

FOSTERING GLOBAL
CITIZENSHIP AND
GLOBAL COMPETENCE:
A NATIONAL SYMPOSIUM

GENERATION G, GLOBAL CONNECTEDNESS & GLOBAL RESPONSIBILITY

Discussion Paper 2a

Associate Professor Anita Harris

Australian Research Council
(ARC) Future Fellow;
School of Social Sciences,
Monash University

August 2014

This paper provides a critical analysis of current knowledge about the conditions, concerns and practices of young people in terms of global connectedness and global responsibility. It suggests that new transition patterns, economic and cultural globalisation and emergent forms of civic engagement are changing opportunities for global citizenship for youth today.

It indicates that civics and citizenship education in schools and organisations can better capitalise on these developments and that existent curricula and programs are in need of more comprehensive review and evaluation.

It outlines the evidence base regarding young people's attitudes and practices in relation to global issues, identifies key principles of effective global citizenship education initiatives and proposes areas of priority research to be undertaken to inform future policy and practice. In conclusion it poses four critical issues for further consideration.

DISCUSSION	3
CONTEXTUALISING GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP: YOUNG PEOPLE AND SOCIAL CHANGE	3
1. Citizenship and new transitions	
2. Globalisation and new mobilities	
3. Becoming global citizens?	
GLOBAL CONNECTEDNESS AND RESPONSIBILITY: YOUNG PEOPLE'S ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES	6
1. Attitudes towards global issues	
2. Global social action	
CHANGES IN CITIZENSHIP AND CIVICS EDUCATION	8
1. Global citizenship education in schools	
2. New directions in learning for global citizenship	
3. Drivers for global citizenship experiences and education	
PRIORITY RESEARCH AREAS	11
CRITICAL ISSUES	11
REFERENCES	12

DISCUSSION

CONTEXTUALISING GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP: YOUNG PEOPLE AND SOCIAL CHANGE

While there are robust debates about the meaning and validity of the concept of global citizenship, it is widely proclaimed that young people need to be better educated for global interconnectivity to both enhance their competencies in a globalised world and equip them to act effectively on their responsibilities. These two themes of preparing young people for the global economy and developing their global social awareness and capacities have become prominent in education agendas from school curriculum policy to the UN, where these dual aims dominated the agenda of the International Year of Youth in 2010 (Sobe, 2012:100). However, to date, discussion of global citizenship education has focused rather narrowly on what this means for specific local curriculum needs from the perspective of governments, organisations and educators, while the broader question of 'how young people interpret and see their role and relationship to the wider world tends to be ignored' (Bourn, 2013:ix). This paper provides this often overlooked perspective.

The first section of the paper offers an overview of young people's circumstances and aspirations in regard to global citizenship set against the backdrop of generationally distinctive social change. It demonstrates how the current generation of youth is facing unique socio-economic conditions that have a direct impact on their capacity for and dispositions towards global connectedness and responsibility. These circumstances can be summarised as:

1. new transitions that are resulting in less structured pathways towards adulthood and citizenship,
2. economic and cultural globalisation and increased movement of people and information, and
3. changing opportunities and practices regarding civic engagement and social action on a global scale.

These new socio-economic conditions necessarily shape how young people understand global issues, how they prepare for a global economy and the ways they enact their social responsibilities.

These issues are covered in the second section of the paper. A deeper understanding of this context can ultimately help us develop more effective kinds of global citizenship education programs, which is the topic addressed in the third section.

1. Citizenship and new transitions

This generation of youth is facing a world of major social and economic change that is transforming many dimensions of citizenship for them. Diverse and more complex transition patterns are challenging the conventional notion of a clear-cut entry point to 'adulthood' (Wyn, 2013:60). The linear model of the life-course (moving along a pathway from school to work, independent living, marriage, children rearing and retirement) is changing as trajectories become less structured. Traditional sources of collective identity such as family, place and work have also weakened in relevance (Wyn, 2013; Furlong and Cartmel, 2007:3). The shift from industrial to post-industrial society has changed the nature of work, with the widespread emergence of flexible and precarious employment in place of a career for life (Wyn, 2013:59). There has been an extension of the period for which youth are dependent on their families and a reduction in welfare support across post-industrial societies. This has an impact on young people's capacity for economic security, which is a conventional pillar of citizenship, but more broadly results in an inability to achieve the stability associated with adulthood in previous generations (Wyn, 2013:61). This is variously described as a situation of 'yo-yo' transitions, 'adulthood' or 'new adulthood'.

The fundamental change from an older mode of structured transition to adulthood has broader ramifications in terms of independent living, intergenerational relations, family planning and household formations. Style, consumption and personal expression through image and lifestyle are increasingly important to young people as more traditional forms of identification recede and new patterns of transition emerge (Nayak and Kehily, 2008). Leisure, popular culture and spaces of sociality are becoming increasingly important in creating social belonging and as sites for peer-to-peer education about global social issues for young people (see Pfaff, 2009). Popular culture and media play a large role in the cultivation of global citizenship and sense of membership in a global political community for young people (Nash, 2008:168).

