Global Citizenship in Comparative Perspective: Youth Perceptions of Global Rights, Responsibilities and Efficacy Across Five Continents

Roman Gerodimos*, Cecilia Balbin**, Connie Chan***, Ursula Freundt-Thurne****, Fernando José Gutiérrez Atala*****, Rosemary Nyaole-Kowuor******, Jad Melki*******

* Bournemouth University, UK (rgerodimos@bournemouth.ac.uk)
** Pontificia Universidad Católica Argentina, (cecilia_balbin@uca.edu.ar)
*** Hang Seng University of Hong Kong, School of Communication (conniechan@hsu.edu.hk)
**** Universidad Peruana de Ciencias Aplicadas, Peru (ursula.freundt@upc.pe)
***** Universidad Católica de la Santísima Concepción, Chile (fgutierrez@ucsc.cl)
****** Daystar University, Kenya, School of Communication (rnyaole@daystar.ac.ke)
******* Lebanese American University, Institute of Media Research and Training (jmelki@lau.edu.lb)

Abstract

The quest for a global polity has faced many criticisms and barriers, yet it continues to have strong moral, historical, political, and practical foundations. In this exploratory study, we present a rationale and conceptualization of global citizenship as a response to contemporary global challenges. The study is premised on a need for a robust comparative understanding of youth values, civic attitudes, and perceptions of globalization to identify similarities and differences across cultures. The article makes a case for global empirical research exploring youth perceptions of globalization and modes of citizenship and participation. We first present a conceptualization of global citizenship, drawing on an interdisciplinary body of literature on globalization, cosmopolitanism, political theory, media literacy and civic engagement. We then survey students (n=1,214 students) from 10 countries (Argentina, Chile, Hong Kong/China, Colombia, Greece, Kenya, Lebanon, Peru, the UK, and the US) about the extent to which they are personally affected by globalization and other specific global issues. The findings reveal several patterns, including a divide between participants in Western liberal democracies, who feel more removed from globalization and express less global efficacy and civic responsibility, and those in the Global South, who demonstrate greater levels of engagement, responsibility and efficacy. In addition, only a small group was identified as super-globalized, a term we gave for those who scored high across all indicators of global citizenship.

Keywords: global citizenship, human rights, media literacy, participation, quantitative methods, young people.

Introduction

The agenda of the 21st century features complex challenges that highlight our interdependence as a global community. The challenges include climate change, international terrorism, weapons of mass destruction (WMD), refugees flows, international organized crime, tax evasion, pandemics, food, water and waste management.

However, as the milestone year 2030 fast approaches, global progress on the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) remains uneven. Large areas of the world, particularly the Middle East and Eastern Africa, face ongoing civil and interstate conflicts and suffer from longer-term structural issues of corruption and sectarianism. These problems cannot be solved by national governments and

intergovernmental organizations alone. They require multi-level alliances and engagement with stakeholders, such as networks of experts, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and multinational corporations.

Most crucially, the scale and complexity of contemporary global challenges requires the active participation and support of the global public (Annan, 2014), from changing consumer attitudes on issues such as single-use plastics and recycling to persuading citizens about the value of vaccinations and mask-wearing during pandemics.

Simultaneously, the existing institutions of diplomacy and global cooperation face significant challenges (e.g., Goldin, 2013; Malloch-Brown, 2011). The UN Security Council can be paralysed by the veto of any one of the five permanent members (P5), while that body's composition, shaped in the aftermath of World War II, excludes the voices and interests of the Global South. The UN has been further weakened by member-states not paying their financial contributions promptly, and by political attacks, e.g., in the start of the 2003 US invasion of Iraq.

Internal political crises in the US and the EU have cast doubt over the future and efficacy of liberal democracies as more authoritarian and populist models of governance emerge, not just in Turkey, Russia, or China but also within the EU itself. Central to the grievances of many populist leaders is the economic and cultural consequences of globalization.

Despite these tensions, the last few years have seen a wave of local, national, and international protests and movements on global affairs, often led by young people and focused on matters of sustainability, equality, human rights, and social justice (e.g., Extinction Rebellion, Black Lives Matter, Occupy, Me Too, and the Arab Spring). Social media have encouraged global participation and empathy and enabled a pluralistic global public sphere through multiple cross-national channels of communication. Today, youth around the world can encounter peoples, practices and ideas, and experience products, services and realities different from their own— - although most of these are produced and monetized by a few dominant Western corporations. Social media, however, do not exist in a political or economic vacuum. They are structured on profit and carry inherent political biases; they have a specific algorithmic architecture that mines and monetizes private data for profit, and that data can be weaponized in political and geopolitical contests (Zuboff 2019).

These phenomena raise questions about globalization and the norms-based international order: should globalization be reversed? Is it slowing down? Do we need more or less global governance? Are states becoming sovereign again? What is the role of the citizens and is there such a thing as the global public? Can a global community of youth from around the world emerge to address contemporary global challenges? And what is the role of social media in facilitating or skewing youth digital literacy and global engagement?

Despite the extensive discussion on globalization and the future of the state (e.g., Thomas, 2018; Scholte, 2014; Abraham & Abramson, 2017; Chryssogelos, 2018; Flew, 2020), there is a lack of comparative global empirical studies exploring youth perceptions of global citizenship. Is global citizenship a Western project or are there shared needs and values across cultures? Furthermore, there is a pressing need to move the discussion on global citizenship beyond the theoretical, philosophical, and legal domains and relate it to the daily lives of people around the world. What kinds of issues, causes, rights and responsibilities, do young people from all over the world understand as having a global dimension? Whom do they hold

responsible for the problems facing them? And what kinds of civic actions are they willing to take to engage with these issues?

This article is an exploratory study into these questions, offering three contributions:

- It presents a framework for the conceptualization of global citizenship, drawing on an interdisciplinary and international body of literature on globalization, cosmopolitanism, political theory, civic engagement, and media literacy.
- We then operationalize some of these issues and questions into a research agenda, which we have incorporated into a survey questionnaire.
- At the empirical level, we present the findings of a survey (n=1,214 students) carried out across ten countries in five continents (Africa, North and South America, Europe, Asia, and the Middle East).

Our study tests possible hypotheses and correlations that can identify avenues for further research. This is particularly important in the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic, which appears to have altered how young people engage with global justice issues. Although the pandemic lockdown has pushed most youth activism into the digital realm and away from physical spaces (Pelter 2020, Shewly & Gerharz 2021) – with some governments using quarantine mandates to silence, imprison and oppress activists (Dressler 2021) –

it has simultaneously highlighted the interconnectedness of various global justice causes with the pandemic itself, including racism (Chang 2020), climate change (Christou et al. 2022), and global citizenship (Huish 2021). Therefore, the initial patterns we identify provide a springboard for further research, especially in comparison with today's post-COVID19 world.

