

Author Name: **Anna Dabrowski**

Contact Email: anna.dabrowski@unimelb.edu.au

LEARNING TO BE A GLOBAL CITIZEN: POLICY, CURRICULA AND THE ROLE OF THE TEACHER

Anna Dabrowski
The University of Melbourne, Melbourne

Abstract

Australian schools are increasingly multicultural, with student diversity reflecting processes of migration and globalisation. This has led to an imagining of possibilities, and resultant educational interest in the concept of global citizenship, which offers a conceptual response to the transnationalising orientations and aspirations of students and school culture. The paper will investigate the concept of global citizenship, and in particular, will examine the role of policy, programs, schools and teachers in enhancing student insights on the issue. The phenomenon of global citizenship will be explored within an interpretivist paradigm (Weber, 1978), and will focus on the enactment of classroom discourse in order to understand how reflective school programs and practices are in informing global citizenship education. Few studies have investigated the roles that classroom discourse and the recognition of the cultural and linguistic resources students bring to their learning can play in promoting global mindedness in their students. As such, this paper aims to illuminate the complexities around young people's understandings of global citizenship and consider the role of teachers and schools in developing global mindedness against national agendas.

Imagining Global Citizenship

As part of the ongoing process of globalization, people around the world are more connected than ever before (Rizvi, 2008). It could also be argued that such connectedness has led to the emergence of collective aspirations (Appadurai, 1996), resulting in increasing numbers of individuals seeking access to alternate prospects outside of their country of birth. The society in which we live has become increasingly multicultural, enriched by the aspirations of migrants, transnationals, displaced peoples, and technology, all of which have added to a globalising of people today, augmenting opportunities for connectedness and communication with a myriad of languages and cultures, across and beyond borders. Yet the national sentiment of Australian politics, the corporate media and some individuals presents the world beyond Australia's geographical borders as foreign, different, and dangerous. In multicultural Australia, tensions arising from religious, cultural and linguistic difference are increasing, and movements such as "Reclaim Australia" reflect a fear and a lack of concern for "the Other" – as evidenced for example, by the recently proposed legislation to revoke the Australian citizenship of dual nationals believed to be associated with "terrorist" activities. A further concern in relation to connectedness and belonging: for those of us who share ties with other countries and communities is the Australian Citizenship Amendment (or Allegiance to Australia Act) of 2015 which raises many questions around what it means to be "Australian". It also creates a potential binary between "us" and "them" (Peppers, 2006), reflecting what Richard Sennett described as "corrosion of character" (Sennett, 1998): an indifference for others locally and globally.

However, Australia need not progress down an insular path, and there are many ways to challenge essentialised, nationalistic discourse. For young people growing up in Australia, education and schools can be places of reinforcing dominant norms and the status quo, but education can also be an effective and sustainable way of understanding diversity, rather than viewing 'the Other' as something to be feared. Australia's education system also provides students access to a myriad of opportunities around the world. It is therefore not surprising that schools have capitalized on the changing demographic of students, evident in policies, curricula and educational practices that seek to position learners as global

Author Name: **Anna Dabrowski**

Contact Email: anna.dabrowski@unimelb.edu.au

citizens (Bourn, 2012; Brown, 2009; Robbins, Francis & Elliot, 2003). Yet what it means to be a global citizen and the ways in which global citizenship manifests in society and in the education sector is complex, contested, and under-researched (Andreotti, 2006; Furia, 2005; UNICEF, 2014). While policies related to global citizenship practices and frameworks for enactment in education are increasingly evident in many nations around the world (Banks, 2007), it still remains unclear if global citizenship has arisen from “a globalized identity of elites arising from the integration of capital, if it represents a growth of human solidarity arising from an extension of democratic principles as a result of the exertions of peoples and their voluntary associations” (Brecher, Childs and Cutler, 1993, p. 40). or if it is a reflection of the modern condition in which the lives, aspirations and dispositions of individuals continue to transnationalise.

In some aspects, the tensions between cosmopolitan ideals and the transnational realities for many individuals can be negotiated through the conceptualisation of global citizenship. Education can contribute to both national and globalised identity formation, and it is within these spaces that the concept of global citizenship has been outlined as a “practicable and desirable political ideal” (Furia, 2005; p. 331), extending beyond the cosmopolitan and transnational orientation into a tangible framework to support the shared aspirations of students and their schools. Although broader social and political constructs may influence the way in which students construct and produce meaning, the classroom also offers a space for students to engage in critical and reflexive practice about what it means to be a global citizen. As such, schools and the interactions mediated by the teacher that take place in the classroom afford students a unique opportunity to deepen their understandings of both the local and the global and – within this – develop a global mindedness that supports notions of global citizenship.

