

**Locating a Course on Environmental Justice in Theories of Environmental Education  
and Global Citizenship**

**Abstract:**

Environmental education is an increasingly important concern for policymakers and universities, as it is critical to the success of the broader agenda represented by the 2015 Sustainable Development Goals. Achieving this within the higher education sector has proven difficult, however. This article examines how an interdisciplinary, extra-curricular course on the justice implications of climate change, delivered as part of University College London's Global Citizenship Programme, combined a range of practical and theoretical methodologies to deliver environmental education and the related concept of education for global citizenship. Evidence indicates that courses such as this could be a powerful means of overcoming the shortcomings in mainstream higher education and equipping students with the skills necessary for them to assist society, at global, national and subnational levels, in transitioning towards more sustainable behaviours.

**Key Words:** Climate change; environmental education; environmental justice; global citizenship; higher education

## **Locating a Course on Environmental Justice in Theories of Environmental Education and Global Citizenship**

### **Introduction:**

Global citizenship is an increasingly important concern for higher education institutions, as it both reflects and provides a framework for interdisciplinary and inter and intra-institutional research. The vehicle through which University College London (UCL), an urban, expanding and research-focussed university, incorporates global citizenship into its curriculum is the Global Citizenship Programme (GCP). This multi-faceted course creates an environment in which students can engage in, discuss and reflect on global challenges, thereby providing an opportunity for higher education to “serve as an important site for reflexive, socially accountable, and critically informed conversations” about how society could develop (Stein, 2017, 4). As such, it supports the view that higher education serves to aid individuals in making ‘better’, in this context meaning more environmentally-sound, decisions and rationally inform collective behaviours so as to achieve society’s environmental goals (Gough and Scott, 2007, chapter 2).

This paper examines how a GCP-course on climate change delivered environmental education and education for global citizenship. We begin by providing an overview of the GCP and key aspects of the climate change course. The article then locates the course in theories of environmental education, noting particularly how it goes beyond mainstream approaches to incorporating sustainable development into higher education. Finally, drawing on evaluation data, we examine how the course reflects global citizenship education as a process and its potential to transform students into global citizens. Our findings suggest that interdisciplinary and immersive courses such as the GCP have an important role to play in developing students as global citizens and providing them with the skills necessary to challenge and reform society’s unsustainable behaviours.

### **UCL’s Global Citizenship Programme and the Global Environmental Justice Strand:**

The GCP comprises different strands framed within UCL’s research agenda.<sup>1</sup> Between 2016 and 2018, a strand on global environmental justice (the GEJ strand) was offered, which has now evolved to look more broadly at global environmental challenges. The GEJ strand focused

on the global and local justice implications of climate change, what is being done to tackle climate change and how the students, acting individually and collectively, could deliver positive change. Its learning objectives focused on enhancing the students' ability, working together and individually, to critically analyse different aspects of the climate change debate, contribute to effective campaigning and engage in and present research in a range of formats. Initially a two-week summer school, the GCP has now evolved into a year-long extra-curricular programme. For the environment strand, the course now comprises a series of themed term-time events, a 'weekend challenge' led by NGOs and other partners and a one-week summer school concerned with environmentalism in different countries and contexts. Combined, these enable students to comprehensively understand what 'global citizenship' means as both an intellectual concept and practical ambition within an environmental context.

Each year, approximately ninety students from UCL participated in the strand. The students were from a variety of disciplines and at different stages of their degrees. They were divided into eight groups, each of which was assigned a country.<sup>2</sup> These countries provided a focus for the students' research into environmental justice and were who they represented in the climate change negotiation simulation (discussed below), an integral part of the course. PhD students, again from a range of disciplines, were employed to act as 'navigators'. Their primary responsibilities were to facilitate group discussions, lead the academic tutorials and support the students as they developed their research outputs. The navigators were crucial to the programme's success; their enthusiasm and unique insights undoubtedly enhanced the students' experience by exposing them to additional professional and personal perspectives.

The strand included lectures, tutorials, workshops and project-based activities. An international series of speakers, with expertise in the humanities, science and education, was invited to talk on, inter alia, the Anthropocene, climate activism in the Pacific, human rights in the Niger Delta, the experiences of women in international climate change institutions and the transition towns movement. Workshops covered graphic design, environmental activism and carbon-neutral campaigning. The academic tutorials included tasks such as writing environmental justice manifestos, calculating and responding to the students' personal carbon footprints and debating trade-offs that have to be made within the sustainability agenda. The project work consisted of a research poster based on the environmental justice issues relevant to their assigned country.