Literature review and conceptual framework

Citizenship in domestic political communities

Citizenship has traditionally been understood as membership in a political community within a finite geographic space, with all the rights and responsibilities that membership entails. In the city-states of ancient Greece, being a citizen meant that one was a member of the demos–the decision-making populace. In ancient Rome, citizenship entailed a series of privileges and legal protections. Romans used it as a tool of foreign policy and state expansion: Colonies and allies were granted variable forms of citizenship to both control and integrate them.

In modern times, citizenship is formally and informally associated with sovereign states and has become synonymous with nationality. In the international arena it enables the transnational identification of individuals. In the domestic arena, it confers upon the individual a range of duties and privileges, which vary depending on the legal, political, and cultural context of each country. Nevertheless, it generally means that the individual is subject to the laws of the land. For example, being a citizen may involve having to pay taxes, serve in the military, and carry out jury duty, while having the right to vote, free medical care and welfare protection.

These formal rights and responsibilities of being a citizen are complemented by a range of informal, unwritten, custom-based, or even unspoken duties, depending on the local political context: from participating in parades and national commemorations and celebrations, to respecting the national flag and "being a good citizen" by participating in the collective effort–whether that is in one's local

neighborhood or during natural disasters. Therefore, citizenship is not just a technical and legal term. It has deep moral and philosophical aspects and implications that relate to how we organize ourselves in societies; how we manage to survive and co-exist, and what the role of the individual is vis-à-vis the community.

To use a recent example, wearing a face mask and agreeing to be vaccinated have also been framed, in some countries, as moral responsibilities of all citizens to help stop the spread of coronavirus, protect national health systems, save the lives of fellow citizens , and support the national economy.

The rationale for global citizenship

The idea that alongside–or even instead of–other forms of local or national citizenship, humans are part of one global community and should therefore have recognized *global* citizenship has been proposed by philosophers and political theorists for centuries (Held, 1995). However, the process of accelerating globalization that has been taking place during the last few decades, especially after the end of the Cold War, has made that case existentially pressing (Gerodimos, 2019).

The nature of the global challenges facing us demonstrates the interdependence of communities around the world: one country's action or inaction can have devastating (or beneficial) consequences for people around the world. Therefore, genuine global cooperation is needed to address issues as complex and massive in scale as climate change. However, the weaknesses and failures of existing mechanisms and institutions of global governance have been well documented (e.g., Goldin 2013), as has the need for a "new politics" (Malloch Brown 2011) and a UN that is fit for the 21st century (Annan 2014). In all these accounts the role of the global public is central.

Nationalist and populist resistance to globalization

The negative effects and structural deficiencies of globalization have been driving populist rhetoric across many countries. Some scholars view populism as cultural resistance to globalization (e.g., Kriesi et al., 2008; Inglehart & Norris, 2016), while others believe that globalization is responsible for socioeconomic dislocations that feed populism (Rodrik, 2017). Chryssogelos (2018) argued that populist reaction to globalization is due to state transformation and the ever-shrinking capacity of national governments to regulate increasingly complex societies. As decision-making powers shift away from visible political leaders in the domestic arena towards invisible transgovernmental policy networks, populists demand the re-territorialization of political rule. Brexit and the presidency of Donald Trump are two examples of that drive. A similar but slightly different explanation is offered by Ibsen (2018), who argued that the populist resurgence is indicative of a "profound legitimation crisis of the Western welfare state, which ultimately derives from its inability to control a globalized economic system" (p. 795).

It could be argued, of course, that it is merely Western liberal democracies experiencing this kind of disenfranchisement as a new phenomenon. Many other countries around the world–the lesser developed, the disenfranchised, the formerly colonized, and those that became theatres of proxy wars or interventions by superpowers during the Cold War–have already experienced that sense of powerlessness and disconnect, which may partly explain why they also witness the rise and success of populist movements, including extremist organizations, such as ISIS and al-Qaeda (Melki & Jabado, 2016).

For any given populist leader and their domestic audience, the blame for action or inaction that has caused a crisis can easily be attributed to foreign actors–including other governments, major powers, international organizations, unaccountable elites, and networks–who are framed as the corrupt and hostile *Other*. This is not to deny the share of responsibility that such actors may carry. However, while populist rhetoric can be galvanizing and activating, it is also profoundly disempowering as, by weaponizing a sense of victimhood, it removes the agency and responsibility that citizens themselves have for their own communities–including the global community. It reframes the responsibility and redirects anger towards an imagined enemy, and in service of a false solution championed by opportunistic leaders.

In contrast to recent anti-globalization rhetoric across much of the West, the case of Hong Kong is of particular interest. Previous research has established that a type of liberal patriotism can be observed in Hong Kong, in which the love of the homeland and of the state are qualified by liberal democratic values (Chan & Chan, 2014). Hong Kong's legacy of Western and global influence has acted as a kind of barricade against a nationalistic culture; globalization is seen as having *positively* influenced a civic culture by ameliorating nationalistic tendencies. However, from China's perspective, it may have just served the interests of Western colonizers. While globalization is usually perceived as dissolving natural boundaries and diluting local identities, "the kind of globalizing influence in Hong Kong seems to have had an opposite effect. In Hong Kong – or perhaps in other areas where authoritarian rule is strong – global discourse demonstrates a positive effect from the local's point of view" (Fung, 2008, p. 201).

Globalization and multi-level governance will not like disappear in the near future. Therefore, it may be vital to reform global governance to successfully address global challenges. This requires the development of viable forms of global citizenship, which will facilitate civic participation and collaboration at the global level.

Contrasting approaches to a global polity

Scholars of globalization have put forward different proposals to facilitate global democracy. Statist approaches favor multilateral collaboration among sovereign states. Dingwerth (2014) argued that the institutions of global cooperation that we already have are "sufficiently democratic" and that, instead of creating new institutions, we need to shift our focus to areas such as health, education, and subsistence and facilitate investments that will help weaker states utilize existing mechanisms.

In contrast, proponents of cosmopolitanism (Archibugi & Held, 1995) favor a scaling up of Western liberal democracy to the global level so that citizens of the global community are formally recognized as such. Cosmopolitanism–the idea that all human beings are citizens of the world–has a rich tradition in philosophy, political theory, literature, and the arts.

However, both statist and cosmopolitan approaches have faced criticism. Scholte (2014) argued that statism lacks popular participation and control, and that it fails to acknowledge the complexity and truly global scale of contemporary challenges. The political problems facing intergovernmental and supranational organizations such as the UN Security Council, NATO, and the EU, all of which either require unanimity or can get paralyzed by a member-state's veto, are a good reminder that multilateral structures based on interstate negotiation and consensus may not always meet the needs of our era.

