EDITORIAL

Global Education: a worldwide movement.
An Update

KENNETH A. TYE

The original *Global Education: a worldwide movement,* based on a study begun in 1992, was published in 1999.[1] A brief questionnaire was developed that asked about definitions, goals, content, teaching methods, teacher preparation, decision-making, and barriers to global education in the K-12 (primary and secondary education in the USA and Canada) systems of the world. Ministry of Education people in a number of countries were contacted and asked to respond to the questionnaire. In addition, a number of well-known global educators in the United States as well as in a few other countries were asked to identify potential respondents. Finally, selected members of the International Association for Intercultural Education (IAIE) were sent questionnaires. This was a long and difficult process, often involving much follow-up. By the middle of 1996, after efforts had been made to collect data in more than 100 countries, responses had been received from 52 countries, from every region of the world.

The original study had several limitations. First, data were gathered over several years and changes could have occurred in countries from which early responses were received. Second, there was usually only one respondent from each country, and even though each individual was thought to be fairly knowledgeable, no one person could be expected to know about all global education activities in her or his country. Third, not every country was represented in the study. In fact, in spite of a good deal of effort, responses were not received from some important nations; for example, France and the People's Republic of China. Fourth, despite the fact that the questionnaire was printed in English, Spanish and French, it is possible that it was found by some to be unclear or hard to understand. Finally, there was some evidence to suggest that global education was sometimes viewed as a political matter. For example, it was clear that some people in developing countries saw the movement as a western one, part of the old hegemony, and therefore not appropriate for them because they were more interested in nation building. Such a perspective might have caused potential respondents to dispose of the questionnaire rather than to complete and return it.[2]

In the 18 years since 1996, the field has changed, mostly for the better. This update is an attempt to describe the current status of the field. Rather than repeat the cumbersome methodology of the previous study, and because there now is a substantial international literature about global education, it was thought that a meta-analysis of the field presented in the literature might better suffice to describe what is currently happening in the world with regard to global education. The analysis of the literature is divided into three separate, but interrelated segments, as follows:

1. Definitions of the field, including the degree to which they may have changed or not over time.
2. The current content of the field.
3. Resistance to the movement. While nationalism is still a major reason for resistance, there are new forces brought about by international globalization that need to be considered.

The Search for a Definition of Global Education

The definition used in the first Worldwide Movement report came from the 1991 Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) Yearbook, *Global Education: from thought to action*. That was:

> Global education involves learning about those problems and issues that cut across national boundaries, and about the interconnectedness of systems – ecological, cultural, economic, political, and technological.

> Global education involves perspective taking – seeing things through the eyes and minds of others – and it means the realization that while individuals and groups may view life differently, they also have common needs and wants.[3]

Current definitions include the following.

Canada

There has been much debate and contestation around what is meant by global citizenship education (GCE) in Canada, even though there is much activity in the country. Some consistent elements lead to a definition of GCE as an agenda for a social justice-oriented approach to teaching and learning about global issues in the classroom.[4] One fairly consistent definition has emerged, as follows:

> GCE pushes beyond an exclusively national perspective of world affairs, avoiding reducing civics and global studies to social studies topics, and breaking from tokenizing and exoticizing foreign places and peoples. As an orientation to learning, GCE encourages students to understand globalization, to adopt a self-critical approach to how they and their nation are implicated in local and global problems, to engage in inter-cultural perspectives and diversity, and to recognize and use their political agency towards effecting change and promoting social and environmental justice.[5]

In 2010, the Elementary Teachers' Federation of Ontario (ETFO), working with the Ontario Institute for the Study of Education (OISE) at Toronto University, published *A Global Framework for Junior and Intermediate Teachers*. It includes a month-by-month plan to lead discussion and activities on various global issues for both levels. The program states that the dimensions of global understanding are: (1) Knowledge of a global dynamic: the idea of the Earth as an interconnected system; (2) Human choices: the idea of power to act on an issue; (3) Social action: students have the power to create change (learning = empathy–empowerment = change).[6]

Europe

The Europe-wide Global Education Congress, held in Maastricht, the Netherlands in November 2002, was a pioneering event. It brought together representatives from every nation in Europe except Belarus, as well as representatives from several other nations of the world as observers. Its primary focus was global education in Europe. Broad consensus was achieved on the need to strengthen global education.[7] For the first time there was an agreed-upon statement of the importance of global education for Europe and a corresponding framework to aid in the development of global education programs in the nations of Europe:

> Global Education is education that opens people's eyes and minds to the realities of the world, and awakens them to bring about a world of greater justice, equity and human rights for all.

> Global Education is understood to encompass development education, human rights education, education for sustainability, education for peace and conflict prevention, and intercultural education; being the dimensions of education for citizenship.[8]

Global Education Network Europe (GENE) is the network of ministries and agencies with national responsibility for global education in European countries. These entities develop national policy and provide funding for global education in each participating European country. Expertise is combined through structured networking, sharing of strategies, and a peer learning approach that

leads to enhanced results both nationally and across nations. Beginning in 2001 with six national institutions in six countries, GENE has grown to nearly 30 countries. GENE uses the Maastricht definition of global education.[9]

Japan

Ideas about education for international understanding in Japan came from UNESCO in the aftermath of World War II. Learning more about others, it was argued, would lead to world peace. The term 'education for international understanding' was popularized. The predecessors of global education in Japan, adapted from UNESCO, included education for international understanding, development education, multicultural education, human rights education, and peace education. Each of these movements had its own history, and each involved important tensions between international and domestic politics.[10]

The idea of Global Education, which came from the United States to Japan in the 1970s, was that there should be an emphasis upon global perspectives rather than ethnocentrism, as well as education about global issues such as those listed above.[11]

Australia

Global Perspectives: a statement on global education for Australian schools was first published in 2002, but there had been scattered efforts dating all the way back to the 1970s. The purpose was to clarify the goals, rationale, emphasis, and processes of global education and to serve as a resource – a philosophical and practical reference point – for all Australian K-12 teachers and students. This document was updated in 2008 and aims to make global education even more accessible to teachers and curriculum planners. It provides a revised framework for global education, recommendations about integrating global perspectives within and across learning areas, and advice for teachers and school leadership teams about how to implement the framework at a school level. Professional development advice is also provided for teachers, coordinators and school leaders. The definition of global education used in Australia is:

> Enabling young people to participate in shaping a better shared future for the world is at the heart of global education. It emphasizes the unity and interdependence of human society, developing a sense of self and appreciation of cultural diversity, affirmation of social justice and human rights, building peace and actions for a sustainable future in different times and places. It places particular emphasis on developing relationships with our neighbors in the Asia-Pacific and Indian Ocean regions.

