

[DOI: 10.20472/IAC.2015.018.113](https://doi.org/10.20472/IAC.2015.018.113)

**MIKE SHERRILL**

Aoyama Gakuin University, Japan

## **GLOBAL SERVICE LEARNING AND HIGHER EDUCATION**

### **Abstract:**

In current times universities around the world have bolstered efforts to “globalize” or “internationalize” their campuses. This is often articulated concretely as the intent to prepare students to be “global citizens”. In tandem with this goal some universities also express the desire to develop “servant leaders”, those well equipped to lead, but who do so through collaboration and putting the needs of others first. Indeed such educational pursuits herald new potential in our contemporary societies for greater compassion, peace, and justice through mutual understanding and appreciation across cultures. However, in order to move beyond conceptualization toward actualization, we are forced to carefully consider how and to what degree the core curricula of institutions of higher education cultivate mutual global citizenship. A growing body of research identifies a point of intersection of the concerns above in the rubric “global-service-learning”. Such an approach to learning seeks to integrate academic pursuit with community engagement in a context outside the participant’s country of origin. Moreover, it is characterized by a shift away from thinking of service as “doing for” and more towards “doing with”. Drawing insight from the relevant current literature, this paper explores the relationship between global service learning and higher education. Special consideration is given to the role of universities in promoting capacity development through education and action on behalf of marginalized global communities. The paper concludes with reflections and insights gained from recent participation in global service learning programs in India and the Philippines.

### **Keywords:**

global service learning, higher education, global citizenship, capacity development

**JEL Classification:** I23

## Introduction

Today, universities all over the world are scrambling to respond to the contemporary phenomenon dubbed “globalization.” Of course this term has come into common use across the globe, but renderings of its meaning as well as the responses to it can vary widely. A question grappled with in this paper is “How should universities respond to the challenges and opportunities presented by globalization?” Some might concede that a university is naturally mainly concerned with the needs of the nation in which it finds itself and only secondarily with the needs of other nations. It is arguable that a central task for universities has long been to produce well-equipped constructive national citizens (Harkavy, 2006). That remains true, but the position of this paper is that the pursuit of that fundamental task in contemporary times necessitates civic engagement on the global stage. John DeGioia, president of Georgetown University asks, “How can we harness the forces of globalization?” His answer begins by pointing out that common understandings of globalization are far too often rendered in terms of market economics. As a forward step, he suggests that “globalization should be understood as a force through which we can further advance the betterment of humankind” (DeGioia, 2011). Furthermore, he urges that the locus of creative activity for advancing a broader understanding of globalization is the university campus.

## Globalization in Higher Education

One does not have to look far these days to find university purpose statements that boldly declare the pursuit of globalization or internationalization in their educational programs. For universities in Asia, for instance, this usually coincides with the development of courses, even full degree programs, given in the English language. Such programs not only attract international students, but also prepare national students to interact with the world. It is precisely this type of intercultural encounter on a university campus that fosters mutual appreciation and joint discovery, essential stepping-stones on the path to becoming a global citizen. At the outset this prompts at least two fundamental questions. “What is a global citizen?” and “How are universities attempting to produce global citizens and to what end?”

Among the many things that universities provide for society, at their most fundamental level universities exist to educate the next generation. However, given the rapid pace of change in our contemporary globalized societies, educators are forced to reconsider with care educational programs that have been in place for some time.

Education, which has traditionally preserved and transmitted the values of a particular society, is now changing rapidly to reflect the multicultural nature of a globalized society. International education is revealing an astonishing richness of cultural diversity and, at the same time, addressing some of the tensions that arise from that diversity. It is educating the citizen of the future - the global citizen (Walker, 2006).

Those of us involved in university education are intensely aware of the urgency of this reality. Largely due to the advances in media technology we are all exposed to information flowing into our digital devices from around the world around the clock. Perhaps at times a bit overwhelming, but at the same time our personal and professional

lives have benefitted greatly from the ability to connect with others across the globe in an instant. There is no doubt that each of us is becoming more and more globally connected. However, are we indeed becoming global citizens?

Unfortunately, some overseas programs, whether volunteer work, development or study, although well-intentioned, can unintentionally run the risk of perpetuating views that border on imperialism. Special care is required to avoid emphasizing the role of “the powerful” in helping “the weak”. Lynette Schultz of the University of Alberta identifies this gap as an “abyss” that impedes global relational transformation. “You can change the world” is the herald of global citizenship engagement. However, engagement that can forge new vital global relationships necessitates honest reflection on history, culture, power and equity.

