Special Issue IT.A.CÀ

FUORI LUOGO

Journal of Sociology of Territory, Tourism, Technology

Guest editors
Pierluigi Musarò
Valentina Cappi
Marta Vignola

YEAR VII - VOL. 18 - NUM. 1 - JANUARY 2024
FedOA – Federico II University Press
ISSN (online) 2723 – 9608 – ISSN (print) 2532 – 750X

ALMA MATER STUDIORUM
UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA

DIPARTIMENTO
DI SOCIOLOGIA
E DIRITTO DELL'ECONOMIA

This special issue was created with the support of Department
of Sociology and Business Law University of Bologna.

Summary

Redazione di Fuori Luogo
✉ redazione@fuoriluogo.info
tel. +39-081-2535883

English text editor: Pietro Maturi.
Copertina a cura di Fabio Improta elaborata con illustrazione del Festival IT.A.CA' 2022,
di Antonella Di Gaetano

EDITORE

FedOA - Federico II University Press
Centro di Ateneo per le Biblioteche "Roberto Pettorino"
Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II

Responsabilità editoriale
Fedoa adotta e promuove specifiche linee guida in tema di responsabilità editoriale, e segue le COPE's Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors.
Autorizzazione del Tribunale di Napoli n. 59 del 20 dicembre 2016.
Direttore responsabile: Carmine Urciuoli
ISSN 2723-9608 (pubblicazione on line) ISSN 2532-750X (pubblicazione cartacea)

Articles

In evaluating the proposed works, the journal follows a peer review procedure. The articles are proposed for evaluation by two anonymous referees, once removed any element that could identify the author.
Propose an article. The journal uses a submission system (open journal) to manage new proposals on the site. www.serena.unina.it/index.php/fuoriluogo
Rights and permissions. For each contribution accepted for publication on "Fuori Luogo", the authors must return to the editorial staff a letter of authorization, completed and signed. Failure to return the letter affects the publication of the article.

The policies on the reuse of articles can be consulted at www.serena.unina.it/index.php/fuoriluogo

Fuori Luogo is one of the open access journals published under the SHARE Interuniversity Convention.
Fuori Luogo is included in the ANVUR list of scientific journals for Area 14, Political and Social Sciences (since 2016), in Area 8, Civil Engineering and Architecture (since 2019), Area 11, History, philosophy, pedagogy and psychology (since 2019). It is classified in Class A in 14/C1, Sociology (since 2019), 14/C2, Social Policy and Social Work (since 2019), 14/C3, General and Applied Sociology (since 2017), and 14/D1, Methodology of Social Research (since 2017).

Fuori Luogo is indexed in: DOAJ Directory of Open Access Journals - ACNP Catalogue code n. PT03461557 - Index Copernicus International ID 67296.

The journal is part of CRIS Coordinamento Riviste Italiane di Sociologia.

Fuori Luogo is included in the LOCKSS (Lots of Copies Keep Stuff Safe) network of the Public Knowledge Project (PKP PLN)

Massimiliano Tarozzi[1]

Responsible Tourism as a Strategy for Implementing Transformative Education for Global Citizenship[2]

Introduction

The Manifesto of Responsible Tourism released by the IT.A.CÀ Festival advocates an idea of tourism that multiplies the educational potential of this phenomenon by combining individual wellbeing with local-area sustainability. The same Manifesto also introduces the concept of *"becoming"* as a "transformative indicator" of subjects, proposed as an alternative to the economic indicator of *incoming* that is usually adopted to measure the effectiveness and economic impact of tourism. "Becoming" is an educationally meaningful notion that endorses an approach of transformative education in relation to subjectivities and the local areas in which they live.

This educational approach, embedded in a particular idea of tourism, differs significantly from the traditional "banking education" approach (Freire, 2020). The traditional approach assumes the passive absorption of learning content transferred from an oppressive society to oppressed individuals. In contrast, the proposed approach it echoes and revitalises the concept of 'learning to be' as conceptualised by UNESCO in the famous "Faure report" (Faure *et al.*, 1972), where the relationship between education and society is framed in a humanistic perspective. Developed in the post-1968 French progressive climate that gave birth to a modern and solidarity-based idea of lifelong education, this report has represented a genuine "humanist manifesto" (Elfert, 2018). Since then, there has been a shift from a humanistic to an economic agenda for education (Biesta, 2021), reflected in part in subsequent UNESCO reports on education (Tarozzi & Milana, 2022). This shift resonates especially with the changed social and economic climate that laid the foundations for establishing a functionalist idea of education, within the present-day learning economy in which global education policies are influenced by the same economic imperatives that prioritise "incoming" in tourism.

Yet the educational idea of 'becoming' advocated by responsible tourism concerns not only local areas, but also global citizenship understood as humankind's ecological belonging to the planet. Experiencing the world, also through responsible tourism activities, thus becomes a form of learning to be and learning to live together (Delors *et al.*, 1996) or becoming.

In this sense, tourism cannot be regarded solely as a means of fulfilling consumerist desires, a commercial enterprise, or a luxury for global elites. Tourism, and travel in general, also offers opportunities to expand one's field of experience. As such, it represents an informal educational experience, especially in relation to global dynamics, cultural diversity, and environmental issues.

This article[3] aims to explore the shared working space between responsible tourism and education for sustainability, as well as the countless concrete opportunities it offers for educating active and global citizens. For it to constitute such an opportunity to expand the field of experience, however, tourism must be developed as an authentically educational experience.

To this end, the paper proposes a critical review of multidisciplinary literature combining tourism, development and education studies. These three disciplinary perspectives converge in shedding significant light on the subject by proposing international tourism as experiential learning.

