Moving from moral to political: the three principles derived from John Rawls's ideas of justice that have a potential to transform global citizenship from re-active to pro-active and reflexive

Miss Yulia Nesterova

The University of Hong Kong

yulia.s.nesterova@gmail.com

Dr Liz Jackson

Global citizenship education (GCE) was developed with an objective to equip students with values, knowledge, skills, and action plans to address complexities and challenges associated with globalization. Service learning trips for students between global north and global south countries[1] have become one important part of educating youth to become global citizens, to prepare them to live in harmony with people of diverse cultures and ethnicities by learning about them and the challenges they face. GCE that deals with service learning overseas, however, has been critiqued for prioritizing the needs, interests, and perspectives of global northerners, as well as focusing on morality. We suggest here that this focus on morality can re-enforce global power imbalances, when global citizenship education fails to acknowledge and de-construct inequalities in North-South relationships.

Thus we seek to identify or elaborate an alternative model to help students of diverse cultures find common ground and relate to one another in a just way. This paper reimagines a global citizen as an autonomous, political subject, thus shifting the focus from the moral to the political. We draw on ideas of justice propagated by John Rawls in *A Theory of Justice* and *Fairness as Justice: A Restatement*. The three principles we consider for re-constructing global citizenship education are: elimination of self-interest from moral choices; respect for diversity of views, legitimate conflict of interests and right to decide; and acceptance of persons as autonomous individuals.

The paper begins with a description of GCE for service learning that details some of its problematic aspects. After that, it discusses Rawls's ideas and maps three principles that can help us re-consider GCE education. Each principle has implications for GCE discussed here, though each also poses new challenges to teachers and students. Thus the paper ends addressing the following questions: What kind of "citizen" is it that we want to become global and work to better the world? How is moral different from political and why is it important? How can this new model be built, if at all, and how can it affect students, their picture of the world, and actions for social justice?

Key words: global citizenship education, service learning, intercultural competence, global social cooperation, John Rawls

Global citizenship education for service learning in global south

Globalization has created world-wide relations in which we are closely linked to distant communities and people (Krugman and Foote 2011, p. 108). Out of this

---

[1] Global North is used here to talk about the European countries that used to have colonies in Africa, Latin America and Asia. Global South are the former colonies.

interconnectedness three images have emerged: global consciousness – we need to know of injustices that occur across the world; global ethics – we need to develop values to relate to others and build relationships in a moral way; and global citizenship[2] – we need to learn how to act upon the knowledge and values we have internalized. The concept of global citizenship, as well as global consciousness and global ethics that give foundation to the idea, has become disembedded from the context of the nation state. Instead of allegiance to their place of birth and residence, global citizens are expected to see it as their responsibility to connect to and to protect the wider world – people, living organisms and the environment inside as well as outside their small communities – by acting to better, what is seen as, the universal civil society, and by promoting global, universal ethics (Dower 2003; Krugman and Foote 2011, p. 109; Pashby 2011; Pike 2008).

In this paper GCE is approached as education that provides students with knowledge about the world and the injustices that people face; helps them develop a set of moral values to want to change such unjust circumstances; and equips them with skills to act to better the world. As an important step to deepen students' knowledge and understanding of the world and their place in it, study trips that include service learning between global north and global south countries have become one important part of educating youth to become global citizens. Such intercultural exchanges aim to prepare students to live in harmony with people of diverse cultures and ethnicities by learning about other cultures, building skills to negotiate, have dialogue, and reach consensus with culturally different others, and volunteering in communities to understand the challenges they face (Andreotti and de Souza 2012; Dower 2003).

Residing in another culture, participating in projects with others, and making personal connections are important and valuable activities for developing empathy and pluralism (Bennet as cited in McQuaid 2009, p. 17; Veugelers 2011, p. 480). However, as the following example shows, the approach to GCE described above can be critiqued, first, for being mono-dimensional as it prioritizes the needs, interests, and perspectives of global northerners, and, second, for focusing on the moral aspect of citizenship which is argued to re-enforce global power imbalances as it does not analyse social, political, economic, and historical relations.

