Udine, Italy, 29th and 30th June 2017

G7 UNIVERSITY
EDUCATION FOR ALL UDINE

Garzolini di Toppo Wasserman Palace, via Gemona 92

Draft version at the date of 30th May 2017 ore 18.00

Table 1
Global Citizenship

Global Citizenship and Higher Education

Fabio Rugge

Università di Pavia

GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP AND HIGHER EDUCATION

Fabio Rugge

Discussing the relation between "higher education" (HE) and "global citizenship" (GC), demands a substantial premise. In fact, while we all know what "higher education" is, the same is not true of "global citizenship". No doubt, the expression is ubiquitous in the political and social debate on globalization. Yet, its contours are not always clear or agreed on and, for the sake of our discussion, the notion will benefit from a closer definition. Thus, we shall first clarify what GC is and then reflect about its relation with higher education.

What is Global Citizenship?

A definition of Citizenship

In order to provide some clarification about the notion of GC, we need a working definition of citizenship. Let us agree on the following one: "a citizen is a member of a political community who enjoys the rights and assumes the duties of membership" (Leydet 2011). Such definition seems appropriate to portray the status of a citizen (i.e. citizenship) in entities as different as the Greek polis and the 20th century nation state. Referring in particular to the latter, we can single out three dimensions of citizenship (see Cohen 1999; Kymlicka and Norman 2000; Carens 2000).

(1) A *political* dimension, which concerns the citizen's participation to the governance of the community trough legitimate (i.e. widely acknowledged) institutions;
(2) A *legal* dimension, which concerns the citizen's entitlement to a set of civil and social rights and to judicial protection of those rights;
(3) A *socio-cultural* dimension, which concerns the citizen's identification with ideas, ideals and cultural practises that integrate her/him in a larger community.

In this perspective, citizenship is a status concept that identifies persons as, respectively, (1) political agents (2) legal subjects or entities, and (3) participants in a project of social integration through the formation of a collective identity (Carens 2000). In the 19th and 20th centuries, citizens became politically active inasmuch as they gradually became voters (and party or union members). Their set of legal rights expanded: from the sphere of mere individual freedom to the sphere of social tutelage. In the cultural dimension, national identity functioned as one of the most powerful social glue and was both a constituent and fortifier of a person's citizenship.

From nation citizenship to GC

Both the concept and the reality of GC show the persistence of these three dimensions; but profound changes occur in the contents of each of them:

(1) As concerns the political dimension, today many international instances have emerged that decide on (and provide governance of) extremely relevant issues. Participation to these instances in the form of electoral representation is hardly workable. Therefore, the influence exerted by a person trough her/his vote gave way to the influence gained by individuals through their belonging to international movements. They mobilize public

opinion across states' borders and represent it in the aforementioned instances. Such movements have considerably gained leverage thanks to the dramatic growth of international ICT and transportation.

(2) As concerns the legal order, while in the past rules and laws that shaped citizenship were mostly state's creatures, nowadays international institutions are in the position of attributing rights and demanding duties that either override or integrate national regulations. This new bundle of rights and duties provides a robust nucleus to the new GC. Even more so, since international courts can enforce obedience to – and sanction disregard of – those rules.

(3) Finally, as for the socio-cultural dimension, the idea and ideals of nation no longer dominate the political universe. In our public discourse, we place an increasing emphasis on such common human values as equality and respect for diversity. In addition, we currently address economic and social matters with a global outlook, as problems and solutions that postulate a global approach. Furthermore, the intensification of transnational economic and financial exchanges, the multiplication of channels of communication, as well as the increase of migration flows have brought about a deep cultural contamination of social practises that add to the traditional basis of national feelings.

Dispute about GC

None of these changes is clear-cut; none goes uncontested and undisputed.

