Vol.3 No.2 (2020)

Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching

ISSN : **2591-801X**

Content Available at : **http://journals.sfu.ca/jalt/index.php/jalt/index**

Supporting students in developing critical global citizenship: examples from the English for Academic Purposes (EAP) classrooms

Kyriaki Koukouraki[A] [A] *Lecturer, King's College London*

Keywords

Critical global citizenship;
critical thinking;
EAP;
global citizenship;
globalisation;
higher education;
intercultural competence;
internationalisation;
neoliberalism.

Article Info

Received 12 October 2020
Received in revised form 23 November 2020
Accepted 27 November 2020
Available online 27 November 2020

DOI: https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2020.3.2.16

Abstract

As globalisation is progressively expanding in the fields of economy, politics, society and culture, so too is internationalisation in the sector of higher education (HE). This fact had instigated around the turn of the millennium an increasing interest in the concept of global citizenship also mirrored in the changes of educational strategies in HE. The number of HEIs that include, either in their mission statements the aspiration of developing global citizens, or explicitly embed global citizenship education into their curriculum has risen exponentially. However, because of the lack of a unanimous definition of global citizenship amongst scholars, there is much confusion about what this term entails or should entail. The most pertinent interpretation of global citizenship related to HE is that of the neoliberal approach which has received much critique mainly due to it perpetuating a Western/English-speaking hegemony or supremacy over the rest of the world and its lack of a justice-oriented approach. In agreement with scholars that urge for a critical approach to global citizenship as to counteract to the neoliberal approach, this conceptual paper will propose some practical examples of how critical global citizenship within HE could be fostered by focusing on the aspects of critical thinking and intercultural competence, drawing from the experience within the English for Academic Purposes classroom.

1. Introduction

In an increasingly internationalised higher education (HE) environment, due to greater student and teacher mobility, fostering global citizenship seems to have become a conditio sine qua non with numerous higher education institutions (HEI) including this idea in their mission statements. This trend emerged in the late 1990s, especially in English-speaking countries with the US as vanguard (Schattle, 2009). According to Warwick and Moogan (2013; in Clarke, Yang, & Harmon, 2018, p. 15), internationalisation has 'the capacity to enhance the learning environment for all students, deliver an internationalised curriculum and prepare students for future roles in a global economy and as global citizens'.

The concept of citizenship, though, has not only evolved over time but recently has expanded beyond the fields of politics and history 'into the educational discourse, acknowledging the importance of citizenship for the development of healthy societies' (Diaz, 2017, p. 156). Although the terms 'citizen of the world' and 'global citizen' or 'cosmopolitan' are often used interchangeably, or even in combination as in 'cosmopolitan type of global citizenship' (Oxley & Morris, 2013), strictly speaking they are not synonyms. In like manner, as the term citizenship has evolved, so have the terms world citizen, global citizen or cosmopolitan (O'Byrne, 2003) with no current consensus amongst scholars regarding the definition of the above mentioned terms and in particular the term global citizen which is of the main interest in this article.

Overwhelmingly, the literature analysing this issue primarily focuses on theoretical conversations around the nature of global citizenship and its link to HE or on how study abroad programmes foster global citizenship ('travelling education' (Oxley & Morris, 2013)). However, there is a relative dearth of research on more practical examples of how global citizenship can actually be fostered or taught at university level. In recent years, global citizenship education (GCE) has received much support and specific guidelines from international or intergovernmental organisations such as the OECD (2018) and the UNESCO (2015, 2018) for primary and secondary education. This includes helpful instructions to support teachers in incorporating GCE in their curriculum. However, there is no such guidance for HE teaching professionals, possibly due to the autonomy of HE institutions in many countries around the world.

This article aims to shed some light on how and why global citizenship is being embedded into the HE curriculum. It explains why the author adopts the critical global citizenship approach and how this can be translated into practical teaching activities in order to support students to develop critical global citizenship during their studies. The research is drawing insights from the subject of English for Academic Purposes.

2. Global citizenship

'Essentially contested concepts', such as citizenship, cannot 'ever succumb[s]-as most scientific theories eventually do-to a definite or judicial knock-out' (Gallie, 1956, p. 179). Much more so, when trying to define the broad term of global citizenship (Horey et al., 2018). As O'Byrne (2003, p. 2) states, 'citizenship is a form of belonging' mainly associated with a nation-state 'but it is a specific form of belonging, reliant upon certain rights and duties which betray its contractarian assumptions' even if the 'contract is not mentioned explicitly'. Therefore, the term global citizenship appears as a contradiction to the aforementioned concept of citizenship. This tension is especially visible in a possible leftist approach, which views global citizenship as 'undermining governments' (Rhoads, 2013) . Or as Lo (2013) and Xing (2013) explain particularly between the concept of Chinese citizenship and global citizenship, although this view is not shared by all scholars (Xiao, 2013). Nonetheless, global citizenship should be perceived as a complementary dimension to national or local citizenship and not as an antagonistic one (O'Byrne, 2003, p. x).

