might influence their self-conceptions, objectives, and effectiveness as prospective global citizenship practitioners. While my study introduced the importance of identifying and critiquing such dispositions as well as provided evidence of the role of some of these dispositions as ethical motivators for the students' global citizenship practice, I did not allot sufficient time for my students to methodically develop and critique their own global ethics.

Further, I believe there should be a sustained research focus on the methods used by teacher-practitioners to promote the disposition of intersubjective ethical relations to combat power inequity and to promote collaborative and equitable relations between teacher-practitioners and students. Of equal importance, future studies are needed to determine best practices for nurturing intersubjective ethical relations between school-based and community-based action-learning participants.

Research is also needed to focus upon the “best practices” of teacher-practitioners regarding each aspect of the process involved in forming effective global citizenship communities and action-learning initiatives. To determine such optimal pedagogical practice, future studies must develop tools for evaluating, if not measuring, the relative success of each component involved with the global citizenship action-learning process. Specifically, global citizenship teacher-practitioners must develop increasingly more refined methods of documenting, assessing and promoting best practices regarding pedagogical and community-building methods and activities in the following areas: intersubjective ethical relations, youth voice and empowerment as global citizenship practitioners, the development of global citizenship dispositions by participating youth, and providing access to and engagement with educational resources related to global citizenship topics and problems. Such qualitative means of documenting and assessing growth and success in global citizenship practice is essential to combat an excessive focus on more tangible measures related to the achievement of the programmatic aspects of an action-learning initiative, such as fundraising.

In conclusion, future studies are desperately needed to fill the cavernous gap of extensive qualitative studies of the efforts of teacher-practitioners and pre-adolescent youth to form effective global citizenship communities and action-learning initiatives across the social, economic, cultural, racial, and religious continuum of community contexts. Such studies must focus on the process through which teacher-practitioners and their students seek to establish intersubjective ethical relations between each other and with their community-based action-learning partners. They must seek to demonstrate the capacity of pre-adolescent youth to understand, articulate, develop, and be influenced by global citizenship dispositions. They must examine the capacity of middle school youth to be empowered to participate in all aspects of their action-learning initiatives. Effective methods of documenting and assessing the relative success and growth of global citizenship communities and their youth participants must be developed. Most urgently, the voices of participating youth as they evolve as global citizenship practitioners must be featured prominently in any future studies.

Impact of Study and Research Methodology on My Global Ethic and Global Citizenship Practice

I close this dissertation by identifying two critical areas in which this study impacted and transformed me as a global citizenship practitioner. First, I will explore the ways in which this study has caused me to reconsider aspects of my global ethic as articulated in Chapter Two. Secondly, I will review how this study has transformed my understanding of what it means to be a true teacher- practitioner of global citizenship. Lastly, I will share two critical incidents that have occurred post-study as a means of

demonstrating my commitment to translate the transformative learnings from this study to my ongoing efforts to facilitate global citizenship practice and identity among middle school youth on an international level.

Reconsideration of My Global Ethic

My desire and efforts to identify and articulate coherently my own global ethic has occupied a central role throughout my years of post-secondary study, culminating in their expression in Chapter Two of this dissertation. Indeed, the second probing question utilized in the critical incidents research methodology used for this study focuses solely on this dimension of the global citizenship practice of my participating students. Given my emphasis on the importance of developing one's global ethic, it is entirely fitting that I revisit and critique several aspects of my global ethic in response to my efforts to facilitate development of a successful global citizenship community and action-learning initiative with middle school youth as documented in this study.

Intersubjective ethical relations as my foundational disposition. Given the attention and emphasis placed on the disposition of intersubjective ethical relations in much of the latter portion of this dissertation, I do not need to elaborate upon the nature or importance of it here. Rather, I wish to state how surprised I am regarding the prominence with which I have come to regard this disposition. Undoubtedly, this prominence found its origins in the increasing awareness and emphasis I placed over the course of this study on the importance of relationships: initially, the one between the students and me, followed by the relationship between our school-based global citizenship community and our community-based action-learning partners.

