peDOCS
Open Access Erziehungswissenschaften

DIPF

Osler, Audrey

Education for global citizenship

ZEP : Zeitschrift für internationale Bildungsforschung und Entwicklungspädagogik 27 (2004) 1, S. 22-26

urn:nbn:de:0111-opus-61402

in Kooperation mit / in cooperation with:

ZEP Zeitschrift für internationale Bildungsforschung und Entwicklungspädagogik
"Gesellschaft für interkulturelle Bildungsforschung und Entwicklungspädagogik e.V."

http://www.uni-bamberg.de/allgpaed/zep-zeitschrift-fuer-internationale-bildungsforschung-und-entwicklungspaedagogik/profil

Nutzungsbedingungen / conditions of use

Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Die Nutzung stellt keine Übertragung des Eigentumsrechts an diesem Dokument dar und gilt vorbehaltlich der folgenden Einschränkungen: Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document.
This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. Use of this document does not include any transfer of property rights and it is conditional to the following limitations: All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.
By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Kontakt / Contact:

peDOCS
Deutsches Institut für Internationale Pädagogische Forschung (DIPF)
Mitglied der Leibniz-Gemeinschaft
Informationszentrum (IZ) Bildung
Schloßstr. 29, D-60486 Frankfurt am Main
E-Mail: pedocs@dipf.de
Internet: www.pedocs.de

Zeitschrift für internationale Bildungsforschung und Entwicklungspädagogik

27. Jahrgang · Heft 1 · 2004 · ISSN 1434-4688 D · Preis: 6,00 €

Mit: Mitteilungen der DGfE-Kommission "Bildungsforschung mit der Dritten Welt"

Qualitätsmonitoring im Nord-Süd-Kontext

Aus dem Inhalt:

- Schulleistungsvergleichsuntersuchungen im Süden
- Bildungsvergleich zwischen Nord und Süd
- Evaluation

Zeitschrift für internationale Bildungsforschung und Entwicklungspädagogik

27. Jahrgang März 1 2004 ISSN 1434-4688D

Adama Ouane / Madhu Singh	**2**	**Large Scale Assessments and their Impact for Education in the South**
	9	**Die PISA-Erhebung in Ländern des Südens**
Asit Datta	**13**	**Bildungsvergleiche im Nord-Süd-Kontext**
Priska Sieber	**16**	**Evaluation des nationalen Schulentwicklungsprojekts in Serbien**
Audrey Osler	**22**	**Education for Global Citizenship**
Anke Poenicke	**27**	**Gibt es Stämme in Afrika? Hinweise zur Darstellung eines Kontinents**
Porträt	**32**	**Markus Diebold: Das neue Institut für internationale Zusammenarbeit in Bildungsfragen an der PH Zentralschweiz**
BDW	**34**	**Ganztagsbildung in der Wissensgesellschaft/Global Education Week 2003/ Das Recht auf Bildung für alle**
	36	**Kurzrezensionen**
	43	**Unterrichtsmaterialien**
	44	**Informationen**

Impressum
ZEP - Zeitschrift für internationale Bildungsforschung und Entwicklungspädagogik 27. Jg. 2004, Heft 1

Herausgeber: Gesellschaft für interkulturelle Bildungsforschung und Entwicklungspädagogik e.V. und KommEnt
Schriftleitung: Annette Scheunpflug
Redaktionsanschrift: ZEP-Redaktion, Pädagogik I, EWF, Regensburger Str. 160, 90478 Nürnberg
Verlag: Verlag für Interkulturelle Kommunikation (IKO), Postfach 90 04 21, 60444 Frankfurt/ Main, Tel.: 069/784808; ISSN 1434-4688 D

Erscheinungsweise und Bezugsbedingungen: erscheint vierteljährlich; Jahresabonnement EUR 20,- Einzelheft EUR 6,-; alle Preise verstehen sich zuzüglich Versandkosten; zu beziehen durch alle Buchhandlungen oder direkt vom Verlag. Abbestellungen spätestens acht Wochen vor Ablauf des Jahres.

