

Teaching Globalization Globally
The experience of Globalization, Social Justice and
Human Rights Course

Rodney Coates

Miami University, Oxford, OH, USA

Enzo Colombo

Università degli Studi, Milan, Italy

António Does

Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL), Lisboa, Portugal

Sarah Hernandez

New College of Florida, Sarasota, FL, USA

Jasmin Hristov

University of British Columbia Okanagan, Kelowna Canada

Abstract

The changes introduced by the growing global connectivity represent a challenge for education systems – in particular for universities. To be in tune with the necessity of a global society, university teaching needs to transmit on to students not only contents but also the capacity to think globally, overcoming a nationalistic nation-focused perspective. In order to promote the creation of world citizens, universities have to improve students' capacity to work in cross-cultural virtual teams. The paper aims to present the seven-year experience of teaching a course on *Globalization, Social Justice, and Human Rights* across international and cultural boundaries. In particular, we describe the ways in which the course attempts to go beyond the mere

acquisition of new content and towards promoting dialogue among people with different languages, experiences, university backgrounds, and expectations. The paper ends with a critical assessment of our experience where we discuss the advantages and challenges that students and faculty faced.

Keywords: Globalization; Critical thinking (skill); Diversity; Active learning; Human rights.

Teaching Globalization Globally

The awareness of the world beyond national borders has become a necessary skill for students to succeed in a globalized world, characterized by an increased economic, political and cultural interconnectivity. Universities are increasingly called to prepare their students for a more interdependent world (Sohoni and Petrovic 2010) by promoting students' understanding of the complex dynamics and interconnections that have enabled the world to emerge as a global space. The increasing calls for 'internationalizing' the curricula cannot be restricted to adding some bits of international data and material to an essentially nation-centered curriculum; instead, it requires the direct experience of «working in geographically distributed, cross-cultural virtual teams, with team members who are in multiple time zones, countries, and culture and who work in multiple languages» (Cogburn and Levinson 2008, p. 75). A globalized world calls for 'ways of teaching' that instill content, as well as social consciousness (Dukes et al. 2016); ways of teaching that promote the capacity to learn, recognize and manage cultural difference, and find complex answers and solutions to complex questions and problems. The 'globalization' of the curricula constitutes a specific challenge for the social sciences. Teaching globalization adopting a truly global perspective requires the capacity to develop an appropriate set of concepts, a reflexive approach, and an awareness of how social location (Anthias 2013) affects our experiences and understanding of the world. It also requires a new pedagogical approach; an approach focused on exposing students to the capacity/necessity to face the hyper-diversity (Tasan-Kok et al. 2013) that characterizes their everyday experiences.

This paper aims to present the seven-year experience of teaching a course on *Globalization, Social Justice, and Human Rights* across international and cultural boundaries¹. We start with a brief discussion of how current global processes are

affecting the way in which we understand social reality, undermining large part of the conceptual tools we inherited from the classical Western social sciences and showing the limitations of nationally-centered perspectives. We explore how globalization affects youth experiences and how innovative ways of teaching can promote the development of new skills and knowledge that prepare students to be global citizens. We then explain why the themes of human rights and social justice represent the most appropriate entry point for learning about the subject of globalization in a way where the latter is reflected in the content as well as teaching methodology. Following this, the paper describes the objectives and structure of the course. In particular, we describe the ways in which the course attempts to go beyond the mere acquisition of new content and towards promoting dialogue among people with different languages, experiences, university backgrounds, and expectations. The paper ends with a critical assessment of our experience where we discuss the advantages and challenges that students and faculty faced.