## **Engaging Students with Environmental Justice:**

Environmental justice is a complex concept, theoretically and practically. Its origins lie in the United States, where, during the 1970s and 80s, growing evidence emerged that locally undesirable land-uses were deliberately sited near poor and ethnic minority communities. In short, these communities represented “the line of least resistance” to developments such as toxic waste sites because they lacked the knowledge, capacity and resources to effectively engage in local planning procedures (United Church of Christ’s Commission for Racial Justice, 1987). Responses to this so-called environmental racism culminated in President Clinton’s Executive Order 12898, which required the potential health effects of proposed developments on minority and low-income populations to be taken into account in decisions taken under the National Environmental Policy Act 1969. However, although an important statement of political intent, weaknesses in the design and judicial interpretation of this Act has limited its ability to both protect vulnerable communities and achieve its ambitious environmental objectives (Karkkainen, 2007).

At the global level, questions of justice are particularly relevant in the context of climate change. The impacts of climate change fall hardest on the poorest states, but it is developed states that have contributed more to the rising global temperature through their historic emissions. There is also the question of what obligations, if any, are owed by the current generation to future generations. It has been persuasively argued that any consideration of how we deal with climate change today should take into account the (perceived) interests of those that will follow us tomorrow (Skillington, 2017), 238-243). Brown Weiss (1992), for example, believes that to achieve intergenerational equity in terms of the environment, it is necessary to ensure that each generation does not exploit natural and cultural diversity to the extent that it undermines future generations’ ability to respond to their own environmental challenges. In other words, each generation has an obligation to conserve the options of future generations (1992, 402-404). Creating a sufficiently robust and just international response to climate change has therefore proven difficult. On the one hand, without dramatic reductions in carbon emissions the global temperature will continue to rise, resulting in fundamental ecological change to the planet (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2018). On the other, developing states, quite legitimately, wish to achieve the same level of prosperity as developed states. To do so, and notwithstanding recent developments in the viability and accessibility of renewable energy, they need to not only continue to emit greenhouse gases, but in many cases increase their emissions as well.

Environmental justice is relevant to all aspects of environmental law and policymaking, not just climate change (Ebbesson and Okowa, 2009). It is a legitimate topic for a full academic module and even this would not allow for a comprehensive consideration of every aspect. To make the course material accessible to the students we therefore used three mechanisms. The success of these was evident in the final presentations the students made in their country groups to the rest of the strand. It was clear that not only had the students fully grasped the key principles and challenges of environmental justice, but were also confident enough to begin to develop their own strategies for delivering it in different contexts through a strengthened sense of connection to the global human and natural community.

First, our analysis of environmental justice was framed within its two constituent elements: distributive and procedural justice (Schlosberg, 2007, chapter 2). The students were encouraged to consider what the principal drivers of climate change are, who suffers from the impacts of climate change and who should bear the burden of mitigating these (distributive justice); and who has a say in decision-making, how to make these processes relevant to different communities and why this is important (procedural justice).

Second, to illustrate questions that are central to global environmental justice debates, the students were introduced to Posner and Weisbach's asteroid example (2010, 75 et seq.). Posner and Weisbach ask us to imagine that an asteroid is heading for the Earth and will collide with India in one hundred years' time. If the world acted together, technology could be developed to divert the asteroid and dramatically reduce its impact. This could only be achieved, however, at significant cost to all states. What would be the nature and extent of other states' obligations be towards India? They then posit a different scenario, in which there is no way to predict where the asteroid will hit. Again, what would the obligations of developed states be to poorer states, which would be less able to prepare for the asteroid and cope with its impact? Although different to the long-term and cumulative process of climate change, the asteroid example raises the same issues of legal obligations, moral responsibilities and respective capacities to deal with significant harm that the students engaged with throughout the course.

Third, to demonstrate the difficulties in delivering environmental justice, we highlighted that global and local environmental justice agenda, whilst sharing similar aims and principles, are not always compatible. For example, following a genuinely inclusive and democratic decision-making procedure, a community could decide to reject the construction of a windfarm in their local area. This would be a valid expression of local environmental justice, but also contrary to

the emphasis on low and zero-carbon energy in global environmental justice discourse (for example, see Outka, 2012). If, however, the government overruled the community and approved the windfarm proposal, citing the need to reduce carbon emissions, global environmental justice would be served but local environmental justice would be denied. The students engaged with this tension throughout the course, recognising the value of education in helping to show why global perspectives need to be taken on what appear to be only local issues.

