

2011

Exploring Leadership Through International Education: Civic Learning Through Study Abroad in Uganda

Adam Weinberg
World Learning

Rebecca Hovey
World Learning, rebecca.hovey@gmail.com

Carol Bellamy

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.smith.edu/lgsc_pub



Part of the [International and Area Studies Commons](#), and the [International and Comparative Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Weinberg, Adam; Hovey, Rebecca; and Bellamy, Carol, "Exploring Leadership Through International Education: Civic Learning Through Study Abroad in Uganda" (2011). Book Chapter , Smith College, Northampton, MA.

https://scholarworks.smith.edu/lgsc_pub/4

This Book Chapter has been accepted for inclusion in Lewis Global Studies Center Staff Publications by an authorized administrator of Smith ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@smith.edu

**Exploring Leadership through International Education:
Civic Learning through Study Abroad in Uganda**

Adam Weinberg, President of World Learning and SIT

Rebecca Hovey, Director, World Learning Global Dialogues

Carol Bellamy, Chair, Board of Governors, International Baccalaureate Organization

Leadership education in the 21st century cannot ignore the global risks, opportunities and realities of our interconnected world; so too international education cannot avoid its responsibility to provide the knowledge and vision needed to resolve critical issues we will face as a global community. We argue that a model of international education is needed which acknowledges the diverse global community in which institutions are based and learning takes place. In linking leadership and international education, we propose an alternative approach to both based on recognition, reciprocity and responsibility toward others. Basing our work on the concept of an “ecology of learning” to describe community-based education (Longo, 2007), we refer to a “global ecology of learning” in which students learn through deep cultural immersion in communities through international education (Hovey and Weinberg, 2009). Educational opportunities based in local communities, or learning ecologies, offer insight into how societal problems are constructed, perceived and resolved through the actions of local citizens. In particular, we address the internationalization of undergraduate education as a way to think about and act upon leadership development as a dimension of moral responsibility and democratic civic engagement in an increasingly globalized world.

Over the past two decades, notions of leadership in the United States have been profoundly shaped by the unexpectedly swift collapse of the Soviet Union between 1989-1991 and a rebirth of American exceptionalism in response to the 2001 September 11th attacks. Within U.S. higher education, both historical events stimulated policy efforts to enhance our knowledge of global affairs and the emerging – and uncertain - realities that would follow such dramatic shifts in our world order. Many of the current initiatives to internationalize U.S. higher education were formulated in response to these events and the perceived need to strengthen our national security, economic competitiveness and democratic leadership through education (Hovey, 2004). However, as many internationalization initiatives sought to assert U.S. competitiveness, other voices raised questions regarding the need for peaceful co-existence and collaboration in the face of common threats such as climate change or global health pandemics. The Simon legislation, in honor of former Senator Paul Simon, acknowledges both concerns with its claim that “We are unnecessarily putting ourselves at risk because of our stubborn monolingualism and ignorance of the world” (NAFSA, 2003, p. 1).

At the same time, globalization trends beyond the control of U.S. national security have been altering the landscape of higher education around the world. Knight makes the following claim regarding internationalization of higher education: “Since the 1990s, it has become a formidable force for change, perhaps the central feature of the higher education sector” (Knight, 2008, p. 3). Knight’s analysis of five key elements of globalization – the knowledge society, information technologies, market economies, trade liberalization and changing governance structures – emphasizes the fluid context of institutional change and its relationship to new economic, technological and political forces at play in the world.

The rush to internationalize higher education, however, lacks a sound understanding of the kind of leadership needed for the social challenges we face in the 21st century. For students born after the fall of the Berlin Wall and raised in a web-based media society, they already understand the arbitrary nature of borders, nations and information. What is not clear in this rush to make sure our students and faculty “know the world” is the more profound question of how “to be in the world”. This is not merely an existential question, but one in which we must learn to be with others in a global civil society and to create the social fabric of this new society. We argue that international education needs to more explicitly address the need for alternative approaches to leadership. In order to do so, this involves learning from how others lead.

A Shift in Thinking

As a starting point, we posit that our ability to prepare students to be leaders in the 21st century requires shifting our thinking about higher education in four fundamental ways. First, we have to position civic education as a central driver of higher education. Clearly higher education has civic roots. American colleges and universities were founded to produce informed citizens (Colby, Erlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003; Colby, Beaumont, Erlich, & Corngold, 2007). However, it is also clear that civic education was not a driving priority for colleges and universities throughout the 20th century. This has shifted over the last 20 years. On most campuses, faculty engage in civic engagement efforts through service-learning and community-based research projects. Many campuses encourage this work through programs, institutional strategic plans and affiliation with Campus Compact. Having said this, there has been growing concern among civic education proponents that our progress has slowed. John Saltmarsh, the director of the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (and formerly of Campus

Compact), recently wrote what many of us have been thinking, "...while the movement [to date] has created some change, it has also plateaued and requires a more comprehensive effort to ensure lasting institutional commitment and capacity" (as cited in Boyte, 2008, p. 10).