More specifically, the place of honor I have come to reserve for intersubjective ethical relations reveals the evolution of my conception of the nature of one's relationship to the "suffering other." Whereas, initially, I conceived of this other as necessarily occupying the more passive role of recipient of the activism of the global citizenship practitioner, by the end of the study, I had come to apply the same critique that I had applied to service-learning pedagogy to this relationship with the suffering other. That is, I came to recognize that this relationship had to be based on reciprocity, partnership, and mutual empowerment; further, that a failure to activate these dimensions would, indeed, relegate one's community-based action-learning participants to the role of beneficiary or supplicant, thereby eliminating the necessary grounding for the "subjectivity" of the other and the capacity for either the school-based or community-based action-learning participants to engage in intersubjective ethical relations.

The "suffering other" reconsidered. Throughout my global ethic as expressed in Chapter Two, I use the phrase "suffering other" to refer to those persons who, for reasons of systemic injustice or oppression, are deprived of the necessary resources, conditions, opportunities, and/or protections for the realization of their dignity. In doing so, I deemed my focus on the other's suffering as necessary to highlight this destruction or diminution of her dignity.

However, following my recognition of the centrality of intersubjective ethical relations in Critical Incident Six, this emphasis on the other's "suffering," as opposed to his capacity—whether potential or realized—to resist the indignities thrust upon him by the larger societal institutions controlling access to resources, conditions, opportunities,

and protections, became increasingly uncomfortable for me. Further, this emphasis on suffering over resistance hearkened to my own critique of the use of phrases such as “recipients” and “beneficiaries” in traditional service-learning discourse, as discussed above, to suggest a state of passivity and/or disempowerment on the part of those who “received” the benefits of the service-learning project. Indeed, this critique was appropriately raised by one of the attendees at my dissertation defense, Dr. Tyson Lewis.

With this in mind, another phrase indicative of the resistance efforts of those subjected to injustice and indignity is clearly required to substitute for “suffering others.” Perhaps the phrases “struggling other” (as suggested by Dr. Lewis) or “resistant other” would suffice, since each suggests an activist stance against one’s oppression. Whatever the choice, the phrase must be suggestive of the efforts of those straining under the yoke of injustice to reestablish voice and empowerment over their lives through their participation in global citizenship practice. Indeed, the promotion of such empowerment on the part of the other is an essential foundation for engaging in intersubjective ethical relations.

A new understanding of the nature and evolution of global citizenship practice.

In my explication of my global ethic in Chapter Two, I suggested that only after one has persevered through the first eleven of my selected global citizenship dispositions—that is, only after one has undergone a range of cognitive, affective, evaluative, and critical processes—can one actually engage in global citizenship practice. However, this study has taught me that, in fact, one can hardly experience or internalize any of the dispositions of my global ethic without the benefit of participation in a global citizenship

community. That is, I would now argue that it is primarily through the relationships one generates with fellow global citizenship practitioners—that is, with members of one’s global citizenship community and “resistant/struggling others” with whom one’s community has partnered—that we acquire the necessary ethical/social/political sensibilities to truly practice global citizenship.

In addition, by the end of this study, my emphasis on relationships of reciprocity, partnership, and mutual empowerment made me realize that what I had identified in Chapter Two as the final disposition in my global ethic—global citizenship practice—was actually an overarching descriptor of the entirety of the dispositional process described in my global ethic. That is, what I describe in Chapter Two as involving the development and application of an action plan to address the indignities endured by an identifiable population captures only the concrete outward expression of this process; the unfolding movement of a global citizenship community and its participants towards an evolving identification with global citizenship identity and practice actually begins with the first ethical/social/cultural/political exchanges between a prospective global citizenship teacher-facilitator and her student participants. Put succinctly, global citizenship practice is not some culminating activity measurable through the development and implementation of an action plan; rather, it encompasses the entirety of the process involved in creating the relationships necessary to develop a viable global citizenship community.

A Commitment to Critical Incidents Methodology as an Ongoing Facilitator of My Professional Growth/Transformation

Conducting this study has nurtured my growth as a global citizenship teacher-facilitator in significant—one might even say “transformative”—ways. Indeed, the central research question guiding this study—how did I, in my role as teacher-facilitator of an extra-curricular service club, facilitate development of a collaborative and equitable teacher-students relationship and culture aimed at nurturing the voice, empowerment, and global citizenship dispositions of participating students on behalf of distant, non-intimate, suffering others—could easily have been revised to embody something like the following question: In what ways was I transformed by this study? While the impact of this study on my self-conception as a global citizenship teacher-facilitator has been documented at length throughout this dissertation, it is best encapsulated in the preceding section in this chapter addressing implications for teacher-practitioners. In that section, I cite the importance of forming intersubjective ethical relations with one’s students and between one’s school-based and community-based action-learning participants as foundational to the development of empowered global citizenship practitioners and of a successful global citizenship community and action-learning initiative. Further, I list a series of commitments that I believe are essential to facilitate and solidify such intersubjective ethical relations.