Global education promotes open-mindedness, leading to new thinking about the world and a predisposition to take action for change. Students learn to take responsibility for their actions, respect and value diversity and see themselves as global citizens who can contribute to a more peaceful, just and sustainable world.[12]

United States

There has been no central source for global education since the American Forum for Global Education closed in 2003. Even without a central clearing house, there are many global education programs in the United States. To get a sense of the number of programs that there are in the USA, one has only to go to the *Global Education Yellow Pages*, an online, up-to-date listing of global education resources for K-12 teachers, and based on the definition set forth in the 1991 ASCD Yearbook, stated at the beginning of this article.[13] William Gaudelli did a comprehensive study of the definitions of the field in 2003.[14] The following are representative of the definitions he chose to select:

> Becker (1979) Multiple levels of analysis of events (i.e. individuals, nation states, international organizations), interdependence, individual involvement. Concern for the well-being of all humanity, interactions between humans and the environment.[15]

Case (1993) Substantive Dimensions: universal and cultural values, global inter-connectedness, contemporary worldwide concerns, origins and patterns of world-wide affairs. Perceptual Dimensions: open-mindedness, anticipation of complexity, resistance to stereotyping, inclination to empathize, non-chauvinism.[16]

Hanvey (1976) *Perspective consciousness*: An awareness of and appreciation for others' images of the World. *State of the planet awareness*: An in-depth understanding of global issues and events. *Cross-cultural awareness*: A general understanding of the defining characteristics of world cultures, with an emphasis on understanding similarities and differences. *Systemic awareness*: A familiarity with the nature of systems and an introduction to the complex international system in which state and non-state actors are linked in patterns of interdependence and dependence in a variety of issue areas. *Options for participation*: A review of strategies for participating in issue areas in local, national, and international settings.[17]

Kniep (1986) Global education as content knowledge, human values, global systems, global issues/problems, and global history.[18.]

Merryfield (1997) Global education includes the study of human beliefs and values, global systems, global issues and problems, cross-cultural understanding, awareness of human choices, global history, acquisition of indigenous knowledge, and the development of analytical, evaluative, and participatory skills.[19]

All of the definitions given thus far vary in length and substance. Some focus only on various kinds of knowledge, while others deal more with perspective taking. In general, they tend to involve four major themes:

1. Knowledge of global issues and problems.
2. The world as a set of systems.
3. Perspective taking.
4. Preparing students to become active in working for social justice and a better world.

Thus, it seems that with the addition of the latter theme, taking action, the definition given at the beginning of this article would best seem to define the field in the USA at this time, as follows:

- Global education involves learning about those problems and issues that cut across national boundaries, and about the interconnectedness of systems – ecological, cultural, economic, political, and technological.
- Global education involves perspective taking – seeing things through the eyes and minds of others.
- Global education involves taking individual and collective action for social justice and the creation of a better world.

United Kingdom

See the section below on 'Barriers and Challenges for Global Education'.

New Zealand

New Zealand is an interesting case of a nation that does not per se advocate global education, while at the same time including many of the topics that can be said to be part of a global education curriculum. The neo-liberal economic reforms of the 1980s ultimately led to the New Zealand Education Act of 1989, which was based upon market theory and which focused upon decentralization of decision making to the school site. As a result, social sciences offered in secondary schools and chosen by local authorities have been mostly the classic disciplines: economics, history, and geography.[20]

In recent years, with curriculum decision-making moving back to the center, we can see some global education courses coming back into play.[21] To date we are still looking for a definition of global education in New Zealand.

Higher Education

The Global Studies Consortium is a group of graduate programs in global studies that seeks to collaborate in teaching and research. The consortium is open to any academic program in the world that offers a graduate MA, M.Sc., M.Phil., or PhD related to global studies. The consortium aims to share curricula and ideas about teaching programs; exchange teaching materials, including lectures and reading lists; facilitate cooperative teaching projects, such as distance learning, on both bilateral and multilateral levels; survey student career paths; share information about employment and internships for students; and encourage student and faculty exchange agreements. The first meeting of the consortium was at the University of California, Santa Barbara in 2007, at which time its mission statement was written. In 2013 it met in Moscow, and in 2014 in Roskilde, Denmark. Over 40 universities in Europe, Asia, North America, and Australia have participated in consortium activities.[22]

The Centre for Global Studies in Education at the University of Waikato in New Zealand researches the educational dimensions in distinctive forms of global processes, interconnectivity, and intercultural education and dialogue on the model of open science, open education and open knowledge production. It includes, but is not limited to, education policy and government; global youth cultures and identities; new media and popular cultures; the politics of social identities, gender, class and racial inequalities; political economy of knowledge production and knowledge management; education and development; the new global ecologies of learning; open education; and global citizenship and learning. The Centre for Global Studies in Education helps educators prepare students to navigate the complex, globalized world; to internationalize their curriculum and pedagogy; and help their students to critically reflect and understand what it means to be globally informed, aware and compassionate human beings (citizens of the world).[23]

Content of and Resources for Global Education

Canada

A Global Issues Planning Framework for Junior and Intermediate Teachers is one of the most comprehensive documents in the field. Its nearly 250 pages are full of lesson plans, teaching guides, instructional materials of all kinds (print, video, DVDs, simulations, discussion guides, etc.), and evaluation ideas. It begins with a month-by-month focus on issues such as human rights, environmental protection, racism, world poverty, black history/civil rights, fair trade, and HIV/AIDS. This is followed by listings of many sources of teaching and learning materials appropriate to the issues.[24]

Europe

Subsequent to the Maastricht Declaration of 2002 there have been a number of follow-up GENE conferences: London 2003, Brussels 2005, Helsinki 2007, Espoo, 2011, Lisbon 2012, and The Hague, also in 2012. For over a decade these conferences have focused upon policy issues. Phrases such as 'reflecting upon past achievements', 'growth in number of members', 'sharing of learnings', and 'renewed commitment to global education' seemed to dominate statements of outcomes from these conferences.[25] In addition, a number of member countries of GENE have issued strategy reports: Czech Republic, Austria, Finland, Ireland, Portugal, and Spain.[26] These reports, like the conference reports, deal with policy issues. All in all, there appears to be very little evidence of actual curriculum, teacher training, teaching and learning materials, or global education programs in schools. The following are descriptions of actual program developments in a few European countries.