### **The Climate Change Negotiation Simulation:**

The first week of the GEJ strand built towards a simulation of the negotiations of the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change.<sup>3</sup> The COP is the annual or biannual meeting of states party to an international instrument at which they, *inter alia*, review progress and adopt new rules and programmes of work. Specifically, the students formed a contact group of the 2015 Paris Agreement's Conference of the Parties Meeting as the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA),<sup>4</sup> i.e. a small group of states representing different negotiating blocs, such as the Small Island Developing States Group and the Environmental Integrity Group,<sup>5</sup> tasked with negotiating a text on a specific issue or provision within the Agreement that is then presented to a plenary session of the CMA.

Students were provided with a negotiation text and background paper on an aspect of the Paris Agreement, as well as confidential country negotiation instructions. They began by drafting and presenting their opening statements, in which they set out the position that they would be advocating in the negotiations. Representatives from each country then tried to reach common positions before the groups came together to negotiate. The objective of the exercise was not to agree a final version of the text. Rather, it was to demonstrate the difficulties in reaching agreement by consensus with partners that have different experiences of climate change and hold different, potentially contradictory, values, thereby providing an important insight into the operation of, and links between, international climate change policy and global citizenship.

Role-play exercises have notable advantages in education, including improving communication and listening skills, which, when coupled with the greater levels of enthusiasm associated with more interactive teaching techniques, result in higher knowledge-retention (for example, see Vizeshfar, Zare and Keshtkaren, 2019). The COP simulation therefore provides a way of critiquing current approaches to legal education, which typically rely on more

mainstream modes of delivery, such as lectures and seminars. For three consecutive years, students demonstrated an understanding of complex legal, political and scientific issues that would ordinarily only be expected after years of study. Immersive, interdisciplinary courses taking in a range of perspectives on climate change and other environmental issues, such as the GEJ strand, could therefore be a powerful way of furthering, in a connected manner, transdisciplinary environmental education and ideas of transformative global citizenship. The remainder of this article considers whether the GEJ strand did so.

### **Environmental Education:**

The different approaches to environmental education and their intersections with legal education have been categorized by Holder (2013) on a scale focused around three anchor points. At one end of the scale is education for sustainable development (ESD), a minimum standard of environmental education. It represents a process of mainstreaming sustainable development, defined by the World Commission on Environment and Development as ‘development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs’ (1987, 8 and 43), into all aspects of education. As Holder observes, however, whilst universities have been reasonably successful in incorporating sustainable development into the management of their estates, they have been unable to radically reform curricula so that students not only hear from experts from different disciplines, but are themselves equipped to analyse problems from a range of disciplinary perspectives (2013, 550). This is reflective of a broader trend in the implementation of sustainable development, whereby stakeholders tend to deliver only on those aspects of sustainable development agenda that do not entail fundamental structural reform (Amos and Lydgate, 2019). In the context of education, Sterling (2001) attributes this to the co-evolution of modern education and neoliberal economic systems along the lines of a reductionist and mechanistic world view, which fails to recognize the links within and between human and natural systems. Education is designed so that individuals are equipped to fulfil narrow criteria required by professions, rather than effect meaningful change so that society develops along a more sustainable track (Sterling, 2001, 16). This is perhaps unsurprising, as many siloed disciplines are reductionist, objectivist and materialist, commonly valuing intellectual understanding more than affective and practical knowing (Gaard, Blades and Wright, 2017, 1274). In the words of Giroux, “education has been reduced to another market-driven sphere, pedagogy has been instrumentalized, and public values have been transformed into private interests” (2011, 123).



At the other end of Holder's scale is ecological intelligence. This rejects the division of analysis into disciplines and instead emphasizes the need to understand integrative relationships (Sterling, 2001, 16). Ecological intelligence is the most challenging form of environmental education to import into pre-existing educational structures because it cuts across disciplines in a way that is an anathema to traditional forms of education (Holder, 2013, 545-546). It is, nevertheless, achievable, as experience in conservation shows. Mace (2014) traces the evolution of conservation-thinking through four stages. During the 1960s, a "conservation for itself" mindset prevailed, with the focus being on protecting individual areas of untouched areas of supposed wilderness. As awareness of the impacts of human activities increased in the 1970s and 80s, "nature despite people" conservation emerged. The targets of conservation action remained distinct entities, but were individual threats, species and habitat-types rather than specific places. A major shift in thinking occurred in the 1990s when ecosystems became the object of conservation action. Under this "nature for people" approach, the goal was to ensure the provision of benefits to society by protecting ecosystem services. Finally, the past decade has seen the emergence of "people and nature", which "emphasizes the importance of cultural structures and institutions for developing sustainable and resilient interactions between human societies and the natural environment" (Mace, 2014, 1559). This is a similar evolution in thinking and practice, that is a shift from isolated and narrow consideration of issues to a more holistic appraisal, to what Holder and Sterling advocate in relation to education.