This is a call for a transformed model of global citizenship based on global justice that is fundamentally about changed relationships. This means working to more justly distribute the benefits and burdens of human life on the planet along with a deep reciprocal recognition of the full humanity of all people (Schultz, 2013).

Jean Vanier, founder of L’Arche Community, would refer to this process as a part of “becoming human”. Essentially it is a process of discovering identity and belonging in the context of community. This sense of belonging fosters compassion for others and an appreciation for intrinsic human value that motivates us to serve others outside one’s immediate group.

Healthy belonging is the way a group humbly lives its mission of service to others. It does not use or manipulate other for its own aggrandizement. It does not impose its vision on others but instead prefers to listen to what they are saying and living, to see in them all that is positive. It helps others to make their own decisions; it empowers them (Vanier, 2008).

Key terms that stand out in particular here are, “humbly”, “listen” and “empower.” Are these not essential steps in capacity development and transformative service? Indeed, at the heart of service learning is the herald to humbly listen and empower as we walk together. This facilitates mutual growth in the context of companionship. In other words, personal and social transformation occurs through togetherness.

## **Global Citizenship**

At its foundation, vital global citizenship calls for an awareness of global interconnectedness, an eagerness to facilitate mutual equity, and a determination to be an agent of change. There is not one particular best approach, but at its heart it is about active global learning and then responding responsibly to those discoveries. Cultivating global learning is the responsibility of any globally oriented university. In 2014, Tohoku University in Sendai, northern Japan, opened the Global Learning Center as part of their commitment to the pursuit of globalized education.

Today we live in a globalized society, and exchange across national borders is crucial. This center plays a pivotal role in the establishment and execution

of Tohoku University's education internationalization strategy, and in the promotion of international exchange activities. By actively recruiting excellent international students, developing/improving education/support programs, developing/executing a variety of outgoing overseas programs, and actively promoting educational internationalization, the Center contributes greatly to the fostering of global human resources who possess an international outlook and will fill leadership positions. The Center also works to strengthen ties on and off campus, contributes to the construction of the global campus, performs PR activities, and promotes community ties (TUGLC, 2015).

The very last term in this mission statement is of particular importance. It declares the intent to promote “community ties”. This points out a characteristic fundamental to global service learning, namely, to forge relationships between communities. In the case of a university, this means nurturing connections between the campus community and the local community as well as with communities overseas. Global education certainly does not ignore the local, but rather seeks to form bonds between the local and global. This is one reason some scholars of service learning prefer the term “global” to the term “international” (Longo and Saltmarsh, 2011). Although the latter term does indicate relations across borders, the former seems to better indicate the importance of “co-existence” and “interdependence”. Increased understanding and appropriation of these two pillars is essential to effective global education and is also a learning outcome goal of global service learning. In the case of contemporary Japanese culture, the programs at the Global Learning Center at Tohoku University open a doorway for cautious Japanese youth to engage the world in a way that stimulates mutual growth, which in turn also influences the local social cultural matrix. In other words, this university has recognized that way to cultivate vital national citizenship is to nourish students as global citizens.

Indeed, the university is correctly identified as having a central role in forming socially responsible productive citizens for their own nation. However, in a globalized world, the pursuit of healthy national citizenship goes beyond factors of national identity and economic preservation to include broader issues such as immigration, regional politics and human rights. “Citizenship can be understood both formally as a status and, more adequately, existentially as a shifting set of attitudes, relationships, and expectations with no necessary territorial delimitation” (Falk, 1993). By extension we can describe global citizenship as organic. It is a living entity that is constantly growing, digging deeper roots, unfolding new leaves and blooming new flowers as it reaches upward for yet a fuller expression of human relational vitality. In this process of growth, global citizenship “calls us to humble, careful, and ongoing action to better acknowledge common human dignity” (Hartman and Kiely, 2014). This sentiment “common human dignity” resonates well with Japanese cultural sensibilities, namely, concern for the other and prudent caution in human relationships. At the same time, those of us in the Japanese cultural context must admit that such caution, however sensible, sometimes preempts the courage needed to navigate cultural and relational divides. Education for global citizenship in this cultural milieu serves to mobilize the inherent cultural desire for

human oneness with gains in intercultural and interpersonal skill coupled with strong encouragement to boldly pursue healing and hope for humanity.

## **Servant Leaders**

Educating students for global citizenship points to the task of intentionally nurturing a desire to serve others and to seek mutual relational growth. The concept of “servant leadership” is pervasive in business management seminars. It represents a move away from hierarchical models of leadership to an approach that facilitates mutuality. Robert Greenleaf is credited as having first coined the term “servant-leader” in his 1970 essay “The Servant as Leader”. That pioneering insight launched nothing less than a revolution in the understanding of leadership.