Not much has been written on the relationship between tourism and education, with a few exceptions (Benckendorff & Zehrer, 2017); the literature is especially limited regarding tourism as experiential learning (Ruhanen, 2005; Bos, McCabe, & Johnson, 2015; Arcodia *et al*., 2021). Nonetheless, the complex relationship between these two spheres is articulated in a plurality of

1 Massimiliano Tarozzi, Università di Bologna, massimiliano.tarozzi@unibo.it, ORCID 0000-0002-4354-9728.
2 Received: 17/07/22. Revised: 31/01/23. Accepted: 08/04/23. Published: 31/01/24..
3 A very earlier version of this argument was published in Italian in Tarozzi (2022).

hitherto rarely-investigated forms. Alessia Mariotti and myself (Mariotti & Tarozzi, 2021) have highlighted three essential dimensions in which the multifaceted relationship between education and tourism can be articulated:
Firstly, "Education through tourism". This is the most well-known form, encompassing school tourism and educational visits but also university student or teacher training initiatives that use the opportunities offered by tourism to increase knowledge and skills.
Secondly, "Educating for Tourism". Here the relationship between these fields is reversed, with the educational dimension contributing to enhancing and enriching the tourism experience. At the same time, however, education also aids in forming and refining a tourism culture and disseminating it to a wider audience by valorising areas in new ways and reimagining them through new perspectives, such as the promotion of slow or proximity tourism.
Finally, "Educational tourism" where the two spheres of tourism and education are no longer isolated and instead tourism, under certain conditions, is seen as an educational experience *per se*. This perspective lies not in the objects, projects, or itineraries proposed, but rather in the gaze of the actors who propose activities to the students and construct tourist experiences for them in the form of experiential learning workshops.
In particular, this perspective allows us to develop a contemporary focus on sustainability in all its forms: environmental, economic, social and cultural (see Manifesto Art. 4) or, more broadly, sustainable futures. These latter represent a current priority for the global community, with both tourism and education challenged to provide answers.
My argument is that, if educational, tourism is a form of becoming that can contribute not only to the sustainable development of local areas but also and above all to educating participants in the global dimension. Conversely, the global dimension of education can contribute to tourism meaning-making, beyond the mere commodification of travel.
After a brief theoretical and historical overview of the notion of Global Citizenship Education (GCE) and its strategic role among the 2030 Agenda's sustainable development goals, the potential of tourism as an informal educational practice will be highlighted.
The paper then provides some examples of educational tourism for GCE, followed by several points of critique. Finally, the paper will conclude by illustrating certain feasibility conditions for tourism that may help educate participants in global citizenship.

1. The momentum of Global Citizenship Education

In order to develop my argument on the role that educational tourism can play in education for a global perspective, it is necessary to draw on the relevant literature in education policy research to conceptualize GCE and understand the reasons why this approach is particularly relevant today in the policies of international organizations, as well as in civil society organisations and academic research. This introduction is particularly timely given that the GCE approach itself can be viewed from different and sometimes conflicting angles, and above all the risks involved from a neo-colonial and western-centered perspective that fails to address global inequalities but rather conforms to the dominant neo-liberal discourse. Such a perspective would clearly be inadequate to underpin forms of educational tourism designed to educate for global social justice.
GCE is a semantically indefinite concept: it is informative only when viewed from afar. The more closely you approach it, the more it tends to evaporate and lose its definitory power.
Although lacking in a clear definition and tending to vague characterizations, this concept does point to some directions we might consider in more depth.
The ambiguous term "global citizenship" can be interpreted in many ways. Moreover, it has been used differently in different countries and by different political bodies (Tarozzi & Inguaggiato,

2018). In addition, since citizenship is by definition granted by nation states, any reference to global membership appears legally contradictory.
Beneath the many different interpretations of this educational idea, however, there lies a very general common perspective claiming that, in today's interlocked world, it is ever more important to learn the knowledge, skills, behaviour, and values that will enable new generations to live and succeed in a planetary context.
Over the last decade, GCE has gained momentum in the international policy agenda, academic debates and school practice. As a consequence, many national governments worldwide are introducing educational polices to integrate GCE into school curricula. An important milestone in promoting GCE worldwide was the "Global Education First Initiative" (GEFI) launched by the former United Nation's Secretary General Ban Ki-moon in 2012, establishing "fostering global citizenship" as one of the three main priorities of the global educational agenda. Consequently, many supranational bodies started disseminating this approach across the globe. UNESCO in particular has played a major role in spreading these ideas and acting to promote GCE implementation in national school systems.
If GEFI can indeed be regarded as the consolidation of a new global awareness, it must be noted that the awareness itself can be traced to an earlier moment. In the Western world, cosmopolitan thinking and its implications for education have ancient roots. These roots can be found in ancient and middle Stoicism and, in modern times, in the Enlightenment and especially Kant's "For a Perpetual Peace". After WWII, the very formulation of the right to education as a universal human right in Article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights contains in essence the same enunciation of an education for global citizenship that we then see revitalised in the latest processes of globalisation.
More recently, another milestone for GCE dissemination was its introduction in the 2030 Agenda, explicitly mentioning GCE in target 4.7, together with the twin concept of Education for Sustainable Development (ESD):

> «By 2030 ensure all learners acquire knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including among others through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture's contribution to sustainable development».