Pike (2008) discusses the work of development agencies and social justice groups that affect our understanding of the distant Other through educational and charity campaigns that are encouraged by schools. Following their strategies, teachers in the global north started using shocking images and stories solely focused on poverty, helplessness, hunger, and chaos in the global south to develop a "sense of guilt and shame" in students and to invoke an emotional response from them to attract their attention to 'disasters' that take place in Africa (OXFAM GB 2006b). Such language used to teach students in the north about the other contrasts developing with developed, and help and aid to the global south with leadership and skills in the global north, to name but a few.

As pointed out by Andreotti, Barker and Newell-Jones (cited in McQuaid 2009, p. 18), images and language construct a particular reality and mindset that divides and sets the worlds in opposition to one another. The implications of using dramatic stories and pictures as well as specific words can be grave. First, as images and words are "hugely influential in shaping our ideas about ourselves, other people and the wider world" (OXFAM GB 2015, p. 13), they create a divided world of those who are marginalized thus should be taken care of (southerners), and those who are to provide care (northerners). Second, according to Jackson (2014, p. 1070), such emotions as compassion, sympathy, and pity are believed to be able to

---

[2] Citizenship/being a citizen is treated in the paper as having a will and capabilities to act upon values one possess.

"cause people to act righteously to aid others who are disadvantaged through no fault of their own". Jackson (ibid, p. 1072) argues, however, that the belief that "once an empathy gap is bridged, problems of structural nature can easily be solved" can be naïve. Even though such compassionate models of citizenship can ignite "emotional concern and care," empathizing with others is not automatically "appropriate and effective." As a result, such an approach can create a prejudiced image of a disempowered other who students from the global north will fail to approach in a culturally appropriate way to establish a respectful communication platform.

The approach to develop guilt, pity, and shame in students from the global north when they travel overseas to participate in service learning activities is also considered essential from the environmental sustainability perspective, focusing on the overuse of resources. Krugman and Foote (2011, p. 117) argue that by experiencing life in less privileged countries of the global south where people live with limited resources northerners can benefit by learning about their own privilege as opposed to the lives of disadvantaged communities they visit. The authors mention that "southerners would learn the most from time in the developed North"; however, they do not explain what the benefits are. The question arises, who is to benefit from such an interaction and on whose expense?

The idea of the privileged north versus marginalized south can also be traced in the study conducted by Gallwey and Wilgus (2013) in which they discuss Ireland-South Africa schools links. According to Irish schools personnel, South Africans were motivated to participate in the school exchange primarily to acquire some material goods from their Irish colleagues. The motivation and objectives of the Irish were not explained to their partners in South Africa which resulted in South Africans believing they had no power or control over the project. The conclusion the authors come to is that the Irish schools were firmly in the position of power, the position of the driver in the cooperation, whereas the Other was left disempowered (ibid, p. 9). Another problematic issue brought up in the study is northerners' belief that it is their right to visit a global south country because students' parents set up such links and finance them, whereas southerners were not seen as warranted to be given such an opportunity to visit Ireland (ibid, p. 10). This approach leads us to the belief that the Other is available to the global north because the initiation and financial support comes from the wealthy, privileged northerners.

Gaining more privilege and respect by doing GCE for service learning is a motivation used at special workshops that encourage students to volunteer in the global south to meet the exotic Other, and raise funds for and/or awareness about the problems faced. Self-improvement rationale is one of the strongest when motivating students to commit to acts of improving the lives of others (Jackson and Adarlo 2014). Andreotti (2006, p. 40) describes one such training session for young people that take place before students go to an African country. At the beginning of the first session the young people were asked to imagine a black-tie event at a huge ball-room at which Nelson Mandela rewards one of them for helping people in Africa. The students are encouraged to envision what they wear, how they feel about what they have accomplished, and how they feel knowing everyone is waiting for them to speak at the stage.

Talking to the students afterwards, Andreotti discovered that they did not find such visualizations problematic. Contrary to her feelings of disturbance, the students were motivated by a future possibility of improving their skills, such as leadership, and by feeling responsibility for "changing or saving the world out there" (2006, p. 40). Student participants may be made believe that they are equipped with the right skills and knowledge backed by the right set of values and moral codes that will help them to be competent and effective

when they are in the global south. The idea promoted in such training sessions is that you can take any person from the global north, send him/her anywhere in Africa and the person will a priori have capabilities to take on the responsibility to fight poverty *for* the Other, alleviate hunger *for* the Other, and educate the undereducated Other.