Austria. In 2005, the Ministry of Education produced its GENE report which included a section on how global education can be integrated into teaching.[27] The Department for International Relations in the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture employed three non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to develop pilot seminars on global education for teachers from all of the nine school districts in Austria throughout 2006 and 2007. As part of their training in teaching

content and strategies, teachers were provided with teaching materials. Follow-up support was given to teachers who wished it. At the primary level, it is now compulsory for every school to teach one living foreign language to all students. Also, and while global education is not explicitly mentioned in the curriculum, teachers are encouraged to introduce global justice values across different subjects. At the secondary level, global education is infused into subjects such as geography, history, religious instruction and political education. The quantity and quality of global education depends, in great measure, upon the interest of the individual teacher. There are some courses with a global perspective at the university level focused on global issues.[28] There are 82 schools associated with the UNESCO Associated Schools Project in Austria. Pupils, teachers and education experts join with counterparts from Italy, the Netherlands, Cameroon, and Chile to develop and implement global education approaches. Results and experiences are shared vial the Internet.[29]

The Czech Republic. As in Austria, in the Czech Republic both the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Education take leadership in promoting global education. Also, as in Austria, the major approach to bringing global education into the classroom is to infuse it into the regular curriculum. The following cross-curricular subjects have been defined for basic education, and identified as having significant scope for the integration of global education perspectives: Personal and Social Education, Democratic Citizenship, Thinking within European and Global Contexts, Multicultural Education, Environmental Education, and Media Education.[30] There are a number of initiatives that bring global education into the schools of the Czech Republic. A few of these are described here:

> *One World in Schools* involves providing primary and secondary schools with documentary films focused on different topics including human rights, racism, drugs, Czech history and many others. Instructional handbooks and other materials are provided and seminars for teachers on how to use the documentaries in school lessons are also available.[31]

> The *Varianty* program includes seminars, courses and e-learning for teachers and student teachers of both primary and secondary schools, and provides them with materials and publications on a broad range of themes such as human rights, democracy and development-related issues.[32]

> The aim of the *Fair Trade Society* is to contribute toward the development of Fair Trade in the Czech Republic and raise awareness about development issues in general. It has developed very interesting educational programs for primary and secondary school levels, and has introduced a multicultural education program for kindergarteners in the Czech Republic. Specifically, the Fair Trade Society has developed 'The World in the Shopping Cart,' targeted to 14-18 year olds as well as to their teachers.[33]

The Global Education Network of Young Europeans (GLEN) is a 12-country German-led initiative, including the Czech Republic, aimed at building the capacity of young people in Europe concerning development cooperation and global education. Among its activities, young people go as volunteers to developing countries.[34]

Poland. As with all other countries that signed the Maastricht Accord, the Polish Ministry of National Education and the Ministry of Science took responsibility for the implementation of global education. Poland can be said to be representative of most other countries that have agreed to the Accord. At this point in time, they are still in a planning and consolidation phase. They all have come up against the problems that will be discussed in the next section of this report. That said, there have been some developments in global education in Poland. In 2008 a national curriculum reform took place which included a significant impetus for the infusion of global education into the existing curriculum. The goal is that by the time the reform is fully implemented throughout the curriculum from kindergarten through higher education, 5% of the education that is carried out will be quality global education.[35] NGOs have a major role in bringing global education to the schools in Poland, as they are in other European countries. In addition, the Faculty of Oriental Studies at Warsaw University has developed an educational toolkit with an emphasis on particular areas of Africa and Asia, attacking the concept of 'us' and 'them'. It includes

30 teaching units and a multimedia CD.[36] New curriculum standards across subjects include matters related to global education, such as the promotion of sustainable development, biology, human rights, social policy or intercultural dialogue, and social communication.

And so it goes, one European country after another reporting much the same progress in developing global education programs: a great deal of bureaucratic time spent in justifying no direct action – more specifically stating that action must come from the local government; discussion of problems of funding; and counting on NGOs for actual program development.

The Polish statement that by the time curriculum reform is complete from kindergarten to higher education, 5% of the education that will be carried out will be quality global education is probably representative of all of the twenty-plus European nations involved in the Global Education Network Europe (GENE) program. The other nations of Europe, including others that signed the Maastricht Accord, have done even less. Reasons for this disappointing situation will be discussed in the section on barriers and challenges of this report.

Japan

The globalization of Japanese society in every walk of life was extremely rapid in the 1980s, while the educational system remained somewhat backward. In 1989, the national curriculum emphasized environmental education and education for international understanding. However, it was difficult for teachers to find places in the curriculum to add these two new emphases.[37] Local initiatives to support development education in the 1990s spread widely and carry through to the present, involving schools, communities and NGOs. Development education seeks fairness and justice among members of the global community, and the co-existence of races and nations.[38]

The Ministry of Education set up three special projects in 1998 regarding integrated subjects: curriculum development, a participatory learning study group, and a partnership study group. The partnership study group encourages partnerships among schools, communities and NGOs for integrated studies. The 12 curriculum development groups have built curricula on Child Culture, Food, Environment, Trade, Poverty, Literacy, Refugees, International Cooperation, Gender, Foreigners in Japan, and Our Community. By 2002, Integrated Studies was introduced in primary and junior high schools. This was defined as three hours a week during which time the school is able to conduct its own specially designed courses, particularly utilizing interdisciplinary subjects. In these blocs of time, schools are encouraged to provide lessors having to do with international understanding, the environment, human rights, and other global education topics.[39]

Australia

Australian teachers have a wide range of global education instructional materials available to them. For example, the 'Resource Gallery' has images, videos, teaching activities, publications, templates, and a long list of links to many other agencies that also have materials. These are all organized by level of schooling, issue, and country of interest. There is also a section in which teachers can share their ideas with other teachers as well as see ideas posted by others.[40]