This has had a huge impact on the agenda-setting of national governments' policies to incorporate these two approaches into educational practice and school legislation. Because of the indivisibility of these goals within the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) Agenda, ESD and GCE are regarded as "complementary approaches", both crucial not only for achieving Target 4.7 but also as cross-cutting approaches to all 17 SDGs.
In fact, the educational dimension in a global perspective within the framework of SDGs not only represents a specific target within goal 4, it is also crucial for the achievement of all the other 16 goals. Indeed, these goals require a shift in awareness, skills and behaviour and thus a renewed educational perspective.
Although GCE has been widely promoted by national and supranational political bodies, there are different and sometimes contrasting reasons underpinning this "curriculum global turn" in education (Mannion *et al.*, 2011)curriculum policy-makers in the UK have called for curricula in schools and higher education to include a global dimension and education for global citizenship that will prepare students for life in a global society and work in a global economy. We argue that this call is rhetorically operating as a 'nodal point' in policy discourse a floating signifier that different discourses attempt to cover with meaning. This rhetoric attempts to bring three educational traditions together: environmental education, development education and citizenship education. We explore this new point of arrival and departure and some of the consequences and critiques. © 2011 Taylor & Francis.","author":[{"dropping-particle":"","-

family":"Mannion","given":"Greg","non-dropping-particle":"","parse-names":false,"suffix":""},{"-dropping-particle":"","family":"Biesta","given":"Gert","non-dropping-particle":"","parse-names":-false,"suffix":""},{"dropping-particle":"","family":"Priestley","given":"Mark","non-dropping-particle":"","parse-names":false,"suffix":""},{"dropping-particle":"","family":"Ross","-given":"Hamish","non-dropping-particle":"","parse-names":false,"suffix":""}],"container-title":"-Globalisation, Societies and Education","id":"ITEM-1","issue":"3-4","issued":{"date-parts":[["2011"]]},"page":"443-456","title":"The global dimension in education and education for global citizenship: genealogy and critique","type":"article-journal","volume":"9"},"uris":["http://www.mendeley.com/documents/?uuid=2eceffd7-7844-4384-8e91-5b12ba52d7bd"]}],"mendeley":{"formattedCitation":"(Mannion, Biesta, Priestley, & Ross, 2011 and some scholars maintain that GCE is a highly contested notion (Hartung, 2017; Jooste & Heleta, 2017; Marshall, 2005).

GCE is open to a number of different conceptual, political and educational interpretations, addressing different goals and grounded in contrasting visions and political assumptions, ranging from naïf internationalism to a more critical and postcolonial vision addressing multiple goals (Enns, 2015; Grotlüschen, 2018; Oxley & Morris, 2013; Veuglers, 2011; Stein, 2015; Pashby *et al.*, 2020).

These various, contending approaches to GCE can be positioned along a continuum between two poles - market oriented vs. global social justice - with more nuanced positions in between.

On the one hand, supranational agencies are endorsing GCE in the framework of neoliberal discourse (Shultz, 2007). This approach is intended to promote a new type of entrepreneurial citizen who navigates an increasingly interconnected global community. In this vein, GCE aims to educate global elites for the "global free market", with an emphasis on flexibility, "free market thinking", and competition.

On the other hand, a more critical vision of GCE emphasizes equality and social justice as fundamental educational aims. In this current of thought, scholars are advocating for a transformational Global Social Justice Framework (Bourn & Tarozzi, in press) to provide a de-colonial and anticolonial standpoint on the processes, objectives, and aims of GCE. For example, Vanessa Andreotti (2006) contrasts soft and critical Global Citizenship's political and theoretical assumptions as well as the educational consequences of these two stances. She argues that, because of the lack of critical analyses of power relations and global inequalities, GCE is often reduced to limited educational practices that unknowingly end up reproducing and reinforcing ethnocentric, a-historical, paternalistic views.

In summary, it is key to keep in mind these diverse and contrasting ways of conceptualising GCE when implementing GCE in practice: it is important at that point to be conscious of the fact that different goals, methods, and activities are rooted in contrasting theoretical ideas and political assumptions.

Of the different interpretations and ideas underpinning GCE, I endorse a non-neutral Global Social Justice Framework (Tarozzi & Torres, 2016; Tarozzi, 2021; Bourn & Tarozzi, in press) that conceptualizes GCE not as some new, fashionable educational approach, but rather as an innovative and to some extent revolutionary perspective reframing certain already-existing school content within a new educational posture. This framework embraces a subjective ethical and behavioural attitude towards the social and environmental spheres. Inequalities, discrimination, and racism manifest as social asymmetries on a global scale not only within nations but also between nations. Furthermore, a global social justice stance combines the subjective dimension of individual global-mindedness with socially and environmentally responsible behaviour.

As such, GCE can be viewed as an *ethos* embedded in individual choices and responsibility towards both the social community and the natural environment in the form of knowledge, attitudes, and behaviour but also political engagement.

Against the background of this framework, key educational issues such as interculturality, sustainability and social justice are being reconceptualised and gaining new meaning as part of a holistic global vision (Tarozzi, 2021).

This holistic approach, following a global educational perspective widely endorsed by UNESCO, is particularly relevant, for example, in facing the challenges of climate change education. In this paper, I will employ this conceptualization of GCE to approach tourism as an educational experience.

In an attempt to overcome conceptual vagueness and contrasting perspectives, in the last decade UNESCO has made an assiduous effort to bring together multiple distinct streams under a common perspective (Pashby, 2018; Pigozzi, 2006; Vander Dussen Toukan, 2018). Indeed, UNESCO expressed the holistic nature of GCE as a *framing paradigm* in 2014, when it was defined as follows:

> «a framing paradigm which encapsulates how education can develop the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes learners need for securing a world which is more just, peaceful, tolerant, inclusive, secure and sustainable». (UNESCO, 2014, p.9)

Additionally, in 2015 UNESCO published a comprehensive set of pedagogical guidelines providing school teachers with learning outcomes and objectives for GCE at different schooling levels, focussing on three key learning dimensions: the cognitive, socio-emotional and behavioural dimensions. The same document also offers an inclusive definition of GCE that is related to the global citizenship idea of belonging to a broader community and common humanity. This definition emphasizes political, economic, social and cultural interdependence and interconnectedness between the local, the national and the global (UNESCO, 2015, p.15).