It should be noted that northerners do not need to physically travel to the global south to learn about their own privileges, other people's disadvantages, and what actions they can take to help eradicate poverty and suffering of the Other. The images, stories, and videos that teachers bring to the classroom help to take students to any corner of the world, develop compassion and empathy toward people in distant communities, and prompt them to act to change the world for the better. Creating fundraising and awareness campaigns to help the poor in distant communities is one such way of action. The weakness of such campaigns can be their re-enforcement of the tropes and discourses that position the Other as a victim.

Overall, educators in the global citizenship classroom in the global north convey three key messages to their students. First, northerners are generous givers and southerners are helpless receivers. Since privilege and wealth give northerners better opportunities to acquire skills and quality education, it is their moral duty to build communication platforms with southerners and provide them with intellectual and material resources. Southerners are portrayed as a dependent, disempowered, and helpless *group* that lives in abject poverty and expects material resources from the global north. Second, since northerners and southerners are not materially equal, southerners become *available* to those coming from the global north to visit and learn about them, teach and help them, and represent back home because northerners can pay their way to the lives of global southerners.

Critique of the discourse on global citizenship education for service learning

Some learning activities directed at education of global citizens may have all the elements listed in the previous section, some may contain one or a few. They, however, are all seen as ineffective in relation to developing justice-striving students who are capable of engaging in a respectful dialogue with diverse others. These approaches build students' understandings of and relations with the Other on the idea of the superiority of the global north, thus robbing the Other of agency and preventing northerners from seeing culturally different people as equal human beings (Andreotti and de Souza 2012). It can be seen when the Other is shown as having no knowledge and resources and thus needing external aid, leadership, and expertise. It also suggests the availability of the Other to the global north representatives to learn about, represent the Other and their 'reality', and impose the views and perspectives of the global northerner (Andreotti 2014).

The pattern occurs and is being reinforced due to teachers' choice to opt for moral citizenship education, that is not as sensitive and challenging to implement in the classroom as political citizenship (Veugelers 2011, 473). As defined by Veugelers (ibid), moral GCE is based primarily on "sharing, taking responsibility for each other and preventing exclusion" without systematically engaging historical dynamics or political analysis in discussions and interactions. Political citizenship, on the other hand, aims to develop critical student attitudes towards unequal power relations, change this imbalance, and instil understanding of socio-economic differences and appreciation of cultural diversity. The political thus has a potential to address the past and its implications on the present world situation which the moral approach prefers to overlook. Teachers may believe that moral GCE is an important stage that students need to be helped with and, after having internalized moral values, they will be able to analyse and act on political relations without external help. The result of the attempt to de-politicize GCE, however, is its current over-moralizing nature (Veugelers 2011).

The fault cannot only be attributed to teachers for choosing the methods and stories that they use. Educating students to be in the world with all its complexities and diversity is a challenge that teachers cannot address singlehandedly. International organizations, such as Oxfam, provide schools and teachers with guidelines to integrate elements of GCE into all areas of curriculum and build school partnerships between countries. Oxfam (2006a, 2006b, 2007, 2015) offers an easy to use framework which at first sight may seem unproblematic. However, the framework and the activities suggested can be critiqued for being 'empty' signifiers that should be filled in by the teacher – and since the teacher has his/her own set of beliefs, biases, and values, the approach, texts, images, and opinions s/he uses in the classroom shape students' opinions accordingly.

Overall, as the example of GCE for service learning shows, practices to prepare students to engage with culturally different others can easily be seen to lack depth and reflexivity. Lack of depth in GCE means that there is no focus on unequal global power relations and knowledge construction that occurred due to colonialism and post-colonial realities. By ignoring colonial history and placing it "securely in the past" teachers suggest to their students that as it is over, it does not affect "the construction of the present situation" of a continued exploitation of the global south through development and free trade in which southerners often do not have a voice strong enough to oppose unequal relations and reclaim control over resources (Andreotti 2006; Andreotti and de Souza 2012).