The midpoint between ESD and ecological intelligence on Holder's scale is education for sustainability literacy. The emphasis here is on education imparting the skillset necessary for an individual to help society transition towards a more sustainable future (Stibbe and Luna, 2009). This skillset comprises both practical (such as understanding zero-carbon technologies: Quilley, 2009) and intellectual (for example, adopting systems-level analysis to problems: Strachan, 2009) elements.

The GEJ strand is situated between ecological intelligence and sustainability literacy. Whilst it presented the different scientific, social, technological, anthropological, legal and political aspects of climate change holistically, it fell short of providing the experiential understanding of injustices that are considered essential in delivering ecological intelligence (Holder, 2013, 546). The value of a more immersive approach to teaching in terms of developing responses to challenges such as climate change is evident when reference is made to quotidian epistemology. This emphasizes the importance of experience-based expertise in decision-making in complementing and socially-locating evidence gathered through strict scientific

methodologies (Morrow, 2011, 140). Applying this in the current context, it is argued that it is not possible to formulate comprehensive solutions to problems such as climate change without drawing on peoples' lived experiences. Scientists can predict and measure the *effects* of climate change, but only people who live on the frontline of climate change can provide information about its *impacts*.

Practical limitations prevented us from giving the students an opportunity to engage with such communities. However, they did hear from speakers who had this first-hand experience and were therefore provided with a deeper understanding of climate justice issues than would have been possible in a purely technical lecture. It is the exposure to these experiences, and the students' subsequent application of what they learnt in their tutorial discussions and project work, that shifts the GEJ strand beyond ESD and towards ecological intelligence (see figure 1).

< Insert figure 1 >

### **Global Citizenship:**

Environmental education is an important aspect of global citizenship. The two concepts are brought together under UNESCO's programme for Global Citizenship Education (GCE).<sup>6</sup> UNESCO's work on GCE has in part been presented as a response to incidents such as the 9/11 terrorist attacks (Pigozzi, 2006, 3). GCE should not be seen as limited to such appalling incidents, however. Climate change, whilst lacking the immediate shock value that accompanies such acts, may be considered no less violent in both its causes, as evidenced by the destruction of the Niger Delta by fossil fuel companies and the associated human rights abuses (Izarali, 2016), and its consequences, such as the forced displacement of "climate refugees".<sup>7</sup> The cross-cutting nature of global citizenship is reflected in its inclusion in Target 4.7 of the 2015 Sustainable Development Goals (UN General Assembly, 2015).

Rather than being a single universal ideal, global citizenship may therefore instead be better understood as comprising a range of equally valid, context-specific, interpretations. Oxley and Morris (2013), for example, identify two forms of global citizenship, cosmopolitan-based and advocacy-based, each of which incorporates four distinct types of global citizenship. Environmental global citizenship is considered one of the four advocacy forms (the others

being social, critical and spiritual), characterized by “an ecological awareness of the fundamental interrelatedness of all aspects of the Earth” (Richardson 2008, 128, cited in Oxley and Morris, 2013, 314). What distinguishes it from other manifestations of global citizenship is that it operates within the contested and complex dichotomy of anthropocentrism v ecocentrism in environmental policymaking.

Viewing this tension through the prism of global citizenship highlights the importance of striking a balance between these two paradigms. Placing too much emphasis on anthropocentric concerns, as the current international order arguably does so (Kotzé and French, 2018), results in a destructive relationship between humanity and nature that undermines efforts to deliver other elements of the global citizenship and sustainability agenda. The human rights abuses resulting from the unsustainable exploitation of the Niger Delta, referred to above, are a good example of this. Core ideas of ecocentric theories, such as granting nature legal rights (Stone, 2010) and developing societal infrastructure so that it supports and restores the natural world (Mason, 2011), redefine the nature-human relationship in terms that prioritise the protection of the interactions within and between ecosystems over socioeconomic concerns. This would, it is argued, ensure that sustainable development is actually sustainable because the inevitable policy trade-offs between environmental protection, economic development and social equity would be framed by the Earth’s ecological carrying capacity (Bosselmann, 2017). It follows that other aspects of global citizenship that can be linked with sustainable development would therefore also be facilitated, at least to a greater extent than current systems typically allow. However, pursuing an excessively ecocentric approach risks alienating policymakers, making it harder for more moderate ecocentric policies, such as strengthening the role of ecological science in environmental assessment procedures (Holder, 2007), to be debated in decision-making fora.