The servant-leader is servant first. It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. The best test is: do those served grow as persons: do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on the least privileged in society; will they benefit, or, at least, not be further deprived? (Greenleaf, 2002).

We can readily detect the focus on empowerment of the community coupled with the concern for peace and justice that is inherent to servant leadership. “There is something subtle communicated to one who is being served and led if, implicit in the compact between servant-leader and led, is the understanding that the search for wholeness is something they share” (Greenleaf, 2002). It is essential that servant leaders understand that all of us in this human family share in the pursuit of wholeness. This highlights the component of servant leadership that Larry Spears identifies as “healing.” In fact, Spears distills Greenleaf’s work into ten identifiable attributes: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community (Spears, 2010).

Of course, there are many models of servant leadership that have spawned from the seminal work of Greenleaf. Slightly more streamlined concepts have been proposed for example of just five components: vision, influence, credibility, trust, and service (Farling, Stone and Winston, 1999) and another five-factor model: altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship (Barbuto and Wheeler, 2006). What seems to remain consistent across many proposals is the necessity of a self-perception as a servant. This brings us back to the work of Spears who described servant leadership fundamentally as a “way of being” and a “transformational approach” to leadership (Spears, 1995). This means that at its core the motivation behind leading is to transform and be transformed. This is the essence of global citizenship and servant leadership. Grasping and actualizing this understanding is absolutely essential to preparing higher education for our globalized world.

To cite just one example from Asia, Aoyama Gakuin University in Tokyo recently released a new vision statement giving servant leadership central place in their effort to

globalize. “Aoyama Gakuin is a comprehensive educational institution cultivating servant-leaders to create a brighter future for all people and for society”. Such servant leaders are to be characterized by “sincerity and simplicity”, those who “respect others”, “embrace diversity” and “actively serve people and society” all within their area of “academic specialization” (Aoyama Gakuin, 2015). Ultimately, this is not only a statement of vision. It is also a statement of identity. Based on that identity the university declares its intent to graduate global citizens as servant leaders. Concrete steps being taken by Aoyama in this direction include the 2014 launch of the Global Studies Program within the School of International Politics, Economics and Communication, as well as, the 2015 launch of a new department within the university, the School of Global Studies and Collaboration. In addition to robust offerings in International Internships and Study Abroad Programs, upon close inspection we also find two courses on Service Learning offered in the “Aoyama Standard” core curriculum. It will indeed take years to witness the outcomes of these recent measures, but they are positive signs of the intent to nurture students as global citizens equipped to serve.

## **Service Learning**

In the face of various forms of injustice and inequity in our contemporary societies it would be quite understandable if a young university student felt powerless to affect any significant change. However, university service learning programs provide sturdy footing for students to take a stand and reject the fatalistic view “I can’t do anything about those issues.” Rather, they boldly insist that change is possible through collaborative work. They can find inspiration to challenge the status quo, lock arms with their fellow members of the human family in defiance of prevailing patterns and push forward for equitable change.

Naturally, this necessitates knowing more about what is going on in the world prior to joining hands with others as agents of change. “Knowing more” should include thoughtful reflection on history, politics and economics, and the role of one’s own culture in these arenas. “As change agents, students must recognize power differentials as well as the tendency to impose programs rather than work with those being served” (Kronick and Cunningham, 2013). It is very easy to fall into an attitude of “helping the less fortunate”. However, such a position can actually impede the progress of lasting change.

The Center for Service and Learning at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) produced a well-refined definition of service learning as:

a course-based, credit-bearing educational experience in which students (a) participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs, and (b) reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of personal values and civic responsibility (Bringle and Hatcher, 2009).

Indeed, service learning, by its very nature, seeks not only to address community-identified needs, but also to contribute to the growth of the participant as well, both to the betterment of humanity. Based on this understanding the service learning teaching

approach facilitates a connection between the university and the community. It is “learning by doing” in a way that fosters mutual relationships. Ultimately, service learning urges the pursuit of greater mutuality in the world. The quantitative difference in material resources may be obvious, but the qualitative human oneness of our societies sadly is often overlooked. Vital intercultural relationships are central to fostering global citizenship.

