

2018

Maintaining Global Citizenship Education in Schools: A Challenge for Australian Educators and Schools

John Buchanan

University of Technology, Sydney, john.buchanan@uts.edu.au

Nina Burrige

Andrew Chodkiewicz

Recommended Citation

Buchanan, J., Burrige, N., & Chodkiewicz, A. (2018). Maintaining Global Citizenship Education in Schools: A Challenge for Australian Educators and Schools. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(4).
<http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2018v43n4.4>

This Journal Article is posted at Research Online.
<http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol43/iss4/4>

Maintaining Global Citizenship Education in schools: A Challenge for Australian Educators and Schools

John Buchanan
Nina Burrige
Andrew Chodkiewicz
University of Technology, Sydney

Abstract: Teaching students about global citizenship remains a critical challenge for schools and communities, especially in a developed country like Australia. With increasingly difficult national and international contexts and its marginal place in the school curriculum, there is an urgent need to help maintain support for global citizenship education. Recognising the challenges and limitations, key ways to raise its profile include considering available pedagogies, drawing on the existing Australian Global Education framework, taking up existing curriculum opportunities, accessing quality educational resources and relevant teacher education programs, and working in partnership with key Non-Government Organisations.

Key Words: global citizenship education; schools; curriculum; pedagogies; teacher education.

Introduction

Educators in developed industrialised countries, such as Australia, face significant challenges in maintaining education about global issues and citizenship in schools. This is despite a tradition, dating back to the 1960s, of teaching about global issues in Australian schools, and the emergence of a specific focus on global citizenship education (GCE) since the early 2000s (Tudball & Stirling, 2011; Sigauke, 2013). *Global citizenship*, according to Education Services Australia (ESA, 2011) is about “knowing that we are all citizens of the one globe and behaving in a way which demonstrates a respect for that globe and all people on it.” For UNESCO (2015) it “refers to a sense of belonging to a broader community and common humanity, it emphasises political, economic, social and cultural interdependency and interconnectedness between the local, the national and the global” (p.14). The main values and attitudes that a student, who acts as a global citizen, needs to demonstrate are “empathy; a commitment to social justice and equity; a respect for diversity; a concern for the environment and sustainable development, and a belief that people can make a difference” (ESA, 2011). At its core, it involves three domains of learning - cognitive, socio-emotional and behavioural. The emphasis here is on our interdependency and interconnectedness, a specific set of values, and a focus on domains of learning. This offers a useful starting point for teachers in considering *what* and *how* to teach about global issues in schools. Throughout the paper we mention global learning, global education, global issues, global citizenship as aspects of GCE to consider.

Among the challenges for teachers in Australia are the increasingly difficult political and economic contexts that impact on schools and their ability to offer students opportunities to learn about and act on global issues (Barrow, 2017; Flitton, 2015; Lowy Institute 2016). This is evident with the rising and vocal opposition to diversity and inclusion, and notably, the displacement of notions of global citizenship by strident forms of nationalism (Barrow, 2017). Furthermore, rising anti-immigrant and anti-Muslim feelings, attacks on established international institutions and partnerships, moves towards insularity and exclusionism in the USA, Britain, Europe, and Australia, reflect a move away from global civic values to a narrower negative nationalism (The Economist, 2016). In Australia, since 2014 there has been a significant shift to ‘Australia first policies’, and to a greater extent than governments in other developed countries, Australia has cut back on overseas aid, maintained a strong focus on ‘border protection’, excluded asylum seekers (Flitton, 2015; Lowy Institute, 2016), and ended government financial support for domestic global education initiatives (PTC NSW, 2016).

While nations do need to seek loyalty from their citizens and use their state-funded education systems as a means of doing so, this should not come at the expense of a commitment and loyalty to the planet and its people. Global cooperation is essential in order to effectively address major ongoing international threats such as food security, growing inequality and the North-South divide, future of work, global warming and climate change (World Economic Forum, 2016), as well as the large migration flows, refugee crises, transnational terrorism, ongoing wars and conflicts. Educating students about global issues is one way for students, as Hansen (2013, p. 35) puts it, to learn about the value of “reflective openness to new people, ideas, values and practices”, to take on a multi-perspectivity (Deardorff, 2011), to develop greater intercultural understanding and sensitivity (Buchanan, 2006), and demonstrate a genuine concern for other human beings, beyond our local and national boundaries.

Given the context, it is important to acknowledge the challenges and limitations in the global education field. These include the contested and changing nature of global citizenship education (UNESCO 2014; Bourn 2015), key conceptual difficulties (Standish, 2014; Rapoport 2015), the competing agendas (Marshall 2011; Peterson & Warwick 2015; Mannion et al., 2011; Oxley & Morris, 2013; Standish, 2014), and the dominance of a neo-colonial perspective and the North-South divide (Andreotti 2006; De Souza, 2011; Pashby, 2011). Also, important are the limitations of international and national top-down policy led GCE efforts, the removal of funding to support GCE in schools, and the marginal place of GCE in the school curriculum.

Bearing these factors in mind, we suggest that it is important to focus on ways of better supporting individual teachers and schools, at both the local school level and at an educational policy and curriculum level, to take up the evident challenges of maintaining the teaching of GCE, as part of a student’s school education for children and young people across their school years. In this paper, we provide a brief background to global education movements, the recent leading role of UN and UNESCO, consider a number of challenges and choices facing teachers implementing GCE in practice. And against an Australian policy background, outline key ways to assist teachers and teacher educators to better maintain the teaching of GCE in schools.