But perhaps most significantly in the context of educating for global citizenship is that there is no longer a single, one-way transition from school to work for young people, which in conventional terms is the pathway to adulthood, citizenship and economic security. Young people are already in a constant interaction between work and study, and must prepare themselves for lifelong learning and combining this with employment, and changing employment, in order to be competitive in a global economy requiring a flexible, multi-skilled and mobile workforce. From secondary school onwards they must become adept at moving across these domains in order to respond to the shifting needs of post-industrial, transnational labour markets, but with fewer resources and certainties at their disposal. Both education and employment opportunities are themselves globalising and changing rapidly. Responsiveness to this and readiness to seize these chances are critical for youth to establish pathways to the new adulthood, although there remain deep inequities structuring their opportunities to do so. As Horschelmann and Schäfer (2007:1869) point out, 'young people's trajectories continue to be heavily circumscribed by social, cultural and economic relations of power, equipping them unequally with the skills and confidences needed for future mobility and for joining the ranks of the cosmopolitan elite'.

More complex transition processes have a direct effect on how young people see their place in the wider world and how they can become citizens. These conditions are creating possibilities and demands for more global outlooks on citizenship, as young people attempt to position themselves as workers and students in an international labour and education market but with fewer support structures than in the past. The challenges of establishing economic security in conditions of globalisation and de-industrialisation are in some ways a significant barrier to civic participation and active citizenship as young people's overwhelming priority is to take charge of their livelihoods and to focus on study and work (Lagos and Rose, 1999; Andres and Wyn, 2010). They are differently enabled to deal with these pressures depending on their socio-economic circumstances, and there are growing concerns that stratification has widened and intensified, even while life chances are increasingly perceived as a matter of individual management and choice (Furlong and Cartmel, 2007).

Young people must now negotiate new risks and opportunities as a greater range of pathways are available to choose from (Furlong and Cartmel, 2007:9) and a global landscape opens up to them, but they cannot rely on the norms of the past or traditional support structures. Their own forms of identification are becoming less fixed, long term and nation-bound as they grapple with the individualisation of the life course, economic and cultural globalisation and a shift away from structured trajectories to adulthood. Social class, along with gender, ethnicity, place and ability, continue to shape opportunities and outcomes, but choices and risks are seen as personal responsibilities. As Wyn (2013:62) suggests, young people must now become self-navigators, and this requirement, along with the extent of geographic mobility they must manage, means that in unprecedented ways youth 'need to understand the nature of the social, economic and political world in which they are living and their relationships with others, locally and globally'.

2. Globalisation and new mobilities

In many ways young people are well-positioned to develop these global understandings and relationships as they constitute the first truly global generation. Youth are at the forefront of an unprecedented rate of mobility of people around the world. Young people increasingly move around for survival, work, education and leisure. Young people and children make up large proportions of the world's refugees and immigrants, from the privileged children of international diplomats to those displaced by conflict and seeking asylum (according to the UNHCR, up to half the world's displaced people are children [<http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49c3646c1e8.html>]).

Young people constitute the majority of those in the international student market and almost single handedly drive the international education industry. In 2010, more than 4.1 million tertiary students were enrolled in institutions outside their country of citizenship (OECD 2012:360), and numbers of international students are expected to double by 2020 (Rizvi, 2012:192).

Australia has the second highest percentage worldwide of international students among their tertiary enrolments, with 80 per cent of these students from the Asian region (OECD, 2012:360). International tourism has also expanded rapidly, and youth are drivers of this economy also – as backpackers, gap year-ers, sojourners and aid and development travellers or 'voluntourists'. Youth travel has become a massive industry, with young people no longer simply going abroad for leisure but seeking cultural, educational and work experiences (New Horizons III, 2012).

Youth are also at the vanguard of the international movement and exchange of information and culture. MacIntosh et al (2012) describe new media, and especially the internet, as the space par excellence of young people's self-making and place-making, and note that youth are the age cohort most likely to be online. In Australia, 99 per cent of those aged 18–24 are regular users of the internet (Ewing and Thomas, 2012). The Pew Research Center report (2010:13) on the millennial generation (that is, those born after 1980) notes that they outpace older generations in virtually all types of internet and mobile device use. Social networking and online profile making are especially important to young people. They are also increasingly getting

their information about social, cultural and political issues from new global media: nearly as many now cite the internet as their main source for national and international news as cite television (Pew Research Center, 2010:35). These youth trends are mirrored elsewhere, even while overall equities in internet access remain worldwide (The World Internet Project, 2013).

Developments in communication technologies and new media have enabled transnational connections among young people as they establish their identities, relationships and sense of community. They live in an interconnected world and inhabit global cultures (Nayak and Kehily, 2008:24), and their identities and cultural practices are strongly influenced by the global media and the mediated spaces where they can exchange information and connect with other youth. Physical mobility is not an opportunity or a choice for all young people, but, as Rizvi (2012:201) argues, 'Even if they do not physically move, they are attracted to virtual mobility, and to the mobilities of ideas, images and information, as well as tastes and styles. This has led to the emergence of new cultural practices, competences and performances, especially among

the young, that link together places that would otherwise be widely separated'.

Young people increasingly cultivate virtual and transnational ties that connect them to global youth culture and international networks. This is described as the 'de-territorialisation' of young people (Hopkins and Dolic, 2009:156), because they are now 'living in social worlds that stretch beyond physical places and communities ... thereby facilitating multiple identity constructions'. Social media, global youth culture trends in music, fashion, sport and other forms of leisure, and an increasing awareness of interconnectedness (for example, through information exchange about politics, economics, cultures and the environment) all facilitate this multiplicity in identifications. This has implications for the ways youth identify as citizens of their nations versus more global outlooks. Is there evidence that the combination of the ease and attractiveness of international travel, the prevalence of global media and diasporic movements 'are widening youth horizons and encouraging cosmopolitan forms of citizenship' (Nayak and Kehily, 2008:155)?