Cultivating a sense of civic responsibility extends readily into the realm of developing concern for equity in the world. At a university such study often falls under the category of international education, essentially meaning education concerned with international issues. Such a pedagogy is meant to lead students beyond the locus of their national boundaries into a pursuit of the understanding of political, economic, and culture contexts of other countries even without having yet visited those locales. Martha Nussbaum articulates international education within the rubric “cultivating humanity”. She urges that such a pedagogical approach should be on the core agenda of liberal arts education, namely, to nurture a capacity for reflective-critical thinking on one’s own culture, to foster the realization of self as connected to the rest of humanity, and to cultivate the ability to empathize with others outside of one’s immediate context (Nussbaum, 1997). These are indeed essential steps on the path to competence to becoming a global citizen and should serve as milestones in any program of international education. Study abroad programs take international education to the next level by providing an experiential educational opportunity outside of one’s country of origin. Such programs can range from a short-term cultural exchange of just a week or two to a semester or full year stay as a student in residence at a foreign university. Other alternatives might include intensive language programs, faculty-led practicums, or even international internships.

### **Global Service Learning**

As a first step in approaching a discussion of global service learning it will helpful to recall Bringle and Hatcher’s definition of service learning given above. In short, they define it as a hands-on academic activity addressing needs identified in a community followed by reflection and reporting on the outcomes of that activity. Of particular importance is the component of reflection. This is what will lead the participant to gain new insight.

Reflection activities should be designed by educators to provide new interpretations of events and the activities provide a means through which the community service can be studied, analyzed, and interpreted much like a text is read and studied for deeper meaning (Bringle and Hatcher, 2011).

Intentional and thoughtful reflection links the service experience to the learning objectives laid out at the start. These reflections in some sense are free form, but they are guided by specific assessment criteria. In this way a student can “self-evaluate” based on the expectations defined for the experience. This is then combined with feedback from the instructor that may serve as verification or correction to self-perceptions. The ultimate hope is that the participant will experience a broadening of

values and insight that could not have been gained when restricted to a classroom environment.

In concrete terms, reflection may occur in various forms including: keeping a personal journal, conducting peer assessments, giving presentations or writing reflection papers. Reflection in GSL will ordinarily go through three distinct stages: before departure, during the experience, and after returning. Prior to departure the class may hold lectures on the history, culture and language of the location where they are headed. Students should also conduct background research in these areas and present their findings to the class. With everyone in the class following through with this preparation the entire class will gain a robust background prior to departure.

While on the field engaged in the GSL activity it is highly advisable to conduct regular (perhaps daily) sharing times. Through these conversations the students provide peer feedback to each other and the faculty guide can keep abreast of how each student is doing and offer guidance where needed. Finally, after returning to the home country a de-briefing session is essential. In this context the students can share discoveries and insights and provide support to each other in the process of re-entry. This process may include the submission of reflection reports on the entirety of the experience followed by presentations to student peers who have not yet engaged in a GSL experience. In this way, students end up encouraging students to step out of their comfort zones and consider engaging in a GSL experience.

Well-designed reflection activities link the service experience to learning objectives and facilitates within the student the development of enhanced discernment regarding ongoing actions (Ash, Clayton, and Arkinson, 2005). In other words, this process leads the student to an awareness of his or her civic responsibility. Civic education then should address areas including: social responsibility and social justice, social ethics and leadership, and engaged scholarship (Battistoni, 2002). Higher education that intentionally engages service learning stands a stronger chance of succeeding in civic education that fosters global citizenship.

Overseas volunteer work, international internships, and study abroad programs all contribute to such a purpose, however, global service learning is distinguished from them by several key characteristics. For instance, GSL differs from overseas volunteer work in that it stands as a credit-bearing academic course that includes structured reflection. While volunteer work is generally understood as “doing for”, GSL embodies a stance of “doing with”. GSL also differs considerably from international internship programs through its focus on service more than career preparation. Finally, GSL programs also differ from most study abroad programs through a focus on solidarity with the community and global citizenship rather than on cultural tourism and observation. No doubt, study abroad often carries a high potential for improving intercultural competence in the student. However, the pursuit of cross-cultural mutual relationships and responsibility as a global citizen go beyond the scope of study abroad to be hallmarks of global service learning.

Since 2008, the Ministry of Education, Cultural, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) of the Japanese government has invested millions of dollars in their Global

Human Resource Development programs. The “Global 30” project, which covered a five-year span from 2008 to 2013, was aimed at attracting more international students by lending government support to universities offering four-year programs all in English. A total of thirteen universities were chosen as model cases with a view to influencing all universities to take active steps toward increased internationalization. The “30” in the title of this project refers to 30 “man” (one unit of 10,000 in Japanese) meaning 300,000. This is the target set for the number international students hoped for by year 2020. As of May 1, 2014, there were 184,155 international students in Japan, an increase 16,010 or 9.5% over the previous year (JASSO, 2015). Therefore, Japan seems to be well on its way to the target. However, more action is needed to reach that ambitious goal.