Institutions that are not committed to civic life will not be capable of producing civic leaders.

If the civic education movement has plateaued, what is needed to further develop civic learning? Saltmarsh (2005) has previously urged educators to attend to the civic knowledge, skills and values that link education to the community:

... (A)n understanding of the community's history is essential to effectively participating in it as well as effectively shaping its future. Further, it is important to conceive of civic knowledge as knowledge that emerges from community settings. Civic knowledge, in this framework, emphasizes the role that the community, in all of its complexity, plays in shaping student learning (Saltmarsh, 2005, p. 54).

Significantly, though, this revitalization must not only be a replication of the early service-learning experiences. As emphasized by Lewin and Van Kirk, such community-based learning approaches to civic education must address the question: "How can we engage students in a way that facilitates the greatest community impact?" (Lewin & Van Kirk, 2009, p. 555). Similarly, educators are asking how such learning can motivate students for sustained civic engagement.

One answer is to revive civic education with a greater link to the active pedagogies of civic engagement and high-impact learning. A recent report of the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), using data from the National Survey of Student

Engagement (NSSE), identifies service-learning and community-based learning as among the most effective learning practices for impact on students' personal and professional growth (Kuh, 2008). Most of the other identified effective practices come about through community engagement efforts, including study abroad, internships, undergraduate research, diversity/global learning, learning communities, and capstone projects. A related project is the Bringing Theory to Practice (BTtP) project, an independent initiative funded by the Charles Engelhard Foundation in partnership with the AAC&U. Over fifty institutions affiliated with the BTtP project have been exploring ways that engaged student learning improves the quality of students' education, development, and health. Their empirical work suggests that active pedagogies engage students in their learning through reflection in ways that contribute to the resiliency and health of students and hence to better learning outcomes (AAC&U, 2009).

Second, we need to shift how we conceptualize leadership education. Traditionally, leadership has been conceived of as the heroic individual who achieves the remarkable through charisma. This is an outdated and not very useful conceptualization. Leadership has shifted, as the world has shifted. Today, we are preparing students for what Longo and Shaffer call "leadership for the diverse democracy of the twenty-first century" (Longo & Shaffer, 2009, p. 155). For Longo and Shaffer leadership education is about helping students develop the capacity for the collaborative problem solving needed to address public issues of the 21st century. The leader-follower dichotomy is replaced with leaders who know how to facilitate groups to collectively act across the community and over a sustained period to identify and solve public problems. The role of higher education in preparing leaders is crucial. As Longo and Shaffer emphasize:

(it) must be integrally connected to the kind of learning that asks students to see themselves as creators and agents actively shaping local and global communities, rather than as passive consumers of their education and the broader culture. (Longo & Shaffer, 2009, p. 155).

Third, we need to shift how we see public issues, or social problems. The issues that our students will face in the 21st century are clearly global in scope, even if they require action within the local context. As Skelly puts it, “We know what the challenges are, and they are global in nature: climate change; poverty; environmental degradation; militarism; and increasing hunger, among a myriad of others” (Skelly, 2009, p. 21). But Skelly also goes on to point out that while the mission statements of higher education institutions acknowledge this change, few programs “...fundamentally address the problems our students, and humanity more broadly, will face in the decades to come” (Skelly, 2009, p. 22).

Finally, we need some orienting concepts to ground this approach. We propose civic agency and public work as key concepts. Civic agency refers to the “capacities of communities and societies to work collaboratively across differences like partisan ideology, faith traditions, income, geography, and ethnicity to address common challenges, solve problems, and create common goods” (Boyte and Mehaffy, 2008, p. 1). Higher education is essential to creating a pool of civic agents across society, as society is dependent upon higher education to graduate students who have the capacity and commitment to be community leaders who enhance civic agency. As Boyte states, “the central problem of the 21st century is the development of civic agency. Civic agency is the capacity of human communities and groups to act cooperatively and collectively on common problems across their differences of view”. (Boyte, 2008, p. 1). At its core, we are talking about preparing students to do public work as part of their everyday lives

(Weinberg, 2005). Public work can be defined as “sustained, visible effort by a group of people that creates things - material or cultural - of lasting civic impact, while developing civic learning and capacity in the process” (Boyte 2008, p. 1). This work requires the development of moral judgment and social responsibility that enables students to build strong affiliations and affinities in community that prevent against more instrumental or political abuses of public service.