In this vein, more than representing a new discipline or school subject, GCE constitutes a new educational perspective. It is an *ethos* making sense of and theoretically and methodologically framing different types of knowledge, abilities and values such as "human rights", "sustainability", "social justice" and "peace".

Although the concept of citizenship framed on a global level is meaningless from a narrow legal or political point of view, emphasizing this concept enables educators and social activists to understand citizenship as an educational perspective of ecological belonging to the world and the foundation for a new environmental ethics. Consequently, it sets the conceptual stage for a close connection between citizenship education and sustainability education in terms of 'climate justice', holistically combining environmental issues, social justice and human rights while endorsing an integrated approach to all of Target 4.7 under the term "transformative education". Given these premises, the transformative role of education appears closely related to students' meaningful experiences of the world, the kind of experiences that can be provided by certain tourism initiatives. This intersection of tourism and transformative education will be the focus of the next section.

2. Tourism and GCE

Understood in this way, GCE goes beyond the schooling context as such to become a vision of non-formal and especially informal education. In the following part of this paper, I focus in particular on this latter educational dimension of GCE, not because it is the only or most important one, but because it is significantly connected to the experience of tourism understood as sustainable or responsible tourism (Mihalic, 2016). Since this issue is by definition multidisciplinary, the rationale for reviewing the literature on the relationship between tourism and education in a global perspective entails three main lines of research, namely education research (especially development education), tourism studies, and development studies.

Teaching-learning processes also take place outside the formal education system, and youth learn across a range of educational experiences: in civil society organisations, through participation in associations (non-formal education), in the peer group, or even autonomously through meaningful experiences (informal education).

I will be arguing that educational tourism can contribute to GCE, in that the former can be an informal transnational educational experience.
In the context of the 2030 Agenda, the role of sustainable tourism has been highlighted extensively in relation to economic growth (goal 8.9), production/consumption (goal 12b), ocean conservation, and small island development (goal 14.7).
In this sense, however, although sustainable tourism is widely recognised as being one of the sustainable development goals, it emblematically embodies the contradictions of the 2030 Agenda. Specifically, the Agenda reflects a split between goals advocating sustainable lifestyles and others aimed directly at global economic growth, between goals geared towards "becoming" and those geared towards "incoming" tourism.
To a lesser extent, however, the relationship between responsible tourism and the educational dimension in the context of sustainable development (Goal 4) has been explored. With a few exceptions (Baillie Smith, 2014; Stoner *et al.*, 2014; Santelli Beccegato, 2018; Tiessen, 2017), there is little research on this topic and the discussion of GCE policies and practices is mainly focused on schooling and formal education (UNESCO, 2015).
Although under-researched, there are nonetheless numerous examples of educational tourism aimed more or less intentionally at the formation of a global *forma mentis* or *global mindedness*. Study abroad, either in high school (Newstreet *et al.*, 2018) or university (Blum, 2020), study visits (especially for teachers) (Mags, 2020; Klein & Wikan, 2019; Engel *et al.*, 2017), as well as North-South partnerships between schools and higher education institutions (Larking, 2016) or international volunteering (Baille Smith, 2014; Woosnan *et al.*, 2019) fall into this category.
These activities are not traditionally "touristic" *stricto sensu*; however, they so view travel, encounters and discoveries as opportunities to learn and engage with global issues. Accordingly, they provide opportunities for students to develop a worldview consistent with the idea of global citizenship outlined above (Stoner *et al.*, 2014; Pike & Mckenzy, 2018).
Among the various dimensions of educational tourism, a somewhat widespread type of it (Smith & Holmes, 2009) that has begun to attract interest in the literature as a practice of GCE (Lyons *et al.*, 2012; Palacios, 2010; Butcher, 2017) is volunteer tourism, the form of international volunteering also referred to as "voluntourism" (Sin *et al.*, 2015). These are international, voluntary work programmes, mostly organised and managed by NGOs and sometimes also funded by national and European civil service entities, that combine voluntary work with leisure.
The activities undertaken by international volunteers within these programmes range from community work - such as helping to build a school or hospital - to language teaching (Jakubiak, 2012), intercultural encounters (Everingham, 2014), providing entertainment for children or, finally, environmental protection activities such as reforestation or habitat protection (Wearing, 2003).
Given the explicit educational scope of volunteer tourism and its low level of commitment as work, Cheung Judge (2017) has emphasised its educational value by defining it more appropriately as "transnational informal education". This label indicates the educational purpose of these initiatives, often linked to international youth exchanges, aimed at raising awareness about these issues and promoting public engagement and active participation in social movements (McGehee & Santos, 2005).
Research on voluntourism shows that participants gain knowledge, skills and new awareness about issues such as interculturalism (Howes, 2008), sustainable development (Devereux, 2008), and North-South relations (Wearing & Grabowski, 2011). These skills arise not from the preparatory courses or field training that participants attend, which are also part of the programme, but rather from the experience itself, making this latter a key component of transformative learning. It challenges young participants' precognitions through informal education and prepares them for the re-signification of social and environmental knowledge and behaviour.
As field research following groups of adolescents on exchanges in the global south organised by international NGOs has shown (Le Bourdon, 2018, 2019), the conditions that are especially effective in fostering this transformation and building a global citizenship perspective are informal

spaces, encounters, physical interactions, and emotions (Baille Smith *et al.*, 2016). In other words, the experiential learning that these activities provide is achieved through embodied education (Tarozzi & Francesconi, 2019) in which bodies and their interactions create the conditions for the emergence of new visions and for a more concrete understanding, because this understanding is concretely experienced through hugs, dances, games, and physical activities.
However, in order to make clear the extent to which educational tourism can contribute to educating new generations in global citizenship as defined above, it is necessary to further clarify the perspective from which the notions of education, tourism, and global citizenship make sense. Such clarification is needed to understand what education, what tourism, what global citizenship enable educational tourism programmes to be designed in such a way as to form global mindedness.

