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**Introduction**

In recent years, there has been a growing interest in global citizenship as a concept and its implication for education. It is partly because of the ongoing process of globalisation, and people in different places becoming more interdependent and interconnected, that promotion of global citizenship education is seen as a way of addressing some of the global issues we face today, such as environmental issues, social justice, poverty, and human rights. What does ‘global citizenship’ mean? Is there a universal definition for it? How do we approach it in education? What are the challenges of introducing it in education? In this chapter, we explore how global citizenship is conceptualised and how it has evolved over time; the challenges of facilitating global citizenship education; and different approaches to global citizenship education at different educational stages.

**What is global citizenship?**

Global citizenship is the idea of citizenship in a global context, and is a concept which is highly contested and not straightforward to define. Some argue that global citizenship is based on moral identity, which implies that everyone has a moral obligation to care about each other, regardless of geographic locations or nationality. Others believe global citizenship can only be achieved through the leadership of global institutions, such as the United Nations, or through involvement in non-governmental organizations (NGOs) (Dower, 2002). With such contrasting views on ‘what makes a global citizen’, it is near impossible to prescribe a singular definition.

Heater (1997: 36) suggests interpretations of what it means to be a global citizen: a member of the human race; responsible for the condition of the planet; an individual subject to moral law; and promotion of world government. These interpretations can be placed on a spectrum where the opposed ends are ‘vague’ and ‘precise’. The ‘vague’ end of the spectrum centres on moral responsibility, while the ‘precise’ end focuses on realisation of global citizenship through global governance.

Nussbaum (1996) and Dower (2002) consider global citizenship to be a moral obligation, proposing that a global citizen is expected to feel a moral responsibility to all human beings around the world. According to Dower,

“When someone says of himself ‘I am a global citizen’, he is making some kind of moral claim about the nature and scope of our moral obligations. That is, he accepts that he has obligations in principle towards people in any part of the world; for instance, help alleviate poverty, work for international peace, support organisations trying to stop human rights violations, or play one’s part in reducing global warming. And if someone says, of people in general and not merely of herself, that ‘we are global citizens’, she means to say that people generally have these kinds of obligations, whether or not they are currently aware of them or accept them.” (2002: 146).

However, the above description of global citizenship still seems vague and difficult to apply in practice. As a leading international NGO, Oxfam (2006: 3) characterises the global citizen as someone who:

* Is aware of the wider world and has a sense of their own role as a world citizen
* Respects and values diversity
* Has an understanding of how the world works
* Is outraged by social injustice
* Participates in the community at a range of levels, from the local to the global
* Is willing to act to make the world a more equitable and sustainable place
* Takes responsibility for their actions.

What Dower and Oxfam’s interpretations both seem to emphasise is the ‘moral’ and ‘action’ dimensions of global citizenship.

|  |
| --- |
| Pause for thought  What are the differences between ‘vague’ and ‘precise’ interpretations of global citizenship? Can you think of anyone that is considered to be a global citizen? Why do you feel they are a global citizen? |

**A historical overview of global citizenship education**

Whilst global citizenship continues to elude precise definition, global citizenship education can be better understood by considering some key historical developments.

The idea of global citizenship is not a new one. Dower cites the example of the Stoics from the ancient Graeco-Roman world, who believed that human beings were part of and had obligations to a global community beyond the local, national or wider regional communities in which they were located, to point out that the concept of a ‘universal ethic’ has been part of religious and philosophical movements for centuries (2002: 6). However, the concept has tended to fall in and out of favour until it’s re-emergence in the twentieth century.