How do we do this kind of work? We argue that international education, or study abroad more specifically, is one place where higher education can do a better job preparing students for the public work that will enhance the civic agency of communities in the coming decades. International education has the ability to extend the institutional infrastructure of education beyond the classrooms and walls of the university. By linking students to the kind of learning that occurs in the real world, we connect them to civic life and direct encounters with public problems. Longo (2007), following a tradition associated with the education historian Lawrence Cremin, describes this extended world of education as an “ecology of learning” in which everyday life forms the basis by which knowledge is generated and acquired. Adapting this concept, we propose the notion of a “global ecology of learning” to describe the community-based education in another culture where language learning, cultural understanding, and awareness of alternative world views are gained through the informal social learning integrated with the more formal classroom instruction. The learning that takes place when education is seen as a global ecology involves recognizing the source of knowledge within the community and environment, developing reciprocal relations or partnerships between community and the institution in order to sustain these relations over time, and finally, instilling an ethic of responsibility among students, staff and faculty to respond to local community issues and concerns (Hovey & Weinberg, 2009, pp. 39-41).

Exploring Study Abroad

Clearly, U.S. colleges and universities are internationalizing. The number of American students studying abroad has quadrupled over the past two decades, reaching an all-time high of 262,416 in 2007-2008 (Open Doors, 2009). Internationalization is a central theme in many college strategic plans. Despite this, the number of college students studying abroad remains appalling low, less than two percent of the 18 million undergraduate students enrolled in degree-granting institutions (U.S. Department of Education, 2009). (Likewise, too many internationalization efforts are having impacts well below anticipated outcomes. For example: partnerships and projects often don't last very long, or have far fewer students than anticipated. Efforts to bring more international students to U.S. campuses, leads to too much parallel play, where international students and U.S. students are on the same campus but rarely interact.

We start by distinguishing between two different kinds of study abroad. In one model, universities and programs send college students into the world, with little preparation, for culturally thin experiences. Students make minimal effort to learn local languages or customs, travel in large groups, and are taught in American-only classrooms. They live and go to bars with other Americans, often drinking too much and getting into trouble. They see local sights through the windows of traveling buses. Far from experiencing another culture deeply and on its own terms, these students (at best) simply get the American college experience in a different time zone. It is worth noting as well that many of the study abroad destinations known as “fun” don't even require language study and offer relatively minimal challenges to students' sense of place and culture. These also happen to be the places with the highest percentage of students.

Under a second model, programs are developed to ensure deep cultural and linguistic immersion. Students are oriented to understand and respect local customs and encouraged to take responsibility for projecting a positive image of Americans. Such programs follow principles of cultural reciprocity and emphasize quality of experience over organizational efficiency. They emphasize sustainable, participatory and community-based programming. In study abroad, such programs ensure students become part of the culture by staying with local families and giving back to local communities. U.S. students attend classes but also participate in activities with local community members. They are taught by local staff who are paid fair wages and offer an inside view of the culture. Students return to the U.S. with the motivation to stay active in their relational learning in the community, to help others learn from their experiences, and to push for better understanding from their academic institutions, future workplaces, and political representatives with regard to the world beyond our borders. These students become young intercultural emissaries, global citizens able to adapt and contribute to a complex world.

Study abroad that starts with this deep focus on deep cultural reciprocity and linguistic immersion can help us develop the leadership for the 21st century. In the next section, we use our SIT Study Abroad program in Uganda as a case study.

SIT Study Abroad: A Case Study

SIT Study Abroad offers academic programs in over 40 countries around the world. SIT is the accredited higher education division of World Learning, which had its origins as The Experiment in International Living, the preeminent high school international exchange program founded in 1932. Approximately 2,000 students per year currently participate in SIT Study

Abroad's programs with their focus on critical global issues and many non-traditional study abroad destinations.

SIT's experiential learning and cultural immersion model has served as a guide for many in the international education field (Batchelder & Warner, 1977; Gochenour, 1993); it has also lent itself to educational approaches to understanding inequality and social justice (Lutterman-Aquilar & Gingrich, 2002). Increasingly, the extension of SIT's model to an ethnographic, fieldwork approach to inquiry has reinvigorated approaches to experiential learning by emphasizing its contribution to cultural documentation, policy studies and knowledge construction (Ogden, 2006; Hovey, 2009).

This maturation of SIT's experiential, community-based learning is also a basis for democratic education, global citizenship and leadership for public work. The process of cultural immersion in a community-based learning model has a powerful impact on the civic identity and affiliations of U.S. students. Civic learning becomes even more powerful as students return home and find themselves both representing the host community abroad and reinterpreting their own sense of belonging and citizenship at home. As students develop into young professionals and community members, they enact a role as citizen diplomats, moving respectfully between cultures and building the connections needed for leadership in the global civil society of the 21st century (Hovey & Weinberg, 2009).