Background

Global Education Movements

Both teachers and students need to be aware of the history, evolution and the varying levels of support over time for the global education movements in USA, United Kingdom

(UK) and Australian schools since the 1960s. Importantly, global citizenship emerged as a central focus during the first decade of the 2000s, and was linked to an emerging interest in worldwide solidarity rights and transnational protections (Varella, 2014). At the same time, stronger connections were made to the growing fields of environmental sustainability and sustainable development (Gadsby & Bullivant, 2010; Misiaszek, 2015; Ellis, 2016). Recently the notion of global learning and citizenship has been linked to the challenges of diversity and multiculturalism (Pashby, 2015; Tarozzi & Torres, 2016), the need for intercultural competence (Lantz & Davies, 2015), and the challenges of local citizenship in a global arena (Findlow, 2017). It is clear that GCE is related to other fields such as human rights education, peace education, education for sustainable development, and civics and citizenship education. Each one can provide important entry points for GCE (UNESCO 2014, p.15). Although to date, for example, despite the evident opportunities in schools across Europe, Bourn (2016) finds “there has been little consideration of Global Citizenship within the policies and practices of citizenship education” (p.19).

Leading Role of UN

Internationally, over recent years, the United Nations (UN) and its agency UNESCO have led the support and promotion of GCE. Clear reference points for global development, including schooling, have been the UN’s eight Millennium Goals in 2000 and the seventeen Sustainable Development Goals (UN, 2015). Global citizenship emerged as one of three key priorities in the UN’S *Global Education First Initiative* (GEFI, 2012). UNESCO then positioned GCE as a key aspect in preparing learners for the challenges of the twenty-first century, “signalling a shift in the role and purpose of education to that of forging more just, peaceful, tolerant and inclusive societies” (UNESCO 2014, p.5). UNESCO (2015) developed a learning guide setting out the content, topics and learning objectives, to support GCE in schools and other educational settings. It called for GCE concepts to be introduced into the school curriculum across the pre-primary to secondary years of schooling. Together these international top-down efforts do provide some support for GCE, nationally and at a local school level. But in the absence of further new national or state based policies and support for GCE, it remains for teachers, schools and NGOs at a local level, and teacher educators to: adopt a central role, to choose to act, take up available opportunities, and include teaching *about* global issues and *for* global citizenship.

Challenge and choices in GCE

Recent forms of GCE have been extensively critiqued, and we have noted some of the key challenges and choices that teachers need to make when including aspects of GCE in their teaching. They include the lack of conceptual clarity and ongoing tensions, the competing agendas which feature a strong emphasis on economic skills, the influence of a neo-colonial perspective and the North-South divide, and the limited impact of GCE in practice in schools.

Global Citizenship - Conceptual Difficulties and Tensions

It is important to recognise a number of conceptual difficulties, tensions and competing agendas that have emerged in the field of GCE. Recent critics have identified ambiguity (Standish, 2014), conceptual vagueness (Rapoport, 2015) and the rhetorical

constructions of global citizenship (Abdi, 2017) as important difficulties that need to be addressed. UNESCO (2014:14) concedes there are multiple interpretations of what key terms mean. In assessing school education initiatives, both in the USA and England, Standish (2014:169) found that “researching global education is challenging because the term means different things to different people”. Rapoport (2015) also highlighted the vagueness of key concepts in the field and in the vision of what was to be achieved in teaching students about global citizenship. More recently, Abdi (2017:44), argues that while the ideas of global citizenship may offer potential, the realities in practice are ‘rhetorical’, ‘mostly unrealizable’ and the global citizen is a ‘problematically concocted figure’. Instead he calls for a more critical analysis of the lives of young people around the world, and a greater focus on developing an ethic of care and an ethical global space with young people (p.49).

Among the important ongoing tensions in GCE identified by UNESCO (2014:19) are: global solidarity versus global competition; reconciling local and global identities and interests; and the role of education in challenging the status quo. Broadly the challenge here is how to promote the universal aspects, while still respecting the singular or individual needs. The notion of global solidarity, working to promote outcomes for peoples across the world, contrasts with a focus on global competition among individuals and individual learners acquiring global skills. The challenge of reconciling local and global identities and interests can be seen in the recent struggles of countries seeing their national and local identity under threat, and responding by retreating from global concerns. Similarly, GCE in many countries can be seen as a form of education that challenges local and national interests and the status quo, by promoting active and participatory learning and critical thinking.

Competing Agendas – Curriculum Approaches

Global citizenship education remains a highly contested space, with a set of distinct competing agendas in the curriculum approaches used (UNESCO, 2014; Marshall, 2011). Policies and approaches vary from country to country, because of differing national contexts and perspectives. This is reflected in the variety of approaches to GCE being taken in schools in the many countries surveyed by UNESCO (2014), across Europe (Bourn, 2016), and the UK (Mannion et al., 2011; Oxley & Morris, 2013; Marshall, 2011). The range noted here includes economic, or technical-economic, cultural, political, global social-justice or rights based agendas.

Significantly, the acquisition of narrow, *economic skills*, was found by Bourn (2016, p. 28) to be the dominant approach being taken in Europe, with some examples of promotion of universal values, and a few taking ‘a more critical pedagogical approach’ that encouraged both understanding and active social engagement with global issues. *Economic* and *cultural* aspects, rather than the *political* were foregrounded in the UK global citizenship curriculum, according to Mannion et al. (2011). Another way is to consider two distinct agendas - the *technical-economic* and the *global social-justice* - which Marshall (2011) argued was needed “to expose the [dominant] normative and instrumentalist agendas at play” (p. 412) in reflecting on the UK school experience of a globally oriented curriculum. The *technical-economic* agenda has students gaining the knowledge and skills relevant to national political and economic ends related to life and work in a global economy. Marshall sees this type of GCE as “firmly within existing global economic conditions, reproducing the powerful corporate cosmopolitan ideals” (p. 418). For Camica and Franklin (2011), “market discourses trump critical democratic cosmopolitan discourses” (p. 315). They concluded that this dominance “ensures contemporary and future relations of domination and subjugation within the curriculum and the communities that it privileges and subjugates” (p.321). Similarly,

Standish (2014) asserts that global education is being driven mainly by an economic imperative that works largely to prepare young people for the global market, one that is generally portrayed as being driven by external “forces of globalisation” (p. 167).