Global citizenship can be defined and interpreted in a multitude of ways depending on the political, economic or philosophical approach of the scholars engaging with this abstract concept (e.g. Hunter et al., 2006; O'Byrne, 2003; Oxley & Morris, 2013; Pais & Costa, 2020; Peach & Clare, 2017; Perry et al., 2016). Yet it is worth briefly looking at those different approaches while simultaneously trying to establish the link to the near-synonymous term of cosmopolitanism used from antiquity to the present day.

The idea of a citizen of the world is not new but actually rooted in antiquity and more specifically in Ancient Greece. Although one century before the idea of cosmopolitanism emerged there, Confucius tried to teach a similar concept in China: the concept of Great Unity (大同 - dàtóng), i.e. 'the world commonwealth in which all men once strove for general welfare and harmony and which, he urged, should be restored' (Heater, 2004, p. 9). The term 'cosmopolitan' derives from the Greek words 'cosmos' (world, universe) and 'polites' (citizen). In Athens, Socrates (470-399 BCE) was one of the first to have claimed to be a citizen of the world instead of identifying himself as an Athenian or a Greek ('οὐκ Ἀθηναῖος οὐδ᾽ Ἕλλην ἀλλὰ κόσμιος') (Plutarch, 1878). Similarly, Diogenes the Cynic (412 or 404-323 BCE) and later the Stoics developed the idea of cosmopolitanism opposing 'the traditional (Greek) distinction between Greeks and barbarians [and] by applying to themselves the term cosmopolitans [...]' (Brock, 2015). This means that they did not affiliate themselves with a particular city-state, polis, but as being part of the whole world. During the Enlightenment in the 17th century, the German philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) stressed the importance of world citizenship and freedom of movement which would ultimately lead to making the national movements obsolete. This approach is encapsulated in his cosmopolitan law (Weltbürgerrecht), suggesting a third sphere of public law, additional to constitutional and international law, where 'both states and individuals have rights, and where individuals have these rights as "citizens of the earth" (Erdbürger) rather than as citizens of particular states' (Kleingeld & Brown, 2014). It is worth mentioning that cosmopolitanism bears mostly a positive connotation referring to the universal community of world citizens whereas there are a few versions 'in which it serves primarily as a ground for denying the existence of special obligations to local forms of political organisations.'

(Kleingeld & Brown, 2014).

Moving away from the term cosmopolitanism, which is still being used today (e.g. see Appiah, 2006; Camicia & Franklin, 2011) and towards global citizenship being directly linked to current trends of globalisation (O'Byrne, 2003), the above mentioned difficulties of defining this abstract 'multidimensional and pluralistic' concept (Peach & Clare, 2017, p. 47) become once again apparent and entail numerous distinct categorisations (Oxley & Morris, 2013). Moreover, it is important to keep in mind that the overwhelming majority of the respective literature and proposed definitions derive from English-speaking (Western) countries (Pais & Costa, 2020). UNESCO, for example, as one of the two major international organisations promoting global citizenship education (the other being the OECD), defines global citizenship as follows: 'Global citizenship refers to a sense of belonging to a broader community and common humanity. It emphasises political, economic, social and cultural interdependency and interconnectedness between the local, the national and the global.' (2015, p. 14). Albeit providing an initial understanding of GC, a deeper examination of it is required. For the purpose of this analysis linked to HE, we will first look at one possible categorisation of GC as suggested by Shultz (2007) based on McGrew's (2000) three approaches to globalisation. This is relevant because this terminology is widely used in the respective literature and then we will expand this to critical global citizenship:

a) Neoliberal Global Citizen: within this approach, the primary goal is to 'increase transnational mobility of knowledge and skills' by 'building liberal relationships across the globe' (Shultz, 2007, p. 252). Schulz describes 'the role of the individual as an entrepreneur in the private sector' as 'a privileged position' (p. 250) which is very much in accordance with a clearly business-oriented definition perceiving the global citizen as global leaders.

b) Radical Global Citizen: contrary to the neoliberal citizen, the radical global citizen is 'challenged to build solidarity through breaking down [the] global structures of oppression' (Shultz, 2007, p. 253) and to be in national solidarity with the oppressed and weak.

c) Transformationalist Global Citizen: from this perspective 'globalization is viewed as more than a new form of imperialism or just a path to a single global market economy'. Thus a transformationalist global citizen 'understands his/her role as one of building relationships through embracing diversity and finding a shared purpose across national boundaries' (Shultz, 2007, pp. 254-255).

3. Global citizenship in HE

With the growing trend of internationalisation at universities and, or because of, the increasing interconnectedness through technology, businesses and the economy, universities particularly in the English-speaking countries have been progressively including the concept of global citizenship into their agenda since the late 1990s and early 2000s (Gacel-Ávila, 2005; Hunter et al., 2006). It has lately also spread to many universities in other countries. In Asia for example, universities have embedded the idea of developing global citizens in various ways: from simply stating this in their mission statements to specific modules, study abroad programmes, certificates, or even degrees (Aktas et al., 2017; Green, 2012).