Growing up a Globalized World

In 1999, John Tomlinson introduced the term ‘complex connectivity’ to refer to the cultural dimensions of the current globalization processes, and specifically to «the rapidly developing and ever-densening network of interconnections and interdependences that characterize modern social life» (p. 2). The term helps to highlight the fact that people’s experiences are ‘more connected’ because their lives are increasingly affected by facts, decisions, news and commodities that originate in places far away from their context of physical location. Young people, in particular, may be growing up in contexts in which it is more and more important to become aware of the influence that global events have on local life and, vice versa, how local action may affect the life of other people in other parts of the planet. Young people are included in global fluxes of images, ideas, ideals, goods, services and information and are involved in relationships in which being able to recognise, manage and value personal and collective difference is a necessary expertise for not being excluded or marginalized. Therefore, bilingualism, the ability to rely on different cultural references, a certain relativism in the conception of the rules, adaptability and flexibility seem to constitute fundamental skills that every young person must have to succeed in an increasingly global world. This is not a simple ‘accumulative’ competence: fitting into different contexts involves the ability to ‘adapt’, to ‘translate’, to ‘mediate’ what is or has been learned in one context to different contexts (Purkayastha 2005). In recent years, many scholars have suggested

that current societies are increasingly characterized by super- (Vertovec 2007) or hyper-diversity (Tasan-Koket al. 2013). The terms aim to underline a level and kind of complexity surpassing anything previously experienced in western society. It signals that everyday reality has become increasingly characterized by the proliferation and mutually conditioning effects of a number of significant diversities that go beyond the classical economic, social, cultural and demographic diversities to include lifestyles, attitudes, activities, skills, and formal statuses. In this scenario, young people are keen (and are required) to develop a different, more fluid and contextualized conception of belonging, identification and citizenship (Appadurai 1996; Taylor 1992; Yuval-Davis 2011). Imagination and the opportunity to navigate through plural cultural fragments are becoming typical features of the present generational experience (Massey 1994; Zukin, 2010), promoting new skills and highlighting new opportunities as well as new constraints.

Knowing how to move between different contexts, showing high levels of flexibility (Visser et al. 2014), and adapting what is learned in one place to the needs and expectations of another, constitute the special skills of the new generations. The imperatives of ‘holding together’, continuously adapt and translate, deal with the unavoidable dose of uncertainty (Urry 2003), and be able to play up their abilities according to the constraints and expectations of the contexts, all characterize the common background in which contemporary young people are to act. We can suppose that young people are experiencing more acutely, the need to know how to deal with a world ever more complex, changeable and intertwined. They are summoned daily to cope with patterns of consumption, information, and the construction of identity that circulate in global flows rather than arising, as usually happened in the past, from the material resources and relationships available in the local context.

Considering young people as part of a new generation does not mean erasing internal differences. The label ‘young people’ hardly refers to a homogeneous category: the intersection between gender, race, class, sexuality, education, ethnicity, religion, family background, dis/ability, and spatial location continues to play a decisive role in defining openings and closings and to set the space for agency. It is part of a responsible and effective educational project to encourage the achievement of the skills necessary to understand the global world through an explicit recognition of the diversities of the students’ social location and promoting awareness of the complexity and diversity of human experiences.

Besides the availability of adequate economic and technological resources, the capacity to deal with the complexity of their everyday experiences requires the development of specific skills that are mainly based on the ability to access and manage the symbolic codes used and valued in different situations, and to move from one context to another. It becomes important to develop the ability to adapt to diverse relational contexts, characterized by different rules, languages, audiences and interests. Social sciences play an important role here. The capacity/necessity to achieve the skills necessary to live in a global context includes, first of all, acquiring the appropriate set of conceptual tools and practical experiences for understanding the complexity and variability of the diverse situations in which the subject has to act. Words, ideas, theory and methods elaborated by classical social sciences seem not enough to completely grasp the ‘complex interconnectivity’ of the globalized world. Changes produced by globalization processes have put under critical scrutiny the social sciences and have increased the necessity to revise their epistemological, theoretical and methodological assumptions (Bhambra 2014; Bhambra and de Sousa Santos 2017; Burawoy 2016; Chakrabarty 2000). Under the challenge of understanding globalization, current social sciences often reveal their provinciality and require a critical reconsideration of the conditions of their foundation. An attempt to transcend the provinciality of conventional social sciences and make them more appropriate for a global setting goes through the effort to include the concerns, languages, categories, experiences and practices coming from non-western traditions and histories (de Sousa Santos 2014). In particular, the necessity to overcome rigid forms of methodological nationalism has been widely debated in social sciences in the last years (Beck 2000; Chernillo 2011; Wimmer and Schiller 2002). In order to fully understand globalization, social sciences should rid of the bias of considering the nation state unit as the key-order to study social, economic, cultural and political processes. To facilitate better sociological accounts of global societies, social sciences need not only to introduce in their analysis transnational data and comparisons, but also to recognize the complexity of the current world. This means accepting that the conceptual tools built within the western theoretical and methodological framework are limited and inadequate, and that «the world around us is so complex in its operations that it is simply not ‘knowable’ through any single concept or even existing sociological categories, such is the fluidity and inter-relationship between the processes we commonly call ‘globalization’» (Munck 2016, p. 242). This means recognizing the need to enrich the social sciences’ tool-kit with concepts and point of views coming from histories and experiences different from the western tradition. A better sociological account of globalization