For example, nationalists (e.g., Miller 2000) claim that only certain kinds of political practice have the force to generate the sense of belonging presupposed by social integration. The latter requires a deep degree engagement of the kind that occur between individuals that share a common history, the same set of cultural values, and participate in the same political project. This level of engagement, nationalists believe, is only present within the boundaries of the nation. By eroding its boundaries, current processes of globalization undermine the pivotal role of national identity as a pre-condition for social integration. In so doing, they risk making the idea of citizenship inapt to fulfil the integrative role it has historically performed.

Like nationalists, post-nationalist (e.g., Habermas 2001) commentators have noticed that the pluralisation of society, which processes of globalisation have brought about, has weakened the capacity of the idea of nationality to function as a "suitable focus of allegiance and identity" (Leydet 2011). Yet, post-nationalists, instead of advocating a return to the close boundaries of the nation state, have argued for a renewal of our conception of citizenship. This renewal is a requirement of the process of globalisation itself and responds to the crisis of the relation between citizenship and state sovereignty (see Leydet 2011).

Looking at these arguments more closely, we can conclude that neither nationalists nor post-nationalists deny the existence and energy of the processes that pose the question about GC. They differ in their attitude toward this notion: the former ones stress its feebleness and inability to serve the welfare of the people in the present world; the latter ones take it as a practical (even indispensable) notion to secure a positive evolution of globalization.

In this second sense, the project of social integration that GC entails has a clear cosmopolitan connotation. Central to this cosmopolitan project is a rethinking of the idea of political community

that GC may presuppose. At the heart of this idea is a broader conception of political community in which membership is attributed through the distribution of universal rights (e.g., human rights) and appeal to general principles (e.g., respect for diversity) that may apply trans-nationally and secure the allegiance of a diverse citizenry.

However, both supporters and detractors of this project agree that GC may not only be a matter of extending the protection of individual rights and liberties beyond the boundaries of the nation-state. GC, in other words, demands more than working only – or even primarily – on the legal dimension of this idea. In order to deliver its promises of social integration at a global level, the idea of citizenship develop a political dimension.

A way to achieve this consists in divorcing the idea of citizenship from that of a territorially circumscribed community. In this perspective GC has multiple "sites"; and it postulates the idea and effectiveness of a "multi-level governance" (Pogge 1992). In turn, this entails some degree of "vertical dispersal of power" (Leyedet 2011), no longer centred at the level of the sovereign state, but distributed both above (regionally, globally) and below it (locally).

GC and HE. How do they relate?

Education and the Nation State

So far, we have discussed the notion of GC, the real processes that give ground to that notion, the debate about them. It is now time to investigate the relation between global citizenship and higher education. To this purpose, it is once more advisable to contrast GC with the idea and practise of citizenship revolving around the nation state of the 19th and 20th centuries.

In fact, education at all levels played a decisive role in the nation and state building that took place in those centuries. In first place, it spread literacy and disciplined behaviours; thus providing the people, especially farmers and industrial workers, with the abilities and the mind-set they needed for becoming "citizens". For instance, literacy was frequently a condition for enfranchisement, in its turn, one of the crucial components of citizenship.

In second place, education massively contributed in transmitting social values and narrations essential to build up state and nation citizenship. For instance, schools were formidable in diffusing the awareness about the rights and duties associated with citizenship. Equally important they were in transmitting those civic and national values that amalgamated people scattered over vast territories and imbued with feelings of local belonging. In sum, nationalization and state citizenship building were largely the task and the work of education at all levels.

Can we say the same of today's higher education with reference to the building of a GC? The answer must be affirmative. Actually, we can regard universities as one of the most active and effective factors in the development of a GC.

Universities as transnational entities

Firstly, we should bear in mind that universities were born and largely present in Europe and elsewhere well before the nation states were born. They were cosmopolitan in essence and enjoyed 'privileged' position and special immunities from territorial powers. For instance, Charles IV founded the University of Prague in 1348, but gave foundation letters to other universities too, in Perugia

(1355), Siena (1357), Pavia (1361), Florence (1364), Geneva (1365), Orange (1365) and Lucca (1369).