During the early part of the twentieth century a series of initiatives took place in the wake of the First World War, which sought to promote ‘education for international understanding’. These included the League of Nations Union, the Council for Education in World Citizenship (CEWC) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), and they laid the foundations for different educational movements which emerged in the UK between the 1960s and 1980s, although similar movements were also taking place elsewhere in the world (Tye, 2003). Each of these educational movements took a different focus in terms of the ‘issue’ they were aiming to address and some some of these are listed below:

* Global education
* Development education
* Environment education
* Human rights education
* Peace education
* Race, diversity and multicultural education
* Futures education
* Citizenship education

(Hicks, 2007; Marshall, 2005)

Whilst each of these bear some influence on the concept of global citizenship education as it might be understood today, three of these will be considered in more detail.

***Global education***

World Studies was the original term used by educators who led a series of projects during the 1970s and 1980s, providing training and resources for a large number of teachers, teacher trainers and NGO educators, often in cooperation with local education authorities (Tye, 2003). The earliest of these was the the World Studies Project led by Robin Richardson (1976) and colleagues at the University of London Institute of Education, which was particularly influential in providing a model for exploring global issues which emphasised the need to explore the economic and political context of such issues, the role of values and opportunities for action.

Richardson’s ideas were taken forward in later projects developed by Fisher and Hicks (1985) and Pike and Selby (1988) and the term ‘global education’ became used instead of World Studies. This also reflected influences from the US where educators were seeking to define a ‘global perspective’ and even develop ways of measuring such a perspective (Hanvey, 1976: 2). For example, Hett developed a ‘Global mindedness Scale’ to measure ‘a worldview in which one sees oneself as connected to the world community and feels a sense of responsibility for its members.’ (1993: 143).

***Development education***

Running parallel to the emergence of Global Education was the field of development education, which originated in the campaigning work of NGOs, such as Oxfam and Christian Aid, and the locally based network of Development Education Centres (DECs), who continue to work directly with schools, teachers and in other education contexts today. A lot of support for this work came through the Department for International Development (DFID) whose role is to harness public support for overseas aid through awareness raising campaigns and education.

Initially, development educators focused on teaching *about* poverty in developing countries, or what became referred to increasingly as the ‘global south’, but over time they have adopted a more holistic and critical approach, linking poverty with issues like climate change, social justice and human rights, and examining the social, economic and political causes of inequalities. In common with those involved in World Studies and its successor, Global Education, development educators promote teaching methods which place a strong emphasis on thinking critically about issues, and promoting participation and action, for which they draw heavily on teaching methods and activities developed by radical educators such as Paulo Freire*.*

As development educators shifted towards a broader conceptualisation of their work, the term ‘development education’ fell out of favour. Oxfam began to use the term global citizenship and devised an action-orientated framework which continues to be used by schools today (see Case Study 1). This framework sets out the knowledge, skills and values which young people need to develop as global citizens and emphasises a willingness to act in order to ‘make the world a more equitable and sustainable place’ (Oxfam, 2006: 3).

***Citizenship education and the ‘global dimension’***

Whilst Oxfam and others were promoting the idea of global citizenship in education, there was increasing interest in and debate debate around the idea of citizenship education, although this came later to the UK than other parts of the world (Davies, Evan and Reid, 2005). In 2002 citizenship was introduced as a statutory subject to the UK National Curriculum and there was some recognition of the need for young people to understand the global context of citizenship through exploring themes such as interdependence, but generally citizenship education continued to be ‘far more attuned to the demands of the nation state than to global education’ (ibid: 75). In spite of this, there was growing support for a ‘global dimension’ in education both in the UK and countries like Australia and Canada, often influenced by the work of NGOs and DECs in collaboration with government departments responsible for education and international development. In the UK, this resulted in a series of guidance documents being issued to schools, including *Developing a Global Dimension in the School Curriculum* and *the Global Dimension in Action*, the latter proposing that:

“The global dimension explores what connects us to the rest of the world. It enables learners to engage with complex global issues and explore the links between their own lives and people, places and issues throughout the world. The global dimension can relate to both developing and developed countries, including countries in Europe. It helps learners to imagine different futures and the role they can play in creating a fair and sustainable world.” (QCA, 2007: 2)