Australian schools are increasingly multicultural, with student diversity reflecting processes of migration and globalisation. This has led to an increased educational interest in the concept of global citizenship, which it is argued affords the student and school culture a number of advantages and benefits, including greater inter-cultural awareness, increased empathy and understanding, a better appreciation of diversity and connectedness and responsibility to those who are vulnerable in society (Andrzejewski & Alessio, 1999; Schattle, 2008a, 2008b). This paper provides an overview of the imaginings of global citizenship in the education space, and is underpinned by a theoretical framework (Beck, 2012; Vertovec & Cohen, 2002) that positions global citizenship and transglobal identity as dependent upon a complex and shifting social structure that has led to a constructed binary between national and international identity. It acknowledges educators as having a significant role in shaping the attitudes and experiences of students during their final years of school, and aims to explore the ways in which classroom discourse is mediated by the transnationalising dispositions of schools, and how the experiences, knowledge and resources of students augment the classroom program. It also aims to identify and explain the ways in which the opportunities afforded to students within their school setting are influenced by policy and curricula objectives and prescriptions.

Global Citizenship: Complex and Contested

Despite the diversity of Australian society today, political rhetoric and the rise of nationalised sentiment can pose a challenge as to what it means to “belong”. Debates around citizenship and nationality in the media and broader government policies have the potential to reflect monocultural, monolingual perspectives that position “the Other” as something to be feared, paving the way for an insular, even paranoid (Hage, 2003) version of Australia. However, it is impossible to ignore the ways in which increased movement of peoples and the connectedness facilitated by social media have rendered us all part of an imagined “global citizenry” despite the absence of a common political authority or a world order.

The idea of a “global citizen” is not a nascent concept, but a term that is increasingly used by policy makers, humanitarians and educators despite its contested definitions (Davies, 2006; Oxfam, 2015;

Author Name: **Anna Dabrowski**

Contact Email: anna.dabrowski@unimelb.edu.au

Sheppard, 2004). Although some researchers have criticized such “soft” conceptualizations of global citizenship (Andreotti, 2006; Tully; 2008), much of the existing global citizenship literature is based on shared advocacy for a world government, offering a utopian way to unify individuals as part of a shared world (Dower 2000, 2002; Heater, 1997; Karlberg 2008; Nussbaum 1996). Other discussions on the concept of global citizenship relate to globalization and economic integration (Folk, 1993), and the impacts of these processes (Dobson, 2005) while others relate global citizenship to the notion of New World Order (Brecher, Childs & Cutler, 1993; Folk, 1993), driven by utopian ideals. For the human species, global citizenship also is seen as a way to work towards mitigating the impacts of climate change (Stoner, Perry, Wadsworth, Stoner & Tarrant, 2014), war and radicalization (Yamashita, 2006) and offers a way for the Global North to critically engage with individuals and collectives facing poverty, social injustice and various types of gender, race and religious based inequality (Carter, 2013; Jefferess, 2008; McIntosh, 2005). At its essence, the concept of global citizenship affords a reimagining of the spaces between the local and the global (Appadurai, 2000): a way for individuals to generate collective aspirations, a way for us to be equal (Haydon, 2006; Pigozzi, 2006; Torres, 2015).

Furthermore, the articulation of what it means to be a global citizen is dependent on the perspective and positioning of those who offer a definition of the concept (Furia 2005; Hutchings 2002; Kapoor 2004; Schattle 2008). Heater (2002), positions a global citizen as “a member of the human race who is responsible for the environment and the promotion of a world government” (p.36) while UNICEF (2015), defines a global citizen as someone “who understands interconnectedness, respects and values diversity, has the ability to challenge injustice, and takes action in personally meaningful ways”. It could therefore be argued that a global citizen is not only a member of the human race, but someone who cares deeply about the injustices being committed within and beyond our own borders. Such definitions are idealistic, and are problematic in that they also assume that good “global citizens” possess the appropriate capital to critically reflect and engage with processes that facilitate such local and global inequities.