SIT Study Abroad's programs in Uganda illustrate this experiential community-based learning as a contribution to global leadership education. What makes the Uganda case unique? SIT's programs in Uganda evolved from our extended presence in East Africa during the 1980s and 1990s. Initially an excursion site from the SIT Kenyan programs, relationships with local community members and organizations (initially in Mbale, Jinja, Kampala, and other towns

along Uganda's southern east-west corridor) offered a unique location to study critical approaches to Development Studies. Kevin Brennan, former Regional Director for African Programs and the Uganda program founder, initiated an early shift in SIT programming at the time with a focus on local practicum experiences employing participatory research methods, identification of local intellectuals with alternative perspectives on development, and a focus on asking critical questions about our knowledge of the region. In his view, this shift was a move beyond cultural immersion for its own sake and one in which students and staff actively engaged with communities in ways that could make a real difference due to the program's presence. (K. Brennan, personal communication, September 30, 2009). For example, the SIT Uganda program developed the Uganda Resource Center in Kampala, a library open to local residents and an important local center for access to information, internet services and recent scholarly material relevant to development studies in Uganda. Kampala has become a burgeoning site of non-governmental organizations (NGO) and the resource center offers a reciprocal exchange of resources with local activists and scholars by providing access to library, along with multiple and diverse opportunities for students to interact with the local NGO community.

The growing worldwide attention to the civil war in Northern Uganda and the barbaric abduction of children as child soldiers, along with the Rwandan genocide hearings held by the United Nations International Criminal Tribunal, are additional focal points in this region. They have contributed to making the larger Great Lakes region of Rwanda, Uganda and Tanzania a site for understanding the human rights and social justice issues surrounding conflict transformation and reconciliation. The lessons from these frequently horrific accounts of violence and interethnic bloodshed are critical for understanding some of the very real obstacles to democratic civil society. The local struggles of East African communities to seek justice

through both traditional and global human rights mechanisms, as well as to promote stronger and more accountable governance, offer models of local leadership needed to rebuild the social fabric of local communities. These examples of local leadership, alongside the presence of NGOs and multilateral institutions, from groups such as ResolveUganda (formed by former SIT Study Abroad students) to the International Criminal Court, offer insight into the challenges and possibilities needed for effective leadership in global civil society.

SIT Study Abroad currently offers three undergraduate programs in Uganda: the Kampala-based Development Studies program, the northern Post-Conflict Transformation program, and the Rwanda/Uganda program on Peace and Conflict Studies in the Lake Victoria Basin. Each of these programs shares key components of SIT Study Abroad's community-based learning model. The programs are each led by Academic Directors (ADs) whose primary responsibilities involve administering the local program and, as faculty, facilitating the integrated coursework, lecture series, field visits and independent study work of the students. The core components of the SIT model are 1) intensive language study for communicative competence, 2) home-stay with local families and/or villages as a first hand cultural immersion experience, 3) seminars on the theme of the program that introduce students to a variety of local academics, policymakers, activists, intellectuals and other community representatives through lectures, site visits, research activities and discussion groups, and 4) some form of independent project.

In the SIT Uganda programs, this fourth component is offered in three distinct ways. The Post-Conflict Transformation program offers the typical SIT Independent Study Project (ISP), a four-week independent field project guided by a local mentor. The Development Studies program offers an alternative six-week Practicum in which students serve as interns with local organizations and write policy papers based on their experiences. The practicum experiences

correspond to one of four modules introduced during the thematic seminar: public health, human rights, gender, and grassroots micro-finance. The Peace and Conflict Studies program, given its shorter length over the summer, allows for a shorter “mini-ISP” in which students can explore a topic of their own choosing.

Community-Based Learning

The SIT community-based learning model depends first on the integration of the community into the program. This is done through careful identification and selection of communities, meetings with appropriate groups of elders, local councils, or NGO leaders in which the program is clearly explained, the establishment of clear expectations on the part of the leaders, students and host families, and ongoing follow-up and engagement with the community. Working through the local leadership is a critical element of community integration. The local elders and leaders play a role that is much more than just cultural gate-keeping – once they agree on common expectations, they assume the responsibility of building the program with the local community. (M. N. Wandera, personal communication, July 10, 2009).

In some cases, community relations are facilitated by program lecturers. For example, the two-week Development Studies module on Gender and Development is coordinated by faculty at the Department of Gender and Women’s Studies at Makerere University. During the first week, students receive lectures at Makerere University; during the second week they are introduced to community organizations associated with projects connected with Gender and Women’s Studies faculty.

Dan Lumonya, a long-term Academic Director of the SIT Uganda programs, describes the five key principles of community-based learning that accompany student participation in

community interactions: bottom-up, inclusiveness, flexibility, cultural sensitivity, and culturally appropriate behavior (D. Lumonya, personal communication, July 14, 2009). These principles are applied throughout the program as students gain experience interacting and developing relationships with local individuals and organizations. For example, in the homestay experience, students learn to engage with the local community through the knowledge gained from their homestay family in program assignments such as constructing a family tree, drawing a village map, and debriefing with other students living within the same community.

As the students gain knowledge of their local context, they are better prepared to understand the larger themes of development and post-conflict issues that are core to the programs. Uganda is a case study for learning about development and conflict studies in general; but as an Academic Director Martha Nulubega Wandera emphasizes, the first lesson of understanding development or conflict in practice is that it is important to understand the local culture. The ADs create the structure of the program, but they want the students to learn from the “very people who do the practice” (M. N. Wandera, personal communication, July 10, 2009).