However, it is imperative to locate the above professional transformations within the context of my use of critical incidents methodology. The success of this research methodology for me is evidenced directly by its capacity to provoke me to understand

and re-envision my practice in constructive and transformative ways. As such, I now deem it an essential responsibility and commitment of my global citizenship practice as a teacher-facilitator to continue to use critical incidents methodology as both a means of self-critique regarding the discrepancy between my ideals and my practice and as a mechanism for eliciting continuous constructive learnings.

Epilogue

Since the completion of the field work portion of this study, I have attempted to apply a number of the above recommendations to my own continuing practice as a teacher-facilitator of a global citizenship community with middle school youth. In particular, I am focusing on fulfilling the commitments I outlined above toward myself, my students, and our community-based partners.

I have begun this new phase of my own growth as a global citizenship teacher-practitioner by attempting to implement a model for relations with my students and our action-learning partners based self-consciously on the development of intersubjective ethical relations. I have done this by seeking and obtaining connections with teacher-facilitators and their students from several international settings. Specifically, we are in the process of developing a burgeoning “global citizenship community” involving middle school youth and educators from the following geographic and socio-economic contexts: my current school, Sunrise Middle School; a relatively socio-economically privileged school in Cordoba, Argentina; a private school in Accra, Ghana, catering to students whose families can afford monthly tuition costs; and a school in the “slums” of Kampala, Uganda, whose students live in conditions of extreme poverty.

By ensuring that each of our partners has at least one functioning computer as well as internet access, we have begun a pilot program that aims to integrate connection, education, and action as overarching shared themes among our global citizenship members. Significantly, unlike our past initiatives, the connections we are currently forming are *not* the outgrowth of having first identified a global problem and then identified a prospective “beneficiary” population; rather, our initial connections were made through a simple outreach to fellow educators interested in exposing their students to different cultures and in working collaboratively to identify and address global problems. Consequently, the manner in which I have developed these connections ensures that the founding basis for our connection is based on a transparent desire for reciprocity, and for collaborative and equitable exchange, negotiation, and decision-making related to all aspects of any future action-learning initiative: that is, our connection will be based on intersubjective ethical relations.

Of course, the above efforts to nurture intersubjective ethical relations as the backbone disposition for all participants in the current incarnation of our global citizenship community have inevitably encountered roadblocks and challenges. A brief description of two critical incidents that have occurred between my students, my colleagues, and me, as well as between one of our school-based partners and me, illustrates the forms these challenges have taken to date.

In the first instance, our connection between the teacher-facilitator and students from Ghana was jeopardized by a sudden doubling in the cost for their internet access. Prior to this situation, the exchanges between the students and fellow teachers had been

based solely on engaging in sharing our respective cultures, daily lives, personal interests, passions, and aspirations, largely via videoconferencing. We had also just begun to engage in exchanges of opinions regarding our respective definitions of global citizenship via forums posted on our revised Citizens of the World website. Further, the Ghanaian teacher-practitioner, Kwame, had become a staple in sharing his opinions and answering student questions via videoconferencing with the global citizenship classes that I teach to middle school students at SMS. However, the urgency of the need to assist our Ghanaian partner school in raising funds to enable them to continue engaging in this mutually beneficial exchange forced my students and me to switch our current emphasis from “connection” to “action”; to this end, our students and Kwame’s students worked jointly to create a video for an online fundraising effort aimed at restoring internet access for our Ghanaian partners.