The degrees bestowed by the universities he established had recognition throughout his empire. University students came from distant countries to the university cities and there split into nations. In Prague, they were Bohemian, Bavarian, Polish and Saxon. Pavia, welcomed students from Heidelberg, Cologne, Vienna, Erfurt, Leuven, Leipzig. During the last decade of the 15th century, foreign students outnumbered Italians, who made up only 40% of enrolments (even a non-Italian rector could be appointed).

We should not dismiss such historical background as an antiquarian curiosity. The past has left a profound imprint on universities. In fact, people have always seen them as home to freethinking, tolerance, openness to foreigners; and loyalty to these attitudes are part of the foundation myths of any academic institution.

From time to time, reality may have differed from such representation. In particular, academic cosmopolitanism, effervescent as generally it has been, was often interspersed with quite different attitudes. Let us think of the European wars of religion that so negatively affected the circulation of both scholars and students in the 16th and early 17th centuries. Let us recall those patriotic fevers that, in the 19th and 20th centuries, brought about the so-called 'nationalization of science'. In sum, the international inclination of universities was, and is, constantly under threat.

Today's international mobility

Nevertheless, the beginning of the 21th century witnesses an impressive flowering of the tertiary education institution's cosmopolitan vocation. Students' and faculty's international mobility registers unprecedented figures. According to the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, in the last fifteen years the number of globally mobile international students has doubled to reach 4 million students (Choudaha, 2017). Economic circumstances, such as the global demand of highly qualified labour especially in some fields, and institutional circumstances, such as the Bologna Process and the creation of the European Higher Education Area Mobility sustained and shaped the trends and flows of students' mobility.

We can notice relevant changes in students' mobility. Although retaining the role of leading destination, the US has lost attractiveness compared to other countries. Australia and Canada have strengthened their role as destination countries. Half of the ten top destination countries are European. A very high proportion of international students come from Asia. Although presently slowing down, the growth of outwards mobile Chinese students has been dramatic. Remarkable fluxes are also coming from other Asian countries, namely India, Japan, South Korea, Saudi Arabia, Malaysia and Vietnam. However, Japan and China have a significant role as destination countries too.

Over time, we can also detect a shift regarding both the field of study and the level of education of internationally mobile students. From science and technology to business and from masters' and doctoral levels to the undergraduate level. The focus of higher education institutions' policies has also changed: from attracting global talents in order to support academic excellence to recruiting international students in order to increase revenues from tuition fees. Competition between higher education systems and institutions at the global level has intensified.

Whatever the causes and the features, processes of internationalisation and globalisation of higher education have fostered the international mobility of a considerable proportion of world youth, has enhanced intercultural interactions, and has made it possible for both mobile and non-mobile students to experience cultural diversity to a higher extent.

It is not difficult to realize how these developments relate with GC. Students' international mobility can favour possible convergence of social values and behaviours in the young people involved; they can trigger students' critical attitude towards received opinions, and can help dispel prejudices of all sorts. International mobility could also aid polity's model transfer. There is general agreement about the fact that international students have higher chances of becoming social or political leaders in the future. Therefore, their experience of different political and legal systems will help polity models to travel. Under this point of view, the contribution of student's international mobility can hardly be overstated.

Faculties' mobility

Compared to student mobility faculty international mobility is smaller in size (Teichler, 2011) and, while official data on student mobility are abundant, data on the mobility of scholars are not. However, according to the results of a large international survey on the academic profession (Rostan & Hoehle, 2014), 42% of faculty have experienced international mobility during their life course. The two most frequent types of academic international mobility are short-term mobility for purposes of study occurring early in the life of prospective faculty (16%) and short-term mobility for purposes of work when they are on the job (10%). Other types of international mobility such as long-term assignments or contracts abroad, and study or work migrations are less frequent.

The different types of academic mobility are associated with three global issues, namely brain drain, brain circulation and the functioning of a global academic labour market (Rostan & Ceravolo, 2014). The results of the above-mentioned survey on faculty educational and job migrations – that is an aspect of the brain drain – show that people and their human capital move from non-English speaking countries to English speaking ones, and from emerging or less developed economies to mature ones confirming the persistence of global inequalities even among highly qualified workers.