requires the developing of ‘connected sociologies’ (Bhambra 2014) that recognize «the historical connections generated by processes of colonialism, enslavement, dispossession and appropriation, that were previously elided in mainstream sociology» (Bhambra and de Sousa Santos 2017, p. 6).

The required enlargement of sociological horizon, necessary to recognize the uncertainties and complexities of the global world, also involves the necessity to rethink how social sciences are taught and how teachers transmit the body of knowledge needed to deal with a global world.

Globalization and teaching

The changes induced by the growing global connectivity represent a challenge for education systems – in particular for universities. On one hand, universities are called to foster ‘internationalization’ in order to prepare students for a neo-liberal market and knowledge economies that need individuals who can use knowledge, know how to adapt to new situations, recognise and manage cultural diversity, and are curious and ready to explore the unknown (Sahlberg 2004; Stromquist 2007). On the other hand, ‘internationalization’ is a way to respond to the increasingly diverse, multicultural, and international composition of the student body. Western universities are constantly pressed to increase their level of internationalization, and funding is increasingly tied to their capacity to attract foreign students. This is a sign of how globalization changes universities and their vocation: they no longer educate only national elites but struggle for the recruitment of international students (Shin 2011).

Globalization calls on universities to revise and strengthen their social tasks, too. New global realities require, as Fujikane (2003, p. 145) observes, the «creation of new world citizens with proper knowledge of, skill for, and disposition applicable to the globalized world». To be in tune with the necessity of a global society, university teaching needs to transmit on to students not only contents but also the capacity to think globally, overcoming a nationalistic nation-focused perspective. In order to promote the creation of world citizens, universities have to overcome the students’ lack of exposure to and knowledge of other-countries’ contexts (especially non-Western contexts). Assuming a truly, complex and open to change global perspective is a viable and valuable tool not only in learning about the world but also in recognizing, analysing, and correcting inevitable local biases (Sohoni and Petrovic 2010, p. 291). Exposing students to the complexity of a global world implies pushing students to reflexively consider their (social) location and how it

informs what and how they know. Avoiding a sterile criticism of their biases, students are encouraged to gain and promote a mature awareness of the partiality of any interpretation and, at the same time, the unavoidability to interpret the situation starting from one's own location.

Globalization represents an open challenge for university teaching. On the one hand, we are witnessing a growing trend towards the standardization of teaching and curricula. From above, governments push universities to adopt performance standards for students and teachers, and indicators that help to assess the achievement of these standards. Closely scripted curricula with predetermined attainment targets or learning standards are implemented as a way to (objectively) assess the performances of both students and teachers. As a result, as Sahlberg (2004, p. 76) notes, «many school systems and particularly their secondary schools have become rational, factory-type institutions that impose standardized knowledge on students rather than promote curiosity, creativity and self-actualization». On the other hand, promoting critical thinking, awareness of the complexity, and the capacity to perform elaborate analyses and practices to face the variability and interconnectedness of social reality, become an unavoidable task for universities. In order to face the challenges of understanding and tackling the problems of environment pollution, migration and multiculturalism, growing inequalities, terrorism, and implementation and respect of human rights – to name a few – it is necessary for students to develop an awareness of the world beyond the national borders and beyond their taken-for-granted categories. Grasping the mutual, albeit multifaceted, pattern of interaction between global forces and local conditions (Shin 2011, p. 39) is a crucial step in promoting the capacity to think out-of-the-box and to face complexity and uncertainty.