The questions that arise at this point are the following: Why do universities wish to develop global citizens? What type of global citizens are universities trying to develop? How can teaching professionals in HE foster the development of global citizens if this has not been explicitly incorporated in the curriculum or the syllabus?

3.1. The importance of GC in HE

Analysing the relevant literature, three main reasons for promoting global citizenship in HE emerge: 1. the current global political, environmental and societal situation, 2. the role and responsibility of universities in educating for citizenship, and 3. students' employability.

UNESCO (2018, p. 3) delineates the current situation in the world as being one characterised by mass migration with around one quarter of a billion people being displaced. There are multiple hearths of 'prejudice, ethnocentrism, racism, xenophobia, nationalism, discrimination and violence' which can decisively be overcome through 'social cohesion, mutual respect and tolerance of difference'. Hence, in order to solve transnational challenges such as (forced) migration, climate change, malnutrition and obesity, gender equality, global citizens are needed as no one country alone can manage these global problems. These global citizens are people who:

- Understand the complexity of today's interconnected world
- Know their social, ethical and political responsibilities
- Solve problems through innovation and entrepreneurship
- Overcome barriers of exclusion
- Realise or re-evaluate their positionality within the global context

In other words, as Caruana (2014, p. 90) elucidates, it is 'about being proactive, being capable of making change happen and living ethically in both the global and the local, the distant and the proximate simultaneously'. That is to say on three levels: the local, the national and the global. Eventually it requires people to be able to see the whole picture beyond

the confinement of their hometowns or states and consider the longer term implications. Consequently, if it is assumed that one is not born a "good" citizen. Becoming one involves acquiring these behaviours and capabilities through learning (Galston, 2001; in Tarrant, 2010, p. 442). The role of education in general becomes evident and is being mirrored in the most recent endeavours of the UNESCO (2015; 2018) the OECD (2018) and Oxfam (2015) to explicitly include Global Citizen Education and respectively Global Competence in schools' curricula worldwide.

The second reason for actively promoting GC within HE stems from its responsibility as proclaimed in 1998 by UNESCO in the World Declaration on Higher Education for the Twenty-First Century: Vision and Action. There it is clearly declared that the core mission of HE should expand beyond its contributing to the 'sustainable development and improvement of society as a whole' and 'educate for citizenship and for active participation in society, with a worldwide vision [...]' (UNESCO, 1998, p. 4).

The third reason for promoting global citizenship in HE stems from the globalised job market's demand for future employees. This is especially so for managerial positions where people should be equipped with greater international knowledge, thus becoming globally competent and successfully facing the global marketplace (Aktas et al., 2017; Gacel-Ávila, 2005; Horey et al., 2018; Hunter et al., 2006; Tarrant, 2010; Perry, et al., 2016).

Consequently, HEI have an obligation to foster "global citizens", either as a consequence of their educational mission reacting to the changing global environment, which in Shultz's (2013) opinion is an additional strong PR and branding tool for universities, or in strengthening the employability of their graduates.

3.2. The case for Critical Global Citizenship

A deeper analysis of this seems to reveal that HEI aim primarily at developing global citizens who adhere to the neoliberal approach and fail to create larger/global identities because of the extreme specialisation in their curricula, ultimately only aiming at serving the job market. Such criticism is widespread amongst scholars investigating this topic even describing the current situation in education as subject to 'neoliberal hegemony' (Pais & Costa, 2020, p. 11) that is predominantly market-oriented and heavily influenced by corporate views (Camicia & Franklin, 2011) and the commodification of HE. Evidently, within the discourse of global citizenship, there appears to be a tension between ideal global citizenship, underpinned by ethical and moral responsibility (e.g. such as outlined by the UNESCO), and capitalism (Peach & Clare, 2017) or the actual implementation of the concept as this will be 'implemented in and by people immersed in the dynamics of capitalist economics' (Pais & Costa, 2020, p. 3). Other criticism of the neoliberal approach of global citizenship, as it is taught and fostered within HE, focuses on the aspect that it is mono-directional, i.e. from Western/ English-speaking countries to non-Western countries, from the North to the South or from the developed to the developing countries, thus reproducing the existing power inequities (Aktas et al., 2017). This entails that global citizenship can potentially become the new 'civilising mission' (Andreotti, 2006, p. 41) and coincides with Dobson's (2005) parallelism to that of the 'Good Samaritan' acting mainly due to the sense of charity rather than that of justice. Partly, this notion stems from the fact that the globalisation process is asymmetrical (Dobson, 2005) with globalisation expanding from the powerful to the powerless (Shiva, 1998 in Dobson, 2005), resulting in 'globalisers' and the 'globalised' (Gacel-Ávila, 2005).