Redaktion: Barbara Asbrand, Hans Bühler, Asit Datta, Heidi Grobbauer (Österreich), Helmuth Hartmeyer (Österreich), Richard Helbling (Schweiz), Torsten Jäger, Ulrich Klemm, Gregor Lang-Wojtasik, Claudia Lohrenscheit, Gottfried Orth, Bernd Overwien, Georg-Friedrich Pfäfflin, Annette Scheunpflug, Klaus Seitz, Barbara Toepfer
Technische Redaktion: Gregor Lang-Wojtasik (verantwortlich) 0911/ 5302-735, Claudia Bergmüller (Rezensionen), Matthias Huber (Infos)
Abbildungen: (Falls nicht bezeichnet) Privatfotos oder Illustrationen der Autoren.
Titelbild: Urheber konnte nicht ermittelt werden
Diese Publikation ist gefördert vom Evangelischen Entwicklungsdienst-Ausschuss für Entwicklungsbezogene Bildung und Publizistik, Bonn. Das Heft ist auf umweltfreundlichem chlorfreien Papier gedruckt.

Audrey Osler

Education for Global Citizenship

Zusammenfassung: Cosmopolitan Citizenship wird als eine Konzeption Globalen Lernens auf der Grundlage internationaler Vereinbarungen (UNESCO und Council of Europe) vorgestellt. Um in einer globalisierten Welt zu leben und zu handeln, bräuchten Menschen neben einer Grundbildung verschiedene social skills als Kompetenzen einer political literacy.

Abstract: Cosmopolitan Citizenship is described as a concept of Global learning based on international agreements of UNESCO and the Council of Europe. To live in a global world people would need – besides basic education – different social skills as competencies of political literacy.

Teachers face a number of challenges in preparing their students for citizenship within a fast-changing world. In particular they are faced with the challenge of teaching for equity, justice and solidarity in contexts where their students are all too aware of inequality and injustice, both in their own communities and in the wider world. Education for citizenship, like all other aspects of education, needs to take account of our global interdependence. Processes of globalisation make this task particularly urgent.

The draft Global Education Charter of the Council of Europe's North South Centre defines global education as education which encourages learners ‚to identify links between the local, the regional and the world-wide level and to address inequality'. Global education is characterised by pedagogical approaches based on human rights and a concern for social justice which encourage critical thinking and responsible participation. According to UNESCO, global education addresses: „ Education for human rights, peace, international understanding, tolerance and non-violence. It also [includes] all aspects of education relating to the principles of democracy and multicultural and intercultural education" (UNESCO 2000).

Global education also requires education for sustainable development (UNESCO 1995). It must therefore include the global dimensions of development education and environmental education. Some aspects of global education may be addressed through established curriculum subjects and others are likely to be addressed through special projects.

These concerns have long been on the agenda of international organisations such as UNESCO and of regional intergovernmental organisations such as the Council of Europe. Indeed, UNESCO was set up as part of a project for world peace. The intention is that education for peace, human rights and democracy should be a mainstream concern and part of the entitlement of every learner. The 1994 UNESCO General Conference recognised that any attempt to incorporate these issues into the curriculum will need to be matched by processes of democratisation within education authorities and schools (UNESCO 1995). UNESCO echoes the sentiment of the Council of Europe Committee of Ministers Recommendation some ten years earlier, on teaching and learning about human rights: ‚Democracy is best learned in a democratic setting' (Council of Europe, 1985, re-printed in Osler/Starkey 1996).

Such statements are likely to remain at the level of exhortation, unless opportunities are created for national policy-makers, education authorities, schools and teachers to explore the meanings of these documents in depth and devise action strategies at each level through to the classroom. It is only when such (democratic) processes are set up that education for peace, democracy and human rights will be mainstreamed.

If such education is to be effective and young people are to recognise its relevance to their lives, it is important that programmes acknowledge the contexts in which they are living and the anti-democratic forces that operate both within communities and across the globe. Education does not take place within a political vacuum.

The terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 and their aftermath serve to reinforce the need for an education which prepares young people to live together in an interdependent world. The scale and shock of the attacks left many young people (and adults) feeling vulnerable and powerless. The repercussions are not only felt at national and international levels but also within local communities across the world. For example, in Britain, the USA and in other parts of the world many Muslims, particularly women, and other people judged to be of Middle Eastern or Asian origin or appearance have been subjected to abuse and harassment (Amnesty International 2001, *The Independent*, 4 January 2002, p. 30). As one group of US educators reminds us: „In times of crisis human rights are often called into question, yet if humanity is to advance, these rights and standards must not be set aside, but rather reinforced. Human rights must not be placed on a subordinate plane to political objectives. We must reassert the validity of these rights, and *work to assure that human rights do not become a footnote in the debate over what will and has to be done*. They must form the foundation of not only our personal lives, but also the life of our community and our world. We cannot be selective, not with specific rights nor with specific people, nor with specific countries. Human rights are for ALL people, and by their very nature are indivisible" (Amnesty International 2001; our emphasis).

If we are to ensure that ‚human rights do not become a footnote in the debate over what will and has to be done' then we need to ensure that all children are guaranteed their right to education in human rights, in line with the provisions of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (Article 29).

Such an education must equip children and young people with skills to participate and to effect change, including the skills of language, advocacy and mobilisation. This implies programmes which promote political literacy.

GLOBAL EDUCATION

Aim

To build a global culture of peace through the promotion of values, attitudes and behaviour which enable the realisation of democracy, development and human rights.

Definition

Global education encompasses the strategies, policies and plans that prepare young people and adults for living together in an interdependent world. It is based on the principles of co-operation, non-violence, respect for human rights and cultural diversity, democracy and tolerance. It is characterised by pedagogical approaches based on human rights and a concern for social justice which encourage critical thinking and responsible participation. Learners are encouraged to make links between local, regional and world-wide issues and to address inequality.

(based on definitions in UNESCO and Council of Europe documents)

A working definition of global education

Alternative narratives of globalisation

The term globalisation refers to those developments which are increasing levels of global interdependence and which are affecting nearly all aspects of our lives. Dominant narratives of globalisation tend to focus largely or exclusively on economic developments and on the increasing power of transnational companies at the expense of nation states. Yet globalisation is political, technological and cultural as well as economic. It not only relates to the level of world trade and the ‚virtual economy' or electronic flow of capital, but also to labour and production, information, ecology, legal and administrative systems, culture and civil society. Throughout the 1990s there was a debate as to whether globalisation was a meaningful concept, with some asserting that the world economy continues as it has done in the past, and that the world has not changed that much. The focus of the debate has now shifted, and the focus is now on the consequences of globalisation rather than whether or not it exists (Giddens 2000).

At the same time the ‚anti-globalisation' movement has also grown and is exerting pressure. For many people the question is not how to *stop* globalisation, since it is impossible to stop satellite technology, or to ban such things as the spread of popular culture or access to air travel, but how to *influence* and shape it. Those who protested on the streets of Seattle in November 1999 halting the World Trade Organisation (WTO) conference and those who were at Prague the following year were challenging corporate power and inequality. Some, frustrated and disaffected with formal politics, were prepared to use violence. Most significantly, many were organising transnationally to express solidarity with the victims of globalisation. Their response is significant in that their efforts mark the beginning of demands for a global response to globalisation. It places the idea of a global civil society on the public agenda.

A number of political theorists argue that we need to re-think democracy in the context of our increasingly interdependent world. Held (1995; 1996) proposes a model of ‚cosmopolitan democracy', challenging the notion that the nation state is the most appropriate locus for democracy. He argues for the building of human rights into the constitution of states and for the creation and development of regional and global institutions, which would coexist alongside states, but over-ride them on those issues which escape their control, such as monetary management, environmental questions, elements of security and new forms of communication.

Indeed, many such reforms have been introduced since the mid-1990s. For example, in the UK, the Human Rights Act 1998 incorporates the European Convention on Human Rights into domestic law. At global and regional levels new mechanisms to promote greater accountability and democracy are also being developed: „From the UN system to the EU, from changes to the law of war to the entrenchment of human rights, from the emergence of international environmental regimes to the foundation of the International Criminal Court, there is also another narrative being told - the narrative which seeks to reframe human activity and entrench it in law, rights and responsibilities" (Held 2001).