A significant number of teaching strategies are listed for teachers interested in global education. These include skills such as:

1. Distinguishing between fact and opinion.
2. Analyzing stereotypes.
3. Using statistics.
4. Simulations and online games.
5. Web tools and apps.
6. Thinking skills.
7. Intercultural understanding.[41]

Another source for Australian teachers is a list of sample learning activities that encourage a global perspective across the various subject areas of the curriculum and levels of schooling. Such issues as human rights, peace, the environment, disaster preparedness, HIV/AIDS, sustainability, micro-financing, and the United Nations millennium goals are included.[42]

Finally, there are school case studies, separate from the gallery, describing various global education programs that could be of value to teachers everywhere. They cover such things as sustainability, peace, human rights, making a multicultural school, connecting through technology, bridging cultures, and poverty and fair trade.[43]

The United States

Like many countries in the western world, the United States suffered from the rise of neo-liberalism. The *Nation at Risk* report of the Reagan administration in 1983 [44] and the *No Child Left Behind* act of the George Bush administration in 2001 [45], both of which called for 'a return to the basics' and constant standardized testing, led many teachers to be conservative and turn away from global education.

As with the Australian K-12 teachers, however, there has been room for committed teachers in the United States to infuse global education into their curricula and there is a wealth of global education teaching materials available. One has to go no further than the *Global Education Yellow Pages*, mentioned earlier, to see the vast array of instructional materials.[46] The resource is divided into three major sections: Regional Resources, Subject Matter Resources, and Grade Level Resources. The first section, Regional Resources, contains multiple sites with resources for teaching about Africa, Asia, Canada, Europe, Latin America, the Middle East, and international issues. The second section, Subject Matter Resources, includes global issues covered in subject matter taught in American schools: the arts, business and economics, civics, the environment, foreign languages, geography, law and values, science, sustainability, technology, and world history. There are special sections on human rights, global education, global issues (hunger, indigenous peoples, multicultural education, peace and conflict studies, population, and poverty).

The final section, Grade Level Resources, directs teachers to programs at the K-12 level, including single schools and network programs. All in all, there are 525 specific resources for teachers to access as they search for ideas, programs, and instructional materials. In addition, many of these sites have links to other resources. For example, the UNESCO Associated Schools Network has 9000 educational institutions listed in over 180 countries.[47] While the main target of the *Global Education Yellow Pages* is teachers in the United States, it can be useful to teachers around the world. Of course, that is true of all of the resources described in this document. Cross-national borrowing is encouraged.

As a point of interest, the following are examples of sites listed under technology, which is included in the definition of global education given at the beginning of this paper: Classroom Connect, Education World, e.Pal.com, Classroom Exchange, Kidlink, Lesson Planet, School Wires, Inc., Skype in the Classroom, and Think Quest.

The United Kingdom

Margaret Thatcher was the leader who brought neo-liberal values to United Kingdom public K-12 schools in the 1980s. The National Curriculum was introduced, mandating that in England and Wales there would be a strong emphasis on the basics, frequent testing, and parental choice of schools.[48]

However, and as in Australia and the USA, there are many teachers in England and Wales who wish to infuse global education into their curricula, and many good instructional materials and other resources can be found. One of the most well-known organizations involved in global education in the United Kingdom is Oxfam.[49] The following are some of the most important resources provided by Oxfam to teachers:

1. Catalogue for schools. This catalogue contains over 450 specially selected resources across all curriculum areas, and includes teaching packs, books, games, posters and DVDs.
2. Get Global: a skill-based approach to active global citizenship. A toolkit to help teachers guide pupils in identifying, investigating, and acting upon global issues.
3. *Growing Up Global*: a handbook of over 79 activities, including stories, songs, poems, recipes, and games. It will help young children develop positive attitudes toward diversity.

4. *Education for Global Citizenship: a guide for schools*. Packed with practical activities for all age groups and subjects, this guide is a good starting place for teachers. There are versions for England, Scotland, and Wales.
5. Mapping Our World: An interactive website works with maps and globes to transform pupils' understanding of the world.

The Centre for Global Education in York has a long and exemplary history in global education. Currently, it mostly serves the needs of students and faculty members at the University of York. However, it does have teaching packs and artifacts available for loan to faculty and students as well as K-12 teachers.[50]

When you enter *global education* in your search engine, The Center for Global Education, Belfast is almost always near the top. Established in 1986, it provides in-service training in global education for teachers in Northern Ireland, and publications for teachers interested in various development themes.[51]

Cynfanfyd is a Welsh organization working to promote sustainable development and global citizenship (ESDGC). Cynfanfyd has produced a range of resources and support materials that can be used in schools and by other youth organizations. These include case studies, and *A Guide for Good Practices in Schools*. It also maintains a network of schools in Wales dedicated to the goals of the organization.[52]

The International Development Education Association of Scotland (IDEAS) is a network of organizations and individuals involved in development education and education for global citizenship across Scotland. There are six Development Education Centres in Scotland, all offering a variety of support services. Materials available to schools include teaching packs, videos, games CD ROMs, magazines, posters, books and photographs. The Centers also offer workshops on how to incorporate a global dimension into school curricula.[53]

Global Dimensions in the United Kingdom offers global education materials on the Internet, somewhat like the Global Education Yellow Pages does in the United States. One can go onto the website and choose a subject, topic, and age range or 'whole school', and a resource will come up that a teacher can use in her/his class. There are 34 subjects to choose from, 84 topics, and the age ranges 3-5, 6-7, 7-11, 11-14, 14-16, and 16+.[54]

Finally, the relatively new Global Learning Program (GLP) has created a national network of schools with teachers interested in effective teaching and learning about development and global issues for years 3-6 and 7-9. Resources such as teaching packs and videos are available, and there are workshops for interested teachers.[55]

New Zealand

Once a leader in providing global education in its schools, neo-liberal systems change has almost eliminated the movement from the country, instead calling for a back-to-basics approach labeled as 'Supporting 21st Century Learning for New Zealand Students'.[56]