On the other hand, the *global social-justice* agenda, often led by NGOs, focuses on injustice and requires students to take “an emotional and often active commitment to, and understanding of, particular interpretations of economic, political, legal or cultural injustice” (Marshall, 2011, p.418). Further emphasising rights, Landorf (2009) advocates a global education that is “philosophically based on human rights and equally on the core human rights concept of moral universalism” (p.47). This view suggests that GCE needs to be underpinned by a set of rights that are relevant to all people, such as civil, political, social, economic, cultural, and solidarity rights (such as self-determination, peace, and the right to a clean environment). It highlights the need for a more critical questioning of education for global citizenship, and a strong focus on young people learning about the possibilities of action and political change to achieve a more equitable and just world (Mannion et al., 2011).

Neo-Colonial Perspectives and the North-South Divide

An ongoing critique of global education is that it operates within and from a neo-colonial perspective and adopts a soft, as opposed to a critical framework. Andreotti (2006; 2011), De Souza (2011) and Pashby (2011), among others, call for an engagement with indigenous perspectives, not just those of Western, European and North American developed countries. Bourn (2015) has summarised concerns about the dominance of Euro-centric stances, the lack of recognition and understanding of the North-South divide, and the persistent structures of economic and political inequalities and injustice. A central problem to be addressed, according to Andreotti (2006) is the “economic and cultural roots of inequalities in power and wealth/labour distribution in a global complex and uncertain system” (p. 41). Andreotti also contrasts soft and critical frameworks for GCE. She sees soft frameworks focusing on the symptomatic poverty and helplessness of peoples, while critical frameworks engage with the underlying causes of inequality and injustice (Andreotti, 2006, p. 46).

In response to the dominance of neo-colonialist perspectives, De Souza (2012) highlights the need to ‘reposition’ local students in Europe and developed Western countries. He aims to (dis)locate what he considers the literate global subject from nowhere, so that learners consider the perspective of people in the South, and work towards real transformative change. Similarly, Pashby (2011) calls for the assumed citizen-subject in global citizenship education to be named. In many liberal democratic contexts, according to Pashby (2011), the citizen is often assumed to be an “extension of a hegemonic and particularly positioned Northern/Western national citizen” (p.438). Pashby argues for the development of a more complex notion of global citizenship, one that recognises diverse citizen-subjects, and focuses on unequal power relations.

Limited Impact of Global Education in Practice – Schools and Teacher Education

Evidence of the impact of recent GCE in practice and the nature of student learning achieved by programs or projects in schools is limited and the studies cited here are with Canadian (Massey, 2014) and Australian secondary school students (DeNobile, Kleeman & Zarkos, 2014; Weirenga et al., 2008), and Australian teacher education programs (Varadharajan & Buchanan, 2016; Reynolds et al., 2015). There is evidence that young

people are interested in learning about local and global issues in Australian schools and do want to act to make a difference in the world (Weirenga et al., 2008). However, two recent studies assessing the impact of global education teaching on student attitudes raise some concerns about the actual depth and breadth of student learning about global issues and aspects of global citizenship (Massey, 2014; DeNobile, Kleeman & Zarkos, 2014). For example, Canadian secondary school students taking a Geography Grade 12 class that included a global education component, did develop a stronger global awareness and sense of belonging to the wider world (Massey, 2012). But when asked about acting as a global citizen, student responses were limited to such actions as buying fair trade products, being a volunteer, or making a donation to a charity. These can be seen as useful 'gateway actions', but the findings point to the need for further follow up programs to build on their learning, and to the importance of more holistic experiential approaches being taken in school programs.

A more recent Australian study of Year 7 and 8 secondary school students in nine independent faith-based schools showed mixed results. DeNobile, Kleeman and Zarkos (2014) surveyed values and attitudes before and after the completion of a global perspectives Geography unit. There were significant positive differences in only four of the ten aspects assessed - *Personal identity* (which had the strongest increase); *Social justice*; *Sense of community-membership*; and *Environmental sustainability*. There were mixed results across the schools for *Antipathy towards global issues* and *Tolerance of difference*.

There is also some evidence of the limitations of pre-service teacher education programs. Varadharajan and Buchanan (2016) investigated the impact of a course incorporating Global Development Education on a cohort of pre-service teachers (n = 79), and obtained varied results. While goodwill towards global education prevailed, with a more positive disposition to and knowledge of global development issues among the respondents, levels of global knowledge were found wanting. On the other hand a program for pre-service teachers at the University of Newcastle in NSW (Reynolds et al., 2015), which we detail more below, has highlighted the success of a values led approach to global education.

Together these challenges and limitations highlight some of the important issues that need to be considered in making choices in GCE. As with any values based education, teachers and schools need to navigate these challenges. In making their choices as educators, teachers and teacher educators need to be aware of these aspects and seek approaches that best equip children and young people to connect and engage with global issues. In doing so they may also consider what is possible to achieve within their teaching and community context. It is important to note that contested terrain is not unusual in the curriculum. Part of a teacher's role is to facilitate critical thinking in the learning process. Providing students with strategies and approaches to connect with, engage and evaluate the differing perspectives and complexities of global issues is arguably a fundamental one.

Maintaining GCE in Australian Schools

The remaining sections of this paper, within the context of Australian school policies and programs, address a number of important ways of maintaining GCE. They include considering relevant pedagogies, using an existing Global Education framework, curriculum opportunities, relevant teacher education programs and quality educational resources, and partnerships with Non-Government Organisations (NGOs). Together, these initiatives can assist in maintaining support for a more meaningful GCE in the face of the many challenges of the current educational context.

Australian Policies and Programs

In Australia, aspects of global education have been evident in school programs since the 1960s (Gough, 2013), and Australia's national and state school education policies have responded from time to time, with specific initiatives supporting global education and learning. Most recently, some valuable steps were taken in advancing a GCE agenda in schools from the early 2000s until 2014. The *Global Perspectives: A statement on global education for Australian schools*, published in 2002, was among the first to do so (DeNobile, Kleeman & Zarkos, 2014). Australia's national and state Ministers of Education included a more explicit global perspective in a national statement on the future of schooling in 2008 (MCEETYA, 2008). Since then two states, Victoria (DEECD, 2009) and Queensland (DETE, 2014) have developed specific GCE educational policy documents to support a focus on learning about and for global citizenship.