The experience of our course goes in this last direction. We did not attempt to teach a global sociology – if this means a unified model of sociology for understanding the world society (a project that has been criticised as an element of a Western-centric hegemonic ambition) (Martin and Beittel 1998). Instead, we enable students to face the complexity, variety and – to some degree – contradictions that inevitably characterise the theoretical and methodological tool-kit necessary to interpret a complex world. Our goal is to stimulate students to learn how to face ambivalence, how to translate between different languages, concepts and points of view, how to shift, move and negotiate the uncertainties and complexity of the contemporary condition, and how to discuss and work with who may have different ideas, ideals, goals and interests.

Our Globalization, Social Justice and Human Right Course: Objectives and Methodology

Teaching should be a humanizing experience for both educators and students. Our course *Globalization, Social Justice and Human Rights* represents the collective effort of academics who see pedagogy as a tool for bringing about social change; as part of a lifelong mission of eliminating various forms of oppression and constructing a world based on respect for human rights and dignity. The course has become an infrastructure of empowerment not only for the students but for the faculty as well. Any form of empowerment begins with an understanding of the structural causes of oppression and an awareness of one's role as an agent of change. In his famous work *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire (1970), demonstrates that the goal of the liberatory model of education is not only to help students acquire knowledge, but more importantly to encourage them to develop an awareness of their capacity to transform the world. Today our world is facing many challenges of unprecedented proportions – the two major ones being social inequality and environmental destruction and unsustainability (Sklair 2016), thus the themes of human rights and social justice are more relevant than ever. At the same time, equipping students with the means to face and address these challenges becomes a necessity if we believe in the transformative capacity of education.

Crucial to understanding human experience in our contemporary world is a recognition of the global dimensions of economic, political, and cultural processes. While the course is interdisciplinary in nature (since it is being taught across different disciplines at the participating universities), the idea of global sociology captures particularly well the essence of the underlying philosophy and methodology employed by our course. It is necessary to note here that global sociology is not about universalization or the imposition of theories derived from the experiences of the North / West onto other parts of the world. On the contrary, according to Behbehanian and Burawoy (2011), global sociology is the culminating phase of a reaction against universal sociology. Global sociology is first and foremost about globalizing the 'sociological imagination'. The idea of the interrelatedness between the micro and the macro or individual and society evolves into the interrelatedness between the local and the global. This means that students do not merely learn about other countries as if these were disconnected static entities. Instead, they are encouraged to critically think about the historical interconnectedness among different parts of the world by looking at: a) historical predecessors of globalization, such as colonialism and its legacies as manifested in

the realities of oppression today; and b) present-day trans-societal dynamics and ‘relationality’ that exists above the level of any particular society including processes, phenomena, organizations, and movements that transcend national borders. Examples of these include migration, free-trade agreements, global production chains, land-grabbing, resource extraction, and social movements. Thus, to globalize the sociological imagination it is imperative to grasp the ways transnational forces interact with specific localities – including structures, processes, culture and social actors – as they are being facilitated, sustained, or contested by the latter. In this context, students can appreciate what global interrelatedness is, by realizing that you cannot fully understand the experiences of people in one part of the world without looking at the transnational connections that make this possible. For example, the unemployment experienced by a North American worker due to the outsourcing of production is made possible by the fact that there are masses of people desperate for a job willing to work at extremely low wages in a country in the Global South, which in turn has been made possible by the dispossession of small-scale farmers from their land by a North American mining company operating in that country. The second element of global sociology has to do with developing a reflexivity about the possibility of building a global civil society and the agents that promote or obstruct this process. Adopting such a relational method of critical thinking, students can question common-sense superficial explanations of social reality. Here we consider forces that promote transnational solidarity and alliances among popular movements as well as those that weaken or erode them, such as repression, consumerism, austerity, and the restructuring of workplaces among others.