Several important aspects of the above fundraising effort connect to my current efforts to nurture intersubjective ethical relations. First, while I have worked with the ad hoc assistance and collaboration of colleagues, parents, and local community members in each of my past global citizenship action-learning initiatives, this process marks the first time that I am participating with teaching colleagues within our global citizenship community as true “teammates.” Indeed, since introducing my colleagues, Janice and Marcy, to my desire to form our current global citizenship network with schools from around the world, they have participated with a shared sense of ownership and responsibility regarding the success of this mission. In addition to the fact that each of us brings our own set of talents and aptitudes that complement one another, my position and

status as a teammate among colleagues ensures that my ideas and suggestions are subjected to immediate peer critique and feedback prior to their implementation. Thus, for the first time in my teaching career, I am truly engaging in intersubjective ethical relations with colleagues as a staple of my global citizenship practice. The results to date far exceed anything I believe I may have accomplished as the sole teacher-practitioner within our global citizenship community.

Nevertheless, despite the overwhelmingly positive experience this newfound collegial dimension has bestowed upon our efforts, an incident that occurred during the planning of the video for our fundraiser for our Ghanaian partners challenged me to reaffirm my commitment to intersubjective ethical relations vis-à-vis my students. As the students were reviewing the final proposed script for the fundraising video we were planning, it became obvious to me that most, if not all, of the students did not like the way I had organized and edited the script for filming. (Given the relative urgency of our need to videotape and post our video on the internet for fundraising, it had been agreed that I would try to combine the various writings of the students into a final script for filming at this meeting.) However, when I mentioned my observations to one of my colleagues, it became apparent that we were in conflict regarding the relative importance of student satisfaction with and ownership of the script versus our desire to complete the process of videotaping this script at that meeting.

Fortunately, after stating my concerns regarding my perception of the lack of student support for the script, my colleague voluntarily offered me ownership of this decision. This generous gesture allowed me to quickly organize the students to attend

two emergency morning meetings the following week aimed at identifying and addressing the students' concerns about the script before filming. The subsequent success and student ownership of the revised script, while causing a week's delay, clearly reinforced for the students and me the foundational value of intersubjective ethical relations between a teacher-facilitator and his students. In particular, this incident reinforced the recognition derived from this study of the importance of involving the participation and/or consent of one's students with every aspect of one's joint action-learning initiative.

Indeed, this incident also provided me with an opportunity to reinforce my commitment to promoting intersubjective ethical relations with our community-based partners through the ongoing participation of Kwame in the script-writing and planning process, as well as the participation of his students in the videotaping and crafting of the script. In each aspect of this process, our team made sure to inform our Ghanaian teacher-partner, and to seek his participation and/or consent with our decisions and actions. In this way, the format and the written content of the fundraising video, as well as the process in which it was organized, reflect the spirit of collaboration, reciprocity, and partnership nurtured by our joint fundraising efforts to renew internet access.

While the above critical incident provided opportunities to reinforce the foundational value of intersubjective ethical relations on several levels of relations—between my colleagues and me, between my students and me, and between the global citizenship communities in Ghana and Sunrise—a second incident that occurred regarding our connection with our partners in Uganda served as a poignant and necessary

reminder that there are conditions in which the urgency of a particular humanitarian need can justifiably, if temporarily, override the importance of establishing intersubjective ethical relations prior to identification and addressing of a global problem. Indeed, the forthcoming overview of this second critical incident merits a far more substantial analysis than I can provide in this paper.

In the situation to which I refer, it was brought to my attention by Dembe, the teacher-facilitator of our partner school in Uganda, that their girls' dormitory was at risk of being demolished and its female residents forced to return home to precarious and, in some cases, dangerous scenarios, if he could not procure extensive renovation funds by May 2013. Despite the clear legitimacy and urgency of Dembe's tacit request for fundraising assistance, my teammates and I felt an initial reluctance to undertake such a daunting task. My personal reluctance was grounded in two strong concerns: one related to my newfound commitment to nurture intersubjective ethical relations prior to participation in development of an action-learning initiative, and the other due to my practical concerns regarding the time and energy I could promise to deliver toward helping Dembe to achieve his highly ambitious fundraising goal.

My concerns regarding intersubjective ethical relations in this circumstance derived from a review of the history of our connection with Dembe since we had begun this pilot program in September 2012. Between then and Dembe's introduction of the problem of the girls' dormitory in January 2013, my colleagues and I had already used our own funds to obtain a camera with video capabilities and a laptop computer for his school's use. Shortly thereafter, Dembe had informed us of the serious illness of the

school's headmistress, and her need for immediate and potentially costly medical care. (Fortunately, in this case, a former benefactor of the school volunteered to fly the headmistress to India for emergency medical care.) Given that we had supported Dembe with our personal funds and had not (with the exception of having conducted several positive videoconference sessions) as yet been able to establish a collaborative and equitable relationship between our respective students, my teammates and I had become concerned that Dembe might simply be using us as a resource for funding the needs of his school, however important and legitimate.