The reforms effectively acknowledge overlapping ‚communities of fate' (Held 1996) and the need for collective democratic solutions, at local, national, regional and global levels.

The terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 have brought these concerns into sharper focus. Governments and intergovernmental organisations are required to re-think their global responsibilities, and work co-operatively and with moral consistency with regard to human rights, justice and aid. Indeed, it can be argued that for wealthy countries such policies are in their self-interest. 11 September has caused many groups and organisations to re-think their strategies in reshaping globalisation. There is a growing awareness that the dream of a globalised free market is a misguided, ideologically driven, utopian, non-sustainable social experiment that could have catastrophic consequences: „The west greeted the collapse of communism - though it was itself a western utopian ideology – as the triumph of western values. The end of the most catastrophic utopian experiment in history was welcomed as a historic opportunity to launch another vast utopian project – a global free market. The world was to be made over in an image of western modernity" (Gray 2001).

Beck (2001), in a response to the events of 11 September 2001, stresses that cosmopolitan democracy involves solidarity and respect for difference within communities and states as well as at a global level: „What are we fighting for when we fight against global terrorism? My answer is that we should fight for the right to be cosmopolitan, which is fundamentally based on the recognition of the otherness of others. […] Cosmopolitan states emphasise the necessity for solidarity with foreigners both inside and outside the national borders […] [they] struggle not only against terror, but against the causes of terror. […] they do this by seeking the solution of global

problems […] which cannot be solved by individual nations on their own" (Beck 2001).

This requires us to re-examine how the concept of identity can enable social and political solidarity. Gilroy (2000) examines two ways in which a shared identity can be imagined to support the development of cosmopolitan democracy. First, he draws on the example of South Africa and on President Nelson Mandela's efforts to create a new democratic consciousness, national solidarity and cohesion by appealing to a common relationship to the land. In his inaugural speech as State President, Mandela appealed to a shared connection with and stewardship of the land, in order to build a sense of shared citizenship, solidarity and oneness. In doing so he challenged the violence of Apartheid as a violation of South Africa's natural beauty and of nature itself: „To my compatriots, I have no hesitation in saying that each one of us is as intimately attached to the soil of this beautiful country as are the famous jacaranda trees of Pretoria and the mimosa trees of the bushveld. Each time one of us touches the soil of this land, we feel a sense of personal renewal […] That spiritual and physical onesness we all share with this common homeland explains the depth of pain we all carried in our hearts as we saw our country tear itself apart in a terrible conflict" (Nelson Mandela, May, 1995; quoted in Gilroy 2000, p. 111).

The appeal is to a new South African national identity based on a ‚common homeland' and on shared humanity in order to realise common citizenship and cosmopolitan democracy. Under Apartheid some communities drew on their histories to develop mutually exclusive identities and others had seen their communities shatter as they were forcibly moved from them. At this particular point in South Africa's development it appeared impossible to appeal to a common shared history. Mandela uses the land as a means of enabling diverse groups to feel a common sense of belonging. Nevertheless, the notion of a common homeland has considerable limitations. When it is used to establish a link between the land and one exclusive identity this has led to ethnic conflicts and wars.

In post-colonial societies, many people may have difficulties in identifying with the nation state. Gilroy proposes an alternative way of creating a shared identity, which does not rely on territory, but which is placeless. He draws on the example of the African Diaspora and the difficulties, identified by Martin Luther King, of black Americans in the 1960s whose loyalty to their country was undermined by their lack of economic and political rights. Identity is established through a shared history which promotes solidarity and action, although ‚the role of victim has its drawbacks as the basis of any political identity' (Gilroy 2000, p. 113) and may hinder the development of alliances based on a broader shared commitment to address inequality and injustice. Solidarity is not confined to those who have experienced the suffering, or their descendants, but is a matter of justice. It is therefore the responsibility of all, including the majority who are unlikely to recognise themselves as having a direct link with either the perpetrators or victims: „to possess those histories and consider setting them to work in divining more modest and more plausible understandings of democracy, tolerance for difference, and cross-cultural recognition" (Gilroy 2000, p. 114).