What remains are a few NGOs that offer resources for teachers interested in global education. One of these is *Global Focus Aotearoa* which has as its mission statement 'to take action for a just world'. It produces free magazines and lesson packs for use by classes on such topics as cultural perceptions of the future, the ethics of volunteerism, climate, global issues, potential debt solutions, and many others.[57]

A second source is UNICEF NZ which has materials listed by subject matter and grade level. Examples are: Years 7-8 Social Sciences – Climate Change/Water; Years 9-10 Social Sciences – Children in Conflict/Refugees; and Years 11-12 Geography – Child Poverty. Each unit contains teacher booklets, videos, a unit plan, photo essays and/or stories.[58]

A third source is World Vision New Zealand, from which teachers and schools can order free global education resources or buy or rent others. The pattern is to identify a school level, type of resource, and topic, much like other resources that have been listed earlier.[59]

Higher Education

A look at the eight years of meetings of the Global Studies Consortium from 2007 through 2014 shows an interesting development and increase in sophistication. In the first few years, the majority of sessions at the meetings covered topics such as 'The Common Focus on Global Studies'. 'What is Global Studies?', 'Is Global Studies an Academic Field?', 'Common Standards', and 'Networking'. In later years, topics of importance were far more substantive: 'Modeling & Paradigms for Global Studies', 'Economic Growth and the Extraction of Exhaustible Resources in an Open Economy', 'Regional Perspectives on the Field', and this author's favorite, 'The Emergence of a Global Society and the Crisis of Governance'.[60]

A major contribution of the Centre for Global Studies in Education Program at Waikato University is its focus on open education. It takes the position that the global knowledge economy (comprised of increasingly integrated cross-border distributed knowledge and learning systems) represents a new stage of development that is characterized by a fundamental sociality – knowledge and the value of knowledge is rooted in social relations. It means the rapid development of 'mind-intensive' industries, especially in software, media, health care, education, and other intellectually based industries. Increasingly, the move to the 'knowledge economy' redefines the value creation process, alters the organization and pattern of work, and creates new forms of borderless cooperation and intercultural exchange. This has led many national government and international organizations to plan for an economic restructuring that increasingly focuses on knowledge, education, and creativity.[61]

For the education systems of the world this translates to mean that distance, open learning and flexible systems use educational and telecommunications technology such as printed materials, video or teleconferencing, email, Internet and television. The aim is to give students as much control as possible over what, when, where and how they learn.[62]

Barriers and Challenges for Global Education

Nationalism

Nationalism is an infantile disease … it is the measles of mankind. (Albert Einstein)[63]

Nationalism is one of the major problems faced by those interested in global education. One only has to read the descriptions of global education throughout this report to see that it is invariably described within a nationalistic framework. What we need to do is to rethink what it means to critically conceptualize knowledge about the world – internalizing and acting upon our definition that tells us to 'learn about those problems and issues that cut across national boundaries'. As Binaya Subedi asks, 'How do we engage with complexities surrounding social differences such as gender, race, ethnicity, religion, etc. in the global context?'[64]

Subedi goes on to say that a critical global perspective advocates the value of going beyond the nation-state centered approach of teaching about topics such as history, politics, culture, etc. It calls for the need to develop curricula that account for transnational formations: an intervention that asks us to go beyond the issues that are confined within national borders. However, that is often easier said than done. For example, in Japan one of the main purposes of education is 'to enhance international understanding, and raise the attitude of respecting the culture and tradition of our nation'. In this sense, global education does not have a stable basis.[65]

Gaudelli, in a discussion of nationalism and global education, poses the question, 'How can teachers resolve the seemingly inherent tensions in global education between national loyalty and global responsibility?'[66] He answers by suggesting that rather than limiting study about phenomena to a single country, students can be encouraged to see various social problems as shared and global. Using the United States as an example, he juxtaposes what he calls the *American Exceptionalism Model* with the *Global Model* and then uses them to compare how typical curriculum standards might differ. The following are examples:

American Exceptionalism Model: Students understand the social and cultural impact of immigrant groups and individuals on American society after 1880.

> *Global Model:* Students understand the global phenomenon of immigration, its social effects on the host and country of origin, and increasing phenomenon of refugees.

> *American Exceptionalism Model:* Students understand the social and economic impact of the Great Depression on American society.

> *Global Model:* Students understand the period between World Wars as one of global economic depression and upheaval through a comparative case study of the United States and one of the following societies: China, Germany or the Soviet Union. (See Gaudelli, 2002)

Neo-liberalism

Peter McLaren, citing Dave Hill and Mike Cole [67], says:

> neo-liberalism advocates a number of pro-capitalist positions [including] that the state privatize ownership of the means of production, including private sector involvement in welfare, social, educational, and other state services … allow[s] the needs of the economy to dictate the principal aims of school education; suppresses the teaching of oppositional and critical thought that would challenge the rule of capital; support[s] a curriculum and pedagogy that produces compliant, pro-capitalist workers; and ensure[s] that schooling and education carry out the ideological and economic reproduction that benefits the ruling class. Of course, the business agenda for schools can be seen in growing public–private partnerships, the burgeoning business sponsorships for schools … and calls for national standards, regular national tests, voucher systems, accountability schemes, financial incentives for high performing schools, and 'quality control' of teaching. Schools are encouraged to provide better 'value for money' and must seek to learn from the entrepreneurial world of business or risk going into receivership. In short, neo-liberal educational policy operates from the premise that education is primarily a sub-sector of the economy.[68]

We can look at the Education Reform Act of 1988 in the United Kingdom as the beginning point of neo-liberalism that spread throughout the world and created a national curriculum for all state-supported schools as well as a national system of student testing and inspections. The act was a determined attempt to diminish the power of local education authorities, which often were supporters of the Labor Party, and curriculum reforms such as global education.[69]

Fast-forwarding to the present, Pike has warned that in the post-9/11 era a neo-liberal view of global education has taken over a more critical version despite the urgency for a critical engagement with global issues in classrooms.[70] Richardson argues that when global citizenship education is understood in neo-liberal terms, superficial and neutral differences between cultures are emphasized because individuals are understood to have the same fundamental wants and needs.[71]

To understand the difficulty in agreeing upon the definition and content of global education, one must be able to understand the neo-liberal position and all its implications. If the neo-liberal view represents the view of the far right then it might be well for global educators to understand the view of its antithesis, the far left. McLaren has this to say:

> In so far as our goal is to create a society where real equity exists on an everyday basis, it is impossible to achieve this within existing capitalist social relations. To challenge the causes of racism, class oppression, and sexism and their association with the exploitation of living labor, demands that critical teachers and cultural workers re-examine capitalist schooling in the context of global capitalist relations. Here the development of a critical consciousness should enable students to theorize and critically reflect upon their social experiences, and also to translate critical knowledge into political action.