a) What education. The pedagogical dimension is essential for transforming tourism into an intentional educational experience. In particular, a pedagogy cantered on the value of experience as a genuine source of meaning, capable of changing the perspectives of learners, is fundamental. Along these lines, educational theories referring to the ideas of so-called experiential learning built on the work of Dewey (2015) are especially appropriate. Even more appropriate are phenomenological pedagogies (Bertolini, 2021) that shift the focus from the objects of learning to the educational experiences that give meaning to them. Learning from meaningful experiences is not only a useful form of learning to be at all levels, particularly suitable for GCE; it is also a way for the younger generation to learn about the world and its diversity and to learn to live in this world in a supportive and sustainable way.
I would like to stress here three points about experiential learning applied to GCE and responsible tourism. The first is that the body is central to experiential learning, in contrast to intensely mentalised formal education courses. The body is the place of sensitive perception and emotions where lived experience happens, and it is the subject's conduit for connecting with other subjects. As such, it is the place where intersubjective relations are built and empathy is formed. Secondly, a characteristic of intentional experiential learning is that it blocks and counteracts the kind of unconscious, superficial experiences - and thus tacitly rooted in privilege - that uncritical tourism without a clear pedagogical facet risks encouraging.
Thirdly, the idea of GCE needs to be based on a non-neutral paradigm so as to overcome the elitism often characterising transnational voluntary tourism experiences. The global social justice approach not only critiques the inequalities between the Global North and South, but also aims to provide global education opportunities through forms of responsible tourism for all and especially for marginalised, low-income, underprivileged youth. In addition, a transformative pedagogy modelled after Paulo Freire's vision treats education as a powerful tool for social change that enables the "oppressed" to break the cycle of oppression and promote social change and critical reflection (Freire, 2020).

b) What tourism. To educate for the global dimension in a critical and inclusive way, it is not enough for only privileged global citizens, namely white, middle- or upper-class, and well-educated, to engage in tourism. To educate for global citizenship is not even enough for tourism to be limited to the "aspirational class" (Currid-Halkett, 2017) producing new leisure elites, thus deepening the class divide by enjoying the opportunity for sophisticated touristic adventures, such as volunteer tourism, that remain culturally and economically unaffordable for the majority of the population. This *old and new* elitist tourism produces only commodified and meaningless experiences that, brought face to face with inequalities, often unconsciously reinforce a neo-colonial perspective. Even with the best of intentions, such a perspective aesthetises poverty and individualises fragility. Education for global citizenship, on the other hand, requires a tourism of discovery and adventure, open to uncertainty, exploration and wonder (Farnè, 2022) that is closely linked to the most authentic dimension of travel.

In order to effectively educate participants in a global citizenship that is not only elitist and Western-centred, tourism has to be responsible, sustainable and critical: "responsible", because it is committed to social and economic justice and respect for cultural diversity; "sustainable" in its social, economic, and cultural as well as environmental dimensions, the basis for an ecological belonging to the world; and "critical" because tourism experiences are not relegated to the individual private sphere, but instead require collective and social responsibility. All three of these attributes are explicitly and eloquently addressed in IT.A.CÀ's Responsible Tourism Manifesto.
Conversely, GCE can contribute to resignifying transnational tourist experienced by pointing to new goals and forms of travel based on encounters and sharing within informal spaces as well as embodied intersubjective relationships.

c) What global citizenship. As mentioned above, global citizenship is a controversial notion that assumes different meanings depending on the theoretical and political perspectives in which it is rooted. The idea of global citizenship being combined with tourism to generate meaningful educational experiences is not indifferent and neutral. Firstly, it must be separated from any naive internationalism, abstract utopianism, or empty gesture of solidarity. It must be detached from all the simplified visions that trivialise its formative scope. Instead, global citizenship must be understood as a perspective of meaning but one that is linked to real, even rough, complex and unpleasant experiences, encounters and places. Secondly, it should be critically differentiated from the expressions of veiled colonialism embedded in the many world studies educational projects of the 1950s, especially those organised in Anglo-Saxon countries, but also from the paternalistic attitudes characterising too many cooperation and development programmes. What is needed instead is a decentralised and critical global citizenship perspective that is concerned with post-colonial and de-colonial processes and listens to the dissonant voices of non-Western scholars. Thirdly, global citizenship cannot be limited to those global elites educated at the world's best universities who have the privilege of being able to access the global labour market through the front door. According to Zygmunt Bauman, such elites are the 'tourists' who choose to move; they travel because they want to, visiting remote places and consuming the world as if it were a commodity (Bauman, 2001). In contrast, "vagabonds" travel because they must, simply because they "have no other bearable choice"; nonetheless, they represent the other side of the same coin generated by the neoliberal globalisation in which we are immersed. Globalisation certainly offers new and exciting opportunities to a small number of the privileged, but it then requires huge masses of "vagabonds" to pay the price of these opportunities. Global citizenship formed through responsible, sustainable and critical educational tourism is attentive to issues of social justice and inequalities within and between nations, and it strives to counter them rather than simply exploiting the opportunities they offer.

3. Educational tourism for GCE: A critical view

Various critiques have been directed at these models of informal education, and volunteer tourism in particular. The objections are similar in substance, but based on diametrically opposed theoretical and political assumptions. On the one hand, some critics question the very vocation of education for global citizenship, suggesting that it disregards the political dimension found only in national citizenship (Butcher, 2017; Standish, 2012). The role played by international NGOs in promoting the idea of citizenship is also interrogated, and some observers object to the focus on the global dimension on the grounds that it overshadows the fundamental role communities and nations play in education (Standish, 2012).
Unlike these conservative critics, other scholars have emphasised the often elitist nature of these programmes. The majority of volunteer tourists are privileged in terms of their global mobility

power (Cheung Judge, 2017), observers note, while working-class people and underprivileged youth tend to be regarded as "localized" in urban areas with no chance to experience travel opportunities that could nurture a global imaginary. Research does show that youth from non-elite backgrounds often experience the global dimension through voluntourism in a more creative way, however, and that they tend to better understand social hierarchies and inequalities in global relationships (Cheung Judge, 2016).