3. Becoming global citizens?

A body of Australian and international research demonstrates that young people more than older people tend to be those who are creating new hybrid and transnational identities that can move across national borders and between the global and the local (see Harris, 2013; Dolby and Rizvi, 2008; Hoerder, Hébert and Schmitt, 2005). Both Australian and international research such as the World Values Survey show that cosmopolitan beliefs and practices are more evident amongst younger generations (Norris, 2001; Phillips and Smith, 2008). Young people are those who are driving a shift from more traditional, fixed, monocultural ideas about nationality and belonging to more flexible forms of citizenship (Ang et al, 2006; Maira, 2009). This enactment of multiple identities and communities rather than a more rigid sense of citizenship and belonging are seen as inevitable outcomes of 'increasing mobility and multiple networks of interconnectedness across social worlds, central to the cosmopolitanism of contemporary lifestyles' (Ang et al, 2006:32-3). Such cosmopolitanism may be fragile or changeable, however, and can be tested by economic crisis and political conflict. Young people can also be attracted to defensive identity politics when their social and economic needs are unmet, as is evident in various contemporary examples of nationalist or ethnic revivalism.

The development of a strong sense of belonging remains a central project for youth especially in times of change, mobility and diversity, and this can also occur through the adoption of more fixed and exclusionary forms of identity. Young people's responses to global change can be variously 'localist', 'survivalist' or 'global' (Nayak, 2003), depending on their socio-economic circumstances, material and cultural resources and the contexts within which modes of belonging are expressed.

In Australia, young people tend to have looser national affiliation than older Australians, and often associate Australianess with openness to cultural diversity and an attitude of fairness to others, compassion or 'mateship' and equal opportunities (Bulbeck, et al, 2006; Purdie and Wilss, 2007). They tend to be more supportive of multiculturalism and immigration and more cosmopolitan in their dispositions. This is perhaps not surprising considering they have grown up in times of the normalisation of diversity. Around 46 per cent of the Australian population is now either themselves born overseas or has one parent born overseas (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2012), population growth is driven primarily by overseas migration (Department of Immigration and Citizenship, 2011), and since 1980 Australia has consistently scored higher than any other rated nation on the Multiculturalism Policy Index (Banting and Kymlicka, 2013). Young people constitute the most culturally diverse grouping in Australia, and they often claim hyphenated identifications (Ang et al, 2006; Harris, 2013). Many young Australians, especially those of migrant background, exhibit considerable intercultural competencies, often learned informally through experiences of 'everyday multiculturalism' in their culturally mixed neighbourhoods, schools, workplaces and leisure activities (Ang et al, 2006; Collins et al, 2011; Harris, 2013).

Such young people hold multiple identities and are increasingly knowledgeable about different cultures and have personal connections with other nations and places around the globe owing to their own cultural heritages. Thus global interconnectedness and responsibility are not simply abstract ideas but can have personal and practical meanings for many youth in Australia today. Young Australians of migrant backgrounds in particular can have a strong sense of globalised identities as well as positive views towards their role and belonging in Australian society (Harris, 2013; Collins et al, 2011). At the same time, factors such as place, education, social background, gender and age shape global

outlooks for youth everywhere, and scholars warn against uncritical celebrations of young people's ability to be cosmopolitan (Hörschelmann and Schäfer, 2007). In the Australian context particularly, geographical location is an important element affecting how youth are able to position themselves as global citizens and develop intercultural competencies (Farrugia et al, 2014; Skrbis et al, 2014). Life stage is also critical to understanding dispositions to global citizenship. Research shows that as young people move from early adolescence into their twenties, they place less importance on feeling connected to their local communities or their nations and develop a more outward-looking view towards the global (Skrbis and Western, 2014). Growing up is associated with mobility and being connected to a wider world beyond their immediate environs (O'Connor, 2005; Thomson and Taylor, 2005).

GLOBAL CONNECTEDNESS AND RESPONSIBILITY: YOUNG PEOPLE'S ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES

Having outlined the changing circumstances in which young people are growing up that directly impact upon their capacity for global citizenship, I now turn to their attitudes and practices regarding global connectedness and responsibility.

1. Attitudes towards global issues

Given the new environment of risk in relation to life pathways and especially economic security, it is not surprising that young people's immediate concerns usually relate to school, study, getting a good job, and stress/mental health (Harris and Wyn, 2009; Mission Australia, 2013). But young people are trying to find ways to balance their concerns about their own individual futures with larger global issues that confront them. Young people are deeply concerned about global issues and see themselves as responsible to a community beyond their local and national context.

A number of studies have been undertaken that explore the dispositions of the current generation of youth towards specific global issues. Furlong and Cartmel (2007:11) suggest that 'many of the issues young people regard as important cross the

traditional lines of party politics and reflect concerns about global insecurity, injustice and environmental damage'. Harris and Wyn's (2009) research with young Australians has found that while they are most personally concerned about doing well in their studies and getting a good job, their highest rated national and international concerns are war, terrorism, the environment and poverty. Global social wellbeing is more important to young Australians than older (Devinney et al, 2012), and international politics and NGOs engage them more than domestic issues and party politics (Huntley, 2006). They place a high value on human rights (Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission [HREOC], 2005). They are very concerned about global poverty and are in support of developed countries giving more aid internationally (UNICEF, 2012). They are worried about the economy and the growing gap between rich and poor (Huntley, 2006).