Conversely, cosmopolitanism has been accused of putting forward oversimplified notions of political identity and limited cultural reflexivity (Scholte, 2014). Western-modern rationalist models of citizenship

may not be culturally or politically relevant to other parts of the world. From a more libertarian angle, Thomas (2018) argued that "the state continues to exist today as the only meaningful expression of territorial and coercive power. There are no alternatives to it in spite of the intellectual invocations of cosmopolitanism and the global state" (p. 347).

Scholte (2014) proposed a model of postmodern global democracies based on "transscalarity, plural solidarities, transculturality, egalitarian distribution, ecologically framed ideas of rights and duties" (p. 3). However, it is unclear who would be tasked with enforcing these principles and how that could be achieved in a highly pluralistic and culturally diverse global context.

Challenges facing global citizenship

Thus, constructing a global polity, or even just a global public, faces significant political, legal, and moral challenges. At the core of any *imagined community* (Anderson, 1991) is the tension between the ingroup and the outgroup–the line that separates the community from the *Other*. Tinnevelt and De Schutter (2010) questioned whether we could create demos on the global level:

> [T]he political culture of world society will always lack the common ethical-political dimension - the social boundary between insiders and outsiders - that is essential for a corresponding democratic global community. The all-affected criterion and the principle of democracy will therefore collide at the highest political level. (p. 3)

Therefore, one of the biggest challenges facing any form of global citizenship is the inherent tension between the principle of all-encompassing inclusivity and the fundamental traits of any political community. Abraham and Abramson (2017) proposed a *pragmatic International Relations* tasked with a political project: constituting the public in an age of global governance, with reference to Dewey's political values.

Actually, global mobilization and civic engagement can help overcome the challenges to individual freedom identified by critics of post-statist approaches (e.g., Thomas, 2018). The global does not have to be the enemy of the individual; rather, the goal is to ensure the individual's continued survival vis-à-vis large-scale challenges, while–as in the case of Hong Kong–it can also be an ally against excessive state power, and in favor of the protection of human rights and liberties. In other words, the shift towards a global layer to citizenship may appear attractive to many people around the world, although states may treat it with hostility.

Lagerkvist (2009) noted that global citizenship is bound to clash with those legal authorities that run the territories where they exist as national citizens. This may be a minor issue for Western countries, but "with the increasingly advanced ICT infrastructure in countries such as China and India with authoritarian or colonialist legacies, de-territorialization of citizenship is not on the agenda" (p. 373). As China further integrates across the world's economy, infrastructure and political institutions, this discussion may be irrelevant.

Is global citizenship a Western project?

In fact, Lagerkvist (2009) wondered "whether the discourse on global citizenship is a global phenomenon at all, or something that further reflects the postmaterialist values of a Western agenda" (p. 373). Is

global citizenship a Western concept? Is global citizenship tied to the idea of a global democracy, as many political philosophers imply? While a mechanism of civic participation, voice, and representation, which is at the heart of global citizenship, is also shared by democracy's operating principle-the social contract-could it be that at the global, there can exist other forms of citizenship and governance not tied to Western notions of democracy? Furthermore, is the idea of democracy–let alone a global democracy–a Western project? Or do all polities ultimately depend on the unspoken consent, legitimization, or at least tolerance of their people?

The same accusation has been directed in the past against global governance and universal human rights at large. Steffek and Holthaus (2017) demonstrated that welfare internationalism is not merely the result of the British welfare state or the American New Deal, but that it emerged earlier and combined elements of different origins. "International theorists and practitioners of the early 20th century established a new perspective on international affairs, emanating from individuals and their needs" (p. 106). This approach rivalled intergovernmentalism and helped legitimize the League of Nations and the UN.

Furthermore, the traumatic and formative events of World War II–such as the Holocaust, the dividing of third-world countries into spheres of influence, and redrawing of their state borders (e.g., in the Middle East), and the dropping of atomic bombs in Hiroshima and Nagasaki–were experienced globally and not just in the West. The system of the UN, and the legal, political, diplomatic, and moral framework of international treaties and universal human rights that was constructed as a response to those events were meant to bring humanity together as one. In theory, they belong neither to the West, nor to any other national government, but to all people irrespective of origin or background, although the implementation of these principles has been inconsistent.

The same is true of more recent developments in global governance and international law. This includes the sustainability agenda starting with the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); as well as the Responsibility to Protect doctrine according to which the international community has to ultimately protect the citizens of a state from certain crimes, with military action against that state's government being the last resort (although, as the 2011 military intervention in Libya shows, R2P is not free of controversy and potential abuse to further national agendas).

Thus, the line of legitimation linking the global public to global governance–the global social contract of sorts–is direct. It is not mediated by the consent of states, although, in practice states can play a major role as facilitators or inhibitors of global citizenship, as they seek to serve their national interests.

Realizing global citizenship

Therefore, despite the substantive challenges and constraints facing any attempt to formalize and develop it, and the need to interrogate and conceptualize its contradictions and complexities, there is a solid basis for global citizenship. That basis is moral (shared humanity and social justice), historical (formative experiences such as World War II and international liberation and decolonization movements that emerged in the 20th century), political (any polity's sustainability depends on the consent of its members), and practical (sharing finite resources and addressing pressing global challenges).

The scope of global citizenship has remained very limited compared to that of national citizenship, not just in terms of the rights afforded to global citizens, but particularly of their formal responsibilities

(Gerodimos, 2019). While many activists and scientists have highlighted the need for people to act responsibly, for example by reducing CO2 consumption, citizens of the world today have no formal responsibilities, and therefore accountability, in the global arena, other than not carrying out certain types of mass crimes against humanity, such as genocide and ethnic cleansing. This deficit extends not only to lay citizens but also to those individuals and companies involved in transnational activities, such as organized crime, tax evasion, smuggling, terrorism, destruction of natural and cultural resources, etc.

Yet, if global citizenship is to have any kind of functional relevance or value, it must combine rights with responsibilities–and demonstrate the links and associations between them, in the same way that taxation and public spending (or freedom of speech and the duty of civic engagement) are associated in national discourses. It could be argued that the one-sided emphasis on a rights-oriented discourse and legal framework reflects the values and political practices of Western liberal democracies, in which concepts such as civic duty, sacrifice of the self, and loyalty towards the community have been fading for decades in favor of postmodern self-fulfillment and the entitlement of the individual.

Therefore, one important set of questions is not only whether people (especially youth) in different parts of the world are aware of the link between the global and the local (i.e. the interdependence of communities due to globalization), but also how they delineate the concept of global citizenship (i.e. which rights and responsibilities they perceive as having a universal dimension). Moreover, how do they perceive their own role as active participants in the global public sphere and who do they hold responsible for the problems facing their communities? This can also be a valuable indicator of their sense of efficacy and civic agency.