However, funding for GCE in schools has been limited. A notable leader of GCE in Australian schools from the 2000s was the Global Education Project (GEP). Set up with Australian government funding, AusAID (now Australian Aid) helped establish the GEP, which took a lead in Australian schools. It helped develop the Australian Global Education Framework (Education Services Australia, 2011a), built up a body of valuable online educational/teaching resources, ran teacher education sessions, supported projects in schools and communities, and researched a number of school projects (GEP, 2012). Together with key NGOs such as World Vision, Plan International Australia, Child Fund Australia, the World Challenge, Oxfam, and Amnesty International, GEP was able to play a pivotal role. However, in 2014 the Australian Government ceased funding for global education initiatives across Australia, like GEP, and made significant cuts to international aid programs (Flitton, 2015).

Even when funding was available, global education and teaching about global citizenship remained as a small part of teacher education programs, teacher professional development and teaching practice in schools (Pike, 2008). According to Gough (2013) GCE has remained "on the margins of the school curriculum, generally delivered through Geography, Studies of Society and Environment or as an elective rather than as a central concern for schools" (p. 23). Also, when citizenship issues are addressed the focus in classrooms is mainly on national and regional citizenship, rather than global citizenship, and overall there is a lack of administrative support for GCE (Rapoport, 2015). Given the marginal and often tenuous place of GCE in schools and the challenges identified above, there is a need to refocus efforts and support for GCE. Despite the worsening national policy and funding contexts, the importance of continuing to offer students a GCE program remain. Especially, one that connects students to the global world and equips them with the capacity for rational, critical thought, and evidence-based debate and decision-making.

Drawing on Pedagogies

For teachers, an important first step is identifying the various conceptions of GCE and considering the many, often unstated, meanings of global education and global citizenship. Also important is considering relevant pedagogies to teaching about global citizenship. Here we outline a number of options that teachers need to consider in approaching their teaching of GCE.

A valuable typology (Oxley & Morris, 2013) that teachers can consider distinguishes between two main forms of global citizenship education - *Cosmopolitan* and *Advocacy*. Together they outline eight distinct stances that an educator can take in their teaching

practice. Within the *Cosmopolitan* form are: political, moral, economic, and cultural stances. While the *Advocacy* form includes: social, critical, environmental, and spiritual stances. According to Peterson and Warwick (2015) this typology can assist teachers to better understand and to be more explicit about the assumptions and principles that underpin the particular form of global citizenship they teach their students. Oxley and Morris (2013) note that among these stances, it is the cultural and the social that have been most frequently used in schools. The *cultural* stance refers to a focus on other countries and places, arts and cultures, languages and, taking a cosmopolitan perspective. While the *social* stance focuses on the cross national interconnections between individuals and groups, as part of a global civil society.

A pedagogy for global social justice, according to Bourn (2015), should be chosen to underpin existing forms of global education. Teachers, in applying a pedagogy for global learning, need to incorporate “not only subject and curriculum knowledge, teaching skills, and styles of learning, but also reviewing and reflecting upon issues and their relevance within the classroom, including wider social and cultural factors” (Bourn 2014, p. 8). Addressing Bourn’s challenge of applying appropriate pedagogies for teaching global citizenship, Peterson and Warwick (2015) identified issues-based, problem-based, and service learning, as three key ways to do so.

Another recent approach is the values-based global education pedagogy that has been applied by Reynolds et al. (2015) in the training of pre-service teachers at a university in Newcastle, Australia. The values underpinning their approach include “equality, social justice, diversity, cooperation, care for others and the environment, diversity and difference, tolerance and inclusion, and respect for all people” (p.178). Students learn about a number of dimensions, namely *about*, *for* and *with* the global. The pedagogy of teaching *about* GE involves providing information, appropriate technical and intellectual skills and teaching of concepts. Teaching *for* GE involves “pedagogies of inquiry ... where students... develop curiosity, initiative, persistence and resilience” (p.179). Teaching *with* GE relates to action learning and learning outside school, involving dialogue, sharing and taking actions with others. However, Reynolds et al. (2015, p.31) caution that it is rare to find values-based and critical approaches being adopted by teachers in the classroom.

As a minimum, learning about interconnectedness to the world is vital to an understanding of global citizenship. According to Reynolds (2015) the best teachers have been focusing on teaching interconnectedness, global issues and global connections (p.31). For Merryfield (2015) this approach is important because students need to understand their own connections to the wider world, to see the world as a whole system, and through issues-oriented instruction, to be able to locate current and historical events or issues within a broader context, beyond their immediate local one. While Reynolds et al. (2015) encourage a values-based approach and argue for the importance of more advocacy and critical approaches, it is evident that in order to maintain GCE in schools, a variety of approaches will need to be adopted.

Global Education Framework in Australian Schools

A continuing support for GCE in Australian schools remains the Australian Global Education framework (ESA, 2011a), together with the recent UNESCO learning guide (UNESCO 2015). The Australian framework, which was recently reworked to support GCE in NSW schools (PTC NSW, 2016), was developed to provide a philosophical and practical reference point to help “clarify the goals, rationale, emphases and processes of global education” (p.2). Importantly the framework provides a basis for teaching *about* and *for*

global citizenship, offering “opportunities to develop the values, knowledge and skills and capacity for action to become good global citizens” (p.5). Five key themes are to be addressed including: interdependence and globalization; identity and cultural diversity; social justice and human rights; peace building and conflict resolution; and sustainable futures. To assist teachers there are a number of subject-related links to specific Australian Curriculum learning areas, across Years K-12.