It is by acknowledging the past, understanding injustice and recognising that the history of Europe and of the nation state has not been a steady march of progress that we can recognise and avoid the danger of constructing mutually impermeable national identities. Such mutually impermeable national identities have regularly led to conflict, violence and war as, for example, in Northern Ireland and Bosnia-Herzegovina. The need is for solidarity ‚inside and outside national borders'. Indeed, there are a number of preconditions that need to be fulfilled if the democratisation of transnational institutions and organisations is to be effective and if these organisations are to be accountable. It is important that individuals and groups:

- recognise our common humanity and interdependence
- have a sense of belonging to a global community
- organise to express solidarity with the victims of globalisation
- exercise rights to participation from the local through to the global levels.

These processes of democratisation at a global level require a new vision of education for cosmopolitan citizenship.

Educational responses to globalisation

In the UK, a key Government response to the processes of globalisation is the determination to raise standards of achievement in education, so that learners will have the skills to compete successfully in a world job market. The emphasis is on the basic skills of literacy and numeracy: „A generation ago Britain tolerated an education system with a long tail of poor achievement because there was a plentiful supply of unskilled and semi-skilled jobs. This is no longer the case. By breaking the cycle of underachievement in education we can extend opportunity across society. To prosper in the 21st century competitive global economy, Britain must transform the knowledge and skills of its population. Every child, whatever their circumstances, requires an education that equips them for work and prepares them to succeed in the wider economy and in society" (DfES 2001, p. 5. 1.1 and 1.2).

The 2001 Government White Paper on Education, ‚Schools Achieving Success', stresses accountability, inspection, meeting the needs of the individual, consumer choice and improved incentives for teacher performance as means by which educational standards can be raised in this global competition. The White Paper emphasises diversity, but this is diversity in the provision of schools, so that they can cater for the ‚diverse requirements and aspirations' of learners, ‚particularly beyond the age of 14, when the talents of pupils diversify' (Ibid, p. 6). The aim is to provide either academic or vocational opportunities for these diverse learners, since it is believed that the existing, predominantly academic, curriculum is failing many of them. Research evidence indicates a long history of young people from particular minority ethnic groups being channelled into lower ability streams and lower status vocational qualifications (Eggleston et al. 1986; Osler 1997a; Gillborn/Youdell 2000). Despite this evidence, the proposed arrangements do not include monitoring of academic and vocational ‚options' to ensure equal access for all.

For some years now, one response to the forces of globalisation has been for governments to place greater emphasis on the need for education systems to respond to the need for international *competitiveness*, rather than to emphasise the need for greater international understanding or *co-operation*. The pressure on schools is therefore to improve standards so that students will be well placed to make their contribution to an internationally competitive workforce. Globalisation is seen largely as an economic process and not as a potential force for greater democratisation. Yet without political leadership, education for peace, human rights and democracy is unlikely to be widely recognised as a mainstream issue. It is unlikely to be addressed as a priority in the day-to-day management of schools or to feature on the agenda of headteachers' management training.

Beck (2000) observes that in Germany there is also recognition of the need to develop an education policy response to economic globalisation. This is seen in terms of developing a learning society, with an emphasis on flexibility and lifelong learning. He identifies some of the other skills required to enable citizens to live together in an increasingly interdependent world: „One of the main political responses to globalization is therefore *to build and develop the education and knowledge society*; to make training longer rather than shorter; to loosen or do away with its link to a particular job or occupation, gearing it instead to key qualifications that can be widely used in practice. This should not only be understood in terms of ‚flexibility' or ‚lifelong learning', but should also cover such things as social competence, the ability to work in a team, conflict resolution, understanding of other cultures, integrated thinking, and a capacity to handle uncertainties, and paradoxes'" (Beck 2000, p. 137 – 138).