Our resolution to this problem took a circuitous route. Initially, we decided to share our concerns via a videoconference with Dembe. Then, after having trouble with the audio connection, I sent Dembe an e-mail, on behalf of the team, indicating that we were not in a position to engage in an extensive fundraising initiative for the girls' dormitory, which produced an apparently sour and dismissive response. However, when Marcy reread this e-mail exchange, she reminded us that we needed to be careful about how we interpreted the tone of an e-mail, especially coming from someone living in another culture who, while remarkably fluent in English, was not using his native language. This, in turn, prompted me to reconsider some of the e-mail exchanges Dembe and I had shared during the previous summer when we had introduced ourselves to one another; those e-mails seemed to express a deeply sincere wish on his part to engage in precisely the type of collaborative and equitable relationship I have advocated for in this study. Consequently, during a subsequent text exchange conducted while videoconferencing to ensure we could understand each other's words, I broached my concerns

openly and shared my rationale for feeling that we needed to begin accentuating our collaborative connection in areas that were not focused solely on providing material benefits for his school. Fortunately, my openness and sincerity were reciprocated by Dembe, who both affirmed my concerns and shared his own reservations about having asked for yet another intervention on his school's behalf. Indeed, by the end of this lengthy exchange, we had agreed to focus our ensuing efforts on establishing a collaborative relationship between our students based on the kind of social and cultural exchanges outlined above.

However, as I began to inquire and learn more details about the dire living conditions (extreme poverty, orphans living with relatives or on the streets) and consequences (child marriage, abuse, rape) which many of the girls living in the Ugandan school's dormitory would confront if forced to depart from their school, this commitment to accentuate connection over global citizenship action was soon overpowered; within a week, I declared my desire and willingness to work with Dembe to fund the necessary building repairs, with the mutual understanding that the development of student connection would follow this effort. To this end, my teacher teammates and I provided Dembe with suggestions and feedback regarding the creation of his own fundraising video with his female students, while we wrote a project summary that incorporated Dembe's own writings and received his hearty approval. Remarkably, after editing and posting the above video and project summary on an online fundraising platform and making appeals for support, our global citizenship community raised sufficient funds to achieve our goal and keep the Ugandan girls safely in their school residence.

This latter critical incident reminded me of a foundational aspect of global citizenship practice. That is, while teacher-practitioners must strive to practice global citizenship according to their views of the ideal conditions and phases for facilitating the growth of a global citizenship community and its action-learning initiatives, there are times when one's optimal framework for practice must be subsumed within the greater urgency of the call of the suffering/struggling/resisting other. Indeed, this incident reminded me that the fundamental ethical basis for relation with the other is derived through his appeal, not for my pity, but for my solidarity in acknowledging his face, his voice, his violated dignity, and his capacity to participate as partners in its resurrection; I was reminded that it is necessary not just to acknowledge empathically the face of the suffering/struggling/resisting other, but to perceive it through a lens of intersubjective ethical relations that incorporates the capacity of the other for voice, empowerment, and epistemological and ethical partnership. Thus, as I watched the videotaped testimony of several of the Ugandan schoolgirls whose lives would have been so grievously uprooted by the loss of their dormitory, I came to realize that perhaps all of the global citizenship dispositions comprising my global ethic, as well as each aspect of the framework I have outlined for global citizenship practice, might be embodied within the disposition of solidarity for the suffering/ struggling/resistant other: a disposition that is born through the intersubjective ethical recognition that he who I have referred to as the distant, non-intimate suffering other is, in fact, my brother.