Curriculum Opportunities

The newly developed Australian Curriculum offers a number of entry points for GCE, principally through its Cross-Curriculum priorities, General Capability statements and the curriculum in a number of learning areas/subjects. Cross-Curriculum priorities comprise a set of three key areas to be applied across all learning areas. *Asia and Australia's engagement with Asia* (ACARA, 2013), which specifically reaches out to the world beyond Australia's shores, does so, arguably, with mainly instrumentalist motives, and notably absent is reference to Australia's Pacific neighbours or other parts of the world. *Sustainability* overtly includes a focus on global issues. The third area is *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander histories and cultures* which can help deepen understanding of other Indigenous peoples. The General Capabilities statements focus on seven capabilities students are expected to develop, and which are to be addressed in each learning area (ACARA, 2013a). A number offer some scope for the inclusion of the global. *Intercultural Understanding* arguably offers the most scope for focusing on global citizenship. Other potential entry points include *Critical and Creative Thinking*, and *Personal and Social* capabilities. While the *Information and Communication Technology* and the *Literacy and Numeracy* capabilities can be leveraged to globally related ends. But, unless teachers are aware of the possibilities and dedicated to the cause, these aspects are unlikely to become vehicles for GCE. Neither Cross-Curriculum priorities nor General Capabilities constitute subject areas, meaning that they may end up being ‘owned by everyone and no one’, and remain on the margins of classroom practice.

Among Australian Curriculum subjects, there are important opportunities in *Civics and Citizenship*, *Geography*, and *History* (BurrIDGE, Chodkiewicz, Payne, Oguro, Varnham, & Buchanan, 2013). The *Civics and Citizenship* subject (ACARA, 2013b) refers to participation ‘as local and global citizens’, but otherwise privileges national standpoints. It aims to develop among students an understanding of Australia's diversity and increase their participation in civic life. The subject incorporates numerous references to global citizenship (ACARA, 2013b). Beginning at Year 3, it proposes a progression in children's understanding moving from their class, to school, to community, and then onto global projects - without specific reference to a national focus. The onset of a specific global focus notionally takes place in Year 5, and assumes greater emphasis from about Year 7. International issues assume a stronger focus in the senior secondary curriculum (Years 11 and 12). NSW, Australia's largest state by population, will not be introducing a specific *Civics and Citizenship* subject, but will incorporate elements of it into other curriculum areas, such as *Geography* and *History*. This may jeopardise its profile in that state. The syllabus for Years 7-10 *Australian Geography* (ACARA, 2015) and *History* (ACARA, 2015a) makes some passing references to global scale and scope, providing opportunities for the inclusion of a global perspective.

This means that there are both broad-based and subject-specific curriculum opportunities across the school years for teachers to address aspects of global citizenship. However, as Sigauke (2013) found in a study of the place of *Civics and Citizenship* education in an Australian university social science teacher education program, pre-service teachers have little time devoted to these issues. For many pre-service teachers there are few

opportunities to develop a better understanding of global issues, and they are likely to enter the profession with a limited knowledge base of GCE. We contend that teachers need to be better supported during their pre-service training and across all their school years, to develop a better understanding of GCE. They also need an understanding that children and young people's roles as critical and active local and global citizens begin in early childhood, and that they can be engaged meaningfully across the gamut of the compulsory school years.

Educational Resources

Effective implementation of any educational initiative requires suitable quality educational resources (Guo, 2014). Textbooks commonly used by pre-service teachers in Australia in the social sciences typically include reference to global education pedagogies (e.g. Buchanan, 2013; Gilbert & Hoeppe, 2011; Kriewaldt & Fahey, 2012; Marsh & Hart, 2011; Reynolds, 2014). A valuable set of global education resources remains accessible, including a set of Australian school case studies that were developed by the Global Education Project. They can be accessed via the Professional Teachers' Council NSW (PTC NSW, 2016a). There are a number of other bodies, including NGOs, with valuable teaching resources that specifically address teaching and learning about global issues. The Australian Human Rights Commission (AHRC, 2014) for example, has produced a comprehensive series of resources for teachers and students as part of their *Rights Ed* program. Also, World Vision Australia (WVA, 2014) produced a database with a wealth of teaching resources on global issues. Various Australian Catholic and State and Territory school jurisdictions also produce resources related to global citizenship and rights education, some of which are only accessible by staff within that jurisdiction.

Teacher Education Programs

The provision of well-resourced and focused resources in both pre-service and in-service teacher education programs is vital in building on existing efforts to foster GCE in schools. These programs need to address the varied experiences, backgrounds and teaching styles of classroom teachers (Leighton, 2014). Important components of these programs are strategies to address the concerns of teachers in facing student hostility or indifference, disconnections between participatory pedagogies and student everyday lives, and the challenges of a difficult political context (Osler, 2010). Finally, as some teachers are concerned about teaching controversial issues, such as citizenship (Peterson & Warwick, 2015), there is a need to enable teachers to learn about and practise some of these strategies that have met with success elsewhere (Hahn, 2012, 2016). Hahn (2012) provides a number of examples of citizenship education curriculum resources to assist teachers in addressing controversial issues.

It is also worth noting that the Australian Global Education Project (PTC NSW, 2016) included a specific focus on in-service teacher education, and many teachers across Australia participated in their programs and workshops. Since 2015, although noticeably diminished, that role continues to be supported by two teacher associations, the Geography Teachers' Association of Victoria and the Professional Teachers' Council NSW. And, given the more difficult funding environment facing NGOs, teacher professional associations and universities, all continue to have a key role to play here. They remain vital in offering support and opportunities for teachers to participate in teacher education programs, workshops, and other relevant and targeted professional development activities.

Partnerships with NGOs

A practical and valuable way for schools to include aspects of GCE across the school years is to work with key NGOs who are already active in their local communities. Their role in supporting global education has been emphasised by Bourn (2015), Reynolds et al. (2015), Gough (2013), Weber (2012), and Weirenga et al. (2008). A study by Buridge et al. (2013), while focusing on human rights education, reported examples of projects led by NGOs working with Australian schools that involved students exploring global citizenship issues. They include numerous projects led by UN Global, World Vision, Child Fund Australia, the World Challenge, Plan International Australia, and Amnesty International, involving significant NGO and school partnerships.