National and international qualifications framework

This remark leads us to deal with a different matter, i.e. with the conventional and regulatory framework of graduate students' international mobility. A critical enabling factor for this mobility is the recognition of the qualifications obtained by the students. National, regional and international qualification frameworks (QFs) serve this purpose. National ones contain the classification of educational levels or cycles and of the relevant titles offered by universities in a given country. Regional and international QFs allow the comparability of the degree awarded in the different states (though they do not warrant legal recognition).

Today we can count more than 150 (National Qualification Frameworks (NQFs). Their number was tiny before 2000, but later increased rapidly, in particular between 2008 and 2012. One can say that three in four states have adopted a NQF.

 The concentration is greatest in Europe, where only the continent's tiny surviving city-states or principalities remain outside the NQF network, with the European Qualifications Framework (EQF) its hub. Most NQFs worldwide are comprehensive frameworks, covering all types and levels of qualification, while some are partial, covering only vocational education and training (VET), for example[1].

Doubtless, the diffusion of QFs at any level can perform an important function in the establishment of what we call a GC. QFs offer the possibility of having one's own learning outcome recognized in a country different from the one where one was born. This can be decisive in shaping one person's destiny, in terms of professional and personal choices. To a certain extent, academic titles are part of the social identity of people. Having that acknowledged in a country can foster the individual's personal identification with that country and produce the seed of a formal or informal double citizenship, and in a long-term process of a GC.

The conventional identification of the abilities and skills requisite for certain job and professions is part of this dynamic. One can see it as the commencement of a homologation process (already noticeable in Europe, for instance), from which an international market and a regulative framework of highly qualified labour could arise.

Teaching GC

A major contribution to the rise of GC universities offer through their typical activities: teaching, research and public engagement. Let us mention how HE teaching relate to GC.

Programs all around the world offer a growing number of courses that focus on internationalisation *and* globalisation. Many of these courses simply consider the profound interconnection of the world as a fact that inevitably reflects on otherwise completely traditional subjects. In this perspective, teachers and syllabi take for granted that certain branches of law or economics have changed since that interconnection has occurred.

Other programs and courses engage with internationalisation and globalisation as subjects per se (not only as the cause for an updating of the field or discipline).

In this case, they often deal with sustainability issues. The questions addressed under this conceptual umbrella are numerous and diverse (one of the position papers of this conference is devoted to this topic). Their common starting point is an understanding of the problems and challenges both intellectual and practical posed by 21st century world as indeed global problems and challenges. It is interesting to note that this approach tends to be multi- and interdisciplinary, as if the scale change would entail a change in the methodologic paradigm too.

In addition, the ethics of globalisation receive attention. The everlasting questions and dilemmas of the human being take a new turn when placed in a global context. Think of the questions and dilemmas related to values like respect, responsibility, and tolerance, as they interact with cultural encounters and technologic innovation at planetary level.

It is not difficult to agree on the fact that research, teaching and public engagement on such topics perform an ideological integration function that largely exceeds the definition and transmission of

---

[1] Global Inventory of Regional and National Qualifications Frameworks Volume I: Thematic Chapters, p. 59

scientific contents. Both the students and the scholarly community around the world that work on the mentioned topics are likely to think (and possibly act) as part of a global entity (a community? humanity? simply a transnational elite?). They will incline to reason in terms of obligations and expectations, and eventually in terms of rights and duties, referring to that entity.

If it is so, it is not too daring to compare and assimilate the role of universities concerning GC to that of national schools concerning the state and nation building in the last two centuries.

University Networks

Another effective agent of higher education internationalization are the university networks. Universities join them for various reasons: in order to undertake ambitious educational and scientific programs, in order to seek coalitional or reputational advantages, in order to exchange their good practise and ameliorate their performance etc. However, the growing interconnection brought about by globalization has apparently caused a mushrooming of such networks. In fact, it is not easy to map this phenomenon, also due to the unsteady biographies of these associations. Some observers claim that the outcome of the present impressive growth of university networking brings about a sort of "denationalisation" of the institutions involved.