> A revolutionary critical pedagogy actively involves students in the construction of working-class social movements. Because we acknowledge that building cross-ethnic/racial alliances among the working class has not been an easy task to undertake in recent years, critical educators encourage the practice of community activism and grassroots organization among students, teachers, and workers. They are committed to the ideal that the task of overcoming existing social antagonisms can only be accomplished through class struggle, the road map out of the messy gridlock of historical amnesia.[72]

Confusion in Meaning

There are two kinds of confusion having to do with the term 'global education'. The first arises from the inclusive nature of the movement. As the *Global Education Yellow Pages* shows, global education can include many other issues/topics: environmental education, education for sustainability, multicultural education, technology in education, and so forth. However, many advocates of these other issues/topics consider global education as a subset of their issue. For example, consider this Swiss definition of education for sustainability:

> The concept of Global Education developed in the nineties basically referred to the earlier concepts of Development Education and the Third World. By contrast, now Global Education focuses on everyday challenges of the current society, trying to reflect on and build up a system of values, based on Human Rights, Social Justice and Sustainable Development. The Foundation for Education and Development considers Global Education to be part of the more comprehensive Education for Sustainable Development.[73]

Hillary Landorf, writing about the development of a philosophy of global education, states:

> It is my belief that global educators need to clearly and publicly articulate the central concepts and philosophy upon which our field is based. Upon examination of its content, it is evident that global education is philosophically based on human rights, and especially on the core human rights concept of moral universalism. However, this phenomenon is rarely acknowledged or discussed. I believe that such an articulation would allow those working in global education to have a voice in framing the conversation and policies regarding its scope, methods, curriculum, and direction.[74]

Landorf goes on to examine the historical development of global education and human rights. This leads her to the following conclusion:

> Global educators need to embrace human rights as a philosophy and work to make global education replete with a moral imperative for global citizenship based on human rights. To those who question the case for human rights in global education, I ask the reader to imagine a world without human rights.[75]

There are other confusions that are not much more than people who want to sell their product. For example, a number of universities throughout the world, trying to entice their students to study abroad, advertise their programs as 'global education'.

Open Education

Before I move to bring this article to a conclusion with a statement about my view of the future of global education, I wish to briefly discuss the promise that open education has for the movement.

I met Michael Peters a few years ago, and he confused me at that time, for he talked about Open Education, something I thought I knew about from my own experiences. I had visited Summerhill School in 1980 and knew of A.S. Neill's ideas, which were called 'open education'. More accurately, Neill believed that children should be free to decide when and what they will learn.[76]

Prior to visiting Summerhill, I had been the principal of a non-graded, team-taught elementary school in the mid 1960s where the 5, 6, and 7 year-olds were enrolled in a language experience approach to reading based upon the work of Sylvia Ashton-Warner, who knew that what she had been trained to do in her college teacher-training program wasn't working with her Maori youngsters. She invented ways to teach them based upon their own interests and culture.[77] This, too, was considered a form of open education.

Some years later, after spending some time working overseas in Norway, Indonesia, and the United Arab Emirates, I returned to Los Angeles and became the director of an outstanding progressive school, Westland, where learning involved a variety of activities: block building, care of animals, gardening, a Friday community sing, writing and producing plays, and more. Westland, too, was based on a notion of open education.

I did find out what Michael meant by Open Education and what its relationship is to what I have just described. In a very important piece of work, he sets forth what he calls the 'utopian' history of openness. He cites five historical moments: the Open Classroom, Open Schooling, the Open University, Open Courseware, and Open Education.[78] Then he goes on to cite the Cape Town Open Education Declaration of 2007:

> We are on the cusp of a global revolution in teaching and learning. Educators worldwide are developing a vast pool of educational resources on the Internet, open and free for all to use. These educators are creating a world where each and every person on earth can access and contribute to the sum of all human knowledge. They are also planting the seeds of a new pedagogy where educators and learners create, shape and evolve knowledge together, deepening their skills and understanding as they go.[79]

Finally, a particularly relevant statement is made as follows: 'What is now called simply "open education" has emerged strongly as a new paradigm of social production in the global knowledge economy. In the last year or so four major reports have documented existing developments and new tools and technologies, heralding the utopian promise of 'openness' in global education, extolling its virtues of shared, commons-based, peer-production which contributes to skill formation, innovation and economic development.[80]

In line with the idea of 'openness', interested global educators should be aware of a virtual resource called the Global Education Conference, a free, annual, week-long, online event that brings together educators and innovators interested in global education.[81]

Looking to the Future

Nationalism, neo-liberalism, and confusion of meaning remain barriers to the advancement of global education. These factors, in addition to deep structural forces in each country which act to prevent innovation or to undermine fledgling attempts to alter the conventional curriculum and pedagogy [82], might seem to bode badly for the movement. However, there are several positive signs, as well as newer tools, which suggest that there is new promise.

To begin with, and while there are some disagreements, there is a definition that is felt to be suitable by a large number of global educators, as follows:

> – Global education involves learning about those problems and issues that cut across national boundaries, and about the interconnectedness of systems – ecological, cultural, economic, political, and technological.

> – Global education involves perspective taking – seeing things through the eyes and minds of others.

> – Global education involves taking individual and collective action for social justice and the creation of a better world.

In addition, it is generally agreed that issues to be considered are ecology and environmental studies and education for sustainability; human rights education; education for peace and conflict resolution; and multicultural/intercultural education. This also allows for any of the topics to have their own, separate program and advocates.