Participatory research is an important element of the fieldwork. Traditional interviewing in isolation from their context with a set of structured questions has limitations in understanding the full cultural context and meaning of development. Instead, the Development Studies program facilitates student participation in the rural activities of the community, whether this be planting, gathering water, or farming and using this time to establish dialogue with members of the community. By talking, asking questions, and working alongside the community, students are able to grasp the cultural context and meaning of their responses. In the early founding of this program, this approach was intentionally developed to follow action research methods such as

Rapid Rural Appraisal to complement more typical ethnographic cultural research methodologies (K.Brennan, personal communication, November 9, 2009).

Leadership Education

William Komakech, Academic Director of the Post Conflict Transformation program, emphasizes that coming to Uganda to understand post-conflict transformation is preparation not just for the students and their lives returning to the U.S., but it is preparation for leadership critical for the global community. Leadership, democracy, good governance and accountability are critical challenges in dealing with the impact of a decades-long civil war in Uganda and the genocide in neighboring Rwanda. Students learn about these challenges in their formal academic lectures in Uganda, but they come to understand the profound impact of these issues for local families through their homestays. Most of the homestay families are only now rebuilding their lives after years of displacement from their farms, life in refugee camps, loss of family members due to war and abduction, and the long slow process to reconstruct their culture. Through their understanding of the academic, policy and immediate life-worlds of post-conflict transformation, students are better able to think through the implications of policy decisions made about Africa. Komakech tells students "...next time you hear about how decisions are being made about Africa, you can tell them what you have witnessed." (W. Komakech, personal communication, July 13, 2009).

The powerful significance of learning to listen from the people themselves can be a valuable dimension of foreign policy in the region. Charlotte Mafumbo, an Academic Director of the Development Studies program, reminds students of former President Clinton's foreign policy of "constructive engagement" in the region. When Clinton asked Africans what they needed

from Americans, the response was that they needed Americans to come and learn from Africa; they need decision-makers and policy advisors to know from direct experience what the impact of their decisions will be. (C. Mafumbo, personal communication, July 13, 2009). This message comes across repeatedly from families, community leaders and Academic Directors: the students are witnesses and intermediaries who can inform the world at large and in their own home towns of the realities they encounter from living with communities in Uganda and Rwanda.

Komakech emphasizes that while these experiences prepare students for leadership, it also prepares local Ugandans. When student groups visit a community, the community becomes stronger through telling its story. This is particularly true among the youth who are eager to surpass the conflict. They are determined to be in control of their own lives and obtain the education and economic activity needed to improve their lives. For the Ugandan youth, having U.S. students there to learn from them gives them encouragement. They feel that if others come to Uganda to learn from them, they can emulate these students as well. (W. Komakech, personal communication, July 13, 2009). The power of these educational exchanges are intense and immediate for these Ugandan youth just as they are for the U.S. students who learn that hope and joyfulness of life can reemerge even after the trauma of war and genocide.

From a student's perspective, these exchanges can be seen differently, especially as they develop sensitivity to the overwhelming presence of international NGOs in the Ugandan context. One student responded to a question about examples of Ugandan leadership by stating she had observed a lack of agency among many Ugandans and a frequent dependence on the support of NGOs. From her perspective, this passivity is often created by the very organizations that purport to "help" Ugandans. Unfortunately, this creates a stereotype among the NGOs that the local population is passive, so when Uganda youth attempt to initiate change, they are not viewed as

emergent leaders by the NGO community. She sees her work as trying to advocate for a local perspective on what appear to be global solutions (B.V. T. Ho, personal communication, July 13, 2009).

This student conducted her ISP on traditional justice models for the repatriation of formerly abducted persons (FAPs). Her research utilized qualitative research approaches of participant observation, focus group sessions and individual interviews in Kitgum province, northern Uganda. While multilateral organizations such as the International Criminal Court have called for the arrest and trial of brutal opposition leader Joseph Kony, of the Lord's Resistance Army, she found that an important faction of Ugandan reconciliation advocates opposed to the arrest warrant as an imposed "western" approach to justice through means of punishment. Instead they seek to practice local traditions of justice through truth-telling, forgiveness and cultural renewal traditions. In writing of the painful struggles of families and communities to reintegrate formerly abducted persons who were forced participants in the violence of northern Uganda, she encounters the profound need for the community to move beyond the self-perpetuating discourse of enemy and victim. She writes:

Reconciliation in post-war Uganda encompasses innumerable aspects. It requires an aspect of wholehearted forgiveness: self-forgiveness, person-to-person forgiveness, and community forgiveness. It involves an active effort to reach out to individuals once perceived as "enemies," to provide support and to allow support to be given, and the restoration of relationships. It requires the genuine desire of a whole collective body to come together not as victim and perpetrator, but simply as neighbors, in an effort to rebuild the identity of the community and to regain stability. Post conflict reconstruction

is too often simplified to mean the rebuilding of physical infrastructure when the rebuilding of relationships and lives is of utmost importance. (Ho, 2009, p. 31).