The environment is an especially high priority for youth. The longitudinal Our Lives project has found that young Australians are very concerned about environmental issues such as climate change and global warming, and more likely than the OECD average to support sustainable development practices (Tranter and Skrbis, 2011; see also The Climate Institute, 2013).

Large-scale, comparative international research shows that young people hold more environmentally positive attitudes than older people and prioritise environmental protection (see Boeve-de Pauw, J. and Van Petegem, 2010; Flanagan et al, 2006).

However, while many young people are very concerned about global issues such as environmental degradation, poverty, social and economic injustice and violence, they do not always see straightforward ways to translate their concerns into action (Eckersley et al, 2007; Australian Council for International Development [ACFID], 2012). While there is quite a lot of hyperbole about the millennial generation as 'world savers' and 'world heroes' (see for example Howe and Strauss, 2000), less attention is paid to their strategies for effective global social action. Are young people finding new ways to participate and act as global citizens?

2. Global social action

There is evidence that some are acting on their concerns by creating new modes of global

citizenship practice. According to Vinken (2005:155), young people are developing a 'new biography of citizenship', characterised by 'dynamic identities, open, weak-tie relationships and more fluid, short-lived commitments in informal permeable institutions and associations'. This is a result of the fragmentation of traditional civic life, reduced trust in the political institutions of the nation-state and an increased emphasis on individual choice and action (Beck, 1992; Putnam, 2000; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim, 2001). Under these conditions, young people are becoming 'self-actualising citizens' (Bennett, 2003): disengaging from national politics and turning away from conventional associational life, but personalising and globalising citizenship by emphasising their own behaviour in terms of lifestyle and consumption and creating informal transnational networks for action.

Theorists such as Inglehart (1990) have argued that this is part of a broader generational shift from 'materialist' to 'post-materialist values', such that young people have become more focused on quality of life issues. New kinds of social action have emerged as well, with hierarchical social movement politics diminishing in popularity with young people, but more individualised and horizontally-networked forms of activism such as computer hacking, culture jamming, new protest forms (such as Occupy) and brand boycotts taking their place. Young people have also moved away from many conventional practices of civic engagement, especially being involved in electoral politics or contacting public officials to have their voices heard. However, they are well-represented in activities such as consumer activism. Millennials are also the generation most likely to volunteer for an organisation or help others without being paid (Pew Research Center, 2010).

There are strong suggestions that we are now witnessing a broader shift on the part of youth away from engagement with the state and other formal sites of traditional citizenship activity and towards network-building and issues-driven political or civic action on a global scale (Bang, 2004). As Bennett (2003:3) suggests, 'Living in these disrupted social contexts, young citizens find greater satisfaction in defining their own political paths, including: local volunteerism, consumer activism, support for issues and causes (environment, human rights), participation in various transnational protest activities, and efforts to form a global civil society by organising world and regional social forums'. New media and social networking have become

critical tools in their efforts for global connectedness. Beck and Beck-Gernsheim (2009:34) note crucially that the activism of the global generation tends to arise less in the centre than in the 'peripheral zones' where globalisation has its most problematic effects.

Given these widespread changes in young people's circumstances, attitudes and practices in regard to global citizenship, there is increasing acknowledgement that civics and citizenship education is in need of new approaches. In the next section I outline the identified limits in current civics and citizenship education and some initiatives for moving forward.

CHANGES IN CITIZENSHIP AND CIVICS EDUCATION

In Australia, as elsewhere, the 1990s saw a dramatic increase in research, policy, curricula and professional development initiatives regarding young people's knowledge of civics and citizenship. During this time young Australians' poor scores in the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement Civic Education Study became grounds for concern about a 'civics deficit' amongst youth (see Harris and Wyn, 2009). The Commonwealth Government schools-based program *Discovering Democracy* was implemented during this time to develop curricula and teacher training across Australian states and territories (funded through to 2004). This program had a strong focus on national identity and knowledge of Australia's system of government and distinctive features of Australian civic life. But evaluations have suggested that this needs to be balanced with a more external orientation in order to 'contribute to the development of regional and global citizenship' (Manning and Ryan, 2004:xxii). As the literature reviewed here indicates, this is in part because for young people civic participation, citizenship identities and social action already extend well beyond the nation-state into the spaces of the global.

1. Global citizenship education in schools

More recently, there has been a new emphasis on the role of schools in cultivating students to become global citizens. For example, the most recent statement on national goals for schooling, the Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians, specifically nominates 'the need to nurture global citizenship' and the development of young Australians as responsible global citizens as a goal (MCEETYA, 2008:5-9). This is

also echoed locally such as in the Victorian Curriculum, and also reflects strong international trends: for example, pro-environmental attitudes are now part of the OECD's definition of scientific literacy and these are measured in routine testing of 15 year old students globally through the Program for International Student Assessment [PISA] (OECD, 2007), and many schools worldwide offer some form of global citizenship curriculum.

In Australia there has been a particular focus on improving Asia literacy, especially under the previous Labor Government. For example, the (now archived) White Paper on Australia in the Asian Century (2012:169) outlines the need for schools to 'develop Asia-relevant capabilities for Australian students', especially through language learning, cultural studies and the creation of 'global classrooms', so that learning about Asia becomes 'business-as-usual for every Australian school and every Australian student'. While this specifically Asia-focused agenda may have been jettisoned, the current Coalition Government remains committed to language learning in schools, review of citizenship education, and is implementing the New Colombo Plan to enhance undergraduates' international experience in the Asia Pacific. The development of the new national curriculum is also a platform where global citizenship education can be revitalised.