Additionally, Clarke (2008) argues that there seems to be a lack of commitment to GC by universities in the UK, as respective consciousness raising activities are mainly based on extra-curricular initiatives. In the same manner, Clifford and Montgomery (2017; in Horey et al., 2018, p. 473) support the view that 'many HE internationalisation policies across the world claim to prepare graduates to be global citizens' (emphasis added). The popular model of the T-shaped graduate (the vertical stroke 'I' symbolising the 'deep subject specialist skills', whereas the horizontal bar '-' standing for the 'ability to work in interdisciplinary teams, solve problems creatively, work across cultures and understand how their role fits in to the bigger picture' (Jarvis, 2018)) appears to be the prevailing one. This model clearly lacks social justice as a significant parameter (Jarvis, 2018) especially in relation to the HEI's claim to promote global graduates, i.e. global citizens. Therefore, 'without a critical humanistic framework in HE, the system tends to produce technically competent but socially, morally and politically disengaged and thus in the 'public' sense, amoral graduates' (Taylor et al., 2002, in Peach & Clare, 2017).

The way to counteract this neoliberal trend in HE is by employing a critical approach to global citizenship, which is justice-oriented instead of obligation-oriented (Dobson, 2005). This avoids the potential 'civilising mission' (Andreotti, 2006) and elite-cosmopolitanism (Caruana, 2014) of a Western-dominated view on GC reflecting also the post-colonialist perspective. Not surprisingly, even in the case of critical GC, there is no uniform terminology used in the respective discourse. Andreotti (2006) to date is the only one referring to it as 'critical global citizenship', whereas Camicia & Franklin (2011) use the term 'critical democracy', and Khoo (2011) describes it as 'ethically driven' just to name a few. The underlying common denominator is a critical engagement with the current problematic social, economic, political, and cultural situation of the world (Pais & Costa, 2020). This clearly identifies the global power asymmetries, challenges them, tries to identify the causes of these. Finally it strives for a world with social justice (Tarrant, 2010) while respecting diversity in any form. Arguing in favour of this critical approach, Nussbaum (2002) highlights the importance of the Socratic idea of 'the examined life' in combination with the Stoic idea of 'liberal' education (Seneca), i.e. an education that liberates one's mind.

4. How to foster GC in HE

So how can GC be fostered in HEI that do not offer specific courses, programmes or degrees in that subject, yet still state it in their mission statement? In the absence of any formal guidelines as how to teach and foster GC in HE, the author has chosen to adopt the definition of UNESCO, as it is directly linked to education (though not extended to tertiary education). The UNESCO has been actively promoting GCE since 2012 with global citizenship being one of the three education priorities (the other two being: to expand access to education, and improve the quality of learning) (2015, p. 7). In doing so, UNESCO has identified 'three core conceptual dimensions that are common in various definitions and interpretations of GCED. [...] These [...] are based on, and include, aspects from all the three domains of learning: cognitive, socio-emotional and behavioural' (2015, p. 14-15).

Table 1: Core conceptual dimensions of global citizenship education (UNESCO, 2015, p. 15)

Cognitive:
To acquire knowledge, understanding and critical thinking about global, regional, national and local issues and the interconnectedness and interdependency of different countries and populations.
Socio-emotional:
To have the sense of belonging to a common humanity, sharing values and responsibilities, empathy, solidarity and respect for differences and diversity.
Behavioural:
To act effectively and responsibly at local, national and global levels for a more peaceful and sustainable world.

On a cognitive level the most prominent skill is undoubtedly that of critical thinking, which aligns with the here-adopted approach to critical global citizenship and whose importance has already been referred to in the previous section.

At this point it is worth mentioning that Andreotti (2006) goes even further and advocates for critical literacy which transcends critical thinking, in terms of identifying the truth and instead includes the aspect of critical self-reflexivity. That is, 'to reflect on their [learner] context and their own and others' epistemological and ontological assumptions: how we came to think/be/feel/act the way we do and the implications of our systems of belief in local/global terms in relation to power, social relationships and the distribution of labour and resources' (p. 49).

The latest report of the World Economic Forum related to the future of jobs from 2020-2025, continues to list critical thinking within the four top skills required in order to thrive professionally (World Economic Forum, 2020). Consequenty, HEI that also aim at the employability of their graduates need to include this aspect. The other aspect indirectly addressed within this trichotomy is that of intercultural competence and communication or cross-cultural awareness expressed in the socio-emotional domain through empathy and respect for differences and diversity. Empathy is also one of the three abilities that Nussbaum (2002) advocates for, in order to equip students for the challenges of global citizenship. She calls it 'narrative imagination' (p. 289). Indeed, the very concept of critical global citizenship rests on the interconnectedness with, and perception of, 'the Other'. In Larsen's (2014) conceptual framework of Critical Global Citizenship (CGC), the interplay of 'difference awareness' and 'self-awareness' play a pivotal role. Therefore, the current article will subsequently provide some practical examples of how teaching professionals in HE could include both critical thinking and intercultural competence in their teaching as to foster global citizenship. Although these activities are drawn from the English for Academic Purposes' classroom, they can be adapted to meet the discipline-specific needs of the learner.