Brecher, Childs and Cutler (1993) offer a further explanation for the tensions in the conceptualization of global citizenship, noting the dichotomy between global citizenship as driven by the ideals of elite cosmopolites connected by capital, and the idealized alternate: derived from human solidarity and the aspirations of individuals to create a better world (p.40). It is therefore unsurprising that education is seen as pathway to such opportunities. Although global citizenship education is espoused as a pathway to “bring shared values to life” (United Nations, 2014), the imagined value of belonging to a broader global citizenry is also being increasingly used to appeal to and engage students. Increasingly, there is emphasis in Westernized spaces of education for students to develop a set of global or transnational competencies (Noddings, 2005) which will prepare them for participation in an increasingly connected and interdependent world. This section explores the rise of global citizenship as a construct, and its manifestation within schools and classrooms, with an introduction to the concept of global citizenship explored against a backdrop of cosmopolitanism and transnationalism.

Transnationalising times, national agendas

Migration, international law and erosion in the sovereignty of some nations are highlighted as negative outcomes of globalisation, yet increased technology; work, transport and infrastructure have also led to connectedness and a vision to image and pursue opportunities. Appadurai (2000) declares that conceptions of such possibilities reflect the modern condition, with increasing numbers of individuals imagining shared opportunities and futures for their children and for themselves (p.6). With many individuals now sharing dual and multiple nationalities, either in the form of citizenship or of connectedness to additional cultures (Carter, 1997, 2013), the changing condition of our world necessitates a set of values that do not ignore the complexity of the transnational condition (Appiah, 2006), and within this paradigm the concept of global citizenship offers a response.

Author Name: **Anna Dabrowski**

Contact Email: anna.dabrowski@unimelb.edu.au

The concept of “citizenship” is inherently linked to a sense of belonging, and to the rights associated with national identity (Shachar and Hirschl, 2007) and the sense of belonging afforded by sharing in the rights of sovereign nations. Global citizenship builds upon the notion of belonging and connectedness associated with citizenship theory, developing from the constructs of cosmopolitanism and transnationalism. Although there are different ways of enacting cosmopolitanism (Nussbaum 1996, 1994), in most conceptions cosmopolitanism positions all human beings as citizens in one community offering a path between “ethnocentric nationalism and particularistic multiculturalism” (Vertovec and Cohen, 2002, p.1) and a literal or metaphorical “notion of ‘world citizenship’” (Kleingeld, 2013). Moving beyond the cosmopolitan orientation, transnationalism is a more recent construct, and considers the complexity of the modern condition, illuminating the “sociological phenomenon of cross-border migrants considering more than one place ‘home’” (van den Anker, 2010, p.73). Transnationalism is increasingly cultivated in research as more disciplines acknowledge the prevalence and connectedness between individuals against complex constructs of shared ties with more than one nation state (Vertovec, 1999). Imagined visions of world citizenship and cosmopolitan idealism have arguably led to interest in the concept of global citizenship, but for transnationalising spaces of education, global citizenship aims to focus on tangible ways for individuals to achieve moral empowerment and reflect on their roles and responsibilities to those around them. Despite the absence of a shared global democracy, global citizenship is a way for people to acknowledge the shared connectedness of members of the human race, and in doing, acknowledge an “inherent sense of globality” or “consciousness of the world as a single place” (Robertson 1992, p. 132). Subsequently, as society becomes more connected, either through a shared desire to remedy societal problems or through widespread and universal provision of social capital (Marshall, 2011) so too does the manifesting of global identification and global citizenship.

Education is influential in connecting individuals, cultures and communities across borders (Hanson, 2008; Papastergiadis, 2000; Vertovec, 1999, 2009) and acts as “major driver of the global mobility of people, especially from developing countries to developed English-speaking countries” (Rizvi, 2009, p. 269), with the policy objectives of the Australian government linking both students and institutions “across the borders of nation states” (Vertovec, 1999, p.2). Education plays a critical role in raising awareness of global issues that impact upon society today (Davis, Evan and Reid, 2005; Lapayese, 2003; Su, Bullivant and Holt, 2013), and is increasingly seen as a means in which to support the imaginings of individuals across borders, acknowledging both established cosmopolitan orientations and a response to the transnationalising aspirations and dispositions of the globalised world.