Whilst Oxfam and others continued to use the term global citizenship, the Global Dimension became another overarching term, encompassing many of the ‘issues’ which had previously been fields of education in their own right. It also emphasised themes ‘related to responsibility, awareness and engagement’ which were already part of the discourse around global citizenship, reflected in the historical developments outlined here (Schattle, 2009, in Marais and Ogden, 2010: 3).

|  |
| --- |
| **Pause for thought**  Oxfam sets out the following key elements for responsible global citizenship from which they have developed a whole curriculum framework:  **Knowledge and understanding**  **Skills**  **Values and attitudes**  Social justice and equity Critical thinking Sense of identity and self esteem  Diversity Ability to argue effectively Empathy  Globalisation and interdependence Ability to challenge injustice Commitment to social justice and  Sustainable development and inequalities equity  Peace and conflict Respect for people and things Value and respect for diversity  Cooperation and conflict Concern for the environment and  resolution commitment to sustainable  development  Belief that people can make a  difference  (Oxfam, 2006:4)  Reflecting on your own experience of education or what you know of the education system currently in the UK, to what extent are these ‘elements’ of knowledge, skills and values and attitudes part of the educational experience of young people? Can you think of specific examples of subjects or teaching pedagogies which promote any of these? You may also want to reflect on very recent debates in education about the demand for education to focus on acquisition of knowledge, a debate recently addressed by Bourn (2012) in Global Learning and Subject Knowledge. |

**Challenges of facilitating global citizenship education**

Having identified some key developments and themes in the emerging concept of global citizenship education, we now turn our attention to key challenges. Some of these are due to on-going uncertainty about the precise meaning of global citizenship both in theory and practice, whilst others relate to tensions about *who* is defining *what* and for what purpose, and all of this of course within the context of rapid globalization with all its opportunities, challenges and contradictions.

***Balancing unity and diversity***

Whilst the rise of citizenship education has to some extent promoted exploration of global issues in schools, critics have argued that it needs to adapt and respond further to globalization to build a new kind of education, rather than becoming a hybrid of citizenship education and global education as it has been known (Davies, Evans and Reid, 2005). This poses a challenge for citizenship education in a world where globalisation and nationalism co-exist, and where there are competing demands between recognising diversity locally and globally, promoting unity within and between nations and embracing an ‘overarching set of shared values, ideals and goals to which all citizens are committed’ (Banks et al, 2005: 7). One response to this challenge is the idea of ‘cosmopolitan citizenship’ proposed by Osler and Starkey, which recognises ‘multiple and dynamic identities, embracing local, national and international perspectives’ and seeks to promote young people’s engagement in issues such as peace, rights and democracy (2003: 252).

In the meantime, global citizenship education has never acquired the legitimacy of becoming a statutory subject, but continues to take place in a variety of ways ranging from international school linking and fund raising for charities, to drawing in global themes within subjects, using local contexts to explore global themes of diversity and sustainable living, and promoting participation and ‘pupil voice’ through student councils. Yet despite these activities, the extent to which it is promoted in schools also depends on whether or not it finds favour with the government of the day, as we shall see below.

***A coherent approach***

A further challenge is raised by David Hicks who argues that whilst the concept of global citizenship advocated by DECs and NGOs offers very practical approaches for schools, it still tends to exist as an ‘umbrella’ term for a range of issues and approaches and lacks both theoretical underpinning and coherency, leaving it open to a variety of interpretations (2008: 9). Under the previous Labour Government, global citizenship was promoted through several agendas such as the Global Dimension, the Duty to Promote Community Cohesion and the Sustainable Schools agenda. These provided schools with frameworks and concepts they could use as a basis for planning activities coherently across the curriculum and wider life of the school (see Case Study 1), although schools engaged with these to varying degrees (Bourn 2012). More recently, attempts have been made to move beyond terms such as the Global Dimension and Global Citizenship to seek greater clarity through the concept of Global Learning, defined as ‘education that puts learning in a global context, fostering:

· Critical and creative thinking

· Self-awareness and open-mindedness towards difference

· Understanding of global issues and power relationships; and

· Optimism and action for a better world’

(Think Global, 2012)

This has formed part of a wider debate in which writers and researchers draw on the field Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) to emphasis the need for clear learning outcomes which can enable young people to make decisions about how they act in the world (Scott, 2010). ESD has been promoted heavily by UNESCO, reflected in the UN Decade on ESD 2005 - 2014, and a significant body of literature has emerged around it in recent years. In a literature review conducted on behalf of UNESCO, Tilbury identifies learning in ESD as:

* learning to ask critical questions;
* learning to clarify one’s own values;
* learning to envision more positive and sustainable futures;
* learning to think systemically;
* learning to respond through applied learning; and,
* learning to explore the dialectic between tradition and innovation.

(Tilbury, 2011:8)

Again, whilst there are overlaps with the definition of global learning provided by Think Global, this extends the debate about global citizenship education still further.

***Teachers’ confidence to explore global issues***

In a survey report by the Development Education Association (DEA) into UK teachers’ attitudes to global learning the DEA concluded that despite the vast majority of teachers believing that ‘schools should prepare pupils to deal with a fast-changing and globalised world’ (2009: 5), many lacked confidence to incorporate this into their teaching. Different studies have identified a number of factors involved in this:

* Teachers’ perceptions that ability to teach about global issues depends on their level of knowledge about those issues
* Teachers not being equipped or experienced in the kind of methodologies recommended for exploring complex issues
* Significant differences in attitude towards incorporating global citizenship between teachers of different subjects. For example, teachers of humanities subjects being most enthusiastic

(Bourn, 2012; Brown, 2009; Robbins et al 2003)

Despite apparent, if variable, interest and support from teachers and the extent of activity going on through the work of DECs and NGOs, it is perhaps not surprising that teachers’ confidence to deliver global citizenship in practice is low given its low profile in mainstream education. Government ideas about what education is for and what it should include can also influence teachers’ motivation towards facilitating global citizenship education in schools. The current UK Coalition Government have promoted a ‘back to basics’ approach to education, which emphasises acquisition of knowledge in relation to a narrow range of subjects and minimises the relevance of the global context of young peoples’ lives. This clearly poses a challenge for global citizenship education and its advocates, and has shifted the debate about its role in education yet again (Bourn, 2012).

***‘Soft’ versus ‘critical’ global citizenship***

Despite the challenges raised so far, Bourn (2012) highlights the extent to which global citizenship has evolved from its early focus on development issues, typically confined to subjects such as geography, to the range of approaches outlined earlier. However, what these wide range of approaches also exposes is both a divergence in perspectives about what global citizenship means and a tension that raises questions about how global citizenship should be facilitated. For example, activities such as international school linking are often as much about young people acquiring skills and competence to compete in a global economy as they are about promoting ‘learners to imagine different futures and the role they can play in creating a fair and sustainable world’ (ibid). The challenge here is that if young people continue to see the world in terms of opportunities for trade and gaining competitive advantage, or what Alexander refers to as a ‘contra-national’ rather than ‘international perspective’, this perspective is likely to run counter to attempts to promote mutual cooperation, collectivity and redressing of inequalities (2008: 123) .

What this tension also exposes is a division between more or less critical approaches to global citizenship education. Andreotti defined differences between ‘soft’ and ‘critical’ global citizenship education where soft approaches emphasise poverty, ‘lack of ‘development’’ and the need to take responsibility for those who are helpless, as opposed to critical approaches which emphasise critical reflection on the history of power relations, and the way inequalities and dominant perspectives perpetuate inequalities (2006: 46-48). Equally challenging is Tully’s argument that ‘the globalisation of modern citizenship has not tended to democracy, equality and perpetual peace, but to informal imperialism, dependency, inequality and resistance’ (2008:17). These challenges have been taken up to some extent by organisations such as Think Global who argue that global learning requires critical thinking which questions understanding and assumptions, and recognises ‘how much is contested’ (Shah and Brown, 2009: 2).