The Global Connections Program, led by NGOs Plan Australia and Plan Indonesia, involved six Australian secondary schools in Victoria working with five groups of Indonesian young people, with the help of facilitators and translators (Wierenga et al., 2008, p.16). Over its three years, evaluations showed increasing depth in communication and understanding of personal and global issues, increased vocational and personal skills, increased awareness of global citizenship and ways to take action (p.17). This is just one example that demonstrates the value of longer term and deeper NGO led programs with schools.

While NGOs have a vital role to play in promoting the values of global citizenship, it is also worth noting some of the concerns of teachers and students identified by Burrige et al. (2013) and Varadharajan and Buchanan (2016), which include a lack of confidence in some NGOs and other charity organisations, as well as in the governments of developing nations. Limited funding and limited staffing in many NGOs impacts their ability to be involved with schools on a continuing basis. Their campaigns often prioritise fundraising activities with the educational element as a secondary aim. Hence, sustained curriculum-based activities can often depend on the commitment of individual teachers willing to spend the time, regularly beyond the classroom, to work with students on particular projects that connect them with NGOs working in overseas communities. Varadharajan and Buchanan (2016) also note that at the government level in many developing nations, there are concerns involving issues such as significant ongoing levels of corruption, misuse or misdirection of funds, and working with countries with questionable human rights records.

The changing nature of international NGO global education programming in the UK and Canada has been examined in detail by Weber (2012), showing NGOs have increased in size, become more bureaucratised and increasingly taken up the agendas of developed nation governments. Despite these limitations the role of NGOs in promoting a culture of thinking about and acting on global issues should not be dismissed. Increasingly, schools and NGOs have access to communication technologies, including social media, that can enable schools to connect with communities around the globe (Asia Education Foundation, 2016). The challenge remains how best to apply available technologies to support meaningful learning on both sides. What is required, if we are to see schools as learning communities that engage in authentic ways with their environment outside of the school gate, is a more concerted effort to specifically link the work of NGOs with the current curriculum. This could include NGO-school project partnerships that are supported by various state and systemic Education departments, where NGO staff can assist in developing knowledge of global issues and the strategies to apply in the classroom. This can include teacher professional development in schools and opportunities for experiential learning for students. Similar partnerships could also be adopted by tertiary institutions in teacher training at the pre-service level.

Conclusion

Given the current trends towards more nationalist thinking and the narrowing of international perspectives in many developed industrialised countries, including Australia, educational efforts for global citizenship face a set of increasing challenges. Policy makers and progressive globally concerned movements are struggling to resist the push towards narrow, self-interested, isolationist nationalist views. Given what has been a policy and funding setback to GCE in Australia since 2014, and in the absence of further explicit national or state policies and support for GCE, it is timely to look for leadership among teachers, teacher educators and NGOs. It is vital for them to reconsider ways of re-energising support for global citizenship education in schools, across what are complex, multi-layered educational systems.

This means acknowledging the challenges, including conceptual difficulties, tensions, myriad possible approaches and the marginal position of GCE in schools. A key step is to consider and adopt a global stance and pedagogy, and draw on an explicit framework, such as the Australian Global Education framework, that clearly articulates underlying assumptions and a distinct set of global values. Where possible, the aim is to move students, over time across their schooling, towards a deeper, more holistic and critical pedagogy, that enhances student learning. It is also important to engage with the various discourses of global citizenship and to appropriate the range of relevant curriculum opportunities and available educational resources. Specifically, both pre-service and in-service teachers need to be supported to participate in a range of GCE programs, and to learn about effective ways of working in partnership with relevant NGOs. Taken together these efforts should enable global citizenship education to re-emerge from the margins of school education and take up a more significant place in the educational experiences of children and young people.

References

- Abdi, A.A. (2017). The rhetorical constructions of global citizenship and the location of youth: A critical analysis, *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 8(2), 37-52. <https://doi.org/10.18546/IJDEGL.8.2.04>
- ACARA (2013a). *General capabilities*. Retrieved from http://www.acara.edu.au/curriculum/general_capabilities.html.
- ACARA (2013b). *Civics and Citizenship*. Retrieved from http://www.acara.edu.au/curriculum_1/learning_areas/humanities_and_social_sciences/civics_and_citizenship.html.
- ACARA (2015). *7-10 Geography*. Retrieved from <http://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/humanities-and-social-sciences/geography/curriculum/f-10?layout=1>.
- ACARA (2015a). *7-10 History*. Retrieved from <http://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/humanities-and-social-sciences/history/curriculum/f-10?layout=1>.
- Andreotti, V. (2006). Soft versus critical global citizenship education, *Development Education Policy and Practice*, 3(1), 40-51.
- Andreotti, V. (2011). The political economy of global citizenship education, *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9:3-4, 307-310, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2011.602292>