After completing her study in Uganda, Ho continued her work on traditional justice through a summer internship with the Africa Faith and Justice Network, an organizational advocate for international traditional justice mechanisms. Her depiction of the Northern Uganda efforts at reconciliation and reconstruction lie at the center of what Longo and Shaffer call for in a new approach to leadership for global challenges: leadership that is "... relational, collaborative, community based, and perhaps most important, public" (Longo & Shaffer, 2009, p. 155). Even the best efforts at leadership around social justice and human rights cannot be top-down and applied universally according to abstract principles. Leadership around global challenges of such critical humanitarian dimensions can only be developed in collaboration with local customs, values and community support if it is to be effective. And the education for such leadership requires the on-the-ground experiences and careful analyses such as that provided for this student and so many others in community-based learning programs abroad.

Multi-Dimensional Aspects of Leadership Education

These examples demonstrate the multi-dimensional aspects of leadership education in an international context. Developing and administering programs that can provide access to understanding how local communities handle development and conflict reconciliation involves constructing and supporting leadership in diverse and multi-layered ways. Collaborative leadership needs to be practiced at different levels:

- through the institution’s own training and support of local staff responsible for leading a community-based program;
- through the local staff’s role in developing community relationships, encouraging the local population to emerge as leaders in local projects as they represent their community and find ways to integrate students in their daily lives;
- through access to activists and policymakers as ways of learning about how leadership is practiced in specific contexts; and
- through facilitating a process by which students gain the confidence to participate in the local culture and begin to develop a mindset of mutual learning, appreciation of local moral norms, respect for community belonging and responsibility to further their learning on return home.

Mary Lou Forward, former Academic Dean of Africa for SIT Study Abroad, describes the leadership approach to both education and program administration as one of learning to make connections, to bring resources together and to facilitate interactions with others. From the training of Academic Directors, to the cultivation of community leaders, to the preparation of students as future leaders, the lesson is that leadership “is not about you” and it is not about “follow me.” Instead she describes leadership in the following way: “Leadership education involves giving people a chance to feel part of something that is important and big, then having a chance to participate.”(M.L. Forward, personal communication, July 10, 2009).

The challenge in maintaining a community-based program with group after group of students coming and wanting to be part of “something big” is that this can feel extractive for local communities. SIT’s local Academic Directors carry a large burden in their leadership of doing the hard work – the public work needed for civic education – of being a member of the

community all the time, of talking to people about their needs, of thinking proactively about their needs and how the student groups can be managed in a sensitive way to respond to the community. Many times the local staff and students are able to initiate community projects, such as a women's batik cooperative or health education resources, which require very little in terms of monetary cost, but are incredibly time-intensive in terms of building relationships of trust, respect and attention to local needs.

Training and supporting the local staff in their work with communities requires an institutional leadership that values reciprocity as a goal, value, and intercultural "mind-set." What we often refer to as reciprocity in the SIT programs in this context is less about a specific project or exchange and more about gaining a perspective that is inclusive and committed to maintaining community connections. Hautzinger (2008) distinguishes between direct and deferred reciprocity, reminding us that while students may be the immediate beneficiaries of cultural exchanges, often the mutual returns for both hosts and visitors can come much later in time as relationships evolve and participants are capable of responding in kind. Providing this support involves documenting best practices of community-based education and collaborative leadership; of ensuring that appropriate community members are involved in projects; and extending this "mind-set" or perspective of reciprocity to the pedagogical model itself.

Through deep immersion in these learning experiences, students come to understand the normative aspects of global citizenship as they return home and continue to serve "witness" to the communities and people they have come to know. Many of the SIT students have demonstrated this leadership, developing NGOs to educate the U.S. public about Ugandan conflict and development concerns. Among the many students on the program through an affiliation with the University of Notre Dame, Peter Quaranto and Michael Poffenberger returned

from Uganda wanting to get involved in African justice movements. After a summer spent looking for organizations involved in Ugandan solidarity, they realized they needed to create one. The Uganda Conflict Action Network (UgandaCan) was created to mobilize information and provide a voice for Ugandans seeking to inform the world about the Northern Ugandan war. This organization was later renamed as ResolveUganda to improve their U.S. outreach and focus on the impact of U.S. foreign policy toward Africa (P. Quaranto, personal communication, November 12, 2009). At least one element of leadership that emerges in such efforts is the ability to move between cultures and to take responsibility for action within one's own culture.