In the developed world, global education has been viewed as a way of building cosmopolitanism, defined as: 'free from local, provincial, or national ideas, prejudices, or attachments'.[83] As much as that is viewed as a worthwhile goal, we are now forced to deal with the harsh realities of an era in which globalization, which had promised a world of productivity, opportunity and technological advances, instead, for many, has meant impoverishment and violations of human rights. Thus, global education is forced to move beyond the goal of developing cosmopolitan behavior, to squarely face the reality of our world and its problems, and act to improve this reality and solve these problems. Nongovernmental organizations such as the North-South Centre, Amnesty International, Oxfam, and even the World Bank, each in its own way, works to solve these problems.

A promising development in global education was the Maastricht Global Education Congress in 2002, which set in motion the launching of global education programs in countries throughout

Europe. These programs have a distance to go before they find their way out of their nationalistic orientations and, in many cases, neo-liberal leanings. But they are a very good beginning and hold promise for the future. The countries involved in the GENE network have perhaps evolved the most, and are dedicated to broadening understanding and deepening cooperation between actors in global education at local, national, and international levels. Global education programs in the United States, as identified by the *Global Education Yellow Pages*, as well as those in Australia, described earlier in this article, also suggest that the movement has a strong basis for growth in the future.

The Global Studies Consortium, with its many universities around the world with graduate programs in global studies, as well as the Centre for Global Studies in Education at Waikato University in New Zealand show promise for expanding research, communication, and the development of scholars in the field.

Those involved in the global education movement need to be aware that change does not 'just happen', nor do people accept new ideas just because they are told about them. Educational institutions are 'Janus-faced'. That is, on the one hand they are embedded in a deep structure of schooling that is society-specific; at this point in time, the society of the nation. On the other hand, and hopefully, each institution has its own unique personality.[84] It is impossible to change the deep structure, although features of the single school can and do change, either inadvertently or through conscious intervention. The lesson to be learned is that while those wishing to expand global education may wish to get national support, real change will most likely occur by focusing on the individual schools; in a sense, one at a time.[85]

Another positive idea currently receiving a good deal of attention is that of 'transformational change'. Transformational change is holistic, deriving its power by attending equally to human behaviors and the social systems and structures in which they exist. It is about 'being the change'. That is, change agents must mirror the change they want to bring about: in our case, they must be global educators themselves. Transformational change also relies on collaboration; that is, it is about interdependence and working in partnerships.[86]

Despite the barriers to global education discussed in this article, there are growing forces, tools, and materials available for use by those who wish to move forward with their work. The call for global education is growing – indeed, in view of the rapid pace of global change in every aspect of our lives, I believe that it will very soon be seen as an essential component of the curriculum worldwide.[87] I hope that what has been discussed in this article will be of assistance to those interested in the movement.

Notes

[1] K. Tye (1999) *Global Education: a worldwide movement*. Orange, CA: Interdependence Press.

[2] K. Tye (1999) Global Education at the Beginning of the Twenty-first Century, in K. Sorotnik & R. Soder (Eds) *The Beat of a Different Drummer: essays on educational renewal in honor of John I. Goodlad*. New York: Peter Lang.

[3] K. Tye (Ed.) (1991) Introduction, in *Global Education: from thought to action,* p. 5. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

[4] S. Eido, L. Ingram, A. MacDonald, et al (2011) Through the Kaleidoscope: intersections between theoretical perspectives and classroom implications in critical global citizenship education, *Canadian Journal of Education,* 34(4), 59-85.

[5] K. Pashby (2008) Demands on and of Citizenship and Schooling, in M. O'Sullivan & K. Pashby (Eds) *Citizenship Education in an Era of Globalization: Canadian perspectives*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

[6] T. Wojciechowski (2010) *A Global Issues Planning Framework for Junior and Intermediate Teachers.* Toronto: Elementary Teachers' Federation of Ontario.

[7] E. O'Loughlin & L. Westmont (Eds) (2003) *Global Education in Europe to 2015*. Lisbon: North-South Centre of the Council of Europe.

[8] Ibid., p. 13.

[9] http://www.gene.eu/about-gene/

[10] H. Fujikane (2003) Approaches to Global Education in the United States, United Kingdom, and Japan, *International Review of Education*, 49(1-2), 134.

[11] T. Haruhiko (2001) Globalization and Education in Japan. Paper presented at the Third Asian Studies Frontier Research Project. http://www.rikkyo.ne.jp/~htanka/01/Global_Education.html

[12] K. Quittner (Ed.) (2008) *Global Perspectives: a framework for global education in Australian schools*, p. 2. Carlton, VIC: Curriculum Corporation.

[13] www.chapman.edu/ces/global-ed-yellow-pages/

[14] W. Gaudelli (2003) *World Class: teaching and learning in global times*, pp. 6-11. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

[15] J. Becker (1979) The World and the School: a case for world-centered education, in James Becker (Ed.) *Schooling for a Global Age*, pp. 33-57. New York: McGraw-Hill.

[16] C. Case (1993) Key Elements of a Global Perspective, *Social Education*, 57(6), 318-325.

[17] R. Hanvey (1979) *An Attainable Global Perspective*. Denver: Center for Teaching International Relations.

[18] W. Kneip (1986) Defining Global Education by its Content, *Social Education*, 50(6), 437-446.

[19] M. Merryfield (1997) A Framework for Teacher Education in Global Perspectives: a handbook for teacher educators, pp. 1-24. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

[20] http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/The-New-Zealand Curriculum/Learning-areas/Social-sciences/

[21] http://ssol.tki.org.nz/Social-studies-Years-1-10/Teaching-and-learning/effective _teaching_in_Social_studies/http://globalstudiesconsortioum.org/

[22] http://globalstudiesconsortium.org/

[23] https://education.waikato.ac.nz/global-studies-in-education/

[24] Wojciechowski, *A Global Issues Planning Framework*, pp. 24-25.

[25] N. Forgahni-Arani, H. Lartmayer, E. O'Loughlin & L.Wegimont (Eds) (2013) *Global Education in Europe: policy, practice, and theoretical challenges* (Google eBook). New York: Waxmann.

[26] http://www.gene.eu/policy-frameworks/

[27] http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/nscentre/Resources/Publications/GE_PRP_ Austria.report.pdf

[28] Ibid.