Tensions between competing interests also exist in discussions on what form of global citizenship should be the subject, and aspiration, of education. Stein (2015) identifies four positions on global citizenship, which, like Holder’s three forms of environmental education, offer different opportunities and limitations in shifting social constructs, including education, away from the neoliberal agenda of sustainable development that has broadly failed to solve inequalities within human society and between humanity and nature. The entrepreneurial position, for example, under which global citizenship is seen as a way of enabling students to participate in the global economy, has been criticized for lacking the essential element of responsibility towards “others” (Caruna, 2014) inherent to ideas of global citizenship (Beasley-

Murray, 2015). Provided that everyone has the right to engage in the global economy, questions of inequality can be largely ignored (Stein, 2015, drawing on Harvey, 2005). Consideration of “others”, however, particularly the disadvantaged in global and local societies, was central to the work undertaken by the GEJ students. The course therefore broadly corresponded to the liberal humanist position on global citizenship (see figure 1).<sup>8</sup> Nussbaum’s prerequisite capacities of global citizens, i.e. critical self-examination, recognizing one’s links with other humans and imagining oneself in the position of another (2002, cited in Stein, 2015), were developed through the strand’s tutorials and the climate change negotiation simulation, with the latter also enhancing the students’ capacity for intercultural understanding. As such, the strand can be seen as a tool through which education influences individual and collective mindsets, identified by Wamsler (2020) as an essential necessity to deliver Target 4 of the Sustainable Development Goals.

Global citizenship scholarship offers a range of criteria against which courses such as the GEJ strand can be assessed, relating to both GCE as a process and whether that process results in individuals identifying themselves as global citizens. Taking GCE as a process first, we have selected Oxley and Morris’ three dimensions of curricula – antecedents, transactions and outcomes – as an evaluation tool because they address key aspects of educational courses. They cover not just a course’s learning outcomes, but also its delivery methods (transactions) and wider physical and theoretical context (antecedents) (Oxley and Morris, 2013, 316-317). These criteria will be used to assess the extent to which ideas of (environmental) global citizenship underpin the GEJ strand. If the overarching rationale of the strand is to deliver a course on global citizenship through the prism of environmental justice and climate change, then it is important that these are reflected in the three features of educational courses identified by Oxley and Morris.

The strand’s transactions have already been discussed. Lectures introduced topics relevant to various aspects of climate change and environmental justice. Related tutorials allowed students to consolidate and further explore issues that had been raised in the lectures. The activism workshops and negotiation simulation situated their skills-training within a practical transdisciplinary environment that enabled students to see their potential for application in their future studies and careers. All of this fed into the students’ project work, which allowed them to relate issues that were being discussed during the course to a specific country’s socioeconomic and environmental context.

Turning to learning outcomes, these were:

By the end of this strand, students will be able to:

- Critically analyse theories of environmental justice and their application in specific contexts;
- Challenge preconceptions about the science and impacts of climate change;
- Understand how international law responds to climate change and how different groups engage in international policymaking;
- Participate in negotiations;
- Develop creative and sustainable solutions to social and environmental problems;
- Devise strategies for and engage in environmental activism;
- Undertake collaborative and individual research tasks and present their findings in a range of visual and oral formats.

Whilst these related to the strand's specific content, they lacked an explicit link to global citizenship and the idea of 'global citizens' as both a theoretical concept and practical ambition. This was mitigated, however, by the strand's antecedents. The strand was one part of UCL's wider Global Citizenship Programme and there was consequently an overt emphasis on different aspects of global citizenship. It should also be seen within the broader context of UCL's Grand Challenges, an interdisciplinary framework facilitating integrated research across the university. The work students were undertaking was, therefore, situated at all times within ideas and concepts of global citizenship. A range of materials, such as expert-prepared country negotiation positions, relevant media reports and items that had been gifted by Pacific islanders to some of the speakers contextualized the students' academic discussions and lent a physical dimension to hypothetical tasks.

Overall, the strand can be said to have delivered a strong element of global citizenship. It is, however, important to note its limitations, particularly the short duration of the course. This was a significant restriction on our capacity to allow for an in-depth and immersive consideration of the relationships between climate change, global citizenship and environmental justice. As already noted, environmental justice is a huge academic topic and two weeks is insufficient time to adequately address every aspect. The mechanisms discussed above were a pragmatic response to this, but not a substitute for an extended period of study. The short duration also had an impact on the strand's transactions. In particular, the students'

research into the different countries had to be kept to a relatively superficial level. A comprehensive appraisal of the impacts that climate change has in each country, and the consequent environmental justice issues, was not possible within the timeframe.