A close analysis of human rights and social justice is a good starting point for understanding globalization. These two concepts are first explored from a critical perspective, expecting students to understand the debates regarding the universality of human rights and explore the multiple understandings of what constitutes social justice. Students come to recognize that human rights is an open idea, with an open agenda, and a goal to be achieved but not limited to a single solution. Exploring the different interpretations of social justice also creates a space for thinking, knowing, debating, and deconstructing the doctrinal and common sense understandings of justice and rights. Students also explore specific lived experiences where violations of human rights take place and where social injustice prevails. This offers a clearer picture of the linkages between local conditions and global structures; such that students come to recognize the existence of globalizations (Ritzer 2015) and their relationship to social justice and human rights (Edwards and Usher 2000).

How does the philosophy of global sociology translate into our teaching practice through the course? The central feature of our teaching approach is that it is centred on collective learning. The course exists in the form of a community of learners. The foundation for such a community is a true dialogue - a horizontal relationship where everyone's presence is recognized and respected and where sharing, and not competition, is encouraged. Most of the student interaction in the course is directed by the students since the topics of discussion come from them in the form of blogs and responses to the blogs. Instead of students being always consumers of knowledge, they get to be creators of knowledge in the sense that they have an international audience of readers who respond to their writing. Having such a decentralized discussion allows students to feel that their knowledge and experiences are validated. It also enables them to bring in issues from their realities into the classroom (including the virtual discussion space) and take what they learn from that space to the outside world. The transnational interaction and collective work allows us to teach globalization not only through the content and methods we choose but also through the opening up of new ways of knowing and new spaces for learning. Through the discussions students learn to handle the ambivalence, uncertainties, complexities, and contradictions that surround issues pertaining to human rights and social justice. The sharing, tolerance of diverse viewpoints, and collaboration are further reinforced and culminate in the final group project (discussed further below).

Course Organization and Components

This general framework is the basis upon which the syllabus is built. Participating faculty collaborate during the summer to specify the core assigned readings for each class meeting. We seek to identify relevant works that are readily available in electronic form so that they are accessible to all students. This shared core is very minimal, so as to leave sufficient space for each participating faculty to assign additional readings that meet their course's specific topic. Through this collaboration, faculty are able to develop a class plan that does not standardize the course, but rather privileges plurality and diversity. All participants have half of class time done in-class/in-person and the other half of class time is dedicated for on-line communication and learning. The lingua franca is English. Both the process in creating the syllabus and the syllabus itself serve as models for the cross cultural, global collaboration skills we seek our students will gain. Through this experience we have learned about the importance of identifying a shared, core central

framework that serves as the backbone of the course, and yet to have the flexibility to adjust to our differences, accommodate to our different teaching approaches, and contribute equally to the sustenance of the global course.

Students are encouraged to communicate and collaborate in two ways. First, they communicate on a consistent basis through blogs. In their blogs, students are required to submit carefully crafted, critical analyses of the readings. In addition, they are required to offer thoughtful responses to other students' blogs. This way, they are able to engage in conversation regarding the course topics, sharing their views regarding the shared readings, but also expanding each other's horizons through information of the different works read in the various campuses and their lived experiences. In order to offer more concentrated engagement, each faculty selects one weekly featured blog from among their students. Students first engage in conversation through the featured blogs, and then engage the other students' blogs. Second, students are asked to participate in a group project. Students are randomly assigned to a workgroup, ascertaining that each group will have participants from other institutions. If necessary, students from the same institution may be paired, but not more than two from the same institution will be in any given work group. Faculty develop a list of approximately 20 questions from which each group can select the one question they seek to answer as a team. The team then collaborates in developing their response. The strongest essays are those where students collaborate on the conceptual framework of the answer; making the work truly collaborative, rather than simply cooperative. Once this conceptual framework is achieved, they divide the work evenly, each doing a section of the full answer. This is a rather challenging exercise, as students must only learn to not only collaborate regarding the content of the answer to the question, but also in regards to the different levels of engagement, their different time zones, and the different end dates for their courses.