4.1. Challenges

In order to be able to foster GC within any classroom, teachers themselves need to be global citizens and familiar with the respective terminology, the latter not always being the case. UNESCO has identified 'the lack of teacher capacity' (GEFI, 2012, p. 21) as one of the barriers to GC education, since apart from their strong subject and pedagogic content knowledge, they need to be able to act as role models for GC. Thus, teachers need to be guides and facilitators, 'encouraging learners to engage in critical inquiry and supporting the development of knowledge, skills, values, and attributes that promote positive personal and social change' (UNESCO, 2015, p. 51). Although these findings refer to teachers in primary and secondary education, a projection of this to HE is not unrealistic. Adding to this, there is often no clear directive in HE in general or at specific HEI as to how to approach this issue. Solely expressed as a wishful outcome leaves HE teaching professionals alone in their quest of how to develop global citizens, how to go from theory to practice, how to teach it, and notably how to evaluate or assess it (Diaz, 2017, p. 158). Most of the times, it depends on the teachers' initiative, knowledge, and sensitivity as to whether this topic will be addressed and in what form.

4.2. The English for Academic Purposes (EAP) classroom

EAP is a special field of foreign language teaching mainly addressed at future international undergraduate or post-graduate students. It primarily focuses on further developing partly proficient English learners (often with an IELTS score of already 6.5) with their academic language skills, but moreover also includes the development of study skills. EAP courses are either delivered as short (5-16 weeks max.) summer Pre-sessional or one-year long foundation programmes in combination with content- and discipline-specific courses. Therefore, some of the particular characteristics of these settings include a) the specialised syllabus and academic conventions in English-speaking universities, b) adult learners who are already equipped with a particular cultural, religious, philosophical, and political mindset, and c) the often extremely limited teaching time (e.g. max of 16 weeks in a Pre-sessional programme). Since raising awareness of GC and fostering or developing, it is a lengthy and even life-long and life-wide process (Schugurensky, 2003; in Eidoo, et al., 2011) which cannot be completed in a time-restricted programme, such as a one-year language programme. Only the foundations for such a development can be laid there. A longitudinal study of how and to what extent students use

these acquired skills in their future studies would shed light on the effectiveness and the further development of these foundations.

4.3. Practical examples of how to foster GC

As identified from the respective literature and based on the UNESCO framework, the two key skills for fostering global citizenship are augmented critical thinking and intercultural competencies. However, both skills need a long-term engagement in order to develop and any approach to teaching those skills needs scaffolding, as in particular critical thinking belongs to higher order thinking skills (cf. Bloom's Taxonomy). Below are some examples of activities or teaching methodologies that the author has compiled as being conducive to developing criticality and intercultural competence and are being used in her HE classroom. It should be noted that frequently, there is no clear distinction as to which category an activity belongs, i.e. to critical thinking or intercultural competence. Eventually, this should not be a relevant question as those two attributes are interconnected and function as communicating vessels that nourish each other.

Socratic questioning (maieutics): unlike questioning per se which often merely intends to acquire more information from the interviewee, Socratic questioning is 'systematic, disciplined, and deep, and usually focuses on foundational concepts, principles, theories, issues or problems' (Paul & Elder, 2007, p. 2). Hence it does not aim primarily at checking students' knowledge but anticipates to further explore complex ideas, to get an in-depth understanding of issues, and to uncover assumptions. Eventually the correct application of this methodology will lead to 'an examined life' where one has 'the ability to criticise one's own traditions and to carry on an argument on terms of mutual respect for reason' (Nussbaum, 2002, p. 289). As it is a systematic form of questioning, teaching professionals need to be familiar with this technique and model the procedure. Richard Paul's (1995) work in this field has been significant in that he managed to systematise and categorise Socratic questioning into six key question types:

1. Questions for clarification.
2. Questions that probe assumptions.
3. Questions that probe reasons and evidence.
4. Questions about viewpoints and perspectives.
5. Questions that probe implications and consequences.
6. Questions about the question.

These question types, which should not be perceived as a taxonomy in the sense of a hierarchy, should be introduced to learners by providing explicit explanation of their role in fostering critical thinking. Until students internalise these questions and this process, educators should teach this 'through focused interaction' (Elder & Paul, 2010, p. 38) and scaffold discussions.

Argumentation

Although it might seem as redundant to mention argumentation as one of the techniques to strengthen critical thinking as a key component of GCE, the author's year-long experience in HE classrooms has shown that students need to be explicitly taught and guided towards applying this form of reasoning. This includes encouraging students to stive for a 360^0 view of a topic or issue while taking into consideration as many as possible different perspectives. Moreover, modelling how any argument can be disputed by a counter-argument which in turn can be refuted or rebutted helps students increase their criticality while being mindful of multiple perspectives.