However, schools themselves may struggle to realise these aims, often owing to lack of resources or clarity about how to deliver such teaching (Gough, 2013:23). Even while there has been an explosion of interest internationally in educating youth for global citizenship, the abstract nature of the concept of global citizenship makes it difficult to clearly drive curriculum policy (Davies, 2006). A review of research on teachers' practices in teaching global citizenship finds a great deal of variation in content and delivery as well as problems such as curriculum overload, limited time and resources, and teachers' lack of confidence in teaching controversial issues (Davies, 2006). Guevara (2013:238) further notes that most schools-based education tends to focus on learning about what a global citizen is, and/or learning how to become one rather than understanding that young people are already global citizens, and must learn 'through' this experience.

This further requires an acknowledgement that 'young people's immersion in the globalising world is highly uneven and depends strongly on where they are placed in relation not just to economic but also to sociocultural resources' (Hörschelmann and Schäfer, 2007:1869). Indeed, there are risks that without developing more critical and reflexive pedagogies (see below) that enable learning and action regarding the inequities created by globalisation, young people are potentially facing a 'conflict-laden interaction: one fraction of the global generation against the other' (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim, 2005:33).

There is also evidence that some schools are far better equipped to deliver programs than others. Privileged, high status schools are able to offer students international experiences such as placements, exchanges, conferences and competitions, embedding in sister schools, involvement in international community development programs and curricula such as the International Baccalaureate. Wyn (2013:63) describes how these elite schools might produce 'citizens of the world', but in the process can become disconnected from their local community needs. Many schools that are under-resourced do not have the resources to deliver global citizenship education beyond

offering limited text-based learning about global issues. Significantly, these can often be the schools supporting the most culturally and linguistically diverse student bodies.

2. New directions in learning for global citizenship

As Wierenga (2013:2) notes, 'given the prominence of global citizenship in national and state education policies... surprisingly few models of effective programs for global citizenship education are being published for educators to draw on'. But even while initiatives are unevenly situated and supported, there are some useful examples to highlight. One of these is the Global Connections program, an inter-agency collaboration implemented by Plan International Australia between Year 9 and 10 students in Australian schools and Indonesian youth participating in local community development programs. It aimed to connect youth from different countries to help them understand the local issues each faced and together relate these to global issues.

This has been evaluated as successful because it focused on youth-led learning, sustained connections between young people through meaningful relationships, cultivated shared ownership of issues, enabled purposeful action and endured over time (Wierenga, 2013).

More broadly, Wyn (2013:65) outlines four criteria for the development of schools-based education programs that equip young people to be critical citizens in a global context: partnership, ownership, evidence-based practice and sustainability. She suggests that effective global citizenship education occurs where schools partner with other agencies, where young people have an active, decision-making role in what and how they learn, when new approaches to measuring student outcomes are implemented, and when partnerships are properly enabled and supported. ACFID (2012:5) further recognises that both 'formal and non-formal education channels play an important role in exposing young people to global issues', and that the interplay between them warrants further exploration. Its additional recommendations include incorporating new media, especially online activities, providing an element of socialising, establishing cross-organisational collaborations, developing transferable skills amongst youth, and developing structured pathways for engagement to enhance sustainability. Rizvi (2011) argues moreover that approaches to teaching global interconnectivity should begin with the local, help students come to terms with their situatedness in the world, aim to develop transcultural collaborations, and emphasise criticality, reflexivity and relationality.

3. Drivers for global citizenship experiences and education

In pursuing new ways forward it is also important to understand the confluence of drivers for global citizenship education for young people. These cover a range of domains from the economic to the moral and political. Young people understand that they need to prepare for the global economy and are trying to do this already by combining work, study and leisure and pursuing many forms of virtual and actual international engagement. They are also savvy about building their CVs and the value of exhibiting cosmopolitan competencies and civic engagement as part of their skill set.

Andreotti (2006:40) has noted the propensity for young people to participate in global citizenship training for 'self-improvement, the development of leadership skills or simply having fun'. Young people are seeking to make a difference in the world, but are also looking for benefits such as personal development, professional experience and building networks (ACFID, 2012:6).

Research on youth attitudes to social issues suggests that notions of personal choice, responsibility and self-making have a strong impact. Ideas about 'self-achievement' may be as compelling to young people than those to do with 'social commitment' when it comes to educating for global citizenship (Jonsson and Flanagan, 2000:198; Bulbeck, 2008). Rehberg (2005) has coined the term 'altruistic individualists' to describe young people now driven by the quest for oneself rather than purely a desire to achieve something for others when engaged in activities such as international volunteering. Some researchers therefore indicate that programs should support young people to move beyond 'selfie humanitarianism' (Koffman et al, forthcoming) by cultivating critical awareness of global politics and reflexivity about the global citizenship education agenda.

For example, Guevara (2013:238) advocates for initiatives that encourage action acknowledging 'that we are all part of each other' against the prevailing tendency in most education programs to support action 'for' the other. Andreotti (2006:40),

a Brazilian global citizenship educator who argues from a Southern perspective, describes this as the difference between 'soft' and 'critical' types of education. 'Soft' global citizenship education is founded on a moral obligation to a common humanity rather than a political responsibility for causes of poverty or other forms of structural disadvantage. She suggests that 'soft' education, for example, in the form of training for campaigns such as Make Poverty History, tends to individualise both problems and solutions and avoids addressing how some countries and their citizens are able to have globalising powers while others are constructed as in need of help to develop. Such programs encourage the current generation to 'make a difference' and get motivated to 'save the world' without reflecting deeply on how power relations between North and South are constituted or their own situatedness within these.