Recent changes to the GCP's format go some way in remedying these issues. The greater scope provided by the year-long format enables the students to explore the complex issues raised by the environment strand's content in greater depth than the two-week summer school, thereby allowing for more detailed consideration of how environmental concerns feed into discussions of global citizenship and vice versa. By developing these connections, we provide some basis for co-designing and co-facilitating programmes that contribute directly to the sustainability movement.

The second set of criteria against which we will evaluate the GEJ strand is Oxfam's characteristics of a global citizen. This analysis does not concern the design and content of the course, but rather its potential to transform its participants into global citizens. According to Oxfam, a global citizen is someone who:

- is aware of the wider world and sense their own role as a world citizen
- respects and values diversity
- has an understanding of how the world works economically, politically, socially, culturally, technologically and environmentally
- is outraged by social justice
- participates in and contributes to the community at a range of levels from the local to the global
- is willing to act to make the world a more sustainable place
- takes responsibility for their actions (Oxfam, 1997, 5)

Oxfam's criteria can be broadly divided into two categories: those that relate to active global citizens and those that relate to passive global citizens. A passive global citizen may be defined as someone who recognizes their place in international, national and subnational communities, holds values associated with global citizenship and understands the flaws in current social paradigms, but does not take related actions. An active global citizen, in comparison, takes steps to implement their values in their own lives and also within their communities. They will not only understand how carbon emissions cause air pollution at home and rising sea levels abroad, but reduce their carbon footprint and join a campaign to persuade their local council to divest from fossil fuels. A similar distinction is made by Skrbis, Kendall and Woodward (2004)

between authentic and mundane cosmopolitanism, itself an aspect of global citizenship (Beasley-Murray, 2015). A mundane cosmopolitan is someone who dresses up in the native dress of a country they support in the Eurovision Song Contest whilst an authentic cosmopolitan will immerse themselves in that country's culture by living and working there (Skrbis, Kendall and Woodward, 2004, 129-130). Mundane cosmopolitans are not criticized as somehow being phonies, or as incapable of having a transformative effect on society. Rather, Skrbis, Kendall and Woodward recognize that they may lay the groundwork for deeper social change (130, drawing on Nava, 2002). The same observations apply to passive global citizens. Within the context of climate change, however, it is legitimate to question the value of the mundane and passive when the general consensus is that significant remedial action is urgently required (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2018).

We are able to measure the success of the strand in developing students as global citizens by comparing the (anonymous) responses of the 2018 cohort to a set of global citizen statements given before and after the programme. Students were asked to score from 1 to 5 (1 being lowest) the extent to which these statements applied to them. The statements, devised by the GCP's Academic Director with input from the strand academic leads and the GCP steering committee, were informed by a literature search for existing measures of global citizenship in higher education (including Ferreira, 2011; Morais and Ogden, 2011; Hunter, White and Godbey, 2006). They are a combination of statements that had been validated in other tools that matched or could be adapted to UCL's definition of global citizenship<sup>9</sup> and new statements written specifically for this course in a manner that reflects common practice in how such statements are devised (for example, the use of the phrase "I am informed..."). Asking the students to respond to the statements on the first and last days of the course reduced the influence that non-GCP activities would have on their answers. Statements 1 to 5, 9 and 10 relate to passive global citizens, whilst statements 6 to 8 are more closely associated with active global citizens.

< Insert table 1 >

There are limits to what this evaluation data tells us and it should be noted that they were devised to inform the ongoing developing of the GCP rather than for purposes of research. The sample size was determined by the students who were present on the first and last days and although the majority of participants were the same, it is still the case that a few would have

only responded to one set of statements. It is also not possible to tell whether those students who scored highly on the active global citizen statements followed through and undertook some form of activism or volunteering. Drawing on data from multiple years and tracking the students' engagement in the months following the course will be important when advancing this research in the future. Nevertheless, that there was a positive change across all ten statements suggests at this early stage that the strand succeeded to some extent in developing students as global citizens. It reinforced those characteristics associated with passive global citizenship and strengthened students' self-identification as global citizens. It also inspired and enabled participants to actively engage in activities associated with environmental justice and global citizenship after the course had finished.