The promotion of frameworks that support global understanding as a means to global citizenship is acknowledged in a number of programs, most prominently offered in the United States (Lewin, 2010), the United Kingdom (Ibrahim, 2005; Mannion, Biesta, Priestley, & Ross, 2011) and in Australia, including the Global Education Project, supported by the Australian federal government. However, of the programs driven by aspirations and reform that seek to unite students through education, the International Baccalaureate (IB) is now perhaps the most prominent. Schools operate as places where great amounts of linguistic and cultural diversity are evident, where students display connections to various parts of the world, as well as to constructs such as religion, that transcend national boundaries and reflect and acknowledge a myriad of dispositions. Subsequently, some schools are now actively attempting to accommodate linguistic and cultural diversity and affirm diverse student identities, with programs and curricula choices now promoting facilitation of global understanding (Oxley & Morris, 2013). Yet as more of those living in Australia retain cultural ties with their home and subsequent countries, so too does the difficulty of enacting a school experience that acknowledges the cultural diversity of students against national agendas and interests.

In Australia, education policy reform has focused on policy curriculum, the taught curriculum, the assessed curriculum and the learned curriculum, in addition to the role of the teacher in promoting student outcomes (Hattie, 2009; 2012). In an attempt to ratify Australia’s federalised education

Author Name: **Anna Dabrowski**

Contact Email: anna.dabrowski@unimelb.edu.au

system, a number of national education reforms have been enacted over the past decade, stemming from the established and revised National Goals for Schooling (MCTEEYA, 2008), including the introduction of the Australian National Curriculum (ACARA, 2015) and the implementation of the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers (AITSL, 2015). These policy reforms aim to improve teacher quality and augment the academic performance of Australian students, with the national curriculum acknowledging a need for Australian students to have increased access to a curriculum that fosters and encourages diversity (ACARA, 2015) and support to emerge into the world beyond the classroom. Yet curriculum reforms such as those taking place in Australia continue to be negotiated locally and driven by national agendas (Savage and O'Connor, 2014) despite their enactment taking place transnationalising times.

The Australian Curriculum reflects an effort to acknowledge and support students for a changing world, yet it is a national, rather than transnational curriculum, and it can be seen as a “protective reinforcement of a community centered on Euro-American conceptions, in which ‘Western’ principles dominate at the cost of acknowledging ‘the Other’ “ (Casinader 2015, p.31). The recent Review of the Australian National Curriculum, commissioned by the Australian Government’s Department of Education and Training (2014) and carried out by Kevin Donnelly and Kenneth Wiltshire (2014) espouses a restricted Judeo Christian, Westernized view of knowledge and learning that privileges the local over the transnational, and further problematizes the issue of incorporating diverse perspectives into student learning experiences. While there is undoubtedly a need for Australian students to understand their local and national surroundings, developing a global perspective is critical for students and is “no longer a luxury but a necessity for survival in the new millennium” (Pike & Selby, 2000, p.2), so that individual “views of the world are not ethnocentric, stereotypical or otherwise limited by a narrow or distorted point of view” (Evans & Reynolds, 2004, p.7). Despite increasing levels of student connectedness and share interactions and aspirations with those across borders, much of the teaching and learning that takes place in Australia focuses on local issues and interests (Casinader, 2015), and I argue that there must now be a shift towards policy, curricula and pedagogies that recognise and respond to the transnationalising dispositions of the education sector and foster construct of what Rizvi and Lingard (2000) term a ‘global imagination’. It is in light of these acknowledgements that I will now discuss the “conditions of possibility” (Savage and O’Connor, 2014) for educational reform that acknowledge the transnationalising of schools and students, with a focus on curricula choices in Australia that move beyond the national and the local. Although there are a number of programs and syllabus choices that aim to expand and enrich student perspectives on issues of global understanding and global citizenship, the International Baccalaureate is arguably most vocal in its mission to facilitate the development of global learners.

Driving “International Mindedness” or Cosmopolitan capital?

Recently, international agendas have raised questions about education “within the global context and the location and representation of global citizenship in school curricula” (Osler, 2002, p. 2). The International Baccalaureate is one of several curricula offered internationally that acknowledges the needs and desires of a global cohort of students. However, unlike national curricula choices offered in international settings (such as British or American curriculum taught in international schools outside of the United Kingdom or United States), the aim of the IB is to provide “a truly international education” (International Baccalaureate, 2015a) that acknowledges and engages students with the world around them. The IB offers four programs, the Primary Years Programme (PYP), the Middle Years Programme (MYP), the Diploma Programme (DP) and the Career Related Certificate in more than 4000 schools around the world (International Baccalaureate, 2015b; 2015c). Although traditionally positioned in the domain of international schools and offered to socially advantaged students (Whitehead, 2005), the IB’s growing presence in the Australian education space acknowledges the ongoing “globalization of culture and educational practice” (Rizvi, 2008) across states, territories and sectors. While the Diploma Programme, taught in Years 11 and 12, provides a