- Australian Curriculum and Reporting Authority (ACARA) (2013). *Cross Curriculum Priorities*. Retrieved from http://www.acara.edu.au/curriculum/cross_curriculum_priorities.html.
- Australian Human Rights Commission (AHRC) (2014). *Human rights examples for the Australian Curriculum*. Sydney: AHRC. Retrieved from <https://www.humanrights.gov.au/our-work/education/publications/human-rights-examples-australian-curriculum>.
- Barrow, E. (2017). No Global Citizenship? Re-envisioning Global Citizenship Education In Times of Growing Nationalism. *The High School Journal*, 100(3), 2017, pp. 163-165. [doi:10.1353/hsj.2017.0005](https://doi.org/10.1353/hsj.2017.0005)
- Bourn, D. (2014). *The theory and practice of global learning*. London: Development Education Research Centre.
- Bourn, D. (2015). A pedagogy of development education: Lessons for a more critical global education, In B. M. Maguth & J. Hilburn (Eds) *The State of Global Education: Learning with the world and its people*. (pp.13-26). New York: Routledge.
- Bourn, D. (2016). *Global citizenship & youth participation in Europe*. Retrieved from oxfamlibrary.openrepository.com/oxfam/bitstream/10546/605919/1/rr...pdf.
- Buchanan, J. (2006). *Itadakimasu: Who's Getting the Most Out of Asia Education in Australia? Pacific-Asian Education*, 18(1), 7-21.
- Buchanan, J. (2013). *History, Geography and Civics education: Teaching and learning in the primary years*. Williamstown, Vic: Cambridge University Press.
- Burridge, N., Chodkiewicz, A., Payne, A., Oguro, S., Varnham, S., & Buchanan, J. (2013). *Human rights education in the school curriculum*. Report compiled for the Attorney General's Department.
- Camicia, S. P. & Franklin, B. M. (2011). What type of global community and citizenship? Tangled discourses of neoliberalism and critical democracy in curriculum and its reform, *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9(3-4), 311-322, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2011.605303>
- Council of Councils (2015). *2015 Report Card on international cooperation*. Retrieved from <http://www.cfr.org/global-governance/2015-report-card-international-cooperation/p36532>.
- Davies, I., Evans, M. & Reid, A. (2005). Globalising citizenship education? A critique of 'global education' and 'citizenship education', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 53(1), 66-89, DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8527.2005.00284.x
- De Souza, L.M.T. M. (2012). Engaging the global by resituating the local: (Dis)locating the literate global subject and his view from nowhere, In V. Andreotti & L.M.T. M.de Souza (Eds), *Postcolonial perspectives on global citizenship education*. (pp.68-83) New York & London: Routledge
- Deardorff, D. (2011). Assessing intercultural competence. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 149, 65-79. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.381>
- DeNobile, J. Kleeman, G. & Zarkos, A. (2014). Investigating the impacts of Global Education curriculum on the values and attitudes of secondary students, *Geographical Education*, 27, 28-38.
- Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (DEECD) (2009) *Education for Global and Multicultural Citizenship*. Melbourne: DEECD. Retrieved from <http://www.education.vic.gov.au/Documents/school/teachers/health/multicultedstrat.pdf>

- Department of Education, Training and Employment (DETE) (2014) *Global Schools: Creating successful global citizens. Consultation Draft*. Brisbane: Queensland Government. Retrieved from <http://education.qld.gov.au/curriculum/pdfs/global-schools-consultation-draft.pdf>.
- Education Services Australia (ESA) (2011a). *Global Perspectives: A framework for global education in Australian schools*. Carlton South, Vic: Education Services Australia.
- Education Services Australia (ESA). (2011). *Defining Global Citizenship*. Retrieved from http://www.civicsandcitizenship.edu.au/verve/_resources/S101_Defining_Global_Citizenship_ed.pdf.
- Ellis, M. (2016). *The critical global educator: global citizenship education as sustainable development*. Abingdon, Oxon; New York: Routledge
- Every, D. & Agostinos, M. (2007). Construction of racism in parliamentary debates on asylum seekers. *Discourse & Society*, 18(4), 411-436. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926507077427>
- Findlow, S. (2017). *Local citizenship in the global arena: educating for community participation and change*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Flitton, D. (2015). The blind truth of Australia's foreign aid cuts. *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 11/12/15. Retrieved from: <http://www.smh.com.au/federal-politics/political-news/the-blind-truth-of-australias-foreign-aid-cuts-20151210-gl3e9.html>.
- Gilbert, R. & Hoeppe, B. (Eds.) (2011). *Teaching society and environment*. South Melbourne: Cengage.
- Global Education First Initiative (GEFI) (2012). *Priority 3. Global citizenship*. United Nations Secretary-General. Retrieved from <http://www.globaleducationfirst.org/220.htm>.
- Global Education Project (2012) *Global Education: School case studies*. Retrieved from <http://www.globaleducation.edu.au/teaching-and-learning/school-case-studies.html>
- Gough, A. (2013). Global citizenship as a contemporary curriculum challenge, In A. Wierenga & J.R. Guevara (Eds). *Educating for Global Citizenship: A youth-led approach to learning through partnerships*. (pp.11- 35). Carlton, Vic: Melbourne University Press.
- Guo, L. (2014). Preparing teachers to educate for 21st Century Global Citizenship: Envisioning and enacting, *Journal of Global Citizenship & Equity Education*, 4(1), 1-23.
- Hahn, C. (2012). The Citizenship Teacher and Teaching Controversial Issues: A Comparative Perspective, In J. Brown, H. Ross & P. Munn (Eds). *Democratic citizenship in schools: teaching controversial issues, traditions and accountability*. (pp.48-59). Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press.
- Hahn, C. L. (2016). Pedagogy in citizenship education research: A comparative perspective. *Citizenship Teaching & Learning*, 11(2), 121- 137. https://doi.org/10.1386/ctl.11.2.121_1
- Hansen, D. (2013). Cosmopolitanism as a philosophy for life in our time. *Encounters on Education*, 14, 35-47. <https://doi.org/10.15572/ENCO2013.03>
- Kriewaldt, J. & Fahey, C. (2012). Educating in geography and history for a global perspective. In T. Taylor, C. Fahey, J. Kriewaldt & D. Boon (Eds). *Time and place: Explorations in teaching Geography and History*. Frenchs forest, NSW: Pearson. Pp. 317-340.
- Landorf, H. (2009). Towards a philosophy of Global Education, In T.F. Kirkwood-Tucker (Ed) *Visions in Global Education*. (pp.47-67). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