Lack of engagement with historical dynamics and their implications rob students from developing an ability to reflect on their positioning in relation to the Other. The narrative that is transmitted focuses on the simplistic us/them binary where "us" is contra-distinct and defined in opposition to "them": we are wealthy, they are poor, as one example (Todd 2009, p. 218). The discourse places northern students in the realm where they believe that the Other is poor and disempowered because s/he lacks resources, services, markets, and education (Andreotti 2006, p. 45). The ignorance of the state of affairs casts the blame upon the poor and justifies the mission of the northerner to develop the distant help recipient (ibid). Thus we believe that GCE for service learning requires profound changes.

John Rawls's theory of justice as a key to changing the discourse

Although John Rawls does not talk about education much, drawing on his ideas we can determine that education must play a critical role in building a fair society. Additionally, there are some particular points of reference that can tell us what principles would be preferred for shaping education of citizens for a fair system of global social cooperation. Some ideas of Rawls can be used to develop a fair pedagogical approach for GCE where every person, their knowledge and contribution are treated equally and respectfully.

Principle One: Self-interest should be Eliminated from Moral Choices

This principle (P1) is based on the idea that "each participant's rational advantage, or good" should be considered when developing a just cooperation (Rawls 2001, p. 6). That means that those with power should not be tempted to "exploit social and natural circumstances to their own advantage" (Rawls 1999, p. 136). Speaking about North-South relationships, we can presuppose that those with more power that is derived from colonial history and development patterns that followed it, should be cognizant of their historical positioning in relation to the people in the global south they try to build connections with. In the context of the classroom, this principle is more directed at teachers, who should understand that communication between students of different cultural backgrounds is not carried out for northerners to acquire knowledge *about* the Other, develop tolerance towards difference and skills to live in a globalized world. It is about learning how to engage in a

respectful dialogue recognizing that being from historically opposite economic backgrounds we are differently positioned in global power relations and it affects our decisions, thought process, actions, and achievements.

If we look back at the example of GCE for service learning provided earlier we can see that under GCE interests of northern students are prioritized. Parents of students from the global north believe that it is their children's right to go to the global south to learn *about* it and people living there because they provide financial resources. Under P1 teachers, parents, and students have to consider thoroughly what advantages this interaction can bring to those who have historically been overlooked. In the context of the classroom this will require an honest discussion of the following questions and inclusion of parents of those who participate in service learning:

- Does our material advantage give us more rights? Why do we have this advantage? How do the others see our advantage?

- What can the benefits of such interactions be for people in that country? Are there any benefits?

The example also shows that students go to the global south with an ideal to save the people while helping themselves achieve recognition and success. Under P1 volunteers would be encouraged to re-consider taking advantage of their interaction with the Other to reach their own goals while using the so-called receiver of such help. The questions that should be asked are:

- Whose interests are represented here?

- Who is empowered? Who is disempowered? Who is being empowered?

- Who benefits? Who loses? What are the implications?

The challenge to P1 is that it is not an easy act to step back and reconsider your own position in relation to others, especially when our positioning in global relations is rooted in a historical and economic dynamics that are largely ignored by teachers as these are sensitive and complex topics to bring up with young people. Addressing the question of why some groups are advantaged over others can be tricky, too. Failing to examine the history of North-South relations with all its problematic details can bring us back to the belief that there are the educated, skilled, and capable, and those who are not. However, facing the issue will help us learn about ourselves and our abilities as well as overcome historical trauma that prevents honest and genuine communication with others.

Principle Two: Diversity of Views, Legitimate Conflict of Interests and Right to Decide should be Respected

Rawls argues in *A Theory of Justice* (1999, p. 189) that different people have "separate interests which may conflict". However, they should develop a set of rules and procedures to regulate their conduct that everyone can "reasonably accept" because the set is fair, reciprocal, and appropriate (Rawls 2001, p. 6). The prerequisite would be to see students from both global north and global south as equal persons which, according to Rawls (ibid, pp. 21, 23) means:

> (a) They understand that every person in the group has "the moral power to have a conception of the good", that is, they are able "to form, to revise, and rationally to pursue a conception of the good" ; and
> (b) They understand that everyone is "entitled to make claims on their institutions so as to advance their conception of the good". Thus schools and

school structures should be able to be influenced by students if and when they believe they are not treated fairly.