Author Name: **Anna Dabrowski**

Contact Email: anna.dabrowski@unimelb.edu.au

highly competitive, globally recognized pathway to tertiary study around the world, the underling focus of all IB programs has been to provide students with the opportunity to engage in “a truly international education- an education that encouraged an understanding and appreciation of other cultures, languages and points of view” and supports development of ‘responsible, compassionate citizens’ (Whitehead 2005, p.2). In acknowledgement of Oxfam’s definition of global citizenship as implicitly linked to social justice and social equity, the “internationally minded” nature of the IB curriculum provides a framework under which students can understand and address injustice, and in so doing, develop as socially responsible citizens (Bunnell 2003). Yet there have been criticisms of the IB, with opponents in the United States vocally labeling International Baccalaureate programs “globalist”, “foreign”, “Marxist” and “anti-American” (Bunnell, 2009; Walters, 2006).

In Australia, the International Baccalaureate has grown in popularity, and there are now 157 schools offering one or more of the four IB programs (International Baccalaureate, 2015b). Although criticisms against the IB in Australia have not focused on the global nature of the curricula as an area of detriment, some have argued that IB schools do not facilitate social justice, but rather, instill social advantage (Bagnall, 1997; Sullivan, 2004. Bagnall expresses concern over the proliferation of IB schools in Australia, which he sees as playing a role in the reinforcement of social inequity through the provision of cosmopolitan capital that helps IB learners to stay “ahead of the pack” (Bagnall, 1997, p.142). Yet despite the criticisms that the International Baccalaureate programs have been designed to advantage a cohort of cosmopolitan elites, it could also be argued that the mission of the International Baccalaureate- “to create a better world through education” (International Baccalaureate, 2015a) - offers a pathway to remedying a fragmented society. If we are to assume this perspective on the underlying aims of the IB, the mission of the International Baccalaureate aligns with the conceptions and definitions of global citizenship, and is increasingly relevant to individuals who share connectedness to more than one country. Further, the programs offered by the IB reflect and acknowledge the transnationalising expectations, values and dispositions of Australian schools, and provide a context for the enactment of global citizenship.

Pedagogies, Programs and Practices: The Role of the Teacher

Australian students and their teachers continue to bring rich cultural and linguistic heritage to the classroom and their experiences during the formative years of school have the potential to impact beyond the classroom context. This is a particularly important consideration for transnationalising spaces of education, such as IB schools that appeal to a globally oriented student body. But the diverse aspirations, voices and values of students are also important for educators, who influence the understandings and experiences of students (Hattie 2009, 2012). While transformative pedagogy (Cummins & Early; 2011; McDermott, Shelton, & Mogge, 2012; Miedema, 2012) is increasingly seen as a way to critically respond to student diversity, pedagogies that support global citizenship education remain unclear. The emergence of teacher education certificates such as the Global Competence Certificate facilitated by Columbia University and the Asia Society (GCC, 2015), acknowledge the shifting practices of education sectors and the need to support teachers working in fields of global education, global competence and global citizenship. These certificates reflect the growing aim to develop and sustain global competence in educators, and support them to actively engage with global issues and recognise student diversity. The International Baccalaureate also supports teachers by providing frameworks and pedagogies to develop “21st century skills” with an outcome of international mindedness (Singh & Qi, 2013), promoting the acquisition of knowledge to be supported through activities such as scaffolding, debates, discursive colloquium, oral presentations, written assignments and peer collaboration (Singh & Qi, 2013). Though global citizenship is not described as an explicit outcome of the development of these skills, activities and practices designed to construct and share knowledge about the world are also reflected in existing frameworks and pedagogies for global citizenship education in the United Kingdom (McLean, Cook & Crowe; 2008; Waldron-Moore, 2013).

Author Name: **Anna Dabrowski**

Contact Email: anna.dabrowski@unimelb.edu.au

Deepening content knowledge, improving understanding of curricula frameworks and negotiating pedagogy against educational policies and practices are some of the many issues facing teachers working with a heterogeneous student body and particularly for those working to prepare students for global citizenship outside of the classroom (Waldron-Moore, 2013). Yet, outside of the United Kingdom, there is a paucity of research into what teachers do within the classroom and the role of programs and practices as a way to recognise, navigate and explore the complexity of student voices, attitudes, and beliefs against conceptualisations of global citizenship. It is now important to examine and explore how existing pedagogies for international mindedness and global competency extend further into realisations of global citizenship in Australian schools.