Communication and collaboration is done through NING, a platform designed to create social networks and which facilitates project collaboration for people from different institutions. Although this platform allows for the creation of smaller workgroups, for their group projects, students tend to use e-mail and Facebook. In some instances, students have been able to hold face-to-face or voice communications online.

Global dialogue is facilitated by the existence of a central framework in the course that is paired with flexibility, as well as the use of electronic technology. We are able to encourage reflexive, elaborate analyses and critical thinking, awareness

of the complexity of globalization and its relationship to social justice and human rights. Through their interactions students learn to face ambivalence; to translate between different languages, cultures, concepts and points of view; and to converse and work with people from diverse backgrounds, experiences, and worldviews.

Assessment of our Experience: Achievements, Challenges, and Limitations

One of the main aims of our course is to prepare an increasingly diverse student population to participate, in proactive ways, in a globalized, networked world (Stornaiuolo 2016). After eight years of teaching experience, we can try to assess whether and to what extent we have been able to achieve such a goal. Our students' feedback has been overwhelmingly positive. Although we have yet to create common tools for cross-class, longitudinal assessments, we have relied on students' qualitative and quantitative evaluations, required by teachers or universities at the end of the courses. One of the points consistently made by students demonstrates the value (and difficulties) of 'working together in diversity'. They prize the opportunity to discuss topics concerning social justice, human rights and globalization, with students from other national and cultural backgrounds, using social media that best represent their contemporary world. They appreciate most the chance to express their own point of view to an international audience in an interactive fashion that allows for back-and-forth exchanges of opinions. Through this exercise, students learned to defend and sometime to question their own arguments in the context of a public discussion, especially through the blog postings, which in the words of one student, made them feel that they had more visibility and importance. Another student commented that it made them take their work more seriously because it was no longer only the marks that mattered, but rather other's perception of their abilities. In other words, they attached more value to their work in the course because it received international exposure. This reflects well one element in the rationale behind the structure of the course, which is to allow students to be creators, rather than simply consumers of knowledge. Moreover, learning takes the form of multiple horizontal paths (learning through dialogue with their international peers) rather than vertically (learning from voices of authority such as professors and texts). In this process students learned to align their own understanding of the situation with other different, but equally viable, interpretations. Through the investigation of social justice and human rights from a

global perspective, students understand how different national and cultural groups interpret, influence and prioritize issues of rights, inclusion and exclusion.

One of the challenges we face stems from dealing with different academic schedules, time zones, course focus, different levels of our student bodies (undergraduate and graduate), and demands on students. Through the years we have learned to adjust our courses to match more closely with the programs in other institutions. For instance, those of us who begin in late August or early September may not start writing blogs until the end of September or early October, when participants from Europe begin their courses. Participants in Europe begin their group projects rather earlier in their program, so that they can be done by the time participants in North America finish their semesters in early December. Cross-institution communication is lighter at the start and end of the semester, as students and faculty must learn to be accepting of these shifts. Faculty members need to structure their course in a way where the shared readings on each topic are covered during the same week as all the partner universities. Considering that there is other content that is specific to the course at each location (i.e. is not shared), each faculty's design of their version of the course becomes an exercise in creativity in order to ensure that their syllabus matches the schedule of the partners, while meeting the learning objectives specific to their level, department, and institution.

Ensuring the successful completion of the group project has been a challenge for both students and faculty. Some students may choose to drop a course after the groups have been arranged. In some instances, groups need to be re-structured due to lack of effective communication or collaboration within them. Individual faculty members cannot exercise control over the group project dynamics the way they normally would when teaching a regular course, given that each group comprises students outside of their institution. This therefore poses the question of who exactly is in charge of what. Another potential problem arises when students attribute intra-group conflicts to the fact that their peers are from a different country and instead of making an effort to find solutions to the problems, they conclude that it is impossible because "*they* do things differently". This can be seen as a form of othering which goes exactly contrary to what the course aims to achieve. There are students who are not so willing to make an effort to overcome language and other logistic barriers. The different time zones and lack of face-to-face interaction sometimes become a justification for not taking responsibility for the quality of the final product. It also allows for students to feel more anonymous, less accountable and to diffuse the responsibility. The assessment of this collaborative component of the course can also be a bit complicated due to the fact it represents the joint work

of students coming from different academic levels and institutional expectations. These examples illustrate the importance of developing the capacity to be flexible and recognize the challenges of working globally in an effective manner.