[29] http:www.unesco.at/bildung/unescoschulen_eng.htm

[30] http://www.trialog.or.at/images/doku/gene_czech_report/pdf

[31] http://create2009.europa.eu

[32] K. Kostolanyova & J.Sarmanova (2014) Use of Adaptive Study Material in Education in an E-Learning Environment, *Electronic Journal of E-Learning,*12(2), 172-263.

[33] http//www.fairtrade.cz

[34] http://glen-europe.org/

[35] http://www.polska.pomoc.gov.pl/

[36] http://www.orient.uw.pl

[37] Haruhiko, 'Globalization and Education in Japan', p. 2. http://www.rikkyo.ne.jp/~htanaka/01/Global_Education.html

[38] Ibid., pp. 3-4

[39] Asian Ed Topics (2013) Integrated Studies in Japan: problematizing a 'successful' reform. See: http://asianedtopics. Wordpress.com/2013/

[40] http://www.globaleducation.edu.au/1841.html

[41] http:www.globaleducation.edu.au/teaching-and-learning/teaching-strategies.html

[42] http://www.globaleducation.edu.au/resouces-gallery/resource-gallery-teaching-activities.html

[43] http://www.globaleducation.edu.au/teaching-and-learning/school-case studies.html

[44] Commission on Excellence in Education (1983) *A Nation at Risk: the imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: US Dept. of Education. http://www2.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/index.html

[45] See: The Office of the Undersecretary (2002) *No Child Left Behind: a desktop reference*. Washington, DC: US Department of Education.

869

[46] http://www.chapman.edu/ces/global-ed-yellow-pages/

[47] http://www.unesco.org/education/ecp/publicat/brochure/english/asschpro.htm

[48] http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/special_report/1999/04/99/thatcher_anniversary/330546.atm

[49] http://www.oxfam.org.uk/education/global-citizenship/global-citizenship-guides

[50] http://www.centreforglobaeducation.org

[51] http://www.centrforglobaleducation.com/

[52] http://www.cyfanfyd.org.uk/

[53] http://www.ideas-forum.org.uk/

[54] http://globaldimensions.org.ik/

[55] http://globaldimemsions.org.uk/glp/about

[56] http://gelpoline.org/gelp-community/jurisdictions/new-zealand

[57] http//www.globalfocus.org.nz/page=Publications and Resources

[58] https//www.univef.org.nz/Teacher-Resources

[59] https://www.worldvision.org.nz/catalogue/education/

[60] http://cf5pzyk-aa0-app000.c4sa.net/meetings/santa-barbara-2007 through http://cf5;pzyyk-aa0-appooo.c4sa.net/meetings/Roskilde-2014/ctop

[61] http://www.waikato.ac.nz/globalstudies/research/openness-and-global-education-development/

[62] http://deanz.org.nz

[63] D. Baker (1990) *Political Quotations*, p. 144. Detroit: Gale Research.

[64] B. Subedi (2010). *Critical Global Perspectives: rethinking knowledge about global societies* (Google eBook). Charlotte: Information Age Publishing.

[65] 'iko, Globalization and Education in Japan', p. 5.

[66] Gaudelli, *World Class*, pp. 127-129.

[67] D. Hill & M. Cole (2001) Social Class, in D. Hill & M. Cole (Eds) *Schooling and Equality: fact, concept, and policy*. London: Kogan Page.

[68] P. McLaren (2007) *Life in Schools: an introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education*, p. 27. San Francisco: Pearson Education.

[69] http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/special_report/1999/04/99/thatcher_anniversary/330546.atm, p. 2.

[70] G. Pike (2008) Reconstructing the Legend: educating for global citizenship, in A. Abdi & L. Schultz (Eds) *Educating for Human Rights and Global Citizenship*, pp. 223-237. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

[71] G. Richardson (2008) Caught between Imaginaries: global citizenship education and the persistence of the nation, in M. O'Sullivan & K. Pashby (Eds) *Citizenship Education in an Era of Globalization: Canadian perspectives*, pp. 55-64. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

[72] P. McLaren (2010) Educating for Social Justice and Liberation, in A. Nocella, II, S. Best & P. McLaren (Eds) *Academic Repression: reflections from the academic industrial complex*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

[73] http://www.globaleducation.ch/globaleducation_en/pages/GR/GR_Gn.php?navanchor=211

[74] H. Landorf (2009) Toward a Philosophy of Global Education, in T.F. Kirkwood (Ed.) *Visions in Global Education: the globalization of curriculum and pedagogy in teacher education and schools: perspectives from Canada, Russia, and the United States*, p. 47. New York: Peter Lang.

[75] Ibid., p. 66.

[76] M. Vaughan (2006) *Summerhill and A. S. Neill*. London: Open University Press.

[77] S. Ashton-Warner (1986) *Teacher*. New York: Simon & Schuster (reissue).

[78] M. Peters (2008) The History and Emergent Paradigm of Open Education, in M. Peters & R. Britez (Eds) *Open Education and Education for Openness*, p. 7. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

[79] Ibid., p. 10.

[80] Ibid., p. 10.

[81] http://www.globaleducationconference.com/

[82] B. Tye (2000) *Hard Truths: uncovering the deep structure of schooling*. New York: Teachers College Press.

[83] http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/cosmopolitanism

[84] Tye, *Hard Truths.*

[85] B. Tye & K. Tye (1992) *Global Education: a study of school change.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

[86] http://transform.transformativechange.org/2010/06/robertgass/

[87] B. Tye (1991) Schooling in America Today: potential for global studies, in K. Tye (Ed.) *Global Education: from thought to action. 1991 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development,* pp. 35-48. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

KENNETH A. TYE is Professor Emeritus in Education at Chapman University. Before retiring from Chapman, he taught graduate comparative education, curriculum, and leadership classes; was Chair of the Education Department and was Assistant Provost for International Programs for the University. After retiring, he continued to teach part-time and performed other tasks for the College of Educational Studies, including helping to organize international experiences for faculty and students. He has had short- and long-term positions in Germany, Liberia, Norway, Indonesia, Australia, New Zealand, and the United Arab Emirates as well as consultancies and speaking engagements in South Korea, the Netherlands, Italy, and Russia. Ken has over 70 publications to his credit, including five books. In 2011, he was given the Global Education Scholar of the Year Award by the National Council for the Social Studies. *Correspondence*: ktye@chapman.edu