Enacting Global Citizenship in Australian Schools

Few studies have investigated how classroom discourse, and the individual voices, attitudes, experiences and aspirations students bring to their learning, contribute to understanding how the concept of global citizenship is enacted in classrooms. Educators play a significant role in shaping the attitudes and experiences of students, yet we know little of how teachers and students interpret and construct the concept of global citizenship within their schools, and how these views are shaped and enacted beyond the classroom. Future research must therefore move beyond describing the social and human interactions that occur within the classroom setting and how they relate to the concept of global citizenship, but contribute to the refinement of theory around the concept of global citizenship in order to support the development, implementation and sustainability of relevant programs and practices in Australian schools.

Moving forward, research into global citizenship should consider both the complexities of agendas that result in the myriad of definitions of the concept and also examine global citizenship as a way to illuminate classroom practices that acknowledge student diversity. Subsequently, by acknowledging and exploring programs and policies that respond to the transnationalising condition of Australian schools, a clear framework for understanding how the concept of global citizenship are enacted in classrooms will be increasingly possible. I have argued that the International Baccalaureate and schools that offer its programs are not only “internationally minded”, but also possess the ability to respond to the motives of global citizenship education, and provide a basis for exploration into practices that promote global understanding and acknowledgement of diversity. Research into the policies and pedagogies of International Baccalaureate schools therefore possesses relevance for Australian schools that wish to incorporate a transnational focus into their available programs and practice as a way by which to facilitate global citizenship education.

References

- Alexander, R. (2010). *Children, their world, their education. Final report and recommendations of the Cambridge Primary Review.*
- Andreotti, V. (2006). Soft versus critical global citizenship education. *Policy & Practice-A Development Education Review*, (3).
- Andrzejewski, J., & Alessio, J. (1999). Education for global citizenship and social responsibility. *Progressive Perspectives*, 1(2), 2-17.
- Appadurai, A. (1995). The production of locality. In R. Fardon (ed). *Counterworks* (pp. 204-225). London: Routledge.
- Appiah, K.A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers.* New York: W.W.Norton
- Australian Curriculum and Assessment Authority (2015). *Australian Curriculum.* Last accessed May 1st, 2015 from <http://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/>
- Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (2015). *The Australian Professional Standards for Teachers.* Last Accessed May 1st, 2015 from <http://www.aitsl.edu.au/australian->

Author Name: **Anna Dabrowski**

Contact Email: anna.dabrowski@unimelb.edu.au

- professional-standards-for-teachers
- Australian Government: Department of Education and Training (2014). Review of the Australian Curriculum: Final Report. Last accessed April 23rd, 2015 from <https://docs.education.gov.au/documents/review-australian-curriculum-final-report>
- Banks, J. A. (2007). Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives. Jossey-Bass, An Imprint of Wiley. 10475 Crosspoint Blvd, Indianapolis, IN 46256.
- Beck, U. (2012). "Redefining the Sociological Project: The Cosmopolitan Challenge". *Sociology*, 46(7), 7-12
- Brecher, J., Childs, J. B., & Cutler, J. (1993). *Global visions: Beyond the new world order*. Black Rose Books Ltd
- Bunnell, T. (2009). The International Baccalaureate in the USA and the emerging 'culture war'. *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education*, 30(1), 61-72
- Carter, A. (2013). *Political theory of global citizenship*. Routledge.
- Carter, A. (1997). Nationalism and global citizenship. *Australian Journal of Politics & History*, 43(1), 67-81.
- Casinader, N. (2015). Transnationalism in the Australian Curriculum: new horizons or destinations of the past? *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*.
- Cummins, J. & Early, M. (2011). *Identity Texts: The Collaborative Creation of Power in Multilingual Schools*. London: Institute of Education Press.
- Davies, L. (2006). Global citizenship: abstraction or framework for action?. *Educational review*, 58(1), 5-25.
- Dobson, A (2005) 'Globalisation, cosmopolitanism and the Environment', *International Relations*, Vol.19, pp.259-273.
- Dower, N. (2000). The idea of global citizenship-A sympathetic assessment. *Global Society*, 14(4), 553-567.
- Dower, N. (2002). Global ethics and global citizenship. *Global citizenship: A critical introduction*, 146-157.
- Evans, M. (2006, mimeo). *Educating for Global Citizenship in Schools: Contrasting Perspectives and Practices*. Toronto: OISE/UT.
- Evans, M., & Reynolds, C. (2004). Introduction: Educating for global citizenship in a changing world. Retrieved April 9th 2015, from <http://cide.oise.utoronto.ca/globalcitizenship/intro.pdf>
- Fanghanel, J., & Cousin, G. (2012). 'Worldly' pedagogy: a way of conceptualizing teaching towards global citizenship. *Teaching in Higher education*, 17(1), 39-50.
- Folk, R. (1993). The making of global citizenship. *Global visions: Beyond the new world order*, 39.
- Furia, P. A. (2005). Global citizenship, anyone? Cosmopolitanism, privilege and public opinion. *Global Society*, 19(4), 331-359.
- Global Competence Certificate (2015). *Global Competence Certificate Program*. Last accessed August 1st, 2015 from <http://globalcompetencecertificate.org/>
- Hage, G. (2003). *Against Paranoid Nationalism: Searching for Hope in a Shrinking Society*. Pluto Press Australia.
- Hanson, L. (2008). Global citizenship, global health, and the internationalization of curriculum: A study of transformative potential. *Journal of Studies in International Education*.
- Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. Routledge.
- Hattie, J. A. C. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of 800+ meta-analyses on achievement*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Haydon, G. (2006). Respect for persons and for cultures as a basis for national and global citizenship. *Journal of Moral Education*, 35(4), 457-471.
- Hutchings, K. (2002). *Feminism and global citizenship* (pp. 53-62). Edinburgh University Press.
- Ibrahim, T. (2005). Global citizenship education: Mainstreaming the curriculum? *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 35(2), 177-194.
- International Baccalaureate. (2015a) *Mission*. Last accessed June 4th 2015, from <http://www.ibo.org/en/about-the-ib/mission/>