This is possibly exaggerated. Nevertheless, networks do pool and channel resources and initiatives, welding significant actors and strategies.

"As a new bridge between Denmark and Sweden helped create the Oresund University Network, opening new research areas and educational possibilities. /…/. New forms of cultural engagement between Birmingham (UK) and Chicago involve multiple linkages between museums, theatres, art galleries, and universities, utilizing long-standing «Sister-City» relationships. Businesses also take the lead in establishing networks: Santander Bank created Santander Global Universities Division to support higher education as »«a means of contributing to the development and prosperity of society». There are now 1,000 university members in 17 countries and the bank has funded research, mobility, and scholarships. International associations have also facilitated global networks to pool resources, address pressing challenges, and contribute to the development of societies. The UNITWIN Networks and UNESCO Chairs—a program now involving 650 institutions in 24 countries— «serve as think tanks and bridge builders between academia, civil society, local communities, research, and policy-making»". (Middlehurst, 2015[2]).

Gaps, limits, backlashes

HE can contribute to the growth of a GC and can certainly reinforce it. Yet, there are limits in this process, and reactions to it, that are worth mentioning. Let us mention at least three.

1. Although we live in a post-Westphalian age, states retain to a large amount their power over their territories. That means they can strongly limit people mobility. They can do it toughly, by the means of walls and legal bans, or softly, by the means of their control on travel documents. This may significantly affect universities' international activity and hamper their functioning as agents of GC. One could give many examples of this hindrance.

---

[2] Robin Middlehurst, Perspectives on Global University Networks, in INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION, Number 81: Summer 2015, p. 4

2. International schemes of higher education are intrinsically ambivalent. On the one side, they can be instrumental to the better quality of the programs, to the increase in the number of highly educated people worldwide, and to the diffusion of visions hinging on shared values and mutual understanding. On the other side, the same international schemes can serve economic interests (for some countries higher education is one of the most important industries). International mobility of students and faculties can also strengthen the influence of one leading country over the others. That can happen in different ways, not least shaping the culture and mind-set of the members of the ruling classes of other states and the attitudes of the leaders in strategic economic sectors. Such ambivalence is a threat to the growth and desirability of the international schemes of higher education. It definitely is, if those schemes are to develop some germs of GC.

3. Sometimes, encounters between cultures are conflictual – and this may be true in the academic world too. When international programs are not accurately prepared and governed, they can lead to unease and even confrontations. Some episodes occurred in Australia confirm this danger (Altabach, Welch 2011).

Conclusions

The idea and practise of GC are still unprecise and fragile. However, one can detect signs that give shape and substance to GC in the political, legal, and socio-cultural dimensions.

For those who believe and hope that those signs are able to develop into a full-fledged GC, universities and other HE institutions can be powerful allies. In fact, they are essentially transnational enterprises. As they used to be in the past, universities are today stations of an increasing international mobility of both students and faculties. Thus, they provide the foundation of GC, in as much as they provide opportunity for scientific and cultural dialogues and disseminate awareness about the global scale of issue like environment, energy, development, health, and education itself. A growing number of universities centre their programs on topics that imply a planetary approach to the great societal challenges of the present and many courses explicitly include global topics in their syllabi.

Furthermore, universities are immediately and deeply involved in the task of designing international frameworks that allow the recognition of foreign academic qualifications. That recognition should enable people to have their professional status acknowledged in a foreign country, a crucial ingredient for acquiring membership in a community different from the original one. HE internationalization brings about also an intensive networking activity, which in its turn stimulates imitation and homologation.

Of course, universities' international activities do not necessarily translate into an agency in favour of GC. In fact, they are not immune from ambivalence, as they can easily appear and actually work as a tool for gaining influence in the international arena, both in political and economic terms. However, one thing is clear: nothing similar to what we term GC will become a substantial feature of the planet's intellectual and institutional landscape without a decisive contribution from the universities of the entire world.