Logical fallacies

Directly linked to argumentation and possible flaws in them are logical fallacies, i.e. errors in reasoning. The initial taxonomy of four logical fallacies dates back to Aristotle when he introduced them in On Sophistical Refutations, whereas contemporary philosophers or linguists have expanded that list to up to 300 (e.g. Bennett, 2012). Being critical includes the ability to not only recognise logical fallacies but also to avoid them. Therefore, the author often includes a separate lesson as an introduction to this topic by presenting the most common types of logical fallacies. Once students are familiarised with this concept, retention is gradually increased by follow-up activities with explicit reference to this phenomenon. Such activities can involve the analysis of an argument or evidence that students want to include from a source in their essay for example, or the analysis of their own argumentation in writing or speaking. Ultinately, this strengthens also critical thinking, since learners become gradually and increasingly aware of logical fallacies that can either be genuine errors in logical thinking or manipulative rhetoric devices.

Academic debates

Another activity that students enjoy, are debates. For this activity, students must receive in advance clear rules and instructions on the procedure of an academic debate, being assigned a role (usually by luck of the draw as to ensure impartiality and equality), and have enough time to prepare (either by brainstorming or researching) for it. Global issues, taboo and/or controversial topics which can either be chosen by the tutor or students themselves will give students the opportunity to both apply the aforementioned aspects, and often force them to step out of their comfort zone. Defending opinions that are opposite to their own depending on which side they have been assigned to accentuates the learning experience. The passion, content and quality of arguments, but also the fun students have when engaging in debates indicates the usefulness of such an activity.

Activities or teaching approaches that can increase intercultural competence (linked to the socio-emotional dimension of the UNESCO framework, such as empathy and respect of difference) include the following:

Choice of topics

When choosing topics for discussions, analyses, debates, assignments or simply as a vehicle to teach other aspects (e.g. to teach a grammatical phenomenon in language classes) particular attention has to be paid to this. Especially culturally diverse classrooms present a unique opportunity for topics to be selected also according to the cultural background of the students. The current debate in western HE about decolonising the curriculum and moving away from predominantly western-centric curriculum content while simultaneously increasing diversity and inclusion (cf. Arday et al., 2020), underlines this necessity. Furthermore, this promotes the notion of ethno-relativism, i.e. that all cultures are equally important and that none is more advanced than another. More often than not, this provides an opportunity to identify commonalities amongst cultures rather than only focusing on the differences which in turn undermines a global perspective and enhances the 'us' versus 'them' dichotomy (cf. one of the key learning outcomes for GCE within the 'socio-emotional' domain of learning (UNESCO, 2015, p. 22)). Therefore, choosing material from a variety of cultural and academic backgrounds which should exceed the various cultures represented in a particular classroom will expand the learners' 'knowledge and understanding of local, national and global issues and the interconnectedness and interdependency of different countries and populations' while simultaneously 'develop [their] skills for critical thinking and analysis' (UNESCO, 2015, p. 22). As Curran (n.d. in Hunter et al., 2006, p. 275) argues, cross-cultural awareness is a key aspect of becoming globally comptetent.

Identifying and collecting such material could present two additional challenges for educators: additional workload and foreign language. To overcome these, students can occasionally be asked to actively contribute to the lesson by providing such material and translating it where necessary.

Nonverbal communication

Intercultural competence increases when people become aware of the importance of nonverbal communication, because it is culture specific. In intercultural encounters, most misunderstanding or barriers to communication arise because nonverbal cues are inappropriately interpreted (or sent). These nonverbal communication cues include facial expressions, gestures, posture and eye contact (Knapp et al., 2014). According to Andersen (2000; in Andersen et al., 2003) there are cultural differences in eight nonverbal codes: chronemics, kinesics, proxemics, haptics, physical appearance, oculesics, vocaliscs, and olfactics. This indicates the significance of successful and culture-sensitive communication across cultures that global citizens should possess. In HE, nonverbal communication skills can be included and practised in group work, presentations and seminars. An element of gamification can be embedded in the lesson by asking students to identify the meaning of various gestures, allowing each student to present one from his or her culture.

The presentation of the above teaching approaches and activities can potentially lead to more respect for others, develop empathy, and allow students (and tutors) to realise and/or re-evaluate their own positionality. Eventually, this could also affect in the long term the behavioural dimension of the UNESCO framework and equip students with tools that will allow them as future critical global citizens to negotiate differences, while at the same time respecting them.

5. Conclusion

As opposed to national citizenship which might be solely defined by where a person happens to be born, global citizenship is a personal choice. GC 'is neither a status nor a qualification but a life-long process and foremost an attitude [...]' (Schugurensky, 2003; in Eidoo, et al., 2011). Consequently, its development cannot and should not be confined or even completed solely within HE, especialy in the short term. GC expands beyond the time a student engages with this topic during their studies and continues to be refined through their life experiences. Numerous HEI have made a deliberate choice of mainly promoting a market-oriented, i.e. neoliberal approach to their education strategies and subsequently to their approach to GC. In order to counteract to this development, a critical stance has to be taken. The author supports the position that students need to fathom global inequalities and their consequences mostly resulting from a neoliberal globalisation. However, better GC capabilities can be achieved by emphasising critical thinking and intercultural competence, the two main aspects as described by UNESCO. HE educators can build the foundations for becoming a GC and equip students with tools that will help them continue their development to being a critical global citizens after graduating from university. The limitation of this conceptual paper lies in the absence of data from a longitudinal study that will support this assumption. Albeit the examples presented in this article are drawn from the EAP classroom, they can be adapted to the needs of other disciplines.