Author Name: **Anna Dabrowski**

Contact Email: anna.dabrowski@unimelb.edu.au

- International Baccalaureate (2015b). Facts and Figures. Last accessed June 4th 2015, from <http://www.ibo.org/en/about-the-ib/facts-and-figures/>
- International Baccalaureate. (2015c) Programmes. Last accessed June 4th 2015, from <http://www.ibo.org/en/programmes/>
- Jefferess, D. (2008). Global citizenship and the cultural politics of benevolence. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices*, 2(1), 27-36.
- Karlberg, M. (2008). Discourse, identity, and global citizenship. *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice*, 20(3), 310-320
- Kapoor, I (2004) 'Hyper-self-reflexive development? Spivak on representing the Third World "Other"', *Third World Quarterly*, Vol.4, pp.627-647.
- Kleingeld, P. (2013). Cosmopolitanism. *The International Encyclopedia of Ethics*
- Lapayese, Y. V. (2003). Toward a critical global citizenship education. *Comparative Education Review*, 47(4), 493-501.
- Lewin, R. (Ed.). (2010). *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad: Higher education and the quest for global citizenship*. Routledge.
- McDermott, M., Shelton, N. R., & Mogge, S. G. (2012). Preservice Teachers' Perceptions of Immigrants and Possibilities of Transformative Pedagogy: Recommendations for a Praxis of "Critical Aesthetics". *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 14(2).
- McIntosh, P. (2005). Gender perspectives on educating for global citizenship. *Educating citizens for global awareness*, 22-39.
- McLean, L. R., Cook, S. A., & Crowe, T. (2008). Imagining global citizens: Teaching peace and global education in a teacher education-programme. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 4(1), 50-64.
- 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.
- Miedema, S. (2012). A transformative pedagogy for classrooms with pluralistic worldviews. *Philosophy of Education Archive*, 303-305.
- Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training, and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA). (2008). *Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians*, December 2008.
- Nussbaum, M. (1996). 'Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism', in J. Cohen (ed) *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*, Boston: Beacon Press. Pp 2-20
- Nussbaum, M. (1994). 'Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism', *Boston Review*, 19(5), pp 3-34
- Noddings, N. (Ed.). (2005). *Educating citizens for global awareness* (pp. 1-4). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Osler, A. (2002). *Learning to live together: Citizenship education on an interdependent world*. Global Citizenship Supplement, Centre for Citizenship Studies in Education, University of Leicester, 2-6.
- Oxfam (2014). *Global Citizenship*. Last Accessed May 20th 2015, from <http://www.oxfam.org.uk/education/global-citizenship>
- Oxley, L., & Morris, P. (2013). Global citizenship: A typology for distinguishing its multiple conceptions. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 61(3), 301-325.
- Papastergiadis, N. (2000). *The turbulence of migration*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Peppers, C. (2006). The dangerous pronoun: An ecopoetics of "We.". *International Journal of the Arts in Society*, 1(2), 93-100.
- Pigozzi, M. J. (2006). A UNESCO view of global citizenship education. *Educational Review*, 58(1), 1-4.
- Pike, G. & Selby, D. (2000). *In the global classroom 2*. Toronto: Pippin Publishing.
- Rizvi, F. (2011). Diversity within Transnationalism. Professor Fazal Rizvi looks at the implications of global mobilisation for those involved in education. *International Schools Journal*, 13, 20+
- Rizvi, F. (2009). Global Mobility. In *Globalisation and the Study of Education*. Popkewitz, T. & Rizvi, F. (Eds).
- Rizvi, F. (2008). Education and its cosmopolitan possibilities. *Transformation Learning in Schools and*