Starting in 2012, MEXT initiated the Go Global Japan (GGJ) project. Also covering a five-year span, this constitutes the compliment to the previous project in that it is focused on encouraging Japanese students to go abroad. Forty-two exceptional universities were selected for generous support of up to \$2.6 million per year to facilitate the internationalization broadly understood of the entire university. An additional requirement of each model university is to contribute to the promotion of the globalization of other universities as well. Mina Mizumatsu, director of the Global Learning Center at Tohoku University, Sendai, Japan, explains that these monumental government initiatives have been undertaken in order to improve Japan’s global competitiveness and to enhance ties with other nations. In addition, the GGJ project is aimed at developing human resources equipped to succeed in the global arena. The desired outcomes go well beyond the terms of practical economic competitiveness like developing language skills and intercultural competence. They also seek growth in interpersonal skills, a clarified Japanese identity, and a deepened sense of morality (Mizumatsu, 2014).

The third phase of this intensive effort to globalize Japanese higher education was launched in September 2014. MEXT announced the selection of thirty-seven universities for inclusion in the “Top Global University Project”. As the culmination of the two previous global human resource development projects this stage is meant to set the standard for the future of higher education in Japan. This project is aimed at enhancing the international compatibility and competitiveness of higher education in Japan. Selected universities are expected to press forward with comprehensive internationalization and university reform. (MEXT, 2014). Additional goals are that ten of these universities would ultimately find themselves among the top one hundred of the world, and the twenty of these universities will become flagship institutions that lead the way in the globalization of other universities in Japan.

Year 2015 also saw the initiation of the “Tobitate” (Jump Up) Program. This program will provide support of up to \$2,000 per month per student for up to 1,000 students per year who wish to engage serious study overseas. These stunning measures taken to globalize Japanese higher education clearly demonstrate an understanding of universities as the global supply line of human resources (Friedman, 2005). At the same time, there is a strong emphasis on the role universities take in fostering growth in a student’s moral imagination and sense of global civic responsibility. “In the end, a

justification of the practice of study abroad must come from a commonly shared belief, based on concrete evidence, that this is an excellent way to foster the a priori goal of international competency and globalized consciousness, and that it therefore belongs to the foundational ingredients of education in the 21st century” (Wanner, 2009).

This approach to study abroad closely emulates many of the characteristics and goals of global service learning. Indeed, some of the study abroad programs also include a service component. International education also at times takes its students out of the classroom into the city or even overseas for a closer look at the humanity of what they are studying. Even without a specific service component such excursions can have an eye-opening and transformative effect.

In order to further streamline our understanding of GSL it will be helpful to consider the following freshly articulated definition of global service learning as a:

community-driven service experience that employs structured, critically reflective practice to better understand common human dignity; self; culture; positionality; socio-economic, political, and environmental issues; power relations; and social responsibility, all in global contexts (Hartman, Kiely, Friedrichs, and Boettcher, 2016).

The first aspect of GSL highlighted is “community-driven service experience.” This simply means that needs are identified by the community and addressing those needs is done in collaboration with the community on their terms. The second aspect that bears emphasis is the understanding of GSL as a “critically reflective practice.” Contemplating and reflecting on the service activity as it is playing out is essential to the process of educational discovery both academic and personal. Another key phrase that warrants highlighting is “common human dignity”. We can study about human rights in books, but there is no substitute for experiencing social inequity and poverty in the context of the formation of personal relationships. This leads to a deeper level of understanding that cannot be achieved simply through book study. It is also holds to the potential to influence personal values. This leads us to give special notice to the last phrase “social responsibility”. GSL as an educational approach should inspire students to make a difference in the world.

Amizade is a global service learning agency that effectively mobilizes a vital GSL pedagogy around the world. Its fundamental mission is to empower both individuals and communities across the world through global service learning. Their driving vision is to “create an equitable world where all people can connect freely and forge lasting friendships” a vision built squarely on their guiding philosophy. “We believe in building a more relevant, collaborative, and responsible classroom” (Amizade, 2015). Indeed, they are effectively connecting the university classroom to the classroom “in the field” in communities around the globe. Phrases like “create an equitable world” and “forge lasting friendships” stand out in particular. Such values are indeed fundamental to any educational approach characterized as global service learning. Today’s university students are certainly aware of the world “out there.” However, it takes intentional involvement in a GSL experience to help them grasp their personal role in how social and economic realities are being played out on the global stage.