Understanding the answers to these questions through comparative, cross-continental and cross-cultural research is crucial for two reasons. It provides us with an internationally reflexive conceptualization of global citizenship, highlighting possible cultural similarities and differences (e.g., between the Global South and the West, or between South America and Europe, or between Hong Kong and Europe), which can in turn enrich our understanding of political phenomena. Such a research agenda is also a vital tool for a more informed and effective process of global enfranchisement. Cameron (2018) argues that research on cosmopolitan motivation needs to engage with psychology and communication, which provide us with useful insights on the effectiveness of different strategies employed by moral philosophers to motivate global action. For example, Cameron notes that the emphasis on culpability (e.g., the perceived guilt of affluent individuals in the Global North for poverty in the Global South) can have adverse effects at odds with cosmopolitan ethics.

Global civic engagement, youth perceptions of globalization, and the role of media and education

Media and education in general, and civic and media literacy in particular, are critical tools that enable young people to realize and utilize their civic agency and to take responsibility for global change (Mihailidis, 2014; Mihailidis & Gerodimos, 2016; Gerodimos, 2021). Using the example of pedagogy on genocide, Reese and Melki (2019) outlined a model of a historically rooted but globally reflexive approach to understanding the mediation of human rights. They show that it is possible to humanize global issues and encourage taking responsibility for change. Reese and Melki make the case for a journalism pedagogy that adopts a global outlook in dealing with issues transcending specific communities and fostering greater

empathy across national and tribal affiliations. Other studies in the MENA region (e.g., Banaji & Moreno-Almeida, 2020) indicate that digitization may benefit young people with existing offline economic, social, and cultural capital, as opposed to transforming power structures.

For such a curriculum to succeed, it requires an in-depth understanding of youth values and motivations across regional and cultural contexts. There is a marked lack of studies of youth attitudes towards globalization and global citizenship, let alone ones that provide us with comparative cross-national data. Das (2007) carried out a survey of 575 business students in India and found that they had negative perceptions of multinational corporations. Meng, Janavaras and Gomes (2012) developed a four-dimensional model of youth perceptions of globalization, focusing on positive effects, negative effects, barriers eliminated, and impact on the environment. They then tested that model with a survey with business students across three countries (US, UK, and India) and found a difference between Indian and US/UK students. The former had much higher perceptions on the positive, negative and environmental effects of globalization compared to the latter. Other studies have approached this topic through mediators such as language and heritage. Röll and Meyer (2020) examined perceptions of World Cultural Heritage among German school children, identifying Eurocentric thinking patterns.

A related body of literature has looked at youth perceptions of globalization's effects on the local, and youth perceptions of rights and responsibilities but it focused on the local or microsocial level. Rizzini and Thapliyal (2007) examined youth perceptions of rights and responsibilities at the local level, finding disparities across socio-economic backgrounds. Crucially, their study confirmed the consistent finding of civic engagement studies, that opportunities for participation and collective ownership boost self-efficacy and civic responsibility. Brann-Barrett (2014) conducted an ethnographic study with 41 youth and key informants (community workers, researchers) in a Canadian community. Their perceptions and emotional responses illustrated the effects of post-industrialization and globalization in the daily lives of young people. Their idealistic perceptions of the past imagined economic security and value-oriented social stability clashed with their experiences of an uncertain global digital present. As Brann-Barrett (2014) noted, "[i]n a global society, citizenship and community educators cannot ignore the learning significance of how perceived local histories affect how youth transitioning to adulthood experience civic engagement in their post-industrial communities" (p. 16).

Chui and Leung (2014) found that university students in Hong Kong are aware of the impact of globalization on the economy and on their personal consumption choices, but are relatively apathetic towards international affairs, while they do have an interest in cross-cultural service-learning opportunities. Kennedy, Hahn and Lee (2008) identified "similarities and differences among students across [Australia, Hong Kong and the United States] that could not be easily explained […] Political socialization appears to be a much more unpredictable process than traditional paradigms might suggest" (p. 88). They found that students' conceptions of citizenship are more complex than expected, revealing both thin (i.e., moral or legal) and thick (i.e., identity-oriented, participatory and cosmopolitan) characteristics, although they tend to be more thick than thin.

Therefore, we need more empirical data on, and comparative analyses of, youth attitudes towards globalization and global citizenship. In addition, we need particular emphasis on the interdependence between the global and the local, as well as to the scope, balance and linkages of universal rights and responsibilities, the dynamics of responsibility, shame and blame, and the perceived efficacy of different

methods of engagement and mobilization, including both conventional means of political participation (e.g., voting, protesting), and the role of media, education, communication, and psychology. This requires a three-dimensional research design that allows testing for hypotheses and relations between different factors, and simultaneously across civic cultures.

Methodology and Research Design

Research questions

Based on the discussion above, we pose a series of questions that can be part of a research agenda on global citizenship, and which would advance the global reflexivity and efficacy of any effort to develop it further:

- Do young people feel that globalization affects them and their communities? Does that perception change after they have considered a list of specific global issues?
- Which specific global issues do they feel that they can do something about?
- Are young people aware of their own civic power and responsibility? Whom do they attribute responsibility/blame for the problems facing the world? Is there a sense of disempowerment and victimhood (have rights but no power) or entitlement (have rights but no responsibilities)? Do they recognize associations between rights and responsibilities?
- Which possible universal rights/responsibilities resonate with them? How expansive or narrow is their understanding of rights/responsibilities?
- In what ways are participants willing to engage? What are the particular means of engagement that they see as pertinent for global issues?
- How shared are perceptions of global citizenship? Are there significant differences in perceptions of globalization, responsibility, efficacy, and engagement across continents?
- Is there a distinct subgroup of cosmopolitan (super-globalized) citizens? (high efficacy, strong belief in universal rights/responsibilities, and willingness to engage)

Survey design

We incorporated these questions into the design of an online survey that can be used across local and cultural contexts (see Appendix). After some basic demographic questions (age, gender, country of origin, country of residence, education, languages), the survey asks respondents to consider the extent to which they are personally affected by globalization in general and by specific global issues, as well as which of these issues they can do something about.

It then moves to consider the responsibility of various actors for the problems facing the world today. That list includes domestic actors (e.g., my government, the media), foreign actors (rich countries, the UN) as well as "people like me ", so as to establish whether participants accept a level of responsibility. That question of efficacy is also asked directly (how much power do you personally have to make a positive change in the world today?). The questionnaire then turns to an expansive set of possible universal rights ranging from the more obvious ones (e.g., human rights, life, freedom) to the more politically charged (e.g., democracy, access to media, basic income), as well as a list of universal responsibilities "that every

person in the world should undertake depending on their abilities." These range from the abstract (e.g., respect others) to the more political (e.g., pay taxes). The final section surveys participants on a range of possible actions that they might take to help solve a global problem. These range from conventional means of political participation (e.g., voting, volunteering, attending a protest) to actions associated with civic media (e.g., writing a story or creating a video, sharing a story on social media), and from relatively passive forms of activism (e.g., signing an online petition) to more demanding ones (e.g., joining a group or organization).