In spite of these challenges, there is a persistent drive towards promoting global citizenship education which continues to take place in a variety of forms as will be demonstrated in the case studies below.

|  |
| --- |
| **Pause for thought**  In the introduction to her article Soft Versus Critical Global Citizenship Education, Andreotti describes the following scene:  “Imagine a huge ball-room. It is full of people wearing black-tie. They are all celebrities. You also see a red carpet leading to a stage on the other side. On the stage there is Nelson Mandela. He is holding a prize. It is the activist of the year prize. He calls your name. You walk down that corridor. Everyone is looking at you. What are you wearing? How are you feeling? Think about how you got there: the number of people that have signed your petitions, the number of white bands on the wrists of your friends, the number of people you have taken to Edinburgh. You shake Mandela’s hands. How does that feel? He gives you the microphone. Everyone is quiet waiting for you to speak. They respect you. They know what you have done. Think about the difference you have made to this campaign! Think about all the people you have helped in Africa…”  Bearing in mind Andreotti’s distinction between ‘soft’ and ‘critical’ approaches to global citizenship education, why do you think she might find this ‘disturbing’ and what issues does it raise?  (Andreotti 2006: 40-51) |

**Different approaches to global citizenship education**

This section explores different ways of implementing global citizenship education at three different educational stages: primary school, secondary school and higher education. Three case studies are provided to exemplify some of the approaches discussed.

***Case study 1***

Evelyn Community Primary School in Prescot, England, has been recognised for its high profile global citizenship provision, which is a main focus of their unique curriculum termed ARCS, A Real life Creative Skills based curriculum. Therefore, the school’s ethos is very distinctive because it explicitly presents global citizenship as one of their key aims in their mission statement: “in equipping learners with the tools to be a global citizen in an ever-changing society”. Therefore, the school has drawn on a range of global citizenship education frameworks such as Oxfam’s (2006) *Education for Global Citizenship: A Guide for Schools* and has utilised the previous government’s eight key concepts of the global dimension, listed below, which were taught across all National Curriculum subjects in the UK (DfID, 2005):

1. Global citizenship
2. Interdependence
3. Social justice
4. Human rights
5. Conflict resolution
6. Diversity
7. Sustainable development
8. Values and perceptions

These frameworks provided an active and participatory approach to global citizenship education, which the School addresses in their different approaches to teaching global citizenship education.

The School promotes global citizenship in a number of ways:

- Friday afternoons are dedicated to the exploration of global issues or world events, such as World Food Day or Diversity Day, which are discussed in the afternoon assembly. After the assembly the whole school, from reception to Year 6, go back to their classrooms to further explore the theme for the week by doing related activities;

- A Global Ceremony is held by the school to celebrate and reward the achievements of pupils’ who have been involved in global citizenship projects. Parents and other people from the wider community are invited to this celebration, which again raises awareness of global citizenship education;

- The school are increasingly raising the profile of global citizenship education through the introduction of global, cultural and eco ambassadors. These ambassadors have the opportunity to be rewarded for their efforts by working towards bronze, silver, gold and platinum contribution awards. In addition, the school has a list, The Student Exit Profile, of what children have to achieve before they leave the school in Year 6, and one of these things is to win their Global Learner Award;

- The school understands the importance of awareness on a local and global scale; therefore, they send emails and a copy of the school magazine to the school and wider community to promote the global citizenship initiatives within the school. Additionally, the school hosts fair-trade coffee mornings and festivals.

- The school has recently become partners of a university’s Confucius Institute, which has given the pupils the opportunity to learn about Chinese culture and visit the university for a Chinese Day;

- All the staff are heavily involved in raising the profile of global citizenship education, striving consistently towards sustainability through displaying their own achievements on the staff display board named the Eight Gateways of Sustainability.