## **GSL Reflections: India**

Japan Evangelical Lutheran Association (JELA) is involved in many global service learning projects around the world. Once every two years for the past ten JELA has taken a group of service learners to central India to collaborate with Comprehensive Rural Healthcare Project (CRHP) in making artificial limbs for those in extreme poverty. Here I will recount my personal experience with the 2014 Service Learning Program. JELA recruits participants here in Japan, but it is CRHP, the local agency in India that gives the invitation and identifies the needs of the project.

In this service learning project pre-departure training is encapsulated in a one-day orientation. All other training happens on the field in the first few days with the collaboration of the local agency. Every evening we held a sharing time to process the thoughts of the day and facilitate reflection. It also helped faculty stay aware of how each student is doing. Keeping of personal daily journal is also required. At the end of the experience the journal is re-written into an essay that expresses the personal transformation and learning that occurred during the service experience.

Our main task was to assist in making artificial limbs using only locally available materials, sheet aluminum, cloth mesh, rubber cement and vinyl straps. On the day to register for the free (or very low cost) artificial limbs a large group of applicants gathered under a tent, some having come from a great distance. They waited very patiently in the heat as they were called one by one into the tiny workshop. The staff talk to each person about their needs, concerns, daily activities and work, as they gently take measurements recording all the details in a thick worn notebook. From these notes numerous guide marks are drawn on a pieces of raw sheet metal.

The metal is folded, shaped, welded, hammered out on an anvil, coated with resin, lined with cloth, and fitted with straps. The whole process takes about a week. In all we made over 120 limbs including ankle, knee, and hip versions. When all are complete there is a huge celebratory ceremony where each person receives his or her limb. We who made the limbs had the privilege of assisting in strapping on the limb for the first time and lending a supportive hand in taking the first steps.

CRHP models sustainable development and public health capacity development that is not simply about helping people. It is about walking with people. They are healing a physical and social situation gently step by step and they do this by empowering people. One day we went on rounds with a Village Healthcare Worker (VHW) to a small farming village of about 1,400 people. One visit involved checking blood sugar for a diabetic, and another a pre-natal for a nine-month pregnant young woman. The VHW is trained by CRHP but chosen by the local community. She is usually of a low caste or a widow, but when she is trained to provide primary health care to her community her status increases considerably. She is valued and respected. This is one way of breaking down the barriers of caste.

With respect to public health capacity development, CRHP emphasizes using resources that are available locally as demonstrated by the artificial limb workshop. One of the leading causes driving the need for artificial limbs is untreated diabetes. Although it is

straightforward to check blood sugar with a urine test stick, these are not readily available locally and cost money to buy. Instead, a test tube, a urine sample, and a few drops of a cheap chemical solution are sufficient. Asking for a few hot coals from the kitchen charcoal pit, the VHW can instantly boil the solution and get the needed result. A young apprentice makes rounds with her learning all these techniques. It costs almost nothing. In this way many diabetics can be diagnosed and treated thereby increasing the public of health of the village.

On pre-natal visits, an RN or licensed Mid-wife accompanies, but the VHW conducts the visit because she is a trusted member of the community. The VHW is the vital link between primary care in the village and secondary care in the CRHP Hospital. Through the trust relationship with her, the presence of a Mid-wife will be welcomed at the time of birth. This approach facilitates personal trust relationships which in turn foster an increase in public health. This type of capacity development is about more than healing illnesses or conditions. It is about healing brokenness in all its forms. Fostering human wholeness is indeed central to discovering the deeper meaning of global citizenship.

### **GSL Reflections: The Philippines**

For more than ten years Aoyama Gakuin University has been conducting an overseas learning experience in the Philippines every year. Although centered mainly on cultural exchange, it is also a strong example of global service learning through human companionship. After all a hallmark of service learning is building relationships. Here, I summarize and reflect on the 2014 program. Students who wish to participate in this program must apply, submit an essay, and pass an interview in order to be chosen. This type of screening is essential when taking students on an overseas experience, in particular one that includes encountering extreme poverty and trekking to remote places.

Once team members are chosen we begin pre-departure training sessions. Eight training sessions in all, once a week for eight weeks, are composed of background economic, political, cultural and religious studies. Each student must also make a research presentation to the group within their area of academic study with specific reference to the Philippines. The students also prepare cultural presentations to share while in the Philippines. In all these activities building strong team cohesion is a central concern. At the university we do not plan or coordinate the service activities for the program. Rather, all of those details are defined by the local service agency in the Philippines in coordination with their branch office in Tokyo. They identify the needs and instruct us where to go and what we will do. They also assist us in preparing for interaction with the local communities.