In our example of GCE for service learning northerners go to the global south to learn about their own privileges. As a result an objective to feel better about themselves and to act to better their own environments leads to taking advantage of their peers in a less privileged country. Under P2 they would still travel to engage with their peers in another culture; however, that engagement would be of an equal nature. They would understand that intercultural cooperation is not to learn *about* the Other, it is about sharing and learning to construct meanings and knowledge basis together with every person having space to contribute *no matter* how differing the opinions/values/perspectives are. The questions that should be asked under P2 are:

- Do these people want to interact with us, and how do they see such an interaction?
- What do we want to learn about them and what do they want to learn about us? Do they want to learn about us?
- How do we learn? How do they learn?
- How should we react and continue our cooperation if our views and perspectives are too different?

The example of GCE suggest that southerners do not possess required knowledge, skills, and values to develop economy, political system, health care, education and institutions. Under P2 we understand in contrast that our skills and knowledge may not be needed because the Other has a clear understanding of what is best for their communities and what needs to be done to effect changes that will *work* in that particular context. Teachers and students in the global north also understand that *their* knowledge is partial and through honest interaction they can learn *from* the other.

Shall we stop such exchange, if inequalities are re-enforced when northerners initiate North-South interactions and take up leading position thus having power to shape the discourse and rules of cooperation that may disregard needs and interests of the Other? No, because personal connections are important and valuable in developing empathy, understanding, and pluralism. Nonetheless, we should be aware that views, perspectives, and interests of peoples in different cultures diverge, and that is why in every intercultural interaction we should build an environment where differences are understood, accepted, and respected. As many theorists suggest (see Andreotti 2006; Pashby 2011; Pike 2008; Todd 2009), GCE has failed because it is focused on such values as harmony, consensus, and universal moral code. In contrast, Rawls re-enforces the idea that since peoples of different cultures are different, and they have different interests and aspirations, and therefore we perhaps may not be able to achieve universal harmony. Instead, we can strive for pluralistic difference.

Instead of learning about the Other and teaching them what we think they need to know and do, what should be done is an open and honest dialogue about what we know, what we do not know, what we should know, and how we should know it. Such a dialogue can be uncomfortable as it requires students and teachers to look thoroughly at what the knowledge they possess is and how they have come to have it, what can be problematic about their perspectives and values and what should and can be un-learnt and how they can try to construct knowledge(s) and meanings with others by integrating differing perspectives and values despite how contesting and competing they can be.

Principle Three: Students should be Autonomous Individuals

John Rawls (1999) believes that a society must not socialize and acculturate children to become a certain kind of individual. The third, and the most important, principle therefore requires letting students develop and agree upon their own models and strategies of intercultural relationships in cooperation with peers from other cultures and countries. This Principle can consist of a few clear possibilities for revising conceptions of GCE:

First, Rawls's model of "the veil of ignorance" can be used as a framework in such an activity. "The veil of ignorance" would encourage students to imagine what sort of moral rules and codes they would envision as being just and fair in their overseas study trips by entering an agreement with the Other from an original position. An original position would help them imagine that they were born in different socio-economic and historical circumstances and they need to approach a hypothetical agreement with people of a different culture and value system realizing that they have no bargaining advantages (Rawls 2001, p. 16). What sort of interpersonal relationships would they like to have had they been in the place of the Other? What sort of environment would be safe for them to learn, express themselves, and practice freedoms while not depriving others from enjoying the same privileges?

If we consider the example of GCE for service learning given earlier, the problematic language and images may seem trivial compared to other elements. However, it may have a strong influence on students because images and words help constitute our realities. Under P3 would teachers in the global north use shocking photographs of disaster or description of southerners as needing help and expertise of *northerners*, because they have no abilities to achieve the same level of development, left on their own? The obvious answer is no, as such images are not ethical, as they fail to show us a whole picture and context. Such images can be argued not to be humane, as depicting southerners as victims who lack power and responsibility, their agency is usurped and rights are withdrawn (Dahl 2009, pp. 393, 396). Yet, we can also look at it from a different perspective, of imagining ourselves in a position of a starving child. Would we want someone's pity? Would we want to be seen as lacking inner force or capacity for initiatives? Would we want to be treated with a paternalistic attitude? Would we want to be guilty for finding ourselves in such circumstances when systemic inequalities put people in such a position? Would we want someone else to act on our behalf without taking into consideration our wants, interests, and abilities?