Her table (modified below) outlines some key differences between soft and critical global citizenship education. She suggests that soft frameworks can be important starting points but that critical literacy is also necessary to enable young people in an interconnected world to more fully theorise globalisation and the politics of global citizenship education rather than simply access leadership and personal development training.

	Soft global citizenship education	Critical global citizenship education
Problem	Poverty, helplessness	Inequality, injustice
Basis for caring	Common humanity / being good	Justice / complicity in harm
Grounds for action	Humanitarian / moral	Political / ethical

(Andreotti, 2006:47)

PRIORITY RESEARCH AREAS

Based on this review of relevant literature, research and policy, there are three key areas of focus for priority research that should be undertaken to inform future policy and practice. First, there is a need for a comprehensive review and evaluation of global citizenship education programs that are available to Australian youth to ascertain what is in place and what is successful. As Wyn notes (2013:67), evidence about locally based educational innovations in particular is fragmented and inaccessible. This review then needs to be closely linked to education policy and curriculum planning for civics and citizenship education within and beyond schools.

Second, more research needs to be undertaken on young people's own views and practices regarding global citizenship and their own principles for global citizenship education. This is critical in order to capitalise on the promising developments in critical citizenship education towards youth-led learning and to understand how young people are already (differentially) operating as global actors. The research presented here demonstrates that young people are already routinely engaged in a global world and many have competencies in intercultural relations, broader conceptions of citizenship and looser national identifications and a deep sense of global social responsibility. Amidst significant local differences and enduring power relations, they are already acting and connecting globally through global forms of civic engagement as well as everyday practices such as travel, using ICTs and social networking, consuming and producing new media and popular culture and participating in youth cultural practice. Clearly, we are beyond an approach that seeks to teach youth how to become future global citizens, and instead need to build on the varied ways they are already doing global citizenship and link this to youth-led shaping of critical education programs.

Third, more research is needed to develop a comprehensive understanding of the market for global citizenship education in the Australian higher education context, including both domestic students and the foreign student cohort. There is a need to better understand who tertiary students

are, given the extent, diversity and mobility of the student population, and to clarify who is being educated for what. Given the unevenness in delivery of global citizenship education in schools, it is critical to get a clear picture of what prior experiences, knowledge, competencies and expectations young people bring.

CRITICAL ISSUES

- How could we build on the scattered examples of existent, successful initiatives such as those that focus on youth-led learning, or that account for informal as well as formal environments and techniques, for developing critical global citizenship education?
- What policy and program initiatives would best build from young people's needs to balance the two implicit agendas in global citizenship education: preparation for the global economy and global social action? Relatedly, how can we draw on young people's interest in both self-achievement (of global competencies) and social commitment (to global issues) as parallel drivers for global citizenship?
- How can programs best serve the range of young people who are coming into higher education, given differences and inequalities in experiences of the global?
- How can we develop better understandings of where the 'global' is for youth, encompassing the idea that the global is not simply 'out there' but also 'at home', and how can relationality (and criticality) be better taught in this context? In Australia, there is growing recognition that we need to partner with educators and organisations in the Asia Pacific region to construct co-learning experiences, but how is this best done?

IEAA acknowledges the financial and other support provided by the Australian Government Department of Education, the Victorian Department of State Development, Business and Innovation and the Office for Learning and Teaching.