These social skills, together with basic skills of literacy and numeracy, are, of course, essential for participation in the workforce as well as for cosmopolitan citizenship. If citizens are to shape the processes of globalisation and participate in democratic processes at local, national and regional levels, schools will need to prepare learners for global as well as national citizenship. The processes of globalisation and democratisation demand education for peace, democracy and human rights and the development of a global ethic. As one UK Government education policy adviser has expressed it: „If we want young people to learn the rules of living and working in communities - how to solve differences of opinion, how to respect a variety of beliefs, how to make collective decisions in a democratic society, and so on – then these must feature in the curriculum of schools. […] School leaders will need to see themselves increasingly as citizens of the world. If that sounds implausible, unrealistic or naïve it is worth noting that in the world financial markets and many areas of business it has already occurred. If the global marketplace is to operate within a framework of morality based on notions of a democratic society and focused on solving the huge range of global challenges ahead, then the time left for schools and their leaders to catch up is limited" (Barber 1996, p. 187f; 237f).

UNESCO reminds us of the social and political context, which makes global education so critical: „a period of transition and accelerated change marked by the expression of intolerance, manifestations of racial and ethnic hatred, the upsurge of terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, discrimination, war and violence towards those regarded as 'other' and the growing disparities between rich and poor, at international and national levels alike" (UNESCO 1995).

Global education

Since global education implies education for sustainable development, it needs to address sustainability at both local and global levels. For communities to be sustainable, it is critical that education addresses political sustainability as well as environmental, social and economic sustainability. This implies an education rooted in democratic practice, where learners recognise that their own worldview and many of their values are not universally shared; understand the complexity of differences and similarities; and develop the social and political skills to become effective participants in decision-making, who are able to resolve conflicts peacefully.

An educated cosmopolitan citizen will be confident in his or her own identities and will work to achieve peace, human rights and democracy within the local community and at a global level, by:

- developing skills to cope with change and uncertainty
- accepting personal responsibility and recognising the importance of civic commitment
- working collaboratively to solve problems and achieve a just, peaceful and democratic community
- respecting diversity between people, according to gender, ethnicity and culture
- recognising that their own worldview is shaped by personal and societal history and by cultural tradition
- recognising that no individual or group holds the only answer to problems
- understanding that there may be a range of solutions to problems
- respecting and negotiating with others on the basis of equality
- showing solidarity with and compassion for others
- resolving conflict in a non-violent way
- making informed choices and judgements
- having a vision of a preferred future
- respecting the cultural heritage
- protecting the environment
- adopting methods of production and consumption which lead to sustainable development
- working to achieve harmony between immediate basic needs and long-term interests
- promoting solidarity and equity at national and international levels (adapted from UNESCO 1995).

Human rights can also provide the framework for the development of a set of shared values in a community such as a school. This does not imply that all the values held by individuals will be agreed, but that a diverse community, drawing its values from a range of cultures, religious and secular traditions, will be able to derive a set of core values based on universally agreed human rights principles.

The realisation of global education will require attention being given to democratic processes, institutional ethos and

community as well as to the curriculum. The next section explores each of these in turn, ending with the relationship between global education and lifelong learning.

Mainstreaming global education

A number of commentators have observed the increasing importance which citizenship education is being given in a range of countries world-wide. In a section entitled ‚Rethinking Civic Education', the co-ordinators of the IEA study on ‚Citizenship and Education in Twenty-Eight Countries' observe: „New global realities call for a major reconsideration by educators and policy makers of how young people are being prepared to participate in democratic societies in the early 21st century" (Torney-Purta et al. 2001).

Similarly, UNESCO has recommended that: „civics education, whose value was increasingly apparent in many countries, be strengthened in school curricula, especially in multiethnic societies, in order to promote harmony and social bonding" (UNESCO 2000, p. 3 viii).

While curriculum planners and educators need to identify opportunities for global education across all subjects, citizenship education provides a vehicle through which global education can be mainstreamed. In other words, while it is important that global education permeates the whole curriculum, strategically it also needs a focus within a specific area of the curriculum so that it has a clear status and resources can be appropriately targeted.

Global education, or education for cosmopolitan citizenship, must of necessity address peace, human rights, democracy and development. It must be orientated towards the future, preparing young citizens to play an active role in shaping the world, at all levels, from the local to the global. The forces of globalisation make this a pressing task. This is about equipping young people with the knowledge, skills and attitudes to enable them to make a difference.