Evelyn Community Primary School has had much success with raising the profile of global citizenship education. The school has been granted forest school status. The school also wish to build on their success with the Ambassador and Global Learner Awards to raise the profile even more and make these awards an integral part of the school. Thus, this case study demonstrates how global citizenship provision can be integrated effectively into the wider school life.

(Case study is based on telephone interview with school Headteacher, Ms Carole Arnold)

***Case Study 2***

Marshall proposes following twelve different ways in which schools can develop a global dimension in their teaching practice (2007: 177). However, these approaches are not exclusive to secondary schools. There is no single most effective approach to global citizenship education, as every school is different due to its contexts.

1. Appointment of global dimension coordinator
2. Partnerships with schools abroad
3. Staff development and exchange opportunities
4. Global dimension through the curriculum (e.g. through Citizenship)
5. Working with NGOs (e.g. Development Education Centres) promoting global education
6. Global days, weeks, conferences and outside speakers
7. Promotion and broadening of language learning
8. International visits and hosting international visitors
9. Promotion of values associated with global social justice
10. Development of global education policy
11. Offering the International Baccalaureate
12. Obtaining the International School Award

This case study shows how a London secondary school combines different approaches within their global citizenship education provision.

Notre Dame Roman Catholic Girls’ School in London highly values and appreciates the importance of teaching global citizenship education in a diverse society. The teachers at the school believe that it is their responsibility to teach the pupils about issues that are happening in the world around us, and to empower them with the knowledge that they are able to change the way things are in the world for the better. The school has strong partnerships with other Notre Dame Schools around the UK, as well as having a long established collaboration with Liverpool Hope University, the only ecumenical university in Europe. Therefore, as a Notre Dame Catholic school their aim is to provide all pupils with a well-rounded education, and they feel that global citizenship education is integral to this aim. The school stress how they want to teach the knowledge, skills and attitudes that will enable the students to understand what their role is in an ever-changing world.

Global citizenship is promoted in four significant ways by the School:

- The school has an elected group of 15 students called the ‘Notre Dame Global Citizenship Group’. Once a year these students attend a Notre Dame Global Citizenship Conference either at Liverpool Hope University or in London. During this 3 day conference, the students discuss global citizenship issues with students from other Notre Dame Schools in the UK. In the past the conferences have been based on global issues such as Fairtrade, or Slavery and the students work together to research and design presentations on these topics. It is a great way for the Notre Dame schools in the UK to make links with each other, and for the students from each school to discuss these issues in more depth and see things from different perspectives;

- The school welcomes visiting university students from Liverpool Hope University, who come to the school and run workshops with whole year groups. In 2012, the university students delivered workshops to the whole of Year 8 and Year 9 on themes such as poverty, human trafficking, poverty, disability and stereotyping in society;

- The school hosts a variety of activities that happen during the school year as well, an example being our ‘Lenten lunches’ run by the RE department. During Lent, students can take part in activities that highlight global issues happening around the world during their lunchtimes;

- The school also holds International School status, and many of the projects that we undertake in the school, through which we gained this award, contribute towards global citizenship education.

In a recent Ofsted inspection in November 2012, London Notre Dame School was rated as an outstanding school which ‘provides a range of activities for students to develop students’ confidence, raise their self-esteem and prepare them extremely well for the future.’

(Case study is based on email interview with school global dimension coordinator, Ms Layla Froomes)

***Case Study 3***

|  |
| --- |
| Research focus - Becoming a global citizen through studying abroad  Recent research (Su, 2011, 2012) show that experience of studying and living abroad provides university students with opportunities to understand and appreciate the diversity of cultures and values. In his study, there was evidence that students who studies abroad had developed a social and cultural sophistication through their knowledge and experience of different cultural contexts. As a result, it contributes to their transformation of becoming a global citizen. |

In the UK, many higher education institutions appreciate the importance of the development of students’ capability of being a global citizen since it is central to university study. Service-learning has been recognised as an effective approach to global citizenship education in higher education. The term service-learning is a multifaceted pedagogical tool which directs students’ classroom learning to address the needs of relevant communities, where reciprocity between the institution and the community partner is essential in formulating “proposals, solutions and strategies for meeting their organisational missions” (Ransom, 2009: 215). Case study three demonstrates how service-learning is used to offer students opportunities for community involvement at local, national and international levels.