Bibliography

- Anderson, G., Herr, K., & Nihlen, A. (2007). *Studying your own school: An educator's guide to practitioner action research*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.
- Battistoni, R. (1997). Service learning and democratic citizenship. *Theory Into Practice*, 36, 150-56.
- Beilke, J. (2005). Whose world is this? Toward critical multicultural consciousness through community engagement. *Multicultural Education*, 12(3), 2-7.
- Berman, S. (1997). *Children's social consciousness and the development of social responsibility*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Bourn, D. (2005). Education for sustainable development and global citizenship - The UK perspective. *Applied Environmental Education and Communication*, 4 (No Number), 233-237.
- Boyle-Baise, M., & Binford, P. (2005). The Banneker History Project: Historic investigation of a once segregated school. *The Educational Forum*, 69(3), 305-14.
- Bruner, J. (1996). *The Culture of Education*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press.
- Buber, M. (1947). *Between man and man*. London and New York: Routledge Classics.
- Carlsson-Paige, N. & Lantieri, L. (2005). A changing view of education. In N. Noddings (Ed.), *Educating citizens for global awareness* (pp. 107-21). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Christie, P. (2005). Towards an ethics of engagement in education in global times. *Aust J Educ (Australian Journal of Education)*, 49(3), 246-47.

- Cipolle, S. (2004). Service-learning as a counter-hegemonic practice: Evidence pro and con. *Multicultural Education*, 11(3), 12-23.
- Clark, et al. (1997). Service-learning as civic participation. *Theory Into Practice*, 36, 164-69.
- Cohen, J. (2006). Social, emotional, ethical, and academic education: Creating a life for learning, participation in democracy, and well-being. *Harvard Educational Review*, 27(2), 2006, 201-37.
- Davies, L. (2006). Global citizenship: Abstraction or framework for action. *Educational Review*, 58(1), 5-25.
- Dower, N. (2000). The idea of global citizenship - A sympathetic assessment. *Global Society*, 14(4), 553-67.
- Dower, N., & Williams, J. (2002). *Global citizenship: A critical introduction*. New York: Routledge.
- Dower, N. (2003). *An introduction to global citizenship*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Doyle, L., & Doyle, P. (2003). Building schools as caring communities: Why, what, and how? *The Clearing House*, 76(9), 259-61.
- The earth charter. (2012). *The Earth Charter Initiative*. Retrieved from <http://www.earthcharterinaction.org>
- Fertman, C., et al. (1996). *Service learning in the middle school: Building a culture of service*. Columbus: National Middle School Association.

- Foos, C. (2004). Hatred and objectivity: I'm not prejudiced, but... *Humanity and Society*, 28(1), 83-101.
- Freire, P. (1997). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum Publishing. (Original work published 1970).
- Gaudelli, W. & Fernekes, W. (2004). Teaching about global human rights for global citizenship: Action research in the social studies curriculum. *The Social Studies*, 95(1), 16-26.
- Golmohamad, M. (2004). World citizenship, identity and the notion of an integrated self. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 23, 131-48.
- Halquist, D., & Musanti, S. (2010). Critical incidents and reflection: Turning points that Challenge the researcher and create opportunities for knowing. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 23(4), 449-461.
- Hendrix, J. (1998). Globalizing the curriculum. *The Clearing House*, (Vol & No.???), 305-08.
- Herr, K., & Anderson, G. (2005). *The action research dissertation: A guide for students and faculty*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Hinck, S., & Brandell, M. (1999). Service-learning: Facilitating academic learning and character development. *NASSP Bulletin*, 83(609), 16-24.
- Hoffman, M. (2000). *Empathy and moral development: Implications for caring and justice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hope, W. (1999). Service learning: A reform initiative for middle level curriculum. *The Clearing House*, 72(4), 236-238.

- Kaye, C. (2004). *The complete guide to service learning: Proven, practical ways to engage students in civic responsibility, academic curriculum, & social action*. Minneapolis: Free Spirit Publishing Inc.
- Kielsmeier, J., et al. (2004). Community Service and Service-Learning in Public Schools. *Reclaiming Children and Youth*, 13(3), 138-143.
- Lapayese, Y. (2003). Toward a critical global citizenship education. *Comparative Education Review*, 47(4), 493-501.
- Leming, J. (2001). Integrating a structured ethical reflection curriculum into high school community service experiences: impact on students' sociomoral development. *Adolescence*, 36(141), 33-45.
- LeSourd, S. (1997). Community service in a multicultural nation. *Theory Into Practice*, 36, 157-63.
- Levinas, E. (1998). *Entre nous: Thinking-of-the-other*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Levine, M. (2006). *The price of privilege: How parental pressure and material advantage are creating a generation of disconnected and unhappy kids*. New York: Harper.
- Lin, J. (2007). Love, peace, and wisdom in education: Transforming education for peace. *Harvard Educational Review*, 77(3), 362-65.
- McFarland, S. (2004). Educating for peace: A montessori best practice. *Montessori Life*, 16(4), 24-26.