Another current limitation of our course is that we lack an effective participation of faculty from ‘non-western’ universities. Until now, the core faculty partners came from Canada, Italy, Portugal, Russia, UK, and the United States. Including faculty from Africa, Asia, Middle-East and Latin America would surely enrich our pedagogical (and theoretical) proposal and would represent a relevant contribution to the variety of ideas, perspectives, expectations and experiences to which our students would be exposed and stimulated to take into consideration for enlarging their set of tools for interpreting globalization. We hope – and we are working in this direction – that more partners from all around the world will be interested in participating. Their participation would allow us and our students to further mature and strengthen the course creating a space for dialogue in which the complexity of current globalization can be better understood developing a wider and more differentiated set of concepts, ideas and interpretations.

Conclusion

The capacity to create laboratories in which scholars and students from very different social locations think and discuss globalization can constitute a significant way to overcome a too parochial and western-centric social science. A global course teaching globalization globally could be a suitable place in which to compare knowledge and experiences constructed within and through national perspective without reducing this comparison to a superficial agglomeration of national languages and perspectives. In order to represent a real space for dialogue and discussion, social sciences teaching globalization should preserve its critical gaze: rather than simply celebrating globalization as an unproblematic and egalitarian form of togetherness it should reflexively address issue of power and privilege, and should enhance awareness of the importance of personal social location. Rather than offer a summary, definitive and ill-posed answers, globalized social sciences are in a favorable position to promote new skills in tune with the complexity and changeability of the current social experience. Hyper-diverse contexts require the capacity to develop complex analysis and complex answers, to manage ambivalence and to translate from one symbolic system of reference to different ones, according to the diverse situations. Global social sciences are summoned to develop a more varied tool-kit in order to offer useful concepts for understanding the complex

connectivity that characterize the contemporary globalization processes. Such a varied tool-kit should include words and ideas from tradition other than the Western one as well as the critical instruments that have always characterized western social thought and that are nowadays indispensable for addressing issues of power and privilege. In this way, global social sciences could serve as a catalyst for social change in order to promote (a globally shared idea of) social justice through the concrete enhancement of (a globally shared idea of) human rights. Globalizing our pedagogy can play a crucial role in the achievement of this goal.

Note

1. The course was initially designed by Dr. Rodney D. Coates at Miami University, Ohio, US (cfr. Bell et al. 2015).

References

- Anthias, F. (2013). Hierarchies of social location, class and intersectionality: Towards a trans locational frame. *International Sociology* 28(1), 121-138. doi:10.1177/0268580912463155
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis-London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Beck, U. (2000). *What Is Globalization?* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Behbehanian, L. and Burawoy M. (2011). Global Sociology, Live! *International Sociological Association*. <http://burawoy.berkeley.edu/Global%20Sociology/Global%20Sociology%20Live.pdf>
- Bell, P., Coates, R., Colombo, E., Dolgon, C., Hernandez, S., Margulis, M.E., Nyamathi, A., Pavlish, C. and Romo, H. (2015). Globalizing the Classroom: Innovative Approach to National and International Learning. *Humanity & Society* 39(2), 236-253. doi:10.1177/0160597615574742
- Bhambra, G.K. (2014). *Connected Sociologies*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Bhambra, G.K. and de Sousa Santos, B. (2017). Introduction: Global Challenges for Sociology. *Sociology* 51(1), 3-10. doi:10.1177/0038038516674665.
- Burawoy, M. (2016). The Promise of Sociology: Global Challenges for National Disciplines. *Sociology* 50(5), 949-959. doi:10.1177/0038038516629901