Two other features for enabling students to be autonomous are responsibility and empowerment to act. This may sound similar to GCE for service learning as discussed earlier; however the direction of personal and group development is different. In his study Pike (2008, p. 232) discovered that youth in Canada feel powerless to influence and effect changes in the areas that affect them. If students are autonomous, feeling responsibility for themselves to build something special and unique with others, they can shift from being responsive citizens who are told what to feel and think and how to engage to being proactive citizens who have capabilities to construct alternative models of inclusive environments. Autonomous individuals feel that they have power to explore who they and others are, what defines them and people around them, what everyone wants and how interests and perspectives can be integrated, to name but a few possible possibilities of autonomous inquiry.

Third, autonomy will help have a deeper conversation with the Other which will bring students to a better understanding of what is going on in the world as a whole and in smaller communities and how the events interact. Rawls (2001, p. 9) would say that students should develop an "effective sense of justice, that is, one that enables them to understand and apply the publicly recognized principles of justice, and to act accordingly". In the context this

would mean that students should have a clear comprehension of principles of justice and act upon ideals others in the group share. Under P3 they do not act under rules *taught* to them. They create rules, values, and moral codes with *respected* others.

Through honest interactions with students of other backgrounds, the problematic aspects of GCE for service learning, - that is, no reflection on the past colonial history - can also be addressed. Under P3 open and honest conversations can help students learn about current problems and how they are connected to and influenced by colonialism and post-colonial developments. Understanding the implications will help students see the world in its complexity.

Discussion

Drawing on John Rawls's principles of justice and fairness, three principles can be seen as key to understanding how to educate global citizens, or rather, how students should *educate themselves* to become global citizens. The three principles are: self-interest is eliminated from moral choices; diversity of views, legitimate conflict of interests and right to decide is respected; and finally, students are autonomous individuals.

Based on the principles, what kind of "citizen" is it that we want to become global and work to better the world? We argue that it means seeing citizenship more as a political concept, not moral. If education for global citizenship from a moral perspective would mean developing empathy and sympathy, the political citizen is a more reflexive, proactive, and autonomous concept. It is not someone who *tolerates* the Other and their differing worldviews because it is a moral thing to do; it is someone who has "claims to liberty and equality", "struggles to establish and secure [his/her] views and meanings" and fully accepts the fact that the different Other has liberty and equality to do the same (Todd 2009, p. 218). However, it is not about developing two or more systems of social cooperation that are in *opposition* to one another. Rather, it is acknowledging that the systems are different but equally important and have a right to exist. This approach may lead us to the concept of pluralism and has a potential to give more opportunities to create an alternative system of justice *for all*.

Does that mean that we uncritically accept and agree with knowledge, perspectives, and worldviews of others? Todd (2009, p. 226) contends that it does not. However, "it does require a sustained openness to listen to other perspectives and to counter and respond. It requires treating each other as legitimate adversaries who are engaged in debate and struggle over meaning within a set of contesting norms and competing perspectives." It requires a global citizen who eliminates self-interest from global social interactions, accepts legitimacy of the Other, acts respectfully when engaged in intercultural dialogue and projects, and is able to reflect on his/her actions and their implications.

How can the model be built? In the classroom and while being engaged with the Other students together with their teachers should be determined to re-imagine the dominant discourse on the world. As Pike (2008, p. 226) points out, only by making the discourse "more inclusive and more visionary", only by "allow[ing] a majority of the world's people to find themselves represented within it", can we address global inequalities. It should be noted that such a model can be seen as similar to experiential learning. However, the model built on Rawls's values can only work when all the principles are satisfied. We cannot be autonomous and accept others as autonomous persons without eliminating self-interests and seeing others as different, conflicting but respected and legitimate citizens of the world we all share.

Such an approach can certainly bewilder and disorient students. Instead of providing them with a fixed set of knowledge and values they are asked to act autonomously.