The questionnaire is by no means exhaustive or definitive, and part of this project's aim is to evaluate its strengths and weaknesses. When designing this questionnaire, we were fully aware that every question or variable we added would likely reduce the number of people completing it, because of time-filling constrains.

Therefore, for the purposes of this exploratory project, we aimed for a short design that allows a number of different crosstabulations, across factors (e.g., perception of the relevance of globalization before and after having considered a number of specific global challenges; possible relationship between sense of efficacy and blame attribution to external actors) and across cultures as outlined above. This is the first known study to survey perceptions of civic responsibility, efficacy, and blame at the global level, and also attitudes towards different types of universal rights and responsibilities, which can also compare values and ideological positions across continents.

Finally, this design allows us to create composite variables that may be useful indicators of high global engagement: for the purposes of this study, we hypothesized that the greater number of global issues that a participant feels they can do something about, and the greater number of rights and responsibilities they recognize as having a universal dimension, the more engaged they are with the essence of global citizenship. Furthermore, combining these indicators of global engagement with other indicators of high efficacy and participation allows us to identify a potential subsample of *super-globalized citizens* and try to explore whether they share particular characteristics.

Data collection

From September 2016 to April 2017, we carried out a survey among communication, journalism and media students (n=1,214) from partner universities in 10 countries across five continents (Table 1): Argentina, Chile, China (Hong Kong), Colombia, Greece, Kenya, Lebanon, Peru, the UK, and the US (data from Mexico was excluded due to a very low number of completions).

Table 1: Survey Sample

Country	**Sample**
Argentina	303
Kenya	246
UK	175
Lebanon	112
China	106
Perú	83

Chile	70
Greece	60
Colombia	33
USA	26
Total	**1,214**

Source: own elaboration

It is important to acknowledge the limitations of our sample–which in some cases was very small and uneven across countries and continents–and of the data collection process. The long duration of the data collection window was dictated by the realities of different term times and IRB processes around the world, while the method of data collection (i.e. online versus paper questionnaire, and in-class versus at students' own time) again varied according to the local context. Further caveats that should be taken into account are the gender skew (71.5% female) and the fact that the survey was carried out among English-speaking communication students (in fact half of our respondents speak three or more languages). The big majority of participants belonged in the 18-24 age group (85.5%) while a further 10% were 25-34.

Therefore, these limitations mean that this exploratory study should be viewed as a snapshot at a particular point in time of a demographic group that is on the one hand highly diverse in terms of its origin, but which also shares certain characteristics (multilingual communication students who are more likely to be globally engaged and media-savvy than the average young person in their country). This can inform and guide our analysis and hypotheses. For example, if we were to find that this potentially globally fluent group is completely apathetic about these aspects of global citizenship that are part of our study, or if they feel completely disempowered, then this would certainly be an interesting finding, given the socioeconomic, political and cultural barriers likely faced by students who do not enjoy the privileges of our sample.

As a snapshot, our study may also act as a useful point of reference and comparison for follow-up studies, especially after the global experience of the COVID19 pandemic, which may have brought to the fore the interdependence of communities in the face of global challenges, raising questions about the rights and responsibilities of individual citizens and the role of global actors such as major powers, intergovernmental bodies (e.g., the World Health Organization) and multinational corporations (e.g., pharmaceuticals).

Ethics

Our pilot study was reviewed by the IRB of the lead university, as well as by the boards of those partners that required approval before commencing the data collection process. The survey was entirely voluntary and anonymous. A Participant Information Sheet was included in the preamble of the questionnaire. Students were advised that participating in the survey was not linked in any way to their assessment, that they could skip any questions that they did not feel comfortable answering, and that we would not attempt to trace their IP address.

Results and discussion

Impact of globalization and sense of efficacy

Seven out of 10 participants (69.6%) said that globalization affects them personally "somewhat" or "a lot." Half of our sample (49.4%) feels that the global issues listed affect them and their community "a lot" while another 32.1% "somewhat" (81.5% total). In between these two similar questions about whether globalization affects "you/your community" we asked participants if they can do something about a list of global issues (ranging from climate change and pollution to genocide and WMD).

Interestingly, participants were even more likely to recognize the effects of globalization after reviewing this list (r_S = .288, p < .001, paired t-test Z = -7.262, p < .001). This could indicate that people are unsure of what "globalization" actually means. Another explanation is that people do not always recognize issues that affect them and their communities (e.g., lack of education, lack of food/clean water, terrorism) as *global* issues.

When asked how much power they personally have to make a positive change in the world today, the sample was split evenly: 42.5% said "only a little" or "no power at all," whereas 42.6% answered "somewhat" or "a lot." Another 14.1% were unsure.

One of the potentially most important findings of our study was that participants from richer countries of the Global North (Europe and North America) felt significantly *less* affected by globalization than those from all the other countries (Table 2). This is a potential pattern that is worth unpacking further in terms of interpretations and future research. Is this because participants from richer countries feel shielded from globalization? Or is it that globalization has mostly affected countries of the Global South? Do they view globalization mostly in terms of jobs, trade, and the economy, or in terms of mobility and culture? The Global North has benefitted from both aspects of globalization, although as noted above, both economic and cultural aspects of mobility have been weaponized by populist and nationalist politicians in the West.

Table 2: Key findings across continents

Responses by continent	**Africa**	**Asia**	**South America**	**North America**	**Europe**
Personally affected by globalization	High	High	High	Low	Average
Globalization affects my community	High	High	Average	Low	Low
Responsible for problems: people like me	High	Average	Low	Average	Low
Personally have the power to change the world	High	Average	Average	Average	Low
Range of universal rights (composite)	Low	High	Low	High	High
Range of universal responsibilities (composite)	High	Average	Low	High	High

Source: own elaboration

More interestingly, these Western participants (Europe/North America) also felt they have significantly *less* power to make a positive change in the world than students in the Global South. Again, this could be part of a broader civic malaise and political crisis of identity and efficacy prevalent in Western liberal democracies. It could also mean that young people in the Global South have been engaging more deeply

and widely with the processes and consequences of globalization (i.e. that they are more globally literate as opposed to more insular attitudes amongst Western youth). This is also a pattern worth interrogating further, particularly since globalization for many developing countries has meant the continued exploitation of their natural resources, with small local elites being the main beneficiaries of foreign direct investment and foreign aid.

Efficacy on specific global issues

When it comes to their sense of efficacy in dealing with 12 specific global challenges, the majority thought they could "do something about" pollution (64.9%), poverty and inequality (58.4%), human rights abuses (58.1%), climate change (56.2%) and lack of education (54.1%). Fewer picked lack of food and clean water (44.4%). Very few participants thought they had any power over issues such as lack of medical care (19.4%), war and conflict (16.6%), terrorism (15%), debt and economic crisis (14.3%), genocide (8.8%), and WMD (7.8%). Given the demographic makeup of the sample, this could imply that young people feel a significant sense of disempowerment over these latter global challenges.

While it is only natural that citizens would feel a greater sense of efficacy for issues that are more tangible and visible in their daily life, a well-functioning global polity ought to afford its (global) citizens transparent and effective mechanisms of exercising their voice and will on the full spectrum of public policies and global current affairs. For instance, the handling and non-proliferation of WMDs, which have the potential to destroy humanity, is an issue that all citizens ought to have a say in, not just those who have scientific or military expertise.

Attributing responsibility/blame for global problems

When asked to name who is responsible for the problems facing the world today, most students blamed their own government (85.3%), big corporations (84.5%), other governments (82.3%), rich countries (75.2%), the media (71.7%), the UN (57.9%), whereas just less than half (47.1%) said "people like me."

The analysis by continent revealed an interesting contrast. Whereas in Africa, students scored lower on issues they feel they can do something about, they had a higher-than-average sense of responsibility. The opposite appears to be true in Europe: students felt they could do something about several issues. However, fewer felt that "people like me" are responsible for the problems facing the world and were more likely to attribute blame to elite actors and effectively avoid their global civic responsibility. Finally, South America scored below average in both sets of questions revealing that students felt at the same time less empowered about global issues and less responsible for them, too, revealing an even more disenfranchised approach.

Universal rights versus universal responsibilities

Most participants take an expansive view of the concept of universal rights. When given a list of nine possible rights, more than 80% picked at least five, almost 60% picked at least seven, and 30.9% chose all nine: Human Rights (88.8%), Education (89.3%), Health (85.6%), Freedom (82.9%), Life (82.3%) were the top universal rights. Democracy (66.4%), work (62.4%), basic income (60.5%), and access to

media (51.4%) scored lower, although still more than half of participants thought they were universal rights. This is worth exploring further as it reveals a willingness to think big in terms of the remit of global citizenship.

Somewhat surprisingly, participants took a slightly more cautious and conservative view of universal responsibilities, although still quite inclusive: 21.3% selected all eight options, 48.4% selected at least six, 83.4% selected a minimum of four: Respecting others (86%), protecting the environment (85.8%), and attending education (76.1%) were seen as the top responsibilities, followed by being aware of global issues (65.5%), expressing my voice (60.2%), work (57.6%), and paying taxes (54.9%). Participating in the political process (51.1%) scored the lowest.

Our analysis showed that the more rights people recognize as universal, the more responsibilities they are also prepared to accept ($Rs = .593$, $p < .001$). Furthermore, recognizing universal responsibilities is linked to having more efficacy ($Rs = .299$, $p < .001$), but it is not the sole factor that affects how empowered participants feel. Further exploration, through factorial analysis on a larger and more representative sample, would be useful to establish if there are differences among particular groups.

Means of global civic engagement

In terms of the actions that the participants might take to help solve a global problem, students were happy to engage in several ways, especially basic actions such as voting (79.9%), talking to family and friends (77.6%), and searching for more information about a problem (77.5%). Slimmer majorities were also willing to volunteer their time (66.0%), share on social media (64.5%), sign a petition (60.5%), write an article or create a video (56.1%), join a group or organization (55.7%), or donate (50.5%). Fewer were prepared to attend a protest (40.2%) or contact a politician (30.0%).

We found a positive correlation between a high sense of civic responsibility and engagement through all means (petitions, voting, donating, $p< .001$). However, efficacy–the belief that one has civic agency and the power to make a difference–was the strongest predictor of one's willingness to engage through different types of actions ($p< .001$), which is consistent with the literature on political participation.

Super-globalized citizens

Surprisingly, only a small number of participants (6.3%) are part of what we could describe as a group of super-globalized citizens (i.e. scoring high across all indicators of interdependence, rights, responsibilities, efficacy and engagement). While we did not find any significant differences across age and gender, the number of languages spoken was one significant predictor ($X2(5) = 18.00$, $p< .003$), as was the country of origin: students from Lebanon, Kenya, China, Greece and Colombia were the most globally engaged citizens, whereas those from Peru, the US and the UK were the least.

Conclusions

In this exploratory study we presented a framework and rationale for the conceptualization of global citizenship as a pragmatic response to complex global challenges facing us today, and the interdependence of communities and peoples around the world. While the quest for a cosmopolitan

citizenship and a global polity has faced many criticisms and barriers (not least from the governments of sovereign states, which are still the dominant actors in the international system), the call for global enfranchisement has robust moral, historical, political, and practical foundations. Citizens' global engagement is not a luxury anymore; it is existentially important and at the heart of the sustainability agenda.

We argue that in order to devise effective mechanisms of such citizenship, we need a better and deeper comparative understanding of youth values, civic attitudes, and perceptions of globalization, so as to identify similarities and differences across cultures. Particularly crucial to such a project are the fields of political sociology, communication, and psychology. They allow us to decode the dynamics of efficacy, blame, and responsibility, and to then utilize journalism, education for sustainable development (ESD), and media literacy curricula to help students establish these cognitive and affective links between the world and their individual selves and communities.

We operationalized these general principles into a series of research questions and into an efficient survey design that allows for a three-dimensional exploration of relationships across factors and across cultural and geographical borders. We invite others to use, critique, and adapt that methodological framework, to facilitate further academic research on this topic.

Despite the limitations of its data collection process and sample, our study carried out across five continents produced some tentative patterns that are worth unpacking. Of particular interest is an apparent divide between students in Western liberal democracies–who feel that globalization has not affected them as much, and who feel less global efficacy and civic responsibility–and those in the Global South, who, despite a few local variations (e.g., African and Middle Eastern students tend to have a greater sense of responsibility for global affairs than South Americans and Asian students) are on the whole a lot more engaged.

Furthermore, our data indicate that these students take an expansive view of universal rights and a slightly less expansive view of universal responsibilities, while they are also happy to engage through several different methods of participation, active and passive, direct and mediated. However, even though our sample consisted of mostly bilingual or multilingual communication students, who could therefore be expected to be more globally engaged than the average young person, only a small group could be characterized as *super-globalized* in the sense of scoring high across all indicators of interdependence, rights, responsibilities, efficacy, and engagement. Our study confirms the role of the relationship between blame and responsibility (and between responsibility, efficacy, and engagement) indicating a worthwhile avenue for further research.

Evaluation and Recommendations for Future Research

Our survey design, which combined baseline questions on the impact of globalization and efficacy with global challenges, universal rights and responsibilities, and means of engagement, allowed us to conceptually experiment with many combinations of variables. For example, we found that one's attitude towards specific rights and responsibilities was strongly correlated with the likelihood of choosing to engage through a greater variety of methods of activism. This can subsequently allow us to build more nuanced personas, exploring their values and political ideologies vis-à-vis their attitudes towards globalization.

In terms of weaknesses and improvements, adopting Likert-scale values for some of the questions (as opposed to descriptive values such as "A lot" and "Somewhat") would have allowed us to carry out more advanced statistical tests. Furthermore, our initial study shows that it is probably preferable to split the sample into regions, rather than the stricter taxonomy of continents that we used. We recommend decoupling the Middle East from South/East Asia and the Pacific. In addition, using broader probability sampling and adding more regions (e.g., North and South Africa, Russia, India, mainland China, Scandinavia, etc.) would lead to a more inclusive and representative global outlook.

For future research, we also recommend examining in more depth the difference between caring about issues, wanting to make a difference, and efficacy (believing that you can make a difference), as well as the role of individual responsibility and how that may intersect with local political cultures.

The apparent divide between the West and the Global South is directly relevant to the tense relationship between globalization and populism. While countries with a history of foreign intervention and colonialism, especially those that experience populist movements, are probably more likely to take a more sceptical view of foreign and global actors, particularly since our data show that it is students from the richer Western countries that are detached from globalization and who feel more disempowered. This could be due to several reasons: privileged insularity, economic grievances due to deindustrialization and the shift of jobs to China, or cultural grievances due to increased mobility and urban multiculturalism.

The willingness of different demographic groups to engage and communicate with the *Other*, across cultural, linguistic and platform barriers, and the specific tools and channels that are more likely to succeed in facilitating that communication, is a critical avenue for further research. This could also include different types of participation mechanisms (e.g., from model UN simulations and school trips to social media groups and mobile apps). In essence, we need to find ways of further operationalizing media literacy to test and identify the most effective vehicles of cross-cultural empathy in each region. The role of learning foreign languages is also worth unpacking further. Finally, a future global study should examine the relative resonance of each Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) with citizens from around the world, as well as their perceived efficacy in addressing them.

Observing the rise and decline of the globalization paradigm in media and communication studies, Flew (2020) noted that the rise of populism marks a reassertion of national policy and political priorities into the operations of global corporations and multilateral institutions, and predicts a possible shift away from analysing global phenomena and a turn towards comparative international studies. Finding the balance between acknowledging and incorporating both global and national realities is crucial in designing a research agenda that is relevant and perceptive.

It is unclear yet what the impact of recent developments will be on the quest for global citizenship. The COVID-19 pandemic, extreme weather phenomena due to climate change, and global action on the SDGs highlight our interdependence and the need for cooperation and global public engagement. The political and identity crisis facing the West, the rise of China, and the prospect of a New Cold War between liberal democracies and more authoritarian states could further impede global citizenship; or they could lead to a return to multilateralism after the experience of the Trump presidency, with new forms of global governance, as well as the realization that global politics is not a zero-sum game, and that collaboration is vital to our continued survival. Reforming the representation and decision-making mechanisms of institutions, such as the UN, appears to be a crucial first step towards avoiding past mistakes.

It would be interesting to explore further whether and how young people today, after the experience of the global pandemic, realize not just the linkages between the global and the local, but also the power that they hold to make the world a better, safer, and more sustainable place.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Megan Fromm, Andrew Liaropoulos, Sarah Mallat, Paula Marzulli, Diego A. Mazorra, Paul Mihailidis, Pablo Martinez Zarate, and all our colleagues at partner universities and at the Salzburg Academy on Media & Global Change for their support and assistance with data collection. We are grateful to Eva Makris, Samir Bhatti and Mirva Villa for their assistance with the survey hosting, data storage and data entry. We are indebted to Lucille Harvey, George Vossinakis, Dionysia Dimopoulou and Anthony Ioannidis for their assistance with the data analysis. We would also like to thank colleagues at the Centre for Comparative Politics and Media Research (CCPMR) and the Communication & Journalism Virtual Research Days (VRDs) at Bournemouth University for their feedback and support. Part of this project was supported by Bournemouth University's Student Research Assistants (SRA) scheme.

Bibliographical references

Abraham, K.J. & Abramson, Y. (2017). A pragmatist vocation for International Relations: The (global) public and its problems. *European Journal of International Relations, 23*(1), 26-48.

Annan, K. (2014). *We the Peoples: The Role of the United Nations in the 21st Century*. Paradigm Publishers.

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.

Archibugi, D. & Held, D. (1995). *Cosmopolitan Democracy: An Agenda for a New World Order*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Banaji, S. & Moreno-Almeida, C. (2020). Politicizing participatory culture at the margins: The significance of class, gender and online media for the practices of youth networks in the MENA region. *Global Media and Communication, 17*(1), 121-142.

Brann-Barrett, T. (2014). How did we get here in the first place? The learning significance of perceived local histories in ways young people experience civic engagement in their post-industrial communities. *The Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education, 26*(1), 1-18.

Cameron, J.D. (2018). Communicating Cosmopolitanism and Motivating Global Citizenship. *Political Studies, 66*(3), 718-734.

Chan, E. & Chan, J. (2014). Liberal Patriotism in Hong Kong. *Journal of Contemporary China, 23*(89), 952-970.

Chang, B. (2020). From "Illmatic" to "Kung Flu": Black and Asian Solidarity, Activism, and Pedagogies in the Covid-19 Era. *Postdigital Science and Education*, *2*(3): 741–756.

Christou, G., Theodorou, E., & Spyrou, S. (2022). "The slow pandemic": youth's climate activism and the stakes for youth movements under Covid-19. *Children's Geographies*. https://doi.org/10.1080/14733285.2022.2026885.

Chryssogelos, A. (2018). State transformation and populism: From the internationalized to the neo-sovereign state?, *Politics, 40*(1), 22-37.

Chui, W.H. & Leung, E.W.Y. (2014). Youth in a global world: attitude towards globalization and global citizenship among university students in Hong Kong. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 34*(1): 107-124.

Das, G.S. (2007). Student Perception of Globalization: Results from a Survey. *Global Business Review, 8*(1), 1-11.

Dingwerth, K. (2014). Global Democracy and the Democratic Minimum: Why a Procedural Account Alone Is Insufficient. *European Journal of International Relations, 20*(4), 1124–1147.

Dressler, W. H. (2021). Quarantining activism: COVID-19, frontline defenders and intensifying extractivism in the Philippines. *Journal of Political Ecology, 28*(1): 453-470.

Flew, T. (2020). Globalization, Neo-Globalization and Post-Globalization: The Challenge of Populism and the Return of the National. *Global Media and Communication, 16*(1), 19-39.