- Chakrabarti, D. (2000). *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press
- Chernillo, D. (2011). The Critiques to Methodological Nationalism: Theory and History. *Thesis Eleven* 106(1), 98-117. doi:10.1177/0725513611415789
- Cogburn, D.L. and Levinson N. (2008). Teaching Globalization, Globally: A 7-Year Case Study of South Africa-U.S. Virtual Teams. *Information Technologies and International Development* 4(3), 75-88.
- de Sousa Santos, B. 2014. *Epistemologies of the South*. Boulder: Paradigm Publisher.
- Dukes, C., Darling, S.M. and Gallagher, P.A. (2016). Preparing Teachers for a Global Society: What Special Education Teacher Educators Need to Know. *Teacher Education and Special Education* 39(3), 161-164. doi:10.1177/0888406416640861
- Edwards, R. and Usher, R. (2000). *Globalization and Pedagogy: space, place and identity*. London: Routledge.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Fujikane, H. (2003). Approaches to Global Education in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Japan. *International Review of Education* 49(1-2), 133-152. doi:10.1023/A:1022994613635
- Martin, W.G. and Beittel, M. (1998). Toward a Global Sociology? Evaluating Current Conceptions, Methods, and Practices. *Sociological Quarterly* 39(1), 139-161. doi:10.1111/j.1533-8525.1998.tb02353.x
- Massey, D.B. (1994). *Space, place, and gender*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Munck, R. (2016). Global Sociology: Towards an Alternative Southern Paradigm. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 29(3), 233-249. doi:10.1007/s10767-016-9223-9
- Purkayastha, B. (2005). *Negotiating Ethnicity: Second-Generation South Asian Americans Traverse a Transnational World*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Ritzer, G. and Dean, P. (2015). *Globalization: A Basic Text*. London: Wiley Blackwell.
- Sahlberg, P. (2004). Teaching and Globalization. *Managing Global Transitions* 2(1), 65-83.
- Shin, K-H. (2011). Teaching Globalization in Sociology Courses: Improving Awareness of Multiculturalism. *Multicultural Education Review* 3(2), 37-68.
- Sklair, L. (2016). The End of the World, the End of Capitalism, and the Start of a New Radical Sociology. *Global Dialogue* 6(1).
- Sohoni, D. and Petrovic, M. (2010). Teaching a Global Sociology: Suggestions for Globalising the U.S. Curriculum. *Teaching Sociology* 38(4), 278-300. doi:10.1177/0092055X10378824
- Stornaiuolo, A. (2016). Teaching in global collaborations: Navigating challenging conversations through cosmopolitan activities. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 59, 503-513. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2016.07.001
- Stromquist, N.P. (2007). Internationalization as a response to globalization: Radical shifts in university environments. *Higher Education* 53(1), 81-105. doi:10.1007/s10734-005-1975-5

- Tasan-Kok, T., van Kempen, R.,Raco, M. and Bolt, G. (2013). *Towards Hyper-Diversified European Cities: A Critical Literature Review*. Utrecht: Utrecht University, Faculty of Geosciences.
- Taylor, C. (1992). *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Tomlinson, J. (1999). *Globalization and Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Urry, J. (2002). *Global Complexity*. London: Polity Press.
- Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30(6), 1024-1054. doi:10.1080/01419870701599465
- Visser, K., Bolt, G. and van Kempen, R. (2014). Out of Place? The Effects of Demolition on Youths' Social Contacts and Leisure Activities: A Case Study in Utrecht, the Netherlands. *Urban Studies* 51(1), 203-219. doi:10.1177/0042098013486844
- Wimmer, A. and Glick Schiller, N. (2002). Methodological nationalism and beyond: Nation-state building, migration and the social sciences. *Global Networks* 2(4), 301–334. doi:10.1111/1471-0374.00043
- Yuval-Davis, N. (2011). *The Politics of Belonging: Intersectional Contestations*. London: Sage.
- Zukin, S. (2010). *Naked City: The Death and the Life of Authentic Urban Places*. New York: Oxford University Press.