Dan Lumonya describes the connections he seeks to make between what students learn in Uganda and larger global dynamics that are also evident in the U.S.. In sharing his educational philosophy, he writes:

Rwanda's genocide must be understood as a consequence of the relationships between both historical and contemporary political and economic processes: the relationships between poverty and international trade, colonialism and neo-colonialism. Similarly, our understanding of the political and social construction of genocide must go beyond the geographical boundaries of the territory of Rwanda. For example, the cycle of prejudice as a framework for understanding the social and political construction of genocide can be paralleled with the social construction of racial prejudices and stereotypes in the U.S.. ...

We constantly move from the local to the global. And finally I challenge the students to think about what they might do, and what opportunities exist in their home and community environment to do something. (D. Lumonya, personal communication, July 14, 2009).

Conclusion: Preparing Students to be Global Leaders in the 21st Century

Our initial premise of this chapter was that while civic education lies at the heart of higher education, it is in need of revitalization. We propose that this revitalization needs to link community-based education approaches such as service-learning with more active pedagogies across the curriculum. The active learning that takes place in a community-based program, where students may be living and studying with local families, participating in local economic and social activities, interviewing and observing communities in structured methods advised by community members, and sharing their formal knowledge with local academics and mentors who bring new perspectives to their studies are all ways in which students begin to build relational capacities to interact in diverse settings.

In order for civic engagement to be effective, this also involves learning how communities respond to societal conflict and injustice through this form of direct interaction with community members. Put most bluntly, most study abroad programs do not come anywhere close to offering these types of experiences. Too many students are studying abroad without ever really leaving this country. We need to develop experiences based on principles of deep cultural immersion and learning from the local community. In the SIT Uganda programs, U.S. students have witnessed the resilience of local populations to overcome trauma and rebuild their lives. These students have the opportunity to learn the cultural values and norms that foster this resilience through the social and personal relationships they build while living in Uganda. Through this active learning, they come to understand that global issues of development and reconciliation require reconstructing the social fabric of people's lives and not just the physical infrastructure of institutions – although these too are important. This is possible largely because

there is an active civil society in Uganda accessible to outsiders – a critical component that is also supported when a reciprocal learning environment is developed in collaboration with local leaders (P. Quaranto, personal communication, November 12, 2009).

Our second premise was to reconceptualize leadership education around the qualities of sustained, relational, collaborative, and facilitative approaches as suggested by Longo and Shaffer (2009). In the spirit of community-based knowledge, skills and values, our model seeks to learn from and support best practices of local leadership. In this context, learning how local leadership practices are inspired and realized, as the SIT students learned from Ugandan NGOs and youth organizations, provides a way of understanding what the local obstacles to effective leadership really are, and how sustained community efforts also need to be based in, and with, locally supported efforts such as the traditional justice initiatives.

Leadership education for global engagement needs to be about learning how local leadership emerges, and learning how to interact and collaborate effectively, not to “take charge” or assume personal direction of activity. Creating a community-based learning ecology also involves training and supporting the local faculty to be community leaders. As faculty and staff work with local communities and networks, they are also facilitating the communities’ own role in representing themselves, negotiating their participation, and clarifying goals and visions. This multi-dimensional aspect of leadership education then becomes a basis by which program principles of reciprocity, mutual exchange, and students’ commitment to ongoing engagement around their learning can be cultivated and sustained.

Our third premise involves the need to shift how we see public issues. Specifically, we argue that civic education needs to resituate civic life within a wider global civil society. This involves understanding global challenges as the “fundamental referent” (Skelly, 2009, p. 22) by

which students learn to situate themselves in the world. It also involves making connections between injustices and social action in one context with the analysis and motivation for action in another. For example, Dan Lumonya is able to draw parallels between the construction of ethnic identities in Africa and of racial relations in the United States, and to use these parallels as the lens through which to engage U.S. racial discourse. Ultimately students have the opportunity to reflect upon and to analyze the political and social construction of identity and its implications in contemporary U.S. society and elsewhere (D. Lumonya, personal communication, October 2, 2009). In the broader debates around global citizenship and cosmopolitanism, the challenges of understanding the diverse and intensely local context of community and citizenship can be extended to understanding how we are interconnected through multiple forms of citizenship and belonging (Stoddard & Cornwell, 2003; Benhabib, Shapiro, & Petranovic, 2007).

And, finally, we conclude with our fourth premise, that the connection of civic agency and public work within higher learning underlies our description of a global ecology of learning. Study abroad programs that are carefully developed through community-based learning and cultural immersion in this knowledge ecology can energize student learning while also invigorating higher education. Connecting higher education to the community, whether locally based or globally located, provides an innovative potential that comes from new sources of knowledge, comparative analysis and challenging new moral dilemmas.