### **Conclusion:**

The GEJ strand met key criteria of environmental education and GCE literature. Its immersive and interdisciplinary approach, which placed as much emphasis on practical experience as it did on academic study, shifted the strand beyond the ESD model that has been embraced by higher education institutions towards an educational paradigm arguably more capable of preparing students to deliver positive social change. In terms of GCE as an educational process, the strand delivered important global citizenship messages across its learning objectives, transactions and antecedents. Although these were limited by the two-week duration of the course, recent changes in the GCP's format, so that it is now a year-long programme, provide opportunities to develop these in the future. Further research is needed to establish the extent to which the strand developed students as global citizens, but initial results indicate that such courses could have real value in this regard.

What is clear is that courses such as the GCP and its GEJ strand are important tools in higher education. They remedy some of the artificial limitations imposed by current approaches to teaching by allowing students to critique the causes and potential solutions to challenges such as climate change in a more holistic, and therefore more relevant, manner than is possible in a law course, or an economics course, or a scientific course. They have the potential to produce globally responsible citizens with the skillset necessary to aid society in its transition towards a more sustainable future.



## References:

- Amos R and Lydgate E (2019), 'Trade, transboundary impacts and the implementation of SDG 12'. *Sustainability Science*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-019-00713-9>.
- Beasley-Murray T (2015), 'Global Citizenship and the Problem of Global Fellow Feeling', UCL Minds Lunch Hour Lecture, 5<sup>th</sup> February 2015. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rZIJ1UCOQEM&t=1742s> (last accessed 10/04/2020)
- Bosselmann K (2017) *The Principle of Sustainability: Transforming Law and Governance*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Routledge: Abingdon
- Brown Weiss E (1992), 'Intergenerational equity: A legal framework for global environmental change', in Brown Weiss E (ed), *Environmental Change and International Law: New Challenges and Dimensions*. United Nations Press: Tokyo
- Caruna V (2014) 'Re-thinking global citizenship in higher education: From cosmopolitanism and international mobility to cosmopolitanism, resilience and resilient thinking'. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 68:1, 85-104
- Ebbesson J and Okowa P (eds) (2009) *Environmental Law and Justice in Context*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge
- Ferreira R (2011) 'Development of an Instrument to Measure High School Students' Global Awareness and Attitudes: Looking Through the Lens of Social Sciences'. *FIU Electronic Theses and Dissertations*
- Gaard G, Blades J and Wright M (2017) 'Assessing sustainability curriculum: from transmissive to transformative approaches'. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 18:7, 1263-1278
- Giroux H (2011) 'Once More, with Conviction: Defending Higher Education as a Public Good'. *Qui Parle: Critical Humanities and Social Sciences*, 20:1, 117-135
- Gough S and Scott W (2007) *Higher Education and Sustainable Development: Paradox and possibility*. Routledge: Abingdon
- Harvey D (2005) *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press: Oxford
- Holder J (2007) 'The prospects for ecological impact assessment', in Holder J and McGillivray D (eds), *Taking Stock of Environmental Assessment: Law, Policy and Practice*. Routledge-Cavendish: Abingdon
- Holder J (2013) 'Identifying Points of Contact and Engagement Between Legal and Environmental Education'. *Journal of Law and Society*, 40:4, 541-569
- Hunter B, White G and Godbey G (2006) 'What does it mean to be globally competent?' *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10 (Fall), 267-285
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2018), *Global Warming of 1.5°C*. World Meteorological Organization / United Nations Environment Programme

- Izarali M.R. (2016), 'Human Rights and State-Corporate Crimes in the Practice of Gas Flaring in the Niger Delta, Nigeria'. *Critical Criminology*, 24:4, 391-412
- Karkkainen B.C (2007), 'NEPA and the curious evolution of environmental impact assessment in the United States' in Holder J and McGillivray D (eds), *Taking Stock of Environmental Assessment: Law, Policy and Practice*. Routledge-Cavendish: Abingdon
- Klein Solomon M and Warner K (2013), 'Protection of Persons Displaced as a Result of Climate Change: Existing Tools and Emerging Frameworks', in Gerrard M.B and Wannier G.E. (eds), *Threatened Island Nations: Legal Implications of Rising Seas and a Changing Climate*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge
- Kotzé L.J and French D (2018) 'The anthropocentric ontology of international environmental law and the Sustainable Development Goals: Toward an ecocentric rule of law in the anthropocene' *Global Journal of Comparative Law* 7:1, 5-36
- Mace G (2014), 'Whose conservation?'. *Science*, 346:6204, 1558-1560
- Mason I (2011), 'One In All: Principles and Characteristics of Earth Jurisprudence', in Burdon P (ed) *Exploring Wild Law: The Philosophy of Earth Jurisprudence*. Wakefield Press: Mile End
- Morais D.B. and Ogden A.C. (2011) 'Initial Development and Validation of the Global Citizenship Scale'. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 15:5, 445-466
- Morrow K (2011), 'Perspectives on environmental law and the law relating to sustainability: a continuing role for ecofeminism?', in Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos (ed), *Law and Ecology: New Environmental Foundations*. Routledge: Abingdon
- Nava M (2002), 'The Cosmopolitanism of Commerce and the Allure of Difference: Selfridges, the Russian Ballet and the Tango 1911-1914'. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 1:2, 163-196
- Nussbaum M (2002) 'Education for citizenship in an era of global connection'. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 21:4/5, 289-303
- Outka U (2012), 'Environmental Justice Issues in Sustainable Development: Environmental Justice in the Renewable Energy Transition'. *Journal of Environmental and Sustainability Law*. 19:1, 60-122
- Oxfam (1997), *A curriculum for global citizenship*. Oxford.
- Oxley L and Morris P (2013) 'Global Citizenship: A Typology for Distinguishing Its Multiple Conceptions'. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 61:3, 301-325
- Pigozzi M.J. (2006), 'A UNESCO view of global citizenship education'. *Education Review*, 58:1, 1-4
- Posner E.A and Weisbach D (2010), *Climate Change Justice*. Princeton University Press: Princeton