References

Aktas, F., Pitts, K., Richards, J. C., & Silova, I. (2017). Institutionalising global citizenship: A critical analysis of higher education programs and curricula. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 21*(1), 65-80. doi:10.1177/1028315316669815

Andersen, P. A., Hecht, M. L., Hoobler, G. D., & Smallwood, M. (2003). *Cross-cultural and Intercultural communication.* (W. B. Gudykunst, Ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.

Andreotti, V. (2006). Soft versus critical global citizenship education. *Policy & Practice - A Development Education Review, 17*, 40-51.

Appiah, K. A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers.* New York: W. W. Norton & Co. Inc.

Arday, J., Belluigi, D. Z., & Thomas, D. (2020). Attempting to break the chain: Reimaging inclusive pedagogy and decolonising the curriculum within the academy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory,* 1-16. doi:10.1080/00131857.2020.1773257

Asia Society/OECD. (2018). *Teaching for global competence in a rapidly changing world.* doi:10.1787/9789264289024-en

Bennett, B. (2012). *Logically fallacious: The ultimate collection of over 300 logical fallacies*. eBookIt.com.

Brock, G. (2015, July 8). *Cosmopolitanism*. https://www.britannica.com/topic/cosmopolitanism-philosophy

Camicia, S. P., & Franklin, B. (2011). What type of global community and citizenship? Tangled discourses of neoliberalism and critical democracy in curriculum and its reform. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 9*(3), 311-322. doi:10.1080/14767724.2011.605303

Caruana, V. (2014). Re-thinking global citizenship in higher education: From cosmopolitanism and international mobility to cosmopolitanisation, resilience and resilient thinking. *Higher Education Quarterly, 68*(1), 85-104. doi:10.1111/hequ.12030

Clarke, M., Yang, L., & Harmon, D. (2018). *The internationalisation of Irish higher education.* https://hea.ie/assets/uploads/2018/07/report_internationalisation_of_education_2018.pdf

Diaz, L. C. (2017, January-June). Citizenship education and the efl standards: A critical reflection. *PROFILE, 19*(1), 155-168. doi:10.15446/profile.v19n1.55676

Dobson, A. (2005). Globalisation, cosmopolitanism and the environment. *International Relations, 19*(3), 259-273. doi:10.1177/0047117805055406

Dobson, A. (2006). Thick Cosmopolitanism. *Political Studies, 54,* 165-184.

Eidoo, S., Ingram, L.-A., MacDonald, A., Nabavi, M., Pashby, K., & Stille, S. (2011). Through the kaleidoscope: Intersections between theoretical perspectives and classroom implications in critical global citizenship education. *Canadian Journal of Education / Revue canadienne de l'éducation, 34*(4), 59-85.

Elder, L., & Paul, R. (2010). Critical thinking: Competency standards essential for the cultivation of intellectual skills, part 1. *Journal of Developmental Education, 34*(2), 38-39.

Engel, L. C., Rutkowski, D., & Thompson, G. (2019). Toward an international measure of global competence? A critical look at PISA 2018 framework. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 17*(2), 117-131. doi:10.1080/14767724.2019.1642183

Gacel-Ávila, J. (2005). The internationalisation of higher education: A paradigm for global citizenry. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 9*(2), 121–136. doi:10.1177/1028315304263795

Gallie, W. B. (1956). *Essentially contested concepts. Proceedings of the Aristotelian society, 1955 - 1956. 56* (1955-1956), pp. 167-198. London: Oxford University Press on behalf of The Aristotelian Society.

GEFI. (2012). *Global education first initiative: An initiative of the united nations secretary-general.* http://www.unesco.org/new/en/gefi/about/

Green, M. F. (2012). Global citizenship: What are we talking about and why does it matter? *International Educator*, May/June.

Grotlüschen, A. (2018). Global competence - does the OECD competence domain ignore the global South? *Studies in the Education of Adults, 50*(2), 185-202. doi:10.1080/02660830.2018.1523100

Heater, D. (2004). *Chitizenship: The civic idea in world history, politics and eduction* (3rd ed.). Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Horey, D., Fortune, T., Nicolacopoulos, T., Kashima, E., & Mathisen, B. (2018). Global citizenship and higher education: A scoping review of the empirical evidence. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 22*(5), 472-492.

Hunter, B., White, G. P., & Godbey, G. C. (2006). What does it mean to be globally competent? *Journal of Studies in International Education, 10*(3), 267-285. doi:10.1177/1028315306286930

Jarvis, C. (2018). *Growing global graduates: Teaching for a better world*. Birmingham.

