

Conceptualisation of global citizenship and global citizenship education: Does lack of clarity impact global citizenship education in Aotearoa New Zealand?

Victoria Beckwith
v.beckwith@ucol.ac.nz

This article explores conceptualisations of global citizenship and global citizenship education and questions whether a lack of clarity impacts global citizenship education in Aotearoa New Zealand. Drawing attention to the multiplicity of meanings associated with these phenomena, it argues that the lack of consensus surrounding the notion of global citizenship hinders the implementation of standardised and consistent global citizenship education in Aotearoa New Zealand. The discussion considers the foundation of global citizenship and global citizenship education, highlighting the tensions in reaching global consensus on their definitions. This article contributes to the debates on global citizenship and global citizenship education, particularly focusing on implications for global citizenship education in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Keywords: global citizenship; global citizenship education' sustainable development goal 4; SDG indicator 4.7.1

INTRODUCTION

Global citizenship is a contested notion (Grimwood, 2018). The field of global citizenship research continues to evolve and develop, generating discourse and discussion about its mechanisms and concepts (Dill, 2018). Not only has digital and social media accelerated the ideas and research surrounding global citizenship, but they have also provided accessible resources, connectivity between resources and groups, and exposed people to global issues, often in real-time (Baek, 2018). However, the growth in this field has not yet established a firm identity or foundation from which to develop. Therefore, there is a multiplicity of perceptions, interpretations and definitions about global citizenship, with organisations and nations deciding what it means for them and how they use the notion of global citizenship to interact with others (Hammond & Keating, 2018).

This article aims to provide insights into how global citizenship and global citizenship education (GCE) are conceptualised and what impact this has on educational implementation within Aotearoa New Zealand. The themes being discussed consider the evolution of the notion of global citizenship, reflecting on its definition and how this influences GCE. The article begins by examining the background and growth of global citizenship from a social history viewpoint and then explores what it means to be a global citizen. Building on the growing awareness of global citizenship, the article considers how there has been an increased push to advance GCE in the last decade, with the inclusion of GCE in the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (Pashby et al., 2021), and considers how SDG Indicator 4.7.1 sets the aim for governments to develop GCE through a cultural lens and an appreciation of diversity by 2030 (UNESCO, 2018). By exploring the contestation around the meaning of global

citizenship, the article argues that a lack of global and national consensus hinders the integration of GCE into educational curricula. Finally, this article considers Aotearoa New Zealand's perceptions and contexts and discusses the need for a clearer level of shared understanding of GCE. The conclusion highlights the questions raised regarding the future of global citizenship and GCE within a post-COVID-19 world. A focus on GCE in Aotearoa New Zealand returns the concepts to the author's and other educators' current experiences in their research areas.

SOCIAL HISTORY OF GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP

Throughout the 20th century, there has been a developing interest in global citizenship (Engel & Siczek, 2018; Grimwood, 2018). Significant events throughout the 20th century have led to a growing awareness of how global events shape and impact nations and their citizens. For example, the two world wars spotlighted warfare through the new global media lens of film. These wars affected countries around the globe and demonstrated that even independent nations were not immune to how war disrupted their peace or economies (Kefauver, 1944). Kefauver (1944) discussed how collective action and collaboration would bring advancement, respect, cooperation and stimulation to an increasingly interconnected world. Peace and cooperation were key aspects of rebuilding post-war relationships (Intrator, 2019; Kefauver, 1944). In addition, the media ran images of mass migration that the general public had not previously seen. Newspapers and film footage brought images and stories from war zones into people's homes, connecting people to places and other cultures, bringing the reality of what was happening overseas closer to home and drawing together communities with shared experiences (Gaertner, 2016).

National boundaries have become blurred or diminished through globalisation and global governance. Environmental and natural disasters, such as oil spills, deforestation, floods and earthquakes, and pandemic and epidemic diseases, impact multiple nations (United Nations Environment Programme, 2020; United Nations Joint Inspection Unit, 2019). Partnering nations and global organisations, such as the United Nations, work collaboratively to deliver supportive resources (Robinson et al., 2017). International laws, treaties and targets have required countries to work together to solve global crises. These laws, conventions and targets, such as the SDGs (UNESCO, 2018), work together to develop frameworks for nations to follow (Spijkers, 2019). More recently, the COVID-19 pandemic has required nations to evaluate and focus on interactions between national and international interests to protect and support national populations and economies and maintain national security (Bryson & Vanchan, 2020). This merging of national borders and international issues has highlighted that national citizens now operate in two localities: the national and the global. As a result, the last century has seen the notion of global citizenship emerge. Its development is complex because it remains an ill-defined and largely misunderstood concept.

In summary, world wars, climate change, natural disasters, and pandemics have affected multiple nations on a large scale, acting as catalysts for the development of technologies and collaborative partnerships (Bryson & Vanchan, 2020; United Nations Environment Programme, 2020; United Nations Joint Inspection Unit, 2019). The increasing presence of and accessibility to diverse media platforms provide real-time information, easily accessible data and immediate connections for those with shared issues or interests (Baek, 2018). Awