

Chapter 13

Social Justice Pedagogy and Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL): Across Three Partner Higher Education Institutions

Alina Slapac

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2210-1959>
University of Missouri-St. Louis, USA

Karen Collett

University of the Western Cape, South Africa

Frances Joan Wessels

University of the Western Cape, South Africa

Gasant Gamiet

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2820-5190>
University of the Western Cape, South Africa

Hege Knudsmoen

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3945-1717>
Oslo Metropolitan University, Norway

ABSTRACT

Drawing on reflections by five lecturers involved in two collaborative online international learning (COIL) pilot interventions, this chapter aims at highlighting key learnings and challenges related to implementation of virtual mobility to engage students in online learning across institutions and continents to enhance global teaching. From the lecturers' perspectives, it will explore themes related to social justice pedagogy, global teaching and internationalization at home. The authors draw on Nancy Fraser's notions of social justice and participatory parity to reflect upon intercultural or global engagement in their COIL programs. They conclude with solutions and recommendations to strengthen participatory parity and social justice pedagogy in COIL programs focused on teacher development.

DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3693-0453-2.ch013

Social Justice Pedagogy and COIL

INTRODUCTION

This chapter focuses on the reflections of five lecturers from three higher education institutions (HEIs) involved in two pilot projects conducted across the University of the Western Cape (UWC, South Africa), the Oslo Metropolitan University (OsloMet, Norway) and the University of Missouri-St. Louis (UMSL, United States). These institutions participated in two COIL-inspired course programs. In our case, the two Collaborative International Online Learning (COIL) courses provided opportunities to facilitate the potential for student and faculty/lecturers intercultural and global citizenship competence and the internationalization of teacher development at home.

The objectives of our chapter are to reflect upon social justice and social justice pedagogy through two COIL programs in teacher education development using a range of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) in three HEIs in the Global South, North and West. We draw on Nancy Fraser's (2008; 2009) social justice framework and the notion of parity framework to explore the possibilities and constraints of the economic, cultural and political dimensions of our interaction. This chapter also intends to add to the field of Scholarship in Teaching and Learning (SoTL) as we theorize our teaching (Brew, 2007; Leibowitz & Bozalek, 2016).

BACKGROUND

Factors Shaping Our Higher Education Contexts

Between 2020 and 2022 higher education institutions (HEIs) internationally were required to adjust to the challenges of a global pandemic as COVID-19 forced a rapid transition to online and hybrid forms of teaching and learning (Ali, 2020; Aristovnik et al., 2020). While some HEIs had established practices of online learning and international exchange, many HEIs were challenged by lockdown conditions to rapidly connect remotely and to identify opportunities for both students and faculty to strengthen and build national and international opportunities in learning, teaching and research at home. The digital gap between rich and poor nations, which existed before COVID-19 was exacerbated by these conditions as online learning and teaching became the order of the day.

Although COVID-19 pandemic held many challenges for individuals, institutions and countries, it also opened the door to an exploration of the greater integration of ICT to support teaching and learning and to keep the academic program on track. These conditions heightened the possibility of exploring international collaboration in our course curricula. Internationalization of the curriculum and virtual exchanges are not new concepts (Jones et al., 2015), but the COVID-19 pandemic opened up increased opportunities to connect virtually and brought global issues into one's home and online lecture room. Lecturers globally were challenged to build research and teaching partnerships through collaborative online international learning (COIL) which had been an established practice in some HEIs (Lewis & O'Dowd, 2016).

In many HEIs, internationalization of the curriculum is supported in both policy and practice (Ji, 2020; Jooste & Hagenmeier, 2022; Robson & Wihlborg, 2019; Ward, 2016). There is broad support for educating critical and ethical thinking for global citizens in higher education and researchers in higher education emphasize global citizenship as a disposition incorporating an ethical, social, and professional understanding (Jones & Killick, 2013; Lilley et al., 2015; Slapac et al., 2023). Advances in technology

Social Justice Pedagogy and COIL

have helped to support internationalization at home through virtual exchanges and have promoted ‘internationalization at home’ by, for example, Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL) (Beelen & Jones, 2015). The concept of Virtual Exchange (VE) has been implemented in many HEIs to increase the intercultural dimensions of the curriculum and global citizenship education (Beelen, 2011; Beelen & Jones, 2015; Hauck et al., 2020; O’ Dowd, 2018, 2020).

In the context of teacher and higher education, COIL projects do not only bring an understanding of digital literacies for pedagogical practices, but they also embrace the concept of internationalization through students’ understanding of other cultures and exposure to diversified learning and teaching strategies with technology (Lilley et al., 2015). While COIL programs form one aspect of internationalization, they are not common practice in HEIs internationally. In the three HEIs participating in these COIL pilot programs, our COIL initiatives were either new, or one of only two such initiatives we were aware of in our institutions. COIL opened up opportunities for students to access engagement with international peers and to build their global and intercultural competence. It also opened up opportunities for students to participate in taking action to address local and global issues (Leibowitz & Bozalek, 2016).

Internationalization and Higher Education

Internationalization in higher education has been defined as the process aimed at the integration of global citizenship and intercultural competence concepts for the purpose of instruction of post-secondary education, with the objective being to contribute to diverse society and online learning in between studies and professional work (Bruhn, 2020; De Wit, 2011).

Internationalization at home as a virtual exchange gives students first hand online learning experiences of interacting with other students all over the world, while academic staff collaborate with colleagues from different cultures, regions, and countries. The interpretations of virtual exchange have emerged in different collaborations, for example, through comprehensive education and internationalization at home (IaH). IaH was introduced as a concept of teacher education in 1999 aimed to make students interculturally competent and enhance global teaching without leaving their home, remaining on their university campuses, and getting their credits from there. Students were offered new exchange options online by virtual collaboration with students abroad in collaboration with HEIs (Beelen, 2011; Beelen & Jones, 2015, Custer & Tuominen, 2017; Mundel, 2020).

COIL redefined internationalization in HEIs primarily in the area of global competence and teaching by enhancing internationalization of learning “at home” (Beelen, 2011; Beelen & Jones, 2015, Mundel, 2020). In Europe, Beelen and Jones (2015) identified three contested definitions of COIL: (1) internationalization at home and abroad, (2) Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) internationalized curriculum, and (3) campus internationalization. COIL provides an opportunity to participate in global teaching and intercultural learning.

In the South African context student activism and protests between 2015 and 2016 challenged lecturers to address the decolonization of the curriculum and to promote practices of social justice in their teaching and learning (Abraham, 2017; Lange, 2019). Almeida et al. (2019) argue that creating opportunities for students to engage and learn internationally is key to social justice in education. Based on their COIL research in South Africa, Naicker, Singh and van Genugten (2021) found that enablers to COIL were a structured course outline, students’ openness to COIL and increased academic self-efficacy. They identified the following key barriers to COIL implementation: technological challenges, language barriers, and partner dynamics. They recommend keeping a focus on student experiences in designing

Social Justice Pedagogy and COIL

COIL courses. These learnings have been central in our curriculum development in implementing our worldwide virtual collaboration through COIL.

Global consciousness approaches address global education and learning as a moral imperative and aim for collective goals such as social justice. These typically take a liberal, humanist, or cosmopolitan position, and the goals include universal human rights and intercultural perspectives (Conolly et al., 2019). Conolly et al. (2019) argue that measurements based on these approaches may include knowledge and skills in terms of understanding of human rights and social justice yet lack capacity to be applied across diverse contexts or universally and lack awareness on imbalance of power relations. They argue that global education and learning need critical approaches based on decolonial thinking (Conolly et al., 2019). These concerns raise particular challenges for academics engaged in international collaborative online learning programs, particularly within contexts where access to technology, electricity and connectivity to enable learning is compromised.

COIL Background and Global Citizenship Education

COIL programs provide an opportunity to participate in global teaching and intercultural learning by international collaboration at “home.” COIL is a pedagogical method (Gokcora, 2021), through digital technology, that encourages collaboration among place-bound students of different campuses to enhance their academic skills as well as to deepen their global engagement (Marcillo-Gómez & Desilus, 2016). COIL programs have been found to help prepare students for increasingly diverse and multicultural work environments globally (Rawal & Deardorff, 2021). Research on COIL (Rubin, 2017; Starke-Meyerring, 2010) asserts that, as a teaching paradigm, COIL is not simply to use technology or a technology platform for teaching, but it provides opportunities for students to develop cross-cultural awareness, as well as appreciate cultural diversity in a multicultural learning environment. Furthermore, these courses hold the potential to enrich student intercultural learning while working collaboratively with one another on projects to address globally relevant issues (Rubin, 2017; Starke-Meyerring, 2010). COIL programs hold opportunities for cross-cultural learning by bringing the world into various learning spaces, offering an international experience at home. Internalization at home (IaH) integrates global, international, and intercultural dimensions into the curriculum for all students within domestic learning environments. For the past two decades Virtual Exchange (VE) has been implemented in higher education to develop the intercultural dimension of curricula (Hauk et al., 2020; O’ Dowd, 2018, 2020).

Researchers in higher education have described the notion of global citizenship as a disposition incorporating an ethical, social, and professional understanding (Barrie, 2004; Lilley et al., 2015). Through collaborative courses, dimensions of social responsibility, awareness, and civic engagement (Morais & Ogden, 2011; Schattle, 2008), and developing a sense of “self in the world” (Killick, 2012, p. 13) can be enhanced. Global citizenship research has centered on international mobility with limited exploration of the process of global citizen learning. There appears to be broad support for educating critical and ethical thinking global citizens in higher education and the research literature suggests that university and stakeholder groups identify these dispositions of citizenship (Lilley et al., 2015).

Both the internalization of higher education and collaborative online international learning hold the potential for enhancing Global citizenship education (GCE); however, this depends on the values and intentions of the curriculum designers and funders. Global citizenship research has centered on international mobility with limited exploration of the process of global citizen learning. Guimarães and Finardi (2021) give GCE an alternative third space for promoting intercultural encounters in the international-

Social Justice Pedagogy and COIL

ization of higher education at home. Global citizenship education (GCE) aims to empower students to take active roles in local and globally educational societies. The UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) defines GCE as a form of education that aims to empower learners of all ages to assume active roles, both locally and globally, in building more peaceful, tolerant, inclusive, and secure societies. GCE has been used as a catchphrase and umbrella term by researchers and educators nationally and internationally stakeholders to refer to the context of internationalization of education in various levels and its relation to globalization and citizenship at home (Guimarães & Finardi, 2021).

Theoretical Framework: Participatory Parity: Nancy Fraser

To reflect on our engagement in two COIL pilot programs, we draw on the key dimensions of Fraser's (2008; 2009) normative framework related to social justice and particularly, on the notion of participatory parity. This normative framework has been used by numerous scholars to reflect on their pedagogical practices in higher education (Bozalek et al., 2020; de Kadt, 2020; Leibowitz & Bozalek, 2016).

Fraser's (2008, 2009) framework focuses on the economic, cultural, and political dimensions of social justice, which are regarded as being analytically separate, but also intertwined. These three dimensions correspond to the systems of redistribution, recognition and representation. The dimension of representation or the ability to participate as an equal is regarded by Fraser (2008; 2009) as key to enabling agency at an individual and collective level. According to Fraser (2008) and Leibowitz and Bozalek (2016) for social justice to be exercised, all three of these dimensions would need to be addressed in order for people to be able to socially interact and participate as full partners. Fraser (2008; 2009) argues that, if all conditions are met, then participatory parity can be achieved. In higher education, lecturers engaged in social justice pedagogy would need to consider what could prevent students from participating as equals in each of these dimensions.

Fraser (2008; 2009) also argues that there are either affirmative or transformative stances taken towards addressing social justice. From an affirmative perspective, unequal social arrangements would be addressed, while a transformative approach to social justice would address the root or structural causes of those factors at an economic, cultural, or political level, which prevent participatory parity (Leibowitz & Bozalek, 2016).

From an economic dimension (redistributive), participatory parity in higher education could be constrained by what Leibowitz and Bozalek (2016) identify as a lack of "access to transport, housing, electricity, health care, social literacies, and funding" (p.113) as well as differential fees and the contextual realities of students having to work to support themselves and family members. They argue that "Access to the Internet and Wi-Fi and ability to engage with digital literacies is important for participatory parity in higher education, both for students and for higher education themselves" (Leibowitz & Bozalek, 2016, p.113). Ameliorative approaches to social justice at an economic level include redistributing resources without addressing inequalities in the system. Transformative approaches would address and change who gets access to what resources and time such as time and resources for teaching and research (Leibowitz & Bozalek, 2016)

From a cultural dimension (recognition), the social arrangements, which influence respect and self-esteem could be prevented through certain cultural values or languages being valued over others, thus perpetuating unequal systems of recognition or misrecognition. Leibowitz and Bozalek (2016) argue that for social justice pedagogy to be enacted it is important to identify how perceived attributes of people are either valued or devalued and how this will impact their ability to participate. According to

Social Justice Pedagogy and COIL

Fraser (2008; 2009), institutionalized processes of misrecognition rather than psychological processes of valuing or devaluing are key. Leibowitz and Bozalek (2016) identify inequality in status to include the non-recognition of students' prior knowledge, attributes and values in the curriculum thus making them invisible. They argue for a critical review of which knowledge and whose knowledge and values get more respect and esteem than others, as well as which individuals or groups get valued or silenced. Leibowitz and Bozalek (2016) highlight the need to identify how the voices of students and academics are silenced through language, policies and cultural practices, as well as distribution of resources such as time for building relationality. They distinguish between affirmative and transformative approaches to addressing social justice pedagogy. From an affirmative perspective the focus would be placed on revaluing indigenous knowledge or ability, however from a transformative approach there is a need to destabilize "institutionalized cultural patterns through deconstructing binary categories." (p.114).

From a political dimension (representation), Fraser (2009) identifies representation at a local and global political level. Here the political voice people have or (do not have) to influence decisions that affect them, relates to representation. In higher education, Leibowitz and Bozalek (2016) argue that political representation would need to consider who is included or excluded from higher education pedagogies and opportunities. Fraser (2009) indicates that misrepresentation on a national level can be identified in contexts where groups may be prevented from participation due to the way political boundaries are set or through who is considered a member or not.

Leibowitz and Bozalek (2016) argue that mis-framing in higher education "occurs because of a focus on individual institutions rather than the system as a whole thus depoliticizing and mis-framing the gross inequalities in the education system as a whole and placing the responsibility on the individual institution" (p.114). They assert that from a transformational perspective, the structural injustices at a global level such as the impact of the digital divide and the different ability people in higher education have to access, produce and consume knowledge need to be addressed. An example they give of transformational approaches to addressing those affected across geopolitical contexts is for lecturers to engage in international social justice pedagogical practices which collectively raise concerns (Leibowitz & Bozalek, 2016)

For social justice to occur in pedagogical practices the economic, cultural and political dimensions that enable participatory parity must be engaged with. Drawing on their research into higher education, Bozalek and Zembylas (2017) argue that promoting social justice practices in higher education teaching and learning require what they refer to as an orientation towards justice at the societal level that nurtures relational values of solidarity, care, compassion and respect. In the section below, we will draw on the three dimensions of Fraser's (2008; 2009) normative framework to reflect on our COIL experiences.

MAIN FOCUS OF THE CHAPTER

Context, Participants and Methodological Procedures

In both pilot COIL programs, a participatory action research (PAR) design was used to capture the faculty participants' partnerships and inform the research and development process (Chambers, 2007; Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005). Participants involved five lecturers from two universities reflecting on an ongoing way on key learnings and challenges of their implementation of two COIL pilot collaborations, followed by recommendations. The PAR approach supports collaborative ownership and understanding for change and improved action by participants (Rudolph et al., 2008; Whitehead, 2012).

Social Justice Pedagogy and COIL

During the design and implementation of the two COIL pilots, the faculty involved in these projects met regularly as a professional learning community (PLC) via Zoom, and reflected upon the logistics, activities, equity issues, and challenges of the COIL courses. Data gathered from the ongoing reflections informed our findings and recommendations in this chapter. The PAR process included ongoing and iterative cycles of action and research by lecturers-researchers from University of the Western Cape (UWC, South Africa), the Oslo Metropolitan University (OsloMet, Norway) and the University of Missouri-St. Louis (UMSL, United States). The COIL collaboration was built into the curriculum and assessment design of both courses offered by HEIs. COIL synchronous meetings in both pilots involved specific activities for students to engage in and meet the learning goals. In this era of technology and e-learning, student teachers were encouraged to develop their skills at using technology and digital platforms to enhance learning. In this chapter, we use the terms “faculty”, “lecturers” or “academic staff” interchangeably.

The first pilot was implemented by three faculty members from UWC (second, third and fourth authors) and three faculty members from OsloMet (one of which is the fifth author of this chapter). The first pilot collaboration included ten student teachers (preservice teachers) in their third year of a B.Ed. Foundation Phase (Grades R to Grade 3 level teachers) from UWC and seven, third year Senior Phase (Grades 6 to 10 level teachers) from the OsloMet linked to the development of digital stories. Their task was to develop a digital story they could use in their Teaching Practice and eventually, in their classrooms, linked to themes of social cohesion and inclusion. The goals of the Pilot 1 COIL course were to:

- Develop global online teaching and critical citizenship and awareness in collaboration;
- Develop a digital story related to teaching in diverse and global classrooms and multicultural learning environments;
- Reflect upon the value of traditional stories and indigenous knowledge and respect for local language and heritage;
- Explore cultural and linguistic diversity through collaborative learning.

The second grant-based COIL pilot study was developed by two faculty from the University of Missouri-St. Louis (UMSL) and University of the Western Cape (UWC) (first and second authors of this chapter) and implemented for 12 weeks from February to May 2022. From UMSL, 45 graduate students (total students from two sections taught by two different instructors) enrolled in two in-sequence sections of the action research 8-week online courses took part in the COIL collaboration. The graduate students were inservice teachers seeking different majors depending on their main areas of specialization: elementary, secondary, and special education, and, with a few exceptions, the majority were full-time teachers with little to several years of teaching experience, with average ages between 20s to 40s. The two action research courses (Action Research I and Action Research Capstone) were the last two in the students’ program of study before graduation with a master’s degree. From UWC, to keep the groups manageable, 80 students out of 370 students participated in the COIL synchronous meetings as team leaders from a fourth-year teacher development course on introduction to research, and reported back to their groups. The students did not have to submit a project together; instead, they talked about the action research related topics and literature review activities with their group.

The goals for the Pilot 2 COIL course were:

- To develop global online teaching and critical citizenship and awareness in collaboration;
- To explore cultural diversity through collaborative international online learning;

Social Justice Pedagogy and COIL

- To enhance respect for local challenges and research needs in different teaching contexts;
- (Only American students) to develop an action research study related to teaching in diverse and global classrooms and multicultural learning environments;
- To share literature review tips and benefits of developing a literature review;
- (Only American students) to share interventions and modifications (changes) to research plans within students' own socio-cultural context;
- To explore contextual similarities and challenges related to their topics;
- To discuss the importance of context as action researchers and to reflect on the value of COIL in teacher development.

SOLUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Using Fraser's (2008, 2009) normative framework for social justice, we explore with examples the implications of social justice pedagogy within the two COIL pilot courses. Analysis of reflective session recordings was done using thematic analysis related to the economic, cultural, and political dimensions of Fraser's (2008, 2009) normative framework. Here, we reflect on the aspects of technological access, time, culture, language, and context as they influence participatory parity, discussing our findings, solutions, and recommendations.

ECONOMIC DIMENSION**Pilot 1: COIL Study**

The digital divide between the participants in the Global South and the North had an influence on our ability to participate and connect throughout our collaboration. Faculty planning at UWC was interrupted several times due to internet issues. Student connectivity was also impacted a few times during the synchronous meetings due to inadequate network coverage or bandwidth issues. In addition, our students had limited technological knowledge and experience with digital story software applications (for example, students were only exposed to a few digital story creation applications such as, Moviemaker and Photo Story).

The University of the Western Cape (UWC) students were a very diverse group, whose socio-economic circumstances varied much, with a few coming from marginalized communities; therefore they experienced either a lack of resources or limited access to resources such as laptops, high-speed internet connection, Wi-Fi or data. This resulted in some students not having access to IKAMVA, the online learning platform, and/or not being able to attend synchronous meetings or download recordings of meetings (although the university had allocated students and staff some data). Load shedding, cable theft and bandwidth also caused connectivity challenges. These challenges impacted negatively students and faculty ability to participate as equals.

The OsloMet students also experienced technological challenges in getting access to the UWC platform IKAMVA due to their lack of familiarity with this platform. In addition, they sometimes could not attend synchronous meetings and collaborate with the UWC students due to time constraints and demands of other programs they were involved in.

Social Justice Pedagogy and COIL

While there were technical and resource constraints to participatory parity, there were also factors which supported increased capacity for participatory parity. The COIL initiative introduced student teachers and faculty in both institutions to various new innovative technologies and provided them with various new skill sets in this area, which could increase opportunities for participatory parity in the future.

The students took some immediate action at a local and global level to address the challenges they faced with connectivity. At a local level, they started a buddy system, and were sharing laptops and data in order to complete tasks. Through collaborative online opportunities, student teachers shared their lived experiences, such as explaining what load shedding is and how it affects their economic situation. Students and faculty in the North were sensitized to challenges South African students and faculty faced in buying data; accessing electricity; and having to take additional transport to internet cafés in order to attend synchronous meetings or work on their tasks.

Pilot 2: COIL Study

Some of the challenges related to the economic dimension were also related to technological issues, specifically to connectivity, load shedding times and cable theft (in South Africa) which also impacted students' ability to participate as equals. With few rare exceptions, all American students had Internet access but not all the South African students. For example, not all South African students had uninhibited access to a computer or cell phones to connect to the online meetings or to other students when they were available. Both groups of students had diverse socio-economic status and different kinds of roles and daily responsibilities arrangements.

For example, some students were not able to attend meetings due to their work schedules (and time difference) and or due to specific religious or Observance holidays. Others were also parents and had to take care of their children at home or driving them to sport practices or other extra-curricular activities while trying to be active in the respective meeting. In these cases, some students were using their phones to stay connected and be part of the group activities.

Disparity in terms of class size seemed like a daunting task (there were approximately 80 students from UWC invited into the contact sessions out of a class of 370, and 45 students from UMSL). Not all students from UWC were permitted to attend the COIL session, due to large numbers and had to elect representatives to attend on their behalf.

Discussion of Key Findings

Different resourcing of HEIs and faculty workloads impacted the ability to innovate and get the technical and financial support to run these programs. Often faculty met during the weekends or after hours to conduct the synchronous sessions; however, during these times there was not technical and logistical support to draw on in all three institutions to make this participation possible. Faculty thus had to rely on their one resource and time.

Students at UWC came from predominantly working class and middle class backgrounds while students from UMSL and OsloMet were from middle class socio-economic backgrounds. The two campuses have a stronger economic funding base to draw from than UWC in supporting student and faculty resourcing and support.

Due to high student numbers and no technical support in Pilot 2, decisions had to be made to limit student numbers in synchronous sessions to enable our ability to manage the collaboration. Consciously

Social Justice Pedagogy and COIL

excluding students due to logistical, technical, and administrative resource constraints at an institutional or national level limits the representation of students and staff and thus, participatory parity.

At all three HEIs the provision of e-learning assistance over the weekends and after hours was limited to the support of student assistance. A common experience across all three HEIs was that support after hours for ICT is not currently a paid resource and access to support staff for technical support are either non-existent or limited.

With the South African and American groups the planning of synchronous sessions after the changes in summer and winter time zones caused some confusion and re-planning, which did not make it possible for some participants to be represented in the sessions.

Not all students were on the same level, having technical skills in using different technological platforms. Through this collaboration, all students and faculty were exposed to different ICT that they could use for teaching and learning and connecting in an online environment. For example, the Norwegian students' engagement through resources exposed them to more technological possibilities. Due to load shedding, the South African students were limited in their exploration of technological possibilities and developing what they were doing. When they were in contact with peers in Norway, for example, there was only an hour time zone difference. COIL as educational concepts should be developed as time free zones internationally.

Recommendations to Enhance Participatory Parity for Both COIL Partnerships

Due to technology issues and class sizes, educators should also consider the logistics (dates and times to meet that work for both groups, any holidays or Observances that could impact student availability, possible technology issues and ways to overcome them).

For example, to ensure all students can participate on an equal footing, faculty need to reflect upon the group sizes, dynamics, and the feasibility of working with an unequal number of students during the synchronous meetings. In our case, to make the groups manageable, the South African students were divided in groups with group leaders, and those two groups leaders attended the COIL synchronous meetings with UMSL students (in groups of 4 to 6, with 2 UMSL students, and 2 to 4 UWC students) and reported back to their groups. UWC students also communicated with their colleagues in case they could not attend the meeting and had someone else from their group join the COIL meeting and report back.

Developing greater opportunities for smaller groups to meet synchronously on their own without the lecturers to work on a joint activity could provide for more students to get access to the experience and increase opportunities for connectivity group leaders to model aspects of larger synchronous sessions and to also share recordings and resources from these larger sessions. Additionally, developing empathy and awareness of students' economic hardships of COIL participants and their own students is a very important aspect of COIL. Educators need to be flexible and provide alternative activities or make-up assignments if students cannot attend the COIL synchronous meetings.

Internationalization at "home" means mobility for all to be able to access and to connect to technology so that one can experience an international connection with social peers on an equal footing. In order to transform this the social structures and institutional frameworks (Fraser, 2008; 2009) which make internationalization possible would need to be critically engaged with to ensure participatory parity. To challenge students to learn about each other's cultures, build trust, teamwork and effective intercultural collaborations, instructors should provide opportunities for students to discuss educational topics or practices they are engaging in locally but are experiencing globally. Also, alternatives for missed COIL

Social Justice Pedagogy and COIL

synchronous meetings due to technology/connectivity issues should be offered either through possibilities for off-line engagement in group activities (e.g.) we used Google docs for teams to connect with each other and/or through other low cost alternatives such as email or WhatsApp.

CULTURAL DIMENSION

Pilot 1: COIL Study

The UWC students participating in Pilot 1 were a very diverse group with extremely diverse socio-economic circumstances, cultural contexts and language diversity. Most UWC students had also never traveled abroad while the OsloMet students were familiar with international travel. Due to the lack of familiarity in engaging with students from abroad, some South African students were a bit reluctant to voice their opinions at the onset of the pilot.

English was the language of communication used by students and faculty although English was not the home language of both groups of students or faculty. However, it was a common language they used to communicate that enabled participation and one could assume they most probably had their home language in their heads when they were sharing ideas. When the whole group met, they had to communicate in English in spite of their different levels of proficiency in English.

Teacher students realized that although they lived in different countries with different cultures, there were many similarities identified in their experience of being in classrooms and as being young people. They were all preservice teachers and shared similar experiences such as the anxiety and excitement of examinations and especially, Teaching Practice (practicum). The students prepared the task together as a group, in English, although it was not their home language. As the pilot progressed, students gradually became less insecure, more aware of different cultural ways of perceiving the world and felt more empowered by the virtual experience.

As a result of the interaction and discussions between the Norwegian and South African students and the development of their digital stories, faculty noted that the reflections of their students had greater depth and insight into global issues and concerns.

Pilot 2: COIL Study

The South African students involved in COIL Pilot 2 were multilingual and came from diverse cultural backgrounds. The South African students were used to engaging in diverse language and ethnic contexts. Most participants from UWC were student teachers from Black working and middle class backgrounds, the majority of whom had not traveled outside of the country.

American students, although teaching in diverse schools, were mostly monolingual, female, and Caucasian, living in St. Louis or surrounding areas. The discrepancy between the workforce (teachers) and the diversity of their students (racial, cultural, socio-economic) is often pointed out as an issue to be addressed by researchers and teachers as classrooms around the world are becoming increasingly diverse (Song et al., 2023). During the synchronous meetings, students were asked to share their cultural contexts related to their topics, and were surprised to discover many similar issues (e.g.) classroom management, technology, family involvement, etc. The American students were inservice teachers with different years of experiences in schools, attending a Midwestern metropolitan, public, land grant, research institution

Social Justice Pedagogy and COIL

serving the most diverse and economically important region in St. Louis, taking most courses in their graduate program online due to workload, family responsibilities and/or pandemic. UMSL is considered one of the most culturally and ethnically diverse campuses in Missouri.

Discussion of Key Findings

The COIL programs offered students the opportunity to connect with international students from a range of contexts thus broadening their international contact and giving them some insights into the language and cultural context in another country and in a range of Norwegian, South African and American classrooms.

The language of communication used in the COIL sessions was English although English was not the home language of the majority of students in the Pilot 1 or Pilot 2 COIL studies. However, English was used as the main language to support learning and communication in the synchronous and asynchronous international meetings. A greater acknowledgement and recognition of the range of languages spoken and used in the groups, should have been given as well as a greater recognition of how language ability had an impact on constraining interaction and confidence in participation.

Recommendations to Enhance Participatory Parity

Educators should strive to have a better understanding of their students' local challenges and include cultural icebreakers and discussion boards to build trust, understanding of circumstances and cultural awareness. Educators should provide students with constant opportunities for self-reflections to raise awareness of their own cultural and language competencies. Language competency is a key aspect of cultural competency. COIL lecturers should ensure that the issue of language and language competency are put on the agenda for critical reflection. In addition, there should be a conscious engagement with opportunities to use different languages through icebreakers and opportunities to share reflection on the effects of using particular languages for communication and how this influences participation, recognition and engagement.

In virtual exchanges like COIL, students could discuss cultural similarities and differences. In our case, for example, during the synchronous meetings, students were prompted to discuss their research topics in relation to their cultural challenges and their contexts as impacted by traditions and cultural norms. In their reflections, they also discussed their goals towards improving their cultural competency beginning to proficient or advanced levels, through activities, resources, partnerships or teaching practices. It was clear that there was a yearning from all students to want to learn about each other's cultures and how it influenced their practice and research decisions as preservice or in-service teachers.

Building in opportunities for collaborative action research related to research areas of common interest in supporting social justice pedagogy in classrooms and lecture rooms could be an area to expand in on course program curriculum in order to support students in researching and addressing areas of common concern internationally such as multilingual classrooms.

SUNY COIL Center (2022) cautions educators of several areas in which COIL collaborations may run into challenges: Trust, Time, Language and Culture, encouraging educators to prepare in advance engaging activities, including icebreakers and team building activities. It is very important for educators to scaffold such activities at the intercultural level. Student agency towards active engagement is also very important in designing COIL activities, so students could feel empowered to make decisions during the

Social Justice Pedagogy and COIL

activities, either related to roles and division of tasks within groups (organization), choices on how to communicate beyond the synchronous meetings, or choices of activities and ways to accomplish them.

POLITICAL DIMENSION

Pilot 1: COIL Study

At the beginning of Pilot 1, some UWC students felt a bit overwhelmed by connecting with international peers, especially because they had never traveled abroad. They were thus initially hesitant to voice their opinions. They also did not know what to expect from the interactions and were unsure about participating as equals with the OsloMet students.

All students gained some knowledge and skills to make sense of social cohesion and social justice. They were encouraged to think critically about their circumstances, and reflect critically about society and their roles as future teachers who have to educate and guide future generations to deal with challenges and elements of inequality within society.

The pilot contributed to global citizenship education on social justice. Specifically, it helped students to make more nuanced and informed decisions, to learn about different value systems and conditions in other countries and to work together with students from another country. In co-developing digital stories, the students were also able to raise awareness of issues of migration and inclusion.

Disparities in abilities to connect due to changes in time zones were not an issue for participants that only had a limited number of time zones affecting participation between countries in similar time zones although seasonally different in the North and South.

Pilot 2: COIL Study

On the UMSL side, the action research projects were chosen based on the inservice teachers' context within their schools and sometimes based on their additional roles within school (co-teachers, department leaders, etc.). The administration had to be aware and approve their projects based on the needs and the models used in schools (e.g. differentiated instruction, socio-emotional skills; school-wide management; co-teaching; parental involvement; new programs or technology tools in different subject matters). Sometimes, the graduate students' data collection was interrupted by school testing schedules, short holidays, teacher professional development days and /or students or teachers themselves being absent due to the pandemic.

The UWC students selected an area of action research based on their experience in schools and classroom challenges identified. The work in collaborative groups in identifying a research focus was linked broadly to a topic that the UMSL students had also identified. Sharing common research concerns raised student awareness of factors affecting teaching and learning internationally, which they were able to relate to such as language, cultural diversity, inclusion and disparities in resource provisioning of education. Students were stimulated to identify areas for deepened action and research across continents. While students did not collaborate on research focus areas with the international partners, they were able to deepen their thinking and analysis of issues that required research attention both locally and internationally, thus opening up their horizons.

Social Justice Pedagogy and COIL

The age and experience difference between the UWC students and UMSL students did influence the power dynamics within synchronous meetings. As the UWC students were more often in a learning role while UMSL felt like they were in a mentoring role. Acknowledging these power differences more overtly during the COIL meetings needed to have been done.

Discussion of Key Findings

Disparities in abilities to connect due to different time zones and seasons had implications for all students as staff between the Global South, North and West. As the winter and summer time zones change between countries, this has implications for lecturers and staff having to decide when it would be most convenient to meet and who would be able to make these meeting times. This was often a challenge as synchronous meetings had to take place over weekends and either affected early morning or late evening agenda to enable meeting. Being mindful of sacrifices both students and faculty needed to make to reap the benefits of online engagement was important in enabling participation.

Internationalization at “home” remains possible as a result of internet connectivity and strengthened collaboration between project partners and institutions. While institutions have little agency in relation to power cuts, the curriculum can be planned to ensure that issues which limit participatory parity are challenged at a personal and institutional level. At a personal level, this would include a sensitivity and awareness of language, cultural and economic issues that prevent participatory parity. At an institutional level, it would include the strengthening of policy, funding and administrative support and teaching load commitments for international collaboration. Currently, the ability to access additional institutional funding to support international collaboration tends to be focused on access funding in the Global North or West to funding future collaboration and particularly the possibility of students from both institutions being able to experience engagement in international programs as a result of an actual exchange.

The languages of engagement and the knowledge and values students were exposed to needed careful consideration in the co-curricular planning. During Pilot 1 and 2 both sets of lecturers were aware of identifying issues of concern both students and faculty could experience. The language of engagement and communication both in the synchronous and asynchronous meetings was primarily English as the *lingua franca* however, student and academic staff competency level in English varied. Language did influence the extent to which faculty and students felt confident to participate.

Recommendations to Enhance Participatory Parity for Both COIL Courses

It is necessary to involve students and faculty consciously at reflecting upon aspects of international engagement when they experience mis-recognition at either a national or international level which limits participatory parity. Musara et al. (2021) make the assertion that “Social justice can only be realized when all students are included in educational practices and processes in a meaningful way, and when distribution of material resources is equitable along with cultural recognition and representation in systems.” (p.57). Our experiences on these two pilot COIL programs have highlighted areas that require more attention in order to ensure that participatory parity can be enabled. These include lecturers and preservice and inservice teachers needing to familiarize themselves with the concepts of social justice and participatory parity.

Social Justice Pedagogy and COIL

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

As we reflected on our key learnings from these two COIL pilot courses, we ask ourselves: How can COIL help our students think about their internationalized learning and research? How are we helping our students to become global citizens? What are we doing in our teacher education programs? What learning can we draw in from these pilots to move forward into the future?

Students need to be exposed to such courses and different cultural contexts. By connecting them globally, they are able to see their local contexts and issues in different ways (not just from a national perspective), shaping the international arena of different complex views.

The internationalization of the curriculum should include students' and faculty understandings of other cultures, and diversify learning and teaching strategies through technology. Institutions should provide opportunities for internationalization at home via COIL in teacher and leadership development. There should also be opportunities to create long-lasting communities of practice, self-reflection and reflective practices; and opportunities for collaborative action research (students and faculty).

COIL initiatives can provide faculty with opportunities for staff development and academic advancement. In our experience, COIL partnerships provided opportunities for collaborative learning and co-teaching, as well as the ability to participate in innovative research with international colleagues and to access research grants. This opened up opportunities for international conference presentations and publications, thus furthering the scholarship of teaching and learning at a local and international level.

At an institutional level, greater human and financial resources need to be put into supporting COIL curriculum development and delivery to enable participatory parity. This should include acknowledgement time and workload contributions, the provision of technical support after hours and on weekends.

Ensuring the careful planning and design of COIL programs to support inclusion and participatory parity requires careful attention to a number of aspects at a course and institutional level to ensure participatory parity. Key aspects include the ability to access technological support and assistance after normal working hours; an acknowledgement of time costs included for innovation and co-planning under staff workload allocation; and the ability of faculty and students to access technology and connectivity.

Faculty should find ways to model pedagogical practices related to COIL, and create international online communities that facilitate opportunities for students and staff to address local and global issues with empathy and compassion as well as renewed insight into how they can take action for change.

CONCLUSION

In summary, this chapter holds lessons for academics who aim to deepen their research and practice in relation to social justice pedagogy, advancing equity through COIL inspired collaborations in global partnerships and promoting global citizenship through teacher education and development. Such initiatives are necessary to increase the focus upon global citizenship education. Our students became aware of one another's backgrounds and being citizens in their respective countries and the world. In Pilot 1, the development of digital stories and their content for future use in classrooms to raise awareness of issues of inclusion and social cohesion helped to provide student teachers with resources they could share and use in their classrooms to broaden the global competence of their learners. In Pilot 2, possibilities for exploring the sharing of research articles related to common and diverse problems and research concerns was experienced. In synchronous meetings, students and staff were able to address issues of concerns,

Social Justice Pedagogy and COIL

and think of them locally with a global perspective. When discussing the choices on topics on action research within their socio-cultural-political contexts, the self and group reflections highlighted common pedagogical imperatives such as, multilingualism and psychosocial learning barriers that required research and action to improve practice. In both pilots the building of relationships with one another through the COIL experience and the modeling of a COIL course, opened up the potential for future collaboration between students and faculty.

There are a number of benefits for students and faculty to be engaged in such international collaboration, from connecting diverse knowledge and perspectives with international partners to thinking of new ways about the world, such as through reflective and intercultural dialogues. Teacher students can also engage in either collaborative or cooperative tasks depending on the COIL inspired goals and measures. By meeting regularly and engaging in reflections, discussions and tasks synchronously or asynchronously, teacher students and lecturers can build an international community.

We also identified a number of areas that both faculty and students needed to be aware of with regard to limitations in ensuring participatory parity through COIL. At an economic level these included differences in student and faculty access to data and cost of data and bandwidth as well as access to electricity; different access to online devices; as well as privacy in terms of being able to access private spaces within which to communicate online in different time zones and contexts.

Opportunities for synchronous learning had to be planned over weekends, however, in all three institutions computer laboratories on campus did not provide any support after hours and on weekends. At institutional level, resources need to be invested in technical support after hours and on weekends to support participatory parity in COIL programs.

At a cultural level, participatory parity could be limited by learner confidence and language barriers to engagement with an international audience, and national and cultural norms in forms of interpersonal engagement. Careful reflection and planning for the languages of communication need to be done in synchronous and asynchronous in an ongoing way. Students and faculty need to be encouraged to speak, hear and engage in languages they are not familiar with. During the virtual learning environment, the well-being needs of students need to be considered.

At a political level participatory parity through COIL programs could allow students and faculty who would not have had access opportunities to engage internationally otherwise, to experience internationalization at “Home”. Through virtual mobility students and faculty could be afforded the experience to act as global citizens and to build up international partnerships and experiences.

Although there are challenges to participatory parity, in our experience the COIL programs provide excellent possibilities for inservice and preservice teachers and lecturers to link their local classroom/school/district issues globally through comparative international collaborative international research and teaching. These experiences do provide opportunities for global citizen education and research as all involved could raise issues related to equity, social justice and inclusion. COIL provided opportunities for our students and faculty to engage with one another and build positive attitudes and values. Although our COIL collaborations were at a small scale and had a limited duration, building international relationships holds the potential for our students and faculty to find ways to take collective action to challenge injustice (such as, xenophobic attitudes and discriminatory political agendas) in order to work towards participatory parity in both teaching and in creating opportunities for internationalization at “home”.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Thank you to all our students who participated in these two COIL pilot courses. COIL Pilot 1 was an unfunded program. COIL Pilot 2 was funded through the University of Missouri South African Education Program (UMSAEP) received by the first author in 2021 from UMSL for COIL partnership with second author from UWC. Special thanks to UMSL, UWC and OsloMet for supporting these international partnerships.

REFERENCES

- Abraham, I. B. (2017). Review of fees must fall: Student revolt, decolonisation and governance in South Africa. *The Australasian Review of African Studies*, 38(2), 117-119. doi:10.22160/22035184/ARAS-2017-38-1
- Ali, W. (2020). Online and remote learning in higher education institutes: A necessity in light of COVID-19 pandemic. *Higher Education Studies*, 10(3), 16-25. doi:10.5539/hes.v10n3p16
- Almeida, J., Robson, S., Morosini, M., & Baranzeli, C. (2019). Understanding internationalization at home: Perspectives from the Global North and South. *European Educational Research Journal*, 18(2), 200-217. doi:10.1177/1474904118807537
- Aristovnik, A., Keržič, D., Ravšelj, D., Tomaževič, N., & Umek, L. (2020). Impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on life of higher education students: A global perspective. *Sustainability (Basel)*, 12(20), 1-34. doi:10.3390/u12208438
- Barrie, S. C. (2004). A research-based approach to generic graduate attributes policy. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 23(3), 261-275. doi:10.1080/0729436042000235391
- Beelen, J. (2011). Internationalisation at home in a global perspective: A critical survey of the 3rd Global Survey Report of IAU. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 8(2), 249-264. doi:10.7238/rusc.v8i2.1094
- Beelen, J., & Jones, E. (2015). Redefining internationalisation at home. In A. Curai, L. Matei, R. Pricopie, J. Salmi, & P. Scott (Eds.), *The European higher education area: Between critical reflections and future policies* (pp. 67-80). Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-20877-0_5
- Bozalek, V., Hölscher, D., & Zembylas, M. (Eds.). (2020). *Nancy Fraser and participatory parity: Reframing social justice in South African higher education*. Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780429055355
- Bozalek, V., & Zembylas, M. (2017). Diffraction or reflection? Sketching the contours of two methodologies in educational research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education : QSE*, 30(2), 111-127. doi:10.1080/09518398.2016.1201166
- Brew, A. (2007). *Approaches to the scholarship of teaching and learning*. Sydney University Press.
- Bruhn, E. (2020). *Virtual internationalization in higher education*. WBV Media.

Social Justice Pedagogy and COIL

Chambers, R. (2007). From PRA to PLA and pluralism: Practice and theory (No. 286). The University of Sussex Brighton.

Conolly, J., Lehtomäki, E., & Scheunpflug, A. (2019). *Measuring global competencies: A critical assessment*. The Academic Network on Global Education and Learning Briefing Paper. <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5f6decace4ff425352eddb4a/t/5fc8eeb922891c6875c8a465/1637594418818/measuring-global-competencies.pdf>

Custer, L., & Tuominen, A. (2017). Bringing “Internationalization at Home” opportunities to community colleges: Design and assessment of an online exchange activity between U.S. and Japanese students. *Teaching Sociology*, 45(4), 347–357. doi:10.1177/0092055X16679488

de Kadt, E. (2020). Promoting social justice in teaching and learning in higher education through professional development. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 25(7), 872–887. doi:10.1080/13562517.2019.1617685

De Wit, H. (2011). Globalisation and internationalisation of higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 8(2), 241–248.

Fraser, N. (2008). Reframing justice in a globalizing world. In K. Olson (Ed.), *Adding insult to injury: Nancy Fraser debates her critics* (pp. 273–291). Verso.

Fraser, N. (2009). *Scales of justice: Reimagining political space in a globalizing world*. Columbia University.

Gokcora, D. (2021). Benefits of collaborative online international learning projects. *Academia Letters Article*, 202. Advance online publication. doi:10.20935/AL202

Guimarães, F. F., & Finardi, K. R. (2021). Global citizenship education (GCE) in internationalisation: COIL as alternative Thirdspace. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 19(5), 641–657. doi:10.1080/14767724.2021.1875808

Hauck, M., Müller-Hartmann, A., Rienties, B., & Rogaten, J. (2020). Approaches to researching digital-pedagogical competence development in VE-based teacher education. *Journal of Virtual Exchange*, 3(SD), 5–35. doi:10.21827/jve.3.36082

Ji, Y. (2020). Embedding and facilitating intercultural competence development in internationalization of the curriculum of higher education. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*, 9(3), 13–19. doi:10.5430/jct.v9n3p13

Jones, E., Coelen, R., Beelen, J., & De Wit, H. (Eds.). (2015). *Global and local internationalization*. Springer.

Jones, E., & Killick, D. (2013). Graduate attributes and the internationalized curriculum: Embedding a global outlook in disciplinary learning outcomes. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 17(2), 165–182. doi:10.1177/1028315312473655

Jooste, N., & Hagenmeier, C. (2022). Policy framework for the internationalisation of higher education in South Africa: A compass for comprehensive internationalisation? *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 26(4), 415–435. doi:10.1177/10283153221105318

Social Justice Pedagogy and COIL

Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (2005). *Participatory action research: Communicative action and the public sphere*. Sage Publications Ltd.

Killick, D. (2012). Seeing ourselves-in-the-world: Developing global citizenship through international mobility. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 16(4), 372–389. doi:10.1177/1028315311431893

Lange, L. (2019). The institutional curriculum, pedagogy and the decolonisation of the South African University. In J. Jansen (Ed.), *Decolonisation in universities: The politics of knowledge* (pp. 79–99). Wits University Press. doi:10.18772/22019083351.9

Leibowitz, B., & Bozalek, V. (2016). The scholarship of teaching and learning from a social justice perspective. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 21(2), 109–122. doi:10.1080/13562517.2015.1115971

Lewis, T., & O’Dowd, R. (2016). *Online intercultural exchange*. Routledge.

Lilley, K., Barker, M., & Harris, N. (2015). Educating global citizens: A good ‘idea’ or an organisational practice? *Higher Education Research & Development*, 34(5), 957–971. doi:10.1080/07294360.2015.1011089

Marcillo-Gómez, M., & Desilus, B. (2016). Collaborative online international learning experience in practice opportunities and challenges. *Journal of Technology Management & Innovation*, 11(1), 30–35. doi:10.4067/S0718-27242016000100005

Morais, D., & Ogden, A. (2011). Initial development and validation of the global citizenship scale. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 15(5), 445–466. doi:10.1177/1028315310375308

Mundel, J. (2020). International virtual collaboration in advertising courses: Building international and intercultural skills from home. *Journal of Advertising Education*, 24(2), 112–132. doi:10.1177/1098048220948522

Musara, E., Grant, C., & Vorster, J. A. (2021). Inclusion as social justice: Nancy Fraser’s theory in the South African context. *Handbook of Social Justice Interventions in Education*, 39–58.

Naicker, A., Singh, E., & van Genugten, T. (2021). Collaborative online international learning (COIL): Preparedness and experiences of South African students. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 59(5), 499–510. doi:10.1080/14703297.2021.1895867

O’Dowd, R. (2018). From telecollaboration to virtual exchange: State-of-the-art and the role of UNI Collaboration in moving forward. *Journal of Virtual Exchange*, 1, 1–23. doi:10.14705/rpnet.2018.jve.1

O’Dowd, R. (2020). A transnational model of virtual exchange for global citizenship education. *Language Teaching*, 53(4), 477–490. doi:10.1017/S0261444819000077

Rawal, R., & Deardorff, D. K. (2021). *Intercultural competences for all*. In *Digital experiences of international students: Challenging assumptions and rethinking engagement*. *Internationalization in higher education series*. Routledge.

Rhoads, R., & Szelényi, K. (2011). *Global citizenship and the university: Advancing social life and relations in an interdependent world*. Stanford University Press. doi:10.1515/9780804777803

Robson, S., & Wihlborg, M. (2019). Internationalisation of higher education: Impacts, challenges and future possibilities. *European Educational Research Journal*, 18(2), 127–134. doi:10.1177/1474904119834779

Social Justice Pedagogy and COIL

Rubin, J. (2017). Embedding Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL) at higher education institutions. *Internationalization of Higher Education*, 2, 27-44. <https://studyabroad.uic.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/256/2020/08/Rubin-Embedding-Collaborative-Online-International-Learning-at-Higher-Education-Institutions.pdf>

Rudolph, N., Monson, J., Collett, K., & Sonn, B. (2008). *How to build a caring school community*. Children's Institute, University of Cape Town and South African Democratic Teachers' Union. http://www.ci.org.za/site/includes/content/hivprogrammes/projects/caring_schools/caring_schools.htm

Schattle, H. (2008). *The practices of global citizenship*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Slapac, A., Coppersmith, S., & Cheng, J. (2023). Global competence development through the lens of graduate students in action research courses. In C. E. Ullom & N. Guler (Eds.), *At school in the world: Developing globally engaged teachers* (pp. 98–117). Rowman & Littlefield.

Song, K. H., Kerkhoff, S. N., & Slapac, A. (2023). Educating racially, culturally, and linguistically diverse children in the global era: The world at home and at home in the world. In J. Chitiyo & Z. Pietrantonio (Eds.), *Social justice and culturally-affirming education in K-12 settings* (pp.1-22). IGI Global. doi:10.4018/978-1-6684-6386-4.ch001

Starke-Meyerring, D. (2010). Globally networked learning environments: Reshaping the intersections of globalization and e-learning in higher education. *E-Learning and Digital Media*, 7(2), 27–132. doi:10.2304/elea.2010.7.2.27

SUNY COIL Center. (2022). *COIL Design Workshop*. <https://coil.suny.edu/professional-development/>

Ward, H. H. (2016). *Internationalization in action: Connecting classrooms: Using online technology to deliver global learning*. American Council on Education (ACE). <https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/Connecting-Classrooms-Using-Online-Technology-to-Deliver-Global-Learning.pdf>

Whitehead, J. (2012). Educational research for social change with living educational theories. *Educational Research for Social Change*, 1(1), 5-21. <http://www.mandela.ac.za/helpingteachers/ERSC%20VOL1%20NO1%20APRIL2012/ERSC%20Edition%20Vol%201%20no%201%20All%20Article%202026%20April%202012.pdf#page=8>

ADDITIONAL READING

Beelen, J., Wimpenny, K., & Rubin, J. (2021). Internationalisation in the classroom and questions of alignment: Embedding COIL in an internationalised curriculum. In J. Beelen, K. Wimpenny, & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Reshaping international teaching and learning in higher education* (pp. 29–45). Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780429278075-2

Social Justice Pedagogy and COIL

de la Garza, A., & Maher, C. (2022). Decolonising the film curriculum through South–North collaborative online international learning (COIL) initiatives. *Film Education Journal*, 5(1), 34–40. doi:10.14324/FEJ.05.1.04

Gokcora, D., & Oenbring, R. (2021). Experiential learning across borders: Virtual exchange and global social justice. *Experiential Learning & Teaching in Higher Education*, 4(2), 55–60. <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/elthe/vol4/iss2/12>

Guimarães, F. F., & Finardi, K. R. (2021). Global citizenship education (GCE) in internationalisation: COIL as alternative Thirdspace. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 19(5), 641–657. doi:10.1080/14767724.2021.1875808

Rhoads, R., & Szelényi, K. (2011). *Global citizenship and the university: Advancing social life and relations in an interdependent world*. Stanford University Press. doi:10.1515/9780804777803

Rubin, J., & Guth, S. (Eds.). (2022). *The guide to COIL Virtual Exchange: Implementing, growing, and sustaining Collaborative Online International Learning*. Stylus.

Ullom, C. E., & Guler, N. (Eds.). (2023). *At school in the world: Developing globally engaged teachers*. Rowman & Littlefield.

KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL): Creates cross -cultural learning by bringing the world into various learning spaces, offering an international experience at home.

Global Citizen: A global citizen is someone who identifies as being part of an emerging world community and whose actions help define the communities’ global values and practices.

Global Citizenship Education (GCE): Aims to empower students to take active roles in locally and globally educational societies. Global citizen is someone who identifies as being part of an emerging world community and whose actions help define the communities’ global values and practices.

Information and Communications Technologies (ICT): Is the infrastructure and component that enable digital or virtual interactions.

Internalization at Home (IaH): Integrate global, international, and intercultural dimensions into the curriculum for all students within domestic learning environments.

Participatory Action Research (PAR): Is a method which involves teachers to investigate a problem to solve in practice, infusing global citizenship education within teacher students learning.

Professional Learning Communities (PLC): Is a method to promote collaborative learning among colleagues to ensure professional learning in practice.

Virtual Exchange (VE): Refer to telecollaboration, virtual mobility or online intercultural exchange among others, the student mobility can take place in learning environments globally between domestics.