One of our activities in the Philippines took place at Payatas, the largest trash dump in the Philippines just outside Manila. The local agency had prepared training sessions for us as well as visitations with local families. This is an example of service as “witness”, that is, an encounter of mutual sharing. “What brings you joy?” a student asked to a local father who collects plastic garbage for a \$1.50 a day to feed his family. He answered, “Just seeing the faces of my children everyday gives me joy. And, having enough food for that day. We feel joy just to be together.” No doubt, this is an important

learning point for those of us living in parts of the world characterized by conspicuous consumption and consumer culture.

Another leg of our journey took us to a remote aboriginal village in the mountains of northern Philippines. Here a main source of income is farming sugarcane and coffee. One might think that cash crops such as these would certainly bring wealth for the farmers, but here that is not the case. Poverty is persistent. It is the processors and vendors who are making the money. Therefore, service here involves legal advocacy for farmer's rights and the education and training of farmers in order to become grower-processor-vendor. With that the farmer may finally begin to reap the financial rewards of their hard labor. This is an example of service as capacity development. Through this experience of spending time together, working, eating, talking, we hear each other stories, share our cultures and feelings as well. Bonding experiences like this assist in fostering global citizenship.

Every evening we held a sharing time with the students and in the days after our return to the university in Tokyo we held debriefing sessions as well. Ultimately, each student summarizes their reflections in a paper and gives a peer presentation. In this way, the students not only share what they have learned, but also open the door to more students considering the service learning experience. Finally, these participants "pay it forward" by promoting understanding of fair-trade and selling such products at the annual university festival. Altogether it's nearly a one-year process of active learning and personal growth for each student.

### **GSL Outcomes and Best Practices**

From the outset, global service learning programs should be academically rigorous. That is, such experiential educational programs should take an open-minded stance toward a wide range of views while also forging a clear connection between academic pursuit and service to the community. This connection is facilitated through pre-departure orientations, reflection activities during the service period, and re-entry follow-up. Consistent support throughout the service experience is also essential in order to reach the goal of meeting the needs identified by the community. Ultimately the hope is to form a sense of mutuality between the university and the community.

By their nature as arenas of discovery and the pursuit of truth, universities have the potential to unleash our moral imaginations through active global education. The merits of experiential learning are easily discernible. As the often-cited Chinese proverb says, "I hear and I forget, I see and I remember, I do and I understand". In other words, "we learn by doing". As a vital pedagogy, global service learning takes this maxim a step further rendering it "we learn by doing together". When communities collaborate in service across all sorts of borders we learn from each other and with each other. This approach to education leads not only to growth in practical skills such as language acquisition and intercultural competence, but also to the development of life skills including a broadened understanding of values, and a deepened sense of identity and civic responsibility.

Global service learning programs not only influence students, but also hold a high potential to influence the academy as well. Such activities facilitate international networking as well as collaboration between departments on campus. This can be energizing to both faculty and students. In addition, the impact of these outcomes in many cases has been to foster the integration of service learning into the standard core curriculum of the university. This lends vitality to the identity of the university as an institution that strives to nurture students willing to take action out of compassion for humanity, who thirst for peace and relational healing, and who eagerly pursue justice and mutual equity in the world.

Ultimately, the intersection of compassion, peace, and justice fosters vital mutual global citizenship. Each human being is a unique individual coming from a unique cultural and social background. We are each citizens of a particular nation and yet we are also common citizens of a much larger entity, the planet earth. The more we realize that we stand together on this great blue ship floating in the vast cosmic ocean, the more we may progress in cultivating greater peace and equity, compassion and service for all humanity.