Liverpool Hope University is a post-1992 new university, and has an ecumenical Christian foundation. The University has a strong emphasis on developing students as global citizens through the curriculum design, school partnerships, its award winning charity ‘Global Hope’, and a unique student Service and Leadership Award. This emphasis has been clearly reflected in the University’s mission statement. In order to achieve this goal, the University has purposefully embedded global citizenship into its academic practice at different levels:

- The University’s BA Education Studies and BA (QTS) curriculum introduces students to the concept of global citizenship as an integral part of the courses;

- Strong school partnerships provide students with the opportunity to deliver group workshops on the themes of global citizenship and social justice to both secondary school and primary school pupils in Liverpool, Sheffield or London. This initiative aims to deepen students’ understanding of contemporary issues by teaching others;

- ‘Global Hope’ is an educational charity established by the University to provide its students and staff with opportunities to volunteer in developing countries around the world. It uses the resources of the University to support the educational development of communities overseas. In particular this means using the University’s expertise in teaching and learning, research and subject knowledge to effectively work alongside partners in developing countries to meet their educational needs appropriately. This approach is grounded in the principle of reciprocity. A commitment to these relationships over the longer term has enabled genuine partnerships to develop;

- The University has recently established a unique extracurricular award, termed the Service and Leadership Award (SALA), to provide opportunities for students to engage in service activity during the three years of their undergraduate study. It aims to provide students with opportunities for a well-rounded education that ‘shapes life and vision, such as intercultural learning, experience of other cultures and contexts, engagement in service and voluntary work both locally and internationally’ as articulated in the University’s Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy.

The use of the service-learning has enabled Liverpool Hope University to engage students with their courses, and develop their sense of civic responsibility through participating in community projects.

**Summary and conclusions**

|  |
| --- |
| Research focus - Interpretive pedagogies for global citizenship  Nixon (2012) argues that education for global citizenship is essential in a globally interconnected and interdependent world. He emphasises the need for what he terms ‘interpretive pedagogies’ that value plurality of viewpoint and opinion, and acknowledge the dialogical and interactive nature of all learning. Education for global citizenship, he further argues, is a public good that is of benefit not only to the individual pupils and students concerned but also to the well-being of society as a whole (Nixon, 2011). |

Whilst global citizenship may be perceived as a relatively new issue in education, this chapter has attempted to show how global citizenship has been part of educators’ thinking over a long period, and has a particular history in the UK. Even so, ‘a passport for global citizenship does not yet exist’ and the concept continues to be difficult to define (Bamber 2011: 56). This may be because it remains relatively under-theorised and under-researched, a criticism raised by Hicks (2008). It has also been conceptualised in a variety of ways, hence the need to understand the distinct fields of education from which it has emerged. The chapter considered three of these fields - global education, development education and citizenship education - and showed how in the course of these developments some key themes have emerged; themes such as awareness, responsibility, making connections (between ourselves and other people and places around the world) and action for the future. The chapter also sets out some of the key challenges and tensions in delivering these themes in practice. These included debates about what it means to be a citizen in a rapidly changing global context, what kind of learning outcomes global citizenship education is aspiring to promote for young people and how this process can be sufficiently critical and challenging to truly bring about social justice on a global scale. Many of the themes and debates referred to have been driven by individuals and groups working outside formal education, although in recent years attempts have been made to formalise the role of global citizenship education through agendas such as the Global Dimension and despite concerns about a return to a ‘back to basics’ education system, the UK Government have just launched a Global Learning programme in which it is envisaged some of this work will continue to take place in schools.
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