Young people want to make a difference. They want a more peaceful world, where racism, religious intolerance and inequality are challenged. Our research in Leicester, with young people aged 10-18 years, which set out to explore their understandings of community, identity and citizenship, revealed their sensitivity to injustice, poverty and suffering in other parts of the world. Many of them had been involved in campaigns or political action to address issues in their local communities (such as the closure of a school), but faced with injustice or suffering in more distant places, the most common response was to donate money to charity. Fund-raising was supported and promoted by schools (Osler/Starkey 2001a; b). Students were not equipped to explore the political dimensions of the issues which concerned them.

Developing the skills of political literacy is an essential aspect of global education. We have argued that education for a sustainable future requires an understanding not only of environmental, social and economic aspects of sustainability but also of political aspects. Political literacy requires knowledge and understanding of how political systems work, as well as skills to participate and effect change: for example, skills of language, advocacy and mobilisation. In our increasingly interdependent world it is vital that cosmopolitan citizens are equipped to tackle challenges at all levels, including the global.

References

Amnesty International: September 11 Crisis Response Guide: human rights education program for junior and high schools. New York: Amnesty International USA 2001.

Barber, M.: The Learning Game: arguments for an education revolution. London: Victor Gollancz 1996.

Beck, U.: What is Globalization? Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Blackwell 2000.

Beck, U.: The fight for a cosmopolitan future. New Statesman: 5 (2001) November, p. 33 – 34.

DfES – Department for Education and Skills: Schools Achieving Success. White Paper. London: DfES 2001 (www.dfes.gov.uk/achievingsuccess, 26.1.2004).

Eggleston , J./Dunn, D. K./Anjali, M.: Education for Some: the educational and vocational experiences of 15-18-year-old members of ethnic minority groups. Stoke: Trentham 1986.

Giddens, A.: Globalisation: good or bad? 2000 (www.lse.ac.uk/collections/globalDimensions/globalisation/globalizationGoodOrBad/transcript.htm#Giddens, 26.1.2004).

Gillborn, D./Youdell, D.: Rationing Education: policy, practice, reform and equity. Buckingham: Open University Press 2000.

Gilroy, P.: Between Two Camps: nations, cultures and the allure of race. London: Allen Lane, Penguin Press 2000.

Gray, J.: The era of globalisation is over. New Statesman, 24 September 2001, p. 25 – 27.

Held, D.: Democracy and the new international order. In: Archibugi D. / Held D. (Eds.): Cosmopolitan Democracy. Cambridge: Polity Press 1995.

Held, D.: Models of Democracy. Cambridge: Polity Press 1996 (2nd edition).

Held, D.: Violence and justice in a global age. 2001 (www.opendemocracy.net/debates/article-2-49-144.jsp, 26.1.2004)

Osler, A.: The Education and Careers of Black Teachers: changing identities, changing lives. Buckingham: Open University Press 1997.

Osler, A./Starkey, H.: Teacher Education and Human Rights. London: David Fulton 1996.

Osler, A./Starkey, H.: Young People in Leicester (UK): community, identity and citizenship. Interdialogos, 2(2001a), p. 48 – 49.

Osler, A./Starkey, H.: Legal perspectives on values, culture and education: human rights, responsibilities and values in education, in: J. Cairns, D. Lawton & R. Gardner (Eds.) Values, Culture and Education: World Yearbook of Education. London: Kogan Page 2001b.

Torney-Purta, J./Lehmann, R./Oswald, H./Schulz, W.: Citizenship and Education in Twenty-Eight Countries: civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement 2001.

UNESCO: Declaration and Integrated Framework of Action on Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy. Paris: UNESCO 1995.

UNESCO: Fifth Session of the Advisory Committee on Education for Peace, Human Rights, Democracy, International Understanding and Tolerance: final report. ED-2000/CONF. 501, 25 March. Paris: UNESCO 2000.

Prof. Audrey Osler is Director of the Centre for Citizenship Studies in Education (CCSE) at the University of Leicester. She leads an extensive programme of research on issues relating to human rights, race equality and inclusion. She has a long-term interest in Development Education, both as an activist and academic. Her most recent book is ‚Girls and Exclusion: rethinking the agenda' (Routledge Falmer 2003) with Kerry Vincent.