Khoo, S.-M. (2011). Ethical globalisation or privileged internationalisation? Exploring global citizenship and internationalisation in Irish and Canadian universities. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 9*(3-4), 337-353. doi: 10.1080/14767724.2011.605320

Kim, J. J. (2019). Conceptualising global competence: Situating cosmopolitan student identities within internationalising South Korea Universities. *Globalisation, Education, Societies, 17*(5), 622-637. doi: 10.1080/14767724.2019.1653755

Kleingeld, P., & Brown, E. (2014, Fall). Cosmopolitanism. In. E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.* https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2014/entries/cosmopolitanism/

Knapp, M. L., Hall, J. A., & Horgan, T. G. (2014). *Nonverbal communication in human interaction* (8th ed.). Boston: Wadsworth Cencage Learning.

Larsen, M. (2014). Critical global citizenship and international service learning: A case study of the intensification effect. *Journal of Global Citizenship & Equity Education, 4*(1), 1-26

McGrew, A. (2000). Sustainable globalization? The global politics of development and exclusion in the new world order. In T. Allen, & A. Thomas, *Poverty and development into the 21st century* (pp. 345-364). Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.

Nussbaum, M. (2002). Education for citizenship in an era of global connection. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 21*, 289-303.

O'Byrne, D. J. (2003). *The dimensions of global citizenship: Political identity beyond the nation-state*. Taylor & Francis Group.

OECD. (2018). *Preparing our youth for an inclusive and sustainable world. The OECD PISA global competence framework*. Paris. https://www.oecd.org/education/Global-competency-for-an-inclusive-world.pdf

Oxley, L., & Morris, P. (2013). Global citizenship: A typology for distinguishing its multiple conceptions. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 301-325. doi:10.1080/00071005.2013.798393

Pais, A., & Costa, M. (2020). An ideology critique of global citizenship education. *Critical Studies in Education, 61*(1), 1-16. doi:10.1080/17508487.2017.1318772

Paul, R. W. (1995). *Critical thinking: How to prepare students for a rapidly changing world*. Foundation of Critical Thinking.

Paul, R., & Elder, L. (2007). *The thinker's guide to the art of socratic questioning. The foundation for critical thinking*. criticalthinking.org

Peach, S., & Clare, R. (2017). Global citizenship and critical thinking in higher education curricula and police education: A socially critical vocational perspective. *Journal of Pedagogoc Development, 7*(2), 46-57.

Perry, L., Stoner, K. R., Stoner, L., Wadsworth , D., Tarrant, M., & Tarrant, M. A. (2016). The importance of global citizenship to higher education: The role of short-term study abroad. *London Review of Education and Science, 1*(19), 342-356.

Plutarch. (1878). *Plutarch's morals* (Vol. 3). (W. W. Goodwin, Ed., & S. Hands, Trans.) Boston: Little, Brown, and Co. https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/1213#Plutarch_0062-03_526

Rhoads, R. A. (2013). The case of global citizenship: Challenges and opportunities. In B. S. University, G. E. Kong), & P. University (Ed.), *Global citizenship curriculum in higher education: Evolving policy and practice and a future research agenda,* (pp. 5-7). Hong Kong. https://www.gcedclearinghouse.org/sites/default/files/resources/Global%20citizenship%20curriculum%20in%20higher%20education.pdf

Schattle, H. (2009). Global citizenship in theory and practice. In R. Lewin, *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad: Higher education and the quest for global citizenship* (pp. 3-20). New York and London: Routledge.

Shultz, L. (2007). Educating for global citizenship: Conflicting agendas and understandings. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 53*(3), 248-258.

Shultz, L. (2013). *Mobility, entrepreneurism, justice, or action: What is educational in global citizenship education? global citizenship curriculum in higher education: Evolving policy and practice and a future research agenda*, (pp. 11-13). Hong Kong.

Simpson, A., & Dervin, F. (2019). Global and intercultural competence for whom? By whom? For what purpose?: An example from the Asia Society and the OECD. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 49*(4), 672-677. doi:10.1080/03057925.2019.1586194

Tarasheva, E. (2008). *Integrating citizen education into English language courses for university students. Global Citizenship in the English Language Classroom,* 6-12. (T. Gimenez, & S. Sheehan, Eds.) British Council. https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/sites/teacheng/files/pub_GlobalCitizenv2.pdf

Tarrant, M. A. (2010). A conceptual framework for exploring the role of studies abroad in nurturing global citizenship. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 14*(5), 433-451. doi:10.1177/1028315309348737

UNESCO. (1998). World Declaration on Higher Education for the Twenty-first Century: Vision and Action and Framework for Priority Action for Change and Development in Higher Education. (p. 16). *UNESCO*. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000141952

UNESCO. (2015). *Global citizenship education. Topics and learning objectives*. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO. (2018). *Preparing teachers for global citizen education. A template*. Paris and Bangkok: UNESCO.

World Economic Forum. (2020). *The future of jobs report 2020*. World Economic Forum.

Xiao, W. (2013). Cultivating cosmopolitan citizens: On Chinese citizenship education in the era of globalisation. *Global citizen curriculum in higher education: Evolving policy and practice and a future research agenda*, (p. 9). Hong Kong.

Copyright: © 2020 Kyriaki Koukouraki. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.