All of this work involves the moral responsibility of engaged citizens. Civic agency and leadership develop through the capacity to act based on moral judgment. The student's work cited in the case study draws on John Paul Lederach's recent work *The Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Building Peace* (Lederach, 2005) for her analysis of the need of the northern Ugandan Acholi people to imagine their own future (Ho, 2009). Lederach's reflections on his

own work in peace-building and reconciliation is instructive for the work of civic education for global leadership. Just as this volume calls for a shift in how we conceptualize leadership for the 21st century global challenges, Lederach believes that integrating the “art” of peace into the “skills” of mediation involves a shift in worldview that requires a new moral imagination, which he defines as “... the capacity to imagine something rooted in the challenges of the real world yet capable of giving birth to that which does not exist”. (Lederach, 2005, p. ix). Our hope for our students is that a renewed vision of leadership education for civic engagement will result in new hopes and new solutions to global problems that we all face together.

revised draft

References

- AAC&U. (2009). Bringing Theory to Practice. Retrieved October 25, 2009 at http://www.aacu.org/bringing_theory/index.cfm
- Batchelder, D. and Warner, E.G. (Eds.). (1977). *Beyond experience: the experiential approach to cross-cultural education*. Brattleboro, VT: The Experiment Press in cooperation with The Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research (SIETAR).
- Benhabib, S., Shapiro, I. & Petranović, D. (Eds.). (2007). *Identities, affiliations, and allegiances*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boyte, H. (2008). Against the current: developing the civic agency of students. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 40(3), 9-15.
- Boyte, H. & Mehaffy, G. (2008). The civic agency initiative. Retrieved October 28, 2009 at <http://www.changemag.org/Photos/Civic%20Agency.pdf>
- Colby, A., Erlich, A., Beaumont, E., & Stephens, J. (2003). *Educating citizens: Preparing America's undergraduates for lives of moral and civic responsibility*. San Francisco: Jossey Press.
- Colby, A., Beaumont, E., Erlich, T., and Corngold, J. (2007). *Educating for democracy: Preparing undergraduates for responsible political engagement*. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Gochenour, T. (Ed.) (1993). *Beyond experience: The experiential approach to cross-cultural education*. (2nd ed.). Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.
- Hautzinger, S. (2008). From direct to deferred reciprocity: Service- versus community-based learning in international anthropology training. *The Applied Anthropologist* 28(2), 192-203.

- Ho, B. V. T. (2009). *The heart of forgiveness, in light of unforgettable hurt: A multi-faceted perspective on reconciliation in northern Uganda*. Independent Study Project, SIT Study Abroad, Uganda: Development Studies program.
- Hovey, R. (2004). Critical pedagogy and international studies: Reconstructing knowledge through dialogue with the subaltern. *International Relations*, 18(2), 241-254.
- Hovey, R. (2009). *The ethnographic experience: Experiential learning via ethnographic practice*. Presentation at the annual meeting of The Forum on Education Abroad, Portland, Oregon, February 18-20, 2009.
- Hovey, R. & Weinberg, A. (2009). Global learning and the making of citizen diplomats. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad: Higher education and the quest for global citizenship* (pp. 33-48). New York: Routledge Press and Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U).
- Knight, J. (2008). *Higher education in turmoil: The changing world of internationalization*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges and Universities.
- Lederach, J.P. (2005). *The moral imagination: The art and soul of building peace*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lewin, R. & Van Kirk, G. (2009). It's not about you: The UConn social entrepreneur corps global commonwealth study abroad model. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad: Higher education and the quest for global citizenship* (pp.

- 543-564). NY: Routledge Press and Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U).
- Longo, N.V. (2007). *Why community matters: connecting education with civic life*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Longo, N. & Shaffer, M. S. (2009). Leadership education and the revitalization of public life. In B. Jacoby & Associates (Eds.), *Civic engagement and higher education: Concepts and practices* (pp. 154-173). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lutterman-Aguilar, A. & Gingrich, O. (2002). Experiential pedagogy for study abroad: Educating for global citizenship. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*. VIII(Winter), 41-82.
- NAFSA (2003). *Securing America's future: Global education for a global age*. Report of the Strategic Task Force on Education Abroad. Washington, DC: NAFSA.
- Ogden, A.C. (2006). Ethnographic inquiry: Reframing the learning core of education abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*. XII(November), 87-112.
- Open Doors. (2009). *Open Doors 2009: Report on international educational exchange*. New York: Institute for International Education.
- Saltmarsh, J. (2005). The civic promise of service learning. *Liberal Education* 9(2), 50-55.
- Skelly, J. (2009). Fostering engagement: The role of international education in the development of global civil society. In R. Lewin (Ed.) *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad: Higher education and the quest for global citizenship* (pp. 21-32). NY: Routledge Press and Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U).

Stoddard, E.. & Cornwell, G.H. (2003). Peripheral visions: towards a geo-ethics of citizenship. *Liberal Education*, 89(3), 44-51.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2009). *Digest of education statistics, 2008*. (NCES 2009-020), Table 188. Retrieved November 21, 2009 at <http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=98>

Weinberg, A. (2005). Residential education for democracy. *Learning for Democracy*, 1, 29-46.

revised draft