Fung, A. (2008). Discourse and Cultural Identity: Towards a Global Identity for Hong Kong. In: D. D. Wu, *Discourses of Cultural China in the Globalizing Age*, Hong Kong University Press.

Gerodimos, R. (2019). Global Citizenship. In R. Hobbs and P. Mihailidis (eds). *The International Encyclopedia of Media Literacy*, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Gerodimos, R. (2021). Media Literacy, Security, and Youth Engagement with Global Current Affairs: The Case of Deterrence. *Journal of Media Literacy, 67*.

Goldin, I. (2013). *Divided Nations: Why global governance is failing and what we can do about it*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Held, D. (1995). *Democracy and the Global Order*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Huish, R. (2021). Global citizenship amid COVID-19: why climate change and a pandemic spell the end of international experiential learning. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies, 42*(4): 441-458.

Ibsen, M. F. (2018). The Populist Conjuncture: Legitimation Crisis in the Age of Globalized Capitalism. *Political Studies, 67*(3), 795-811.

Inglehart, R.F. & Norris, P. (2016). Trump, Brexit, and the Rise of Populism: Economic Have-Nots and Cultural Backlash. HKS Faculty Research Working Paper Series, HKS Working Paper No. RWP16-026, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Kennedy, K.J., Hahn, C.L. & Lee W. (2008). Constructing Citizenship: Comparing the Views of Students in Australia, Hong Kong, and the United States. *Comparative Education Review, 52*(10), 53-91.

Kriesi, H., Grande, E., Lachat, R., Dolezal, M., Bornschier, S. & Frey, T. (2008). *West European Politics in the Age of Globalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lagerkvist, J. (2009). Global Media for Global Citizenship in India and China. *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice, 21*, 367-375.

Malloch-Brown, M. (2011). *The Unfinished Global Revolution: The Limits of Nations and the Pursuit of a New Politics*. London: Allen Lane.

Melki, J., & Jabado, M. (2016). Mediated public diplomacy of the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria: The synergistic use of terrorism, social media and branding. *Media and Communication, 4*(2), 92-103. https://doi.org/10.17645/mac.v4i2.432

Meng, J.(G.), Janavaras, B., & Gomes, E. (2012). 'Cultural Differences in Globalization Perception among Younger Generations in the U.S., U.K., and India. *Journal of Euromarketing, 21*, 53-64.

Mihailidis, P. (2014). *Media Literacy and the Emerging Citizen: Youth, Engagement and Participation in Digital Culture*, New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Mihailidis, P. & Gerodimos, R. (2016). Connecting Pedagogies of Civic Media: The literacies, Connected Civics, and engagement in daily life. In E. Gordon and P. Mihailidis (eds). *Civic Media: Technology, Design, Practice*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Pelter, Z. (2020, April 14). Pandemic participation: youth activism online in the COVID-19 crisis, UNICEF. https://www.unicef.org/globalinsight/stories/pandemic-participation-youth-activism-online-covid-19-crisis.

Reese, S. & Melki, J. (2019). Genocide and the mediation of human rights: Pedagogies for difficult stories. In: K. Fowler-Watt and S. Jukes (eds), *New Journalisms: Rethinking Practice, Theory, and Pedagogy*, New York: Routledge.

Rizzini, I., & Thapliyal, N. (2007). Young People's Perceptions and Experiences of Participation in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. *Children, Youth and Environments, 17*(2), 75-92.

Rodrik, D. (2017). Populism and the Economics of Globalization. NBER Working Paper No. 23559, June. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. Available at: https://www.nber.org/papers/w23559

Röll, V., & Meyer, C. (2020). Young People's Perceptions of World Cultural Heritage: Suggestions for a Critical and Reflexive World Heritage Education. *Sustainability, 12*(20), 8640.

Scholte, J.A. (2014). Reinventing Global Democracy. *European Journal of International Relations, 20*(1), 3–28.

Shewly, H. J. & Gerharz, E. (2021). Youth activism against rape and the culture of impunity in Bangladesh: street protests amidst COVID 19. *Interface, 13*(1): 38–45.

Steffek, J. & Holthaus, L. (2017). The social-democratic roots of global governance: Welfare internationalism from the 19th century to the United Nations. *European Journal of International Relations, 24*(1), 106-129.

Thomas, P.N. (2018). Information, communications, rights and freedoms: Observations on the sovereignty of the state and its citizens. *Global Media and Communication*, *14*(3), 343-360.

Tinnevelt, R. & De Schutter, H. (2010). Introduction: Global Democracy and Exclusion. In Tinnevelt, R. & De Schutter, H. (eds). *Global Democracy and Exclusion,* Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. London: Profile Books.

Appendix: Global Citizenship Survey - Questions

[Demographic]

Age, Gender, Country of origin, Country of residence, Highest level of education or qualification achieved, Number of languages spoken, University studying/working at

[Globalization]

"To what extent are you personally affected by globalization?" (Not at all, Only a little, Not sure, Somewhat, A lot)

"Which of the following global issues can you do something about? (Please select all that apply)" (Climate Change, Debt & Economic Crisis, Human Rights Abuses, Lack of Education, Weapons of Mass Destruction, Lack of Food & Clean Water, Poverty & Inequality, Pollution, Terrorism, Lack of Medical Care, Genocide, War & Conflict)

"To what extent do these global issues affect you and your community?" (Not at all, Only a little, Not sure, Somewhat, A lot)

[Power and Responsibility]

"To what extent are the following actors responsible for these problems facing the world today? (Please select one option per row)" (Not at all, Only a little, Not sure, Somewhat, A lot)
(My government, Other governments, Big corporations, The media, Rich countries, People like me, The United Nations)

"How much power do you personally have to make a positive change in the world today?" (Not at all, Only a little, Not sure, Somewhat, A lot)

[Rights and Responsibilities]

"Which of the following should be regarded as universal rights? (i.e., rights that should be protected by international law and enjoyed by every person in the world) (Please select all that apply)"
(Health, Education, Human Rights, Democracy, Life, Freedom, Access to Media, Basic Income, Work)

"Which of the following should be regarded as universal responsibilities? (i.e., responsibilities that every person in the world should undertake depending on their abilities) (Please select all that apply)"
(Respect others, Participate in the political process, Work, Protect the environment, Be aware of global problems, Express my voice, Attend education, Pay taxes)

[Civic Action and Media]

"Finally, which of the following actions would you take in order to help solve a global problem? (Please select one option per row)" (Definitely not, Probably not, Maybe, Probably yes, Definitely yes)
(Sign an online petition, Search for more information about the problem, Share a story on social media, Write an article or create a video, Talk to family and friends, Vote, Donate money, Volunteer my time, Attend a protest, Contact a politician, Join a group or organization)