It is crucial to counter the tendency to offer opportunities for transnational mobility only to privileged elites and expand international volunteer programmes by involving various public and private actors that can provide grants and funding to facilitate these experiences for those who cannot afford the cost of voluntourism. For example, international or European civil service can be a channel for making these experiences accessible to all, provided it is not used by third-sector organisations as a wat to recruit an underpaid workforce.

Above all, however, criticism has been raised about the implicit neo-colonial tendencies in which the viewpoint of the volunteer tourist is rooted (Sin *et al*., 2015, Baille Smith, 2013). Such criticisms are framed within a post-colonial and de-colonial redefinition of development discourse (Post-colonial Perspectives on Global Citizenship Education, 2012). These programmes often convey the profile of a global citizen as "western, white, middle or upper class, educated, [and] connected" (Tiessen, 2011, p. 581) and as exhibiting a paternalistic attitude of aid and solidarity towards unfortunate peoples.

According to these radical critiques, volunteer tourism ends up reinforcing the neo-colonial and neo-liberal imaginary of the global citizen (Tiessen, 2011). Such an imaginary a-critically fits into the narrative of a benevolent Global North that, ignoring the historical context of inequalities produced by colonialism (Andreotti, 2006), contributes to othering local populations by depriving them of their humanity and agentivity (Vrasti, 2012). Volunteer tourists thus reproduce the dominant pattern of piety-based international cooperation reproducing an asymmetrical view of development that mirrors the relations between "tourists" and "visitors". The result is an aestheticized view of poverty that obscures understanding of structural inequalities and social injustices through a depoliticised discourse of aid and solidarity (Crossley, 2012; Daley, 2013). When they are depoliticised in this way, social responsibility and aid initiatives remain relegated to the private sphere, framed as individual choices, and lose much of their educational potential.

A final area of critique focuses on the commodification of voluntary tourism, whereby profit and income often prevail over the objectives of growth and development.

It is therefore crucial that transnational educational activities involving the North-South relationship be reframed by recognising that volunteer tourists are part of a privileged elite and come from an advantaged part of the world with serious historical responsibilities for colonial domination, cultural hegemony and economic exploitation. However, drawing on an awareness of these historical and political premises, some call for de-commodified and sensitive forms of volunteer tourism (Wearing et al., 2005). When critically embedded in a political awareness of the overall framework in which they are situated, volunteer tourism projects can indeed raise awareness about Western privilege (Cheung Judge, 2017) and instil a critical and post-colonial GCE vision rather than only a "soft" version of this vision (Andreotti, 2006).

Conclusion

Responsible tourism, as reflected in the IT.A.CÀ Manifesto, promotes the concept of "becoming" as a "transformative indicator" of subjects. This concept is structurally connected to the educational dimension understood as transformative education. In this sense, tourism, if proposed and practiced as an educational experience, can stimulate the formation of global citizens and,

conversely, the global dimension of education can contribute to granting new sense to tourism, a meaning alternative to mere commercialisation.

I then introduced the concept of global citizenship education, showing its different and sometimes conflicting theoretical premises and proposing a model of critical GCE oriented towards social justice. This is one of the main aims of several promising examples of informal education through transnational mobility, such as volunteering tourism or voluntourism. The main features of this approach have been highlighted along with its strengths and weaknesses.

I have argued that transnational educational tourism, particularly in the form of volunteering tourism, can contribute to educating global citizens insofar as it takes the form of an informal educational experience, education as 'learning to be'. However, for tourism to represent a valuable contribution to GCE, certain preconditions are necessary. The educational intentionality of the experiential dimension requires that we engage with the three concepts around which I have constructed my argument consciously and critically. As mentioned above, education should be treated as experiential learning; tourism should be responsible, sustainable and critical; and GCE should be de-colonial, non-naïve and oriented towards global social justice.

Having experiences means stepping out of one's comfort zone, daring and taking risks. This is what builds us up to be active, responsible and critical citizens. Responsible, sustainable and critical educational tourism fosters this type of experience and helps participants to become citizens who construct their own discourses about the world on the basis of experiences and then make them meaningful through reflection and knowledge.

References

Andreotti, V. (2006). Soft versus Critical Global Citizenship Education. *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review*. V.3 (Autumn), 40-51.

Arcodia, C., Abreu Novais, M., Cavlek, N. & Humpe, A. (2021). Educational tourism and experiential learning: students' perceptions of field trips. *Tourism Review*, 76 (1), 241-254.

Baillie Smith, M. (2014). "Development education, global citizenship and international volunteering". In Desai V. & Potter, R. (edited by), *The Companion to Development Studies*, London: Routledge.

Bauman, Z. (2001). "Turisti e vagabondi". In Id. *Dentro la globalizzazione: le conseguenze sulle persone* (pp. 87-112). Roma-Bari: Laterza.

Benckendorff, P., & Zehrer, A. (Eds.). (2017). *Handbook of teaching and learning in tourism*. Cheltenham, UK; Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Bertolini, P. (2021). *L'esistere pedagogico. Ragioni e limiti di una pedagogia come scienza fenomenologicamente fondata*, Nuova edizione a cura di M. Tarozzi. Milano: Guerini

Biesta, G. (2021). Reclaiming a future that has not yet been: The Faure report, UNESCO's humanism and the need for the emancipation of education. *International Review of Education*, 68, 655-672.