## References

- AMIZADE. (2015). Amizade: Global Service-Learning. *Philosophy*. Retrieved June 25, 2015, from <https://amizade.org/about/mission-vision-and-values>.
- AOYAMA GAKUIN. (2015). *Vision 2014-2024*. Retrieved July 10, 2015, from <http://www.aoyamagakuin.jp/140th/pdf/vis01.pdf>.
- ASH, S. L., CLAYTON, P. H. and ATKINSON, M. P. (2005). Integrating Reflection and Assessment to Capture and Improve Student Learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*. Vol. 11, No. 2, Pp. 49-60.
- BARBUTO, J. E. and WHEELER, D. (2006). Scale Development and Construct Clarification of Servant Leadership. *Group & Organisational Management*. Vol. 31, Pp. 300-326.
- BATTISTONI, R. (2002). *Civic Engagement across the Curriculum: A Resource Book for Service-learning Faculty in all Disciplines*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact
- BRINGLE R. G. and HATCHER J. A. (2009). Innovative Practices in Service Learning and Curricular Engagement. In *New Directions in Community Engagement*. Sandmann A. Jaeger, C. Thornton, eds. pp. 37-46. San Fransico, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- BRINGLE R. G. and HATCHER J. A. (2011). International Service Learning. In *International Service Learning: Conceptual Frameworks and Research*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- DEGIOIA, J. J. (2011). The Impact of Globalisation and the Future University. *Educause Review*. Vol. 46, No. 3.
- FALK, R. (1993). The Making of Global Citizenship. In J. Brecher, B. Childs, and J. Cutler (eds.), *Global Visions: Beyond the New World Order*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- FARLING, M. L., STONE, A. G. and WINSTON, B. E. (1999). Servant Leadership: Setting the Stage for Empirical research. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*. Vol. 6., Pp. 49-72.
- FRIEDMAN, T. (2005). *The World is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-first Century*. New York: Farrar, Straus, & Giroux.
- GREENLEAF, R. K. (2002). *Servant-leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*. Nahweh, NJ: Paulist Press.

- HARKAVY, I. (2006). The Role of Universities in Advancing Citizenship and Social Justice in the 21st Century. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*. Sage Publications. Vol. 1(1). Pp. 5-37.
- HARTMAN, E. and KIELY, R. (2014). Pushing Boundaries: Introduction to the Global Service-Learning Special Section. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*.
- HARTMAN, E., KIELY, R., FRIEDRICH, J. and BOETTCHER, J. (2016). *Building a Better World: The Pedagogy and Practice of Ethical Global Service Learning*. Sterling, VA: Stylus. as cited in, E. Hartman & R. Kiely. Pushing Boundaries: Introduction to the Global Service-Learning Special Section. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*. Fall, 2014.
- JASSO (2015). Japan Student Services Organisation. *International Students in Japan 2014*. Retrieved July 17, 2015, from [http://www.jasso.go.jp/statistics/intl\\_student/documents/data14\\_brief\\_e.pdf](http://www.jasso.go.jp/statistics/intl_student/documents/data14_brief_e.pdf).
- KRONICK, R. and CUNNINGHAM, R. (2013). Service-Learning: Some Academic and Community Recommendations. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*. Vol. 17, No. 3, Pp. 139-152.
- LONGO, N. V. and SALTMARSH J. (2011). New lines of Inquiry in Reframing International Service Learning into Global Service Learning. In *International Service Learning: Conceptual Frameworks and Research*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- MEXT. (2014). Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. Press Release. *Selection for the FY 2014 Top Global University Project*. Retrieved July 15, 2015, from [http://www.mext.go.jp/b\\_menu/houdou/26/09/\\_\\_\\_icsFiles/afieldfile/2014/10/07/1352218\\_02.pdf](http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/houdou/26/09/___icsFiles/afieldfile/2014/10/07/1352218_02.pdf).
- MIZUMATSU, M. (2014). Project for the Promotion of Global Human Resource Development. Presentation at the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA) Annual Conference: Universalising Global Learning in the 21st-Century Academy. Washington, D.C.
- NUSSBAUM, M. C. (1997). *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- SCHULTZ, L. (2013) "Public Engagement and Educating for Global Citizenship: What do we risk by focusing on 'the Empowered Individual?'" *Centre for Global Citizenship Education and Research: International Conference*. University of Alberta.
- SPEARS, L. C. (1995). Servant-leadership and the Greenleaf Legacy. In L. Spears (Ed.), *Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's Theory of Servant-leadership Influenced Today's Top Management Thinkers*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- SPEARS, L. C. (2010). Character and Servant Leadership: Ten Characteristics of Effective, Caring Leaders. *The Journal of Virtues & Leadership*. Vol. 1, Iss. 1, Pp. 25-30. Regent University.
- TUGLC. (2015). Tohoku University: Global Learning Center (TUGLC). *Mission*. Retrieved July 22, 2015, from <http://www.insc.tohoku.ac.jp/cms/index-e.cgi?df=ect05>.
- VANIER, J. (2008). *Becoming Human*. Nahweh, NJ: Paulist Press.
- WALKER, G. (2006). *Educating the Global Citizen*, Glasgow: Bell & Bain Ltd.
- WANNER, D. (2009). Study Abroad and Language: From Maximal to Realistic Models. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *Study Abroad and the Making of Global Citizens: Higher Education and the Quest for Global Citizenship* (pp. 81-98). New York: Routledge.