ieaa.org.au/global-citizenship

REFERENCES

- Australian Council for International Development (ACFID). 2012, *Youth Engagement in the Australian Aid and Development Sector*, viewed 8 August 2014, www.acfid.asn.au/aid-issues/files/youth-engagement-discussion-paper
- Andreotti, V. 2006, 'Soft versus Critical Global Citizenship Education', *Policy and Practice: Development Education Review*, 3 (Autumn): 40-51.
- Andres, L. & Wyn, J. 2010, *The Making of a Generation: The Children of the '70s in Adulthood*, Toronto: Toronto University Press.
- Ang, I., Brand, J., Noble, G., & Sternberg, J. 2006, *Connecting Diversity: Paradoxes of Multicultural Australia*, Artarmon: Special Broadcasting Service Corporation.
- Australia in the Asian Century*, 2012, Australian Government: Canberra.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics 2012, *Reflecting a Nation: Stories from the 2011 Census, 2012–2013*, cat.no. 2071.0, viewed 20 March 2014, <http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/allprimarymainfeatures/EB2F8382979D8F12CA257842000EC9DA?opendocument>
- Bang, H. 2004, 'Everyday Makers and Expert Citizens: Building Political Not Social Capital'. Canberra: Australian National University, School of Social Sciences.
- Banting, K. and Kymlicka, W. 2013, 'Is There Really a Retreat from Multiculturalism Policies? New Evidence from the Multiculturalism Policy Index', *Comparative European Politics*, 11, 577–598.
- Beck, U. 1992, *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*, London: Sage.
- Beck, U. & Beck-Gernsheim, E. 2001, *Individualization*. London: Sage.
- Beck, U. & Beck-Gernsheim, E. 2009, 'Global Generations and the Trap of Methodological Nationalism for a Cosmopolitan Turn in the Sociology of Youth and Generation', *European Sociological Review*, 25, (1): 25-36.
- Bennett, W. L. 2003, *Civic Learning in Changing Democracies: Challenges for Citizenship and Civic Education*. Working Paper #4. Seattle: Centre for Communication and Civic Engagement, viewed 8 August 2014 http://depts.washington.edu/ccce/assets/documents/bennet_civic_learning_in_changing_democracies.pdf.
- Boeve-de Pauw, J. & Van Petegem, P. 2010, 'A Cross-National Perspective on Youth Environmental Attitudes', *Environmentalist*, 30: 133-44.
- Bourn, D. 2013, 'Forward', in A. Wierenga & J. R. Guevara (eds.), *Educating for Global Citizenship: A Youth-led Approach to Learning through Partnerships*, Carlton, Victoria: Melbourne University Press.
- Bulbeck, C. 2008, *Sex, Love and Feminism in the Asia Pacific: A Cross Cultural Study of Young People's Attitudes*, Milton Park: Routledge.
- Collins, J. Reid, C. & Fabiansson, C. 2011, 'Identities, Aspirations and Belonging of Cosmopolitan Youth in Australia', *Cosmopolitan Civil Societies*, 3, (3).
- Davies, L. 2006, 'Global Citizenship: Abstraction or Framework for Action?' *Educational Review*, 58, (1): 5-25.
- Department of Immigration and Citizenship 2011, *The Outlook for Net Overseas Migration*, Australian Government: Canberra.
- Devinney, T., Auger, P. & De Saily, R. 2012, *What Matters to Australians: Our Social, Political and Economic Values*, A Report from the Anatomy of Civil Societies Research Project, viewed 8 August 2014, [http://www.modern-cynic.org/SEV_Reports/AustralianReport\(31March2012\).pdf](http://www.modern-cynic.org/SEV_Reports/AustralianReport(31March2012).pdf)
- Dolby, N. & Rizvi, F. 2008, *Youth Moves: Identity and Education in Global Perspective*, New York: Routledge.
- Eckersley, R., Cahill, H., Wierenga, A. & Wyn, J. 2007, *Generations in Dialogue about the Future: The Hopes and Fears of Young Australians*, Melbourne: Australia 21 Ltd & Australian Youth Research Centre.

- Ewing, S. and Thomas, J. 2012, *CCi Digital Futures 2012: The Internet in Australia*, ARC Centre of Excellence for Creative Industries and Innovation, Swinburne University of Technology, Melbourne, viewed 11 August 2014, http://apo.org.au/files/Resource/cci_digital_futures_2011_final_160912.pdf
- Farrugia, D., Smyth, J. & Harrison, T. 2014, 'Rural Young People in Late Modernity: Place, Globalisation and the Spatial Contours of Identity'. *Current Sociology*, Published online first, doi: 10.1177/0011392114538959.
- Flanagan, C. et al 2006, 'Adolescents and the "Social Contract": Developmental Roots of Citizenship in Seven Countries', M. Yates and J. Youniss (eds) *Roots of Civic Identity: International Perspectives on Community Service and Activism in Youth*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Furlong, A. & Cartmel, F. 2007, *Young People and Social Change*, Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Gough, A. 2013, 'Global Citizenship as a Contemporary Curriculum Challenge', in A. Wierenga & J. R. Guevara (eds.), *Educating for Global Citizenship: A Youth-led Approach to Learning through Partnerships*, Carlton, Victoria: Melbourne University Press.
- Guevara, J. R. 2013, 'Conclusion: Learning through Global Citizenship', in A. Wierenga & J. R. Guevara (eds.), *Educating for Global Citizenship: A Youth-led Approach to Learning through Partnerships*, Carlton, Victoria: Melbourne University Press.
- Harris, A. 2013, *Young People and Everyday Multiculturalism*, New York and London: Routledge.
- Harris, A. & Wyn, J. 2009, 'Young People's Politics and the Micro-Territories of the Local', *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 44, (2): 327-344.
- Hoerder, D., Hebert, Y. & Schmitt, I. 2005, 'Transculturation and the Accumulation of Social Capital: Understanding Histories and Decoding the Present of Young People', in D. Hoerder, Y. Hebert & I. Schmitt (eds.), *Negotiating Transcultural Lives: Belongings and Social Capital among Youth in Comparative Perspective*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Hopkins, L. & Dolic, Z. 2009, 'Second-Generation Youth and the New Media Environment', in F. Mansouri (ed.), *Youth Identity and Migration: Culture, Values and Social Connectedness*, Altona: Common Ground.
- Hörschelmann, K. and Schäfer, N. (2007) "'Berlin is not a Foreign Country, Stupid!'" - Growing Up "Global" in Eastern Germany', *Environment and Planning A*, 39, 1855-1872.
- Howe, N. & Strauss, W. 2000, *Millennials Rising: the Next Great Generation*. New York: Vintage.
- Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, 2005, *Rights of Passage: A Dialogue with Young Australians about Human Rights*, Sydney: HREOC.
- Huntley, R. 2006, *The World according to Y: Inside the New Adult Generation*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Inglehart, R. 1990, *Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Jonsson, B. & Flanagan, C. 2000, *Young People's Views on Distributive Justice, Rights and Obligations: A Cross-Cultural Study*, Oxford: UNESCO, Blackwell.
- Koffman, O., Gill, R and Orgad, S., forthcoming, 2015, 'Girl Power and Selfie-Humanitarianism', *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies*.
- Lagos, M., & Rose, R. 1999, 'Young People in Politics: A Multi-Continental Survey', *Studies in Public Policy*, 316 (Supplement), 17-24.
- MacIntosh, L. et al, 2012, 'Internet', *Keywords in Youth Studies: Tracing Affects, Movements, Knowledges*, N. Lesko and S. Talburt (eds), Routledge: New York.
- Maira, S. 2009, *Missing: Youth, Citizenship and Empire after 9/11*, Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Manning, B. & Ryan, R. 2004, *Youth and Citizenship*, Canberra: National Youth Affairs Research Scheme, FACS.