Blum, N. (2020). "Study Abroad as a Route to Global Citizenship? Undergraduate Student Perspectives in the UK". In: Bourn, D. (edited by) *The Bloomsbury Handbook of Global Education and Learning* (pp. 427-437). London: Bloomsbury.

Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic Interactionism*. Englewood Cliffs (NJ): Prentice Hall.

Bos, L., McCabe, S. & Johnson, S. (2015) Learning never goes on holiday: an exploration of social tourism as a context for experiential learning, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 18 (9), 859-875.

Bourn, D. & Tarozzi, M. (edited by) (in press, expected 2023) *Pedagogy of Hope for Global Social Justice*. London: Bloomsbury academics.

Butcher, J. (2017). Citizenship, global citizenship and volunteer tourism: a critical analysis. *Tourism Recreation Research*, *42*(2), 129-138.

Cheung Judge, R. (2016). "Volunteer Tourism and Nonelite Young Subjects: Local, Global, and Situated". In Skelton, T., Worth, N., & Dwyer, C. (edited by), *Identities and Subjectivities* (pp. 249-268). Wiesbaden: Springer.

Cheung Judge, R. (2017). Class and global citizenship: perspectives from non-elite young people's participation in volunteer tourism. *Tourism Recreation Research*, *42*(2), 164-175.

Crossley, É. (2012). Poor but happy: Volunteer tourists' encounters with poverty. Tourism Geographies, 14(2), 235-253.

Daley, P. (2013). Rescuing African bodies: Celebrities, consumerism and neoliberal humanitarianism. *Review of African Political Economy*, 40(137), 375-393.

Delors, J., Al Mufti, I.A., Amagi, I., Carneiro, R., Chung, F., Geremek, B., & Nanzhao, Z. (1996). *Learning: The Treasure Within - Report to UNESCO of the International Commission*. Paris: UNESCO.

Devereux, P. (2008). International volunteering for develop- ment and sustainability: Outdated paternalism or a radical response to globalization? *Development in Practice*, 18(3), 357-370.
Dewey, J. (2015). *Experience & education*. New York: Free Press
Elfert, M. (2018). *Unesco's Utopia of Lifelong Learning: An Intellectual History*. London / New York: Routledge.
Engel, L. C., Fundalinski, J., Gatalica, K., Gibson, H. & Ireland, K. (2017) Global Citizenship Education for Every Student: The Washington, DC Public Schools' Study Abroad Program, *Childhood Education*, 93:6, 516-524.
Enns, C. (2015) Transformation or Continuation? A Critical Analysis of the Making of the Post-2015 Education Agenda. *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 13 (3), 369-87.
Everingham, P. (2014). Intercultural exchange and mutuality in volunteer tourism: The case of intercambio in Ecuador. *Tourist Studies*, 15. 175-190.
Farnè, R. (2022). "Viaggiando si impara: per una pedagogia del turismo". In A. Mariotti & M. Tarozzi, (edited by). *Turismo educativo: Cultura in movimento* (1-16). Bologna: AMS Acta Alma DL.
Faure, E., Herrera, F., Kaddoura, A.-R., Lopes, H., Petrovsky, A. V., Rahnema, M. & Ward, F. C. (1972). *Learning to Be: The World of Education Today and Tomorrow*. Paris: UNESCO.
Freire, P. (2020). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. 50th anniversary edition. London: Bloomsbury.
Grotlüschen, A. (2018). Global competence - Does the new OECD competence domain ignore the global South?. *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 50, 185-202.
Hartung, C. (2017). Global Citizenship Incorporated: Competing Responsibilities in the Education of Global Citizens. *Discourse* 38 (1): 16-29.
Howes, A. J. (2008). Learning in the contact zone: Revisiting neglected aspects of development through an analysis of volunteer placements in Indonesia. *Compare*, 38(1), 23-38.
Jakubiak, C. (2012). 'English for the globe': Discourses in/of English language voluntourism. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 25(4), 435-451.
Jooste, N., & Heleta, S. (2017). Global Citizenship Versus Globally Competent Graduates. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 21 (1), 39-51.
Klein, J. & Wikan, G. (2019). Teacher education and international practice programmes: Reflections on transformative learning and global citizenship. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 79, 93-100
Larkin, A. (2016). Decolonizing and Delinking North-South Higher Education Partnerships: Imagining Possibilities for Global Social Justice. Shultz, L. & Viczko, M. (Eds.). *Assembling and Governing the Higher Education Institution*. (215-232). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Le Bourdon, M. (2018). Informal space in global citizenship education. *Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review,* 26. pp. 105-121.
Le Bourdon, M., (2019). "The role of informal spaces in Global Citizenship Education", D. Bourn (edited by) *The Bloomsbury Handbook of Global education and learning* (pp. 402-415). London: Bloomsbury.
Lyons, K., Hanley, J., Wearing, S., & Neil, J. (2012). Gap year volunteer tourism: Myths of global citizenship? Annals of Tourism Research, 39(1), 361-378.
Mags,L. (2020). "Apprenticeship of Reflexivity: Immersive Learning from International Volunteering as Teacher Professional Development". Bourn, D. (Ed.). *The Bloomsbury Handbook of Global Education and Learning* (pp. 416-426). London: Bloomsbury.
Mannion, G., Biesta, G., Priestley, M. & Ross, H. (2011). The Global Dimension in Education and Education for Global Citizenship: Genealogy and Critique. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9 (3-4), 443-56.
Mariotti, A. & Tarozzi, M. (edited by) (2021). *Turismo educativo: Cultura in movimento*. Bologna: AMS Acta Alma DL.
Marshall, H. (2005). Developing the Global Gaze in Citizenship Education: Exploring the Perspectives of Global Education NGO Workers in England. *International Journal of Citizenship and Teacher Education* 1 (2), 76-92.
McGehee, N., & Santos, C. (2005). Social change, discourse, and volunteer tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 32(3), 760-776.
Mihalic, T. (2016), Sustainable-responsible tourism discourse-Towards responsustable tourism, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *111*, 461-470.
Newstreet, C., & Rackard, J. (2018). High School Study Abroad: What do World History Students Really Learn? *Journal of International Social Studies,* 8(2), 55-77.
Oxley, L., & Morris, P. (2013). Global Citizenship: A Typology for Distinguishing Its Multiple Conceptions. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 61 (3), 301-25.
Palacios, C. (2010). Volunteer tourism, development, and education in a postcolonial world: Conceiving global connections beyond aid. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18 (7), 861-878.
Pashby, K. (2018). "Global Citizenship Education as a UNESCO key theme". In L. Shultz & T. Pillay (edited by). *Global Citizenship, Common Wealth and Uncommon Citizenship* (pp. 159-173), Leiden: Brill.
Pashby, K., da Costa, M., Stein, S., & Andreotti, V. (2020). A meta-review of typologies of global citizenship education. *Comparative Education*, *56*(2), 144-164.
Pigozzi, M.J. (2006). A UNESCO view of global citizenship education, *Educational Review*, 58:1, 1-4.
Pike, G. & Mackenzie, S. (2018). "Study Abroad and Global Citizenship: Paradoxes and Possibilities". In Davies, I. et al. (edited by.) *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Citizenship and Education* (pp. 573-587). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Ruhanen, L. (2005) Bridging the Divide Between Theory and Practice, *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, 5 (4), 33-51.