- Lantz, C. & Davies, I. (2015). Global education in theory. In B. M. Maguth & J. Hilburn (Eds), *The State of Global Education: Learning with the world and its people*. (pp.41-59). New York: Routledge.
- Leighton, R. (2014). Citizenship teachers - different types, different needs, *Citizenship Teaching & Learning*, 9(1), 85-98. https://doi.org/10.1386/ctl.9.1.85_1.
- Lowy Institute (2016). *Australian foreign aid overview*. Retrieved from <http://www.lowyinstitute.org/issues/australian-foreign-aid>.
- 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), 443-456, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2011.605327>
- Marsh, C. & Hart, C. (2011). Multicultural education, global studies and studies of Asia. In C. Marsh & C. Hart (Eds), *Teaching the social sciences and humanities in an Australian curriculum*. (pp. 356-391). Frenchs Forest, NSW: Pearson.
- Marshall, H. (2011). Instrumentalism, ideals and imaginaries: theorising the contested space of global citizenship education in schools, *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9(3-4), 411-426, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2011.605325>
- Massey, K. (2014). Global Citizenship Education in a Secondary Geography Course: The Students' Perspectives, *Review of International Geographical Education*, 4(2), 80-101. ISSN: 2146-0353.
- Merryfield, M.M. (2015). Developing global consciousness, In S. Totten (Ed) *The importance of teaching social issues*. (pp.202-207). New York: Routledge.
- Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs. (MCEETYA) (2008). *Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians*. Retrieved from http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/National_Declaration_on_the_Educational_Goals_for_Young_Australians.pdf
- Misiaszek, G.W. (2015). Ecopedagogy and Citizenship in the Age of Globalisation: connections between environmental and global citizenship education to save the planet, *European Journal of Education*, 50(3), 280-292 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12138>
- Osler, A. (2010). Teacher interpretations of citizenship education: national identity, cosmopolitan ideals, and political realities, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 43(1), 1-24, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2010.503245>
- Oxley, L. & Morris, P. (2013). Global Citizenship: A Typology for Distinguishing its Multiple Conceptions, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 61:3, 301-325, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2013.798393>
- Pashby, K. (2011). Cultivating global citizens: planting new seeds or pruning the perennials? Looking for the citizen-subject in global citizenship education theory, *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9(3-4), 427-442, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2011.605326>
- Pashby, K. (2015). Conflations, possibilities, and foreclosures: Global citizenship education in a multicultural context, *Curriculum Inquiry*, 45(4) 345-366 <https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.2015.1064304>
- Peterson, A. & Warwick, P. (2015). *Global learning and education: key concepts and effective practice*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Pike, G. (2008). Global education. *The Sage handbook of education for citizenship and democracy*, 468-480.
- Professional Teachers Council (PTC NSW) (2016). *Global perspectives: A framework for the development of active global citizenship in NSW schools*. Retrieved from: <http://www.ptc.nsw.edu.au/gepnsw/framework-for-global-education>.

- PTC NSW (2016a). *Global Education Project NSW*. Retrieved from: <http://www.ptc.nsw.edu.au/gepnsw/gepnsw-home>.
- Raffer, K., & Singer, H. W. (2002). *The economic North-South divide: six decades of unequal development*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Rapoport, A. (2015). Global aspects of citizenship education: Challenges and perspectives, In B. M. Maguth & J. Hilburn (Eds), *The State of Global Education: Learning with the world and its people*. (pp.27-40). New York: Routledge.
- Reynolds, R. (2014). *Teaching humanities and social sciences in the primary school* (3rd Ed.). South Melbourne: Oxford.
- Reynolds, R. (2015). One size fits all? Global education for different educational audiences, In R. Reynolds, D. Bradbery, J. Brown, K. Carroll, D. Donnelly, K. Ferguson-Patrick & S. Macqueen (Eds), *Contesting and Constructing International Perspectives in Global Education*. (pp.27-42). Sense Publishers: Rotterdam. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6209-989-0_3
- Reynolds, R. Bradbury, D. Brown, J. Donnelly, D. Ferguson-Patrick, K. Macqueen, S. & Ross, A. (2015). A values-based pedagogical stance: Teaching teachers for Global Education in Australia, In B. M. Maguth & J. Hilburn (Eds), *The State of Global Education: Learning with the world and its people*. (pp.174-187). New York: Routledge.
- Sigauke, A. T. (2013). Citizenship Education in the Social Science Subjects: An Analysis of the Teacher Education Curriculum for secondary schools. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(11), 126-139. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2013v38n11.1>
- Standish, A. (2014). What is global education and where is it taking us?, *The Curriculum Journal*, 25(2), 166-186, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585176.2013.870081>
- Tarozzi, M. & Torres, C.A. (2016). *Global citizenship education and the crises of multiculturalism: comparative perspectives*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- The Economist (2016). League of nationalists. *The Economist*, 19 November. Retrieved from <http://www.economist.com/news/international/21710276-all-around-world-nationalists-are-gaining-ground-why-league-nationalists>.
- Tudball, L. & Stirling, L. (2011). *Bright Sparks, Leading Lights: Snapshots of Global Education in Australia*. World Vision Australia: Melbourne.
- UNESCO (2014). *Global Citizenship Education: Preparing learners for the challenges of the 21st century*. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Retrieved from <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/global-citizenship-education>.
- UNESCO (2015). *Global citizenship education: Topics and learning and objectives*. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002329/232993e.pdf>.
- United Nations (UN) (2015). *Towards a sustainable development agenda*. Retrieved from www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/development-agenda.
- Varaharadjan, V. & Buchanan, J. (2016). ‘Give me liberty, or give me ... nice, new, shiny things’: Global development aid education in Australia. *Perspectives on Global Development and Technology*. 15(3),319-336. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15691497-12341392>
- Varella, M. (2014). *Factors and actors behind greater complexity in contemporary international law: Globalization, international law and complexity*. In M. Varella, Internationalization of law: Globalization, international law and complexity. Heidelberg: Springer. Pp. 11-55. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-54163-6_2
- Weber, N. A. (2012). *A Comparative Study of the Shifting Nature Of International Non-Governmental Organization Global Education Programming in Canada and the United Kingdom*. PhD thesis. Department of Adult Education, University of Toronto.

- Wierenga, A. Wyn, J. Guevara, J. R. Gough, A. Schultz, L. Beadle, S. Ratnam, S. & King, J. (2008). *Youth-led learning: Local connections & global citizenship*. Research Report 31. Melbourne: Australian Youth Research Centre, University of Melbourne.
- World Economic Forum (2016). *What are the 10 biggest global challenges?* Retrieved from <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2016/01/what-are-the-10-biggest-global-challenges/>.
- World Vision Australia (WVA) (2014). *School resources*. Retrieved from <http://www.worldvision.com.au/Resources/SchoolResources/Default.aspx>.