Additionally because it shifts the focus from the teacher to the student, employing alternative approaches to learning to engage and relate to others should be employed. However, making GCE for service learning more flexible, inclusive, and dynamic can make students appreciate complexities and uncertainties, and, as a result, develop a desire to create an alternative system.

References:

Andreotti, V. (2006). Soft versus Critical Global Citizenship Education. *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review, 3,* pp. 40-51.

Andreotti, V. (2014). Critical and Transnational Literacies in International Development and Global Citizenship Education. *SISYPHUS Journal of Education, 2*(3), pp. 32-50.

Andreotti, V., & de Souza, L. M. (2012). Introduction: (Towards) Global Citizenship Education 'Otherwise'. In V. Andreotti & L. M. de Souza (Eds.), *Postcolonial Perspectives on Global Citizenship Education* (pp. 1-6). New York: Routledge.

Dahl, G. (2009). Sociology and Beyond: Agency, Victimization and the Ethics of Writing. *Asian Journal of Social Science, 37*, pp. 391-407.

Dower, N. (2003). *An Introduction to Global Citizenship*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Gallwey, S.K., & Wilgus, G. (2013). Equitable Partnerships for Mutual Learning or Perpetuator of North–South Power Imbalances? Ireland–South Africa School Links. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *44*(4), pp. 522-544. doi: 10.1080/03057925.2013.798178

Jackson, L. (2014). 'Won't Somebody Think of the Children?' Emotions, child poverty, and post-humanitarian possibilities for social justice education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory,* 46(9), pp. 1069-1081. doi:10.1080/00131857.2014.931430

Jackson, L. & Adarlo, G. (2014). Bridging Cultures Through Unpaid Labor: U.S. Volunteer Teachers' Experiences in China's Yunnan Province. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations,* pp. 1-23. doi: 10.1007/s11266-014-9519-1

Krogman, N., & Foote, L. (2011). Global Citizenship and the Environment: Embracing Life in all its Forms. In L. Shultz & A. Abdi (Eds.), *Global Citizenship Education in Post-secondary Institutions: Theories, Practices, Policies* (pp. 108-119). New York: Peter Lang.

McQuaid, N. (2009). Learning to 'Un-divide' the World: The Legacy of Colonialism and Education in the 21st Century. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices, 3*(1), pp. 12-25.

OXFAM GB. (2006a). *Education for Global Citizenship: A Guide for Schools*. Retrieved from http://www.oxfam.org.uk/education/global-citizenship/global-citizenship-guides

OXFAM GB. (2006b). *Global Citizenship Guide: Teaching Controversial Issues.* Retrieved from http://www.oxfam.org.uk/education/global-citizenship/global-citizenship-guides

OXFAM GB. (2007). *Global Citizenship Guide: Building Successful School Partnerships*. Retrieved from http://www.oxfam.org.uk/education/global-citizenship/global-citizenship-guides

OXFAM GB. (2015). *Global Citizenship in the Classroom: A Guide for Teachers.* Retrieved from http://www.oxfam.org.uk/education/global-citizenship/global-citizenship-guides

Pashby, K. (2011). Questions for Global Citizenship Education in the Context of the 'New Imperialism': For Whom? By Whom? In V. Andreotti & L. M. de Souza (Eds.), *Postcolonial Perspectives on Global Citizenship Education* (pp. 27-46). New York: Routledge.

Pike, G. (2008). Reconstructing the Legend: Educating for Global Citizenship. In A. Abdi & L. Schultz (Eds.) *Educating for Human Rights and Global Citizenship*. New York: New York University Press.

Rawls, J. (1999). *A Theory of Justice* (rev.ed.). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Rawls, J. (2001). *Fairness as Justice: A Restatement*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Todd, S. (2009). Living in a Dissonant World: Toward an Agonistic Cosmopolitics for Education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 29*(2), pp. 213-227. doi:10.1007/s11217-009-9171-1

Veugelers, W. (2011). The Moral and the Political in Global Citizenship: Appreciating Differences in Education. *Globalization, Societies and Education, 9*(3-4), pp. 473-485. doi:10.1080/14767724.2011.605329