- Millennium development goals. (2010). *United Nations*. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org>
- Miller, S. (2005). Building a peaceful and just world-beginning with the children. *Childhood Education*, 82(1), 14-18.
- Myers, J. (2006). Rethinking the social studies curriculum in the context of globalization: Education for global citizenship in the U.S. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 34(3), 370-94.
- Myers, J. (2008). Making sense of a globalizing world: Adolescents' explanatory frameworks for poverty. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 36(2), 95-123.
- Noddings, N. (2005). *Educating citizens for global awareness*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (1996). *For love of country?* J. Cohen (Ed.). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (1997). *Cultivating humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (2000). *Women and human development: The capabilities approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (2001). *Upheavals of thought: The intelligence of emotions*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Oliner, S., & Oliner, P. (1988). *The altruistic personality: Rescuers of Jews in Nazi Europe*. New York: Free Press.
- Pijanowski, C. (2001). Thou's sacred ways: A case of relational learning for democratic self-formation. *Philosophy of Education Yearbook*, 288-96.

- Pritchard, F. & Whitehead, III, G. (2004). *Serve and learn: Implementing and evaluating service-learning in middle and high schools*. Mahwah, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Rapoport, A. (2009). A forgotten concept: Global citizenship education and state social studies standards. *Journal of Social Studies Research*, 33(1), 91-112.
- Rhoads, R. (2000). Democratic citizenship and service learning: Advancing the caring self. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 82, 37-44.
- Rifkin, J. (2009). *The empathic civilization: The race to global consciousness in a world in crisis*. New York: Penguin.
- Ruiz, P., & Vallejos, R. (1999). The role of compassion in moral education. *Journal of Moral Education*, 28(1), 5-17.
- Ruiz, P., & Minguez, R. (2001). Global inequality and the need for compassion: issues in moral and political education. *Journal of Moral Education*, 30, 155-172.
- Saltmarsh, J. (1997). Ethics, reflection, purpose, and compassion: community service learning. *New Directions for Student Services*, 77, 81-93.
- Schattle, H. (2008). *The practices of global citizenship*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Schukar, R. (1997). Enhancing the middle school curriculum through service learning. *Theory into Practice*, 36, 176-183.
- Seitsinger, A. (2005). Service-learning and standards-based instruction in middle schools. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 99(1), 19-30.

- Sharp, A. M. (2006). The face of the other. *Thinking: The Journal of Philosophy for Children*, 18(24), 43-47.
- Sheffield, E. (2005). Service in service-learning education: The need for philosophical understanding. *The High School Journal*, 89(1), 46-53.
- Simons, L., & Cleary, B. (2006). The influence of service learning on students' personal and social development. *College Teaching*, 54(4), 307-19.
- Smith, G. (2004). Cultivating care and connection: Preparing the soil for a just and sustainable society. *Educational Studies*, 36(1), 73-92.
- Stevenson, C. (1998). *Teaching ten to fourteen year olds*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Taylor, P., & Ballengee-Morris, C. (2004). Service-learning: A language of 'we.' *Art Education*, 57(5), 6-12.
- Terry, A., & Bohnenberger, J. (2003). Service learning: Fostering a cycle of caring in our gifted youth. *The Journal of Secondary Gifted Education*, 15(1), 23-32.
- Terry, A. & Bohnenberger, J. (2004). Blueprint for incorporating service learning: A basic, developmental, k-12 service learning typology. *The Journal of Experiential Education*, 27(1), 15-31.
- Terry, A., & Bohnenberger, J. (2007). *Service-learning by degrees: How adolescents can make a difference in the real world*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Tripp, D. (1993). *Critical incidents in teaching: Developing professional judgment*. London: Routledge.

Wade, R. (1997). Community service learning and the social studies. *Social Studies*, 88(5), 197-202.

Wade, R. (2001). Social action in the social studies: from the ideal to the real. *Theory Into Practice*, 40(1), 23-8.