Author Name: **Anna Dabrowski**

Contact Email: anna.dabrowski@unimelb.edu.au

- Communities. *The Remaking of Education for a Cosmopolitan Society*, 101-16.
- Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2000). Globalization and education: Complexities and contingencies. *Educational Theory*, 50(4), 419-426.
- Robbins, M., Francis, L. J., & Elliott, E. (2003). Attitudes toward education for global citizenship among trainee teachers. *Research in Education*, 69(1), 93-98.
- Robertson, S. L. (2008). Embracing the global: crisis and the creation of a new semiotic order to secure Europe's knowledge-based economy. *Education and the knowledge based economy in Europe*. Rotterdam: Sense.
- Savage, G. C., & O'Connor, K. (2014). National agendas in global times: curriculum reforms in Australia and the USA since the 1980s. *Journal of Education Policy*, (ahead-of-print), 1-22.
- Schattle, H. (2008a). Education for global citizenship: Illustrations of ideological pluralism and adaptation. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 13(1), 73-94.
- Schattle, H. (2008b). *The practices of global citizenship*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Sennett, R. (1998). *The corrosion of character: The transformation of work in modern capitalism*. New York and London: Norton Company.
- Shachar, A., & Hirschl, R. (2007). Citizenship as inherited property. *Political Theory*, 35(3), 253-287.
- Sheppard, K. (2004). Global citizenship: The human face of international education. *International Education*, 34(1), 34.
- Shultz, L. (2007). Educating for global citizenship: Conflicting agendas and understandings. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 53(3).
- Singh, M. & Qi, J. (2013). *21st Century International Mindedness: An Exploratory Study of its Conceptualisation and Assessment*. Centre for Educational Research: University of Western Sydney.
- Stoner, L., Perry, L., Wadsworth, D., Stoner, K. R., & Tarrant, M. A. (2014). Global citizenship is key to securing global health: The role of higher education. *Preventive medicine*, 64, 126-128.
- TeachUNICEF (2015). *Global Citizenship*. Last Accessed May 1st 2015, <http://teachunicef.org/explore/topic/global-citizenship>
- Torres, C. A. (2015). Global Citizenship and Global Universities. *The Age of Global Interdependence and Cosmopolitanism*. *European Journal of Education*.
- Tully, J. (2008). Two meanings of global citizenship: Modern and diverse. *Global citizenship education: philosophy, theory and pedagogy*, 15-40.
- Van Den Anker, C. (2010). Transnationalism and cosmopolitanism: towards global citizenship? *Journal of International Political Theory*, 6(1), 73-94.
- Vertovec, S. (2009). *Transnationalism*. Milton Park, Abingdon: Routledge.
- Vertovec, S., & Cohen, R. (2002). *Conceiving cosmopolitanism: Theory, context and practice*. Oxford University Press.
- Vertovec, S. (1999). Conceiving and researching transnationalism. *Ethnic and racial studies*, 22(2), 447-462.
- Waldron-Moore, P. N. (2013). *Preparing Students for Global Citizenship: Role Play as a Pedagogical Tool*. In 2013 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference Paper.
- Walters, J. (2006). All American trouble. *The Guardian*, 14.
- Wetherell, M., Taylor, S., & Yates, S. J. (Eds.). (2001). *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis*. Sage.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology*. Univ of California Press.
- Whitehead, K. I. (2006). Advertising advantage: The International Baccalaureate, social justice and the marketisation of schooling. *AARE'05 Education Research: Creative Dissent: Construction Solutions*.
- Yamashita, H. (2006). Global citizenship education and war: The needs of teachers and learners. *Educational Review*, 58(1), 27-39.