- Richardson G (2008) 'Conflicting imaginaries: global citizenship education in Canada as a site of contestation', in Peters M, Britton A and Blee H (eds), *Global Citizenship Education: Philosophy, Theory and Pedagogy*. Sense: Rotterdam
- Schlosberg D (2007), *Defining Environmental Justice: Theories, Movements, and Nature*. Oxford University Press: Oxford
- Skillington T (2017) *Climate Justice and Human Rights*. Palgrave Macmillan: New York
- Skrbis Z, Kendall G and Woodward I (2004), 'Locating Cosmopolitanism: Between Humanist Ideal and Grounded Social Category'. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 21:6, 115-136
- Stein S (2017) 'Internationalization for an Uncertain Future: Tensions, Paradoxes, and Possibilities'. *The Review of Higher Education*, 41:1, 3-32
- Stein S (2015) 'Mapping Global Citizenship'. *Journal of College & Character*, 16:4, 242-252
- Sterling S (2001) *Sustainable Education: Revisioning Learning and Change*. Schumacher Briefings, Green Books: Cambridge
- Stibbe A and Luna H (2009), 'Introduction', in Stibbe A (ed), *The Handbook of Sustainability Literacy: Skills for a changing world*. Green Books: Cambridge
- Stone C (2010), *Should Trees Have Standing? Law, Morality and the Environment*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Oxford University Press: Oxford
- UN General Assembly (2015), 'Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development', A/RES/70/1
- United Church of Christ's Commission for Racial Justice (1987) *Toxic Wastes and Race*.
- Vizeshfar F, Zare M and Keshtkaren, Z (2019) 'Role-play versus lecture methods in community health volunteers'. *Nurse Education Today*, 79, 175-179
- Wamsler C (2020) 'Education for sustainability: Fostering a more conscious society and transformation towards sustainability'. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 21:1, 112-130
- World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) *Our Common Future*, Oxford University Press, Oxford

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/grand-challenges> (last accessed 10/04/2020).

<sup>2</sup> Brazil, China, Ecuador, Germany, India, Kiribati, South Africa and the United States. These were selected because they represent countries at different stages of economic development, are members of key blocs in international negotiations and have different relationships with the causes and impacts of climate change.

<sup>3</sup> New York, 9 May 1992, in force 24 March 1994, 1771 UNTS 107.

<sup>4</sup> Note that although meeting as a different body, the representatives involved in meetings of the CMA are typically the same as those in meetings of the COP.

<sup>5</sup> See: <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/parties-non-party-stakeholders/parties/party-groupings> (last accessed 10/04/2020).

<sup>6</sup> <https://en.unesco.org/themes/gced> (last accessed 10/04/2020).

<sup>7</sup> Note that the label “climate refugee” is legally problematic because “refugee” has a specific meaning that cannot be read as including persons that have been displaced by environmental degradation (Klein Solomon and Warner, 2013).

<sup>8</sup> Stein’s other two positions on global citizenship are the anti-oppressive position, which focusses on redressing injustices caused by imbalances in the distribution of power, wealth and knowledge, and the incommensurable position, which is considered conceptually harder to define as although it shares many characteristics of the anti-oppressive position, it does not proscribe particular outcomes for the necessary social reform.

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/global-citizenship-programme/what-is-global-citizenship> (last accessed 10/04/2020).