- Ministerial Committee on Education Early Childhood Development and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA), 2008, *National Report on Schooling in Australia 2008*, Canberra: Commonwealth Government.
- Mission Australia, 2013. *Youth Survey*, viewed 11 August 2014, <https://www.missionaustralia.com.au/what-we-do-to-help-new/young-people/understanding-young-people/annual-youth-survey>
- Nash, K. (2008) 'Global Citizenship as Show Business: the Cultural Politics of Make Poverty History', *Media, Culture & Society*, March, 30:167-181.
- Nayak, A. (2003) *Race, Place and Globalisation: Youth Cultures in a Changing World*, Berg: Oxford.
- Nayak, A & Kehily, M.J. 2008, *Gender, Youth and Culture: Young Masculinities and Femininities*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- New Horizons III, 2012, WYSE Travel Confederation, viewed 8 August 2014, <http://www.wysetc.org/research/publications/new-horizons/>
- Norris, P. 2001, 'Global Governance and Cosmopolitan Citizens', in J. S. Nye & J. Donahue (eds.), *Governance in a Globalizing World*, Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- O'Connor, P. 2005, 'Local Embeddedness in a Global World: Young People's Accounts', *Young*, 13, (1): 9-26.
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development), 2007, *PISA 2006: Science Competencies for Tomorrow's World*, volume 1—analysis. Paris: OECD.
- OECD, 2012, *Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators 2012*. OECD Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/eag-2012-en>
- Pew Research Center, 2010, *Millennials: A Portrait of Generation Next. Confident. Connected. Open to Change*. Viewed 11 August 2014, <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/files/2010/10/millennials-confident-connected-open-to-change.pdf>
- Pfaff, N. 2009, 'Youth Culture as a Context of Political Learning: How Young People Politicize amongst Each Other', *Young*, 17, (2): 167-89.
- Phillips, T. & Smith, P. 2008, 'Cosmopolitan Beliefs and Cosmopolitan Practices: An Empirical Investigation', *Journal of Sociology*, 44: 391-399.
- Putnam, R. 2000, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Rehberg, W. 2005, 'Altruistic Individualists: Motivations for International Volunteering Among Young Adults in Switzerland', *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Non-profit Organization*, 16(2): 109-122.
- Rizvi, F. (2011). 'Teaching Global Interconnectivity'. viewed August 8, 2014, http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/Rizvi__Teaching_Global_Interconnectivity_v.1.Pdf
- Rizvi, F. 2012, 'Mobilities and the Transnationalization of Youth Cultures', in N. Lesko & S. Talburt (eds.), *Keywords in Youth Studies: Tracing Affects, Movements, Knowledges*, New York: Routledge.
- Skrbis, Z. & Western, M. (2014). *Social Futures and Life Pathways of Young People in Queensland ('Our Lives' Study): Wave 4*. Unpublished raw data.
- Skrbis, Z. Woodward, I. & Bean, C. 2014, 'Seeds of Cosmopolitan Future? Young People and their Aspirations for Future Mobility', *Journal of Youth Studies*, 17(5): 614-625.
- Sobe, N.W. 2012, 'Transnational Governance', *Keywords in Youth Studies: Tracing Affects, Movements, Knowledges*, N. Lesko and S. Talburt (eds), Routledge: New York.
- The Climate Institute, 2013, *Climate of the Nation 2013: Australian attitudes on climate change*, viewed 8 August 2014, http://www.climateinstitute.org.au/verve/_resources/TCI_ClimateOfTheNation2013_web.pdf
- The World Internet Project, 2013, *The World Internet Project International Report*, (fifth edition), USC Annenberg School Center for the Digital Future, LA.

- Thomson, R. & Taylor, R. 2005, 'Between Cosmopolitanism and the Locals: Mobility as a Resource in the Transition to Adulthood', *Young*, 13, (4): 327-342.
- Tranter, B. & Skrbis, Z. 2011, 'Attitudes toward Global Warming, Climate Change and other Environmental Issues among Young Queenslanders', Paper presented at The Australian Sociological Conference, 28 November – 1 December, Newcastle.
- UNICEF, 2012, *Does Aid Matter? Australian Youth have their Say*, viewed 8 August 2014, http://www.unicef.org.au/downloads/Education/Does-Aid-Matter_UNICEF-Australia-Report.aspx
- Vinken, H. 2005, 'Young People's Civic Engagement: The Need for New Perspectives', in H. Helve & G. Holm (eds.), *Contemporary Youth Research: Local Expressions and Global Connections*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Wierenga, A. 2013, 'Introduction: Educating for Global Citizenship', in A. Wierenga & J. R. Guevara (eds.), *Educating for Global Citizenship: A Youth-led Approach to Learning through Partnerships*, Carlton, Victoria: Melbourne University Press.
- Wyn, J. 2013, 'Education that Equips Young People in Changing Times', in A. Wierenga & J. R. Guevara (eds.), *Educating for Global Citizenship: A Youth-led Approach to Learning through Partnerships*, Carlton, Victoria: Melbourne University Press.