Santelli Beccegato, L. (2018). *Educazione allo sviluppo sostenibile. Un importante impegno da condividere.* Milano. Guerini e Associati.
Shultz, L. (2007). Educating for Global Citizenship: Conflicting Agendas and Understandings. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*. 53 (3), 248-58.
Sin, H. L., Oakes, T., & Mostafanezhad, M. (2015). Traveling for a cause: Critical examinations of volunteer tourism and social justice. *Tourist Studies*, 15(2), 119-131
Smith, K., & Holmes, K. (2009). Researching volunteers in tourism: Going beyond. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 12(3/4), 403-420.
Standish, A. (2012). *The False Promise of Global Learning: Why education needs boundaries*. London: Bloomsbury.
Stein, S. (2015). Mapping Global Citizenship. *Journal of College and Character*, 16(4), 242-252.
Stoner, K., Tarrant, M., Perry, L., Stoner, Wearing, S. & Lyons, K. (2014) Global Citizenship as a Learning Outcome of Educational Travel, *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, 14:2, 149-163.
Tarozzi, M. (2022). "Educazione alla cittadinanza globale e turismo responsabile". In A. Mariotti & M. Tarozzi, (edited by). *Turismo educativo: Cultura in movimento*. Bologna (pp. 34-49). Bologna: AMS Acta Alma DL.
Tarozzi, M. (2021). "Educating for global citizenship in diverse and unequal societies". In E. Bosio (edited by), *Conversations of Global Citizenship education. Perspectives on research, teaching, and learning in higher education* (pp.89-102). New York: Routledge.
Tarozzi M. & Francesconi D., (2019) "Embodied Education and Education of the Body: The Phenomenological Perspective". In Brinkmann, M., Türstig, J., Weber-Spanknebel, M. (Hrsg.) *Leib - Leiblichkeit - Embodiment. Pädagogische Perspektiven auf eine Phänomenologie des Leibes.* Wiesbaden, Germania: Springer.
Tarozzi, M &. Milana, M. (2022). "Reimagining our Futures Together": Riparare le ingiustizie passate per ricostruire la scuola del futuro. *Quaderni di pedagogia della scuola*. 2 (2022/1), 7-16.
Tarozzi, M. & Inguaggiato, C. (2018) Implementing GCED in EU primary schools: the role of ministries between coordinate and parallel action. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 10 (1), 21-38.
Tarozzi, M. & Torres, C. A. (2016). *Global citizenship education and the crises of multiculturalism*. London: Bloomsbury.
Tiessen, R. (2011). Global Subjects or Objects of Globalisation? The promotion of global citizenship in organisations offering sport for development and/or peace programmes. *Third World Quarterly, 32,* 3, 571-587.
Tiessen, R. (2017). *Learning and Volunteering Abroad for Development. Unpacking Host Organization and Volunteer Rationales*. London/ New York: Routledge.
UNESCO (2014). *Global Citizenship Education. Preparing learners for the challenges of the 21st century*. Paris: UNESCO.
UNESCO (2015). *Global citizenship education: topics and learning objectives.* Paris: UNESCO.
VanderDussen Toukan, E. (2018). Educating citizens of 'the global': Mapping textual constructs of UNESCO's global citizenship education 2012-2015. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 13(1), 51-64.
Veugelers, W. (2011). The Moral and the Political in Global Citizenship: Appreciating Differences in Education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9(3-4), 473-85.
Vrasti, W. (2012). *Volunteer tourism in the global south: Giving back in neoliberal times*. London: Routledge.
Wearing, S. (2003). Volunteer tourism. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 28(3), 3-4.
Wearing, S., & Grabowski, S. (2011). Volunteer tourism and intercultural exchange: Exploring the 'other' in this experience. A. M. Benson (Ed.), *Volunteer tourism: Theoretical frameworks and practical application* (193-210). London: Routledge.
Wearing, S., McDonald, M. & Ponting, J. (2005) Building a Decommodified Research Paradigm in Tourism: The Contribution of NGOs, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 13:5, 424-439.
Woosnam, K. M., Strzelecka, M., Nisbett, G. S., & Keith, S. J. (2019). Examining Millennials' Global Citizenship Attitudes and Behavioral Intentions to Engage in Environmental Volunteering. *Sustainability, 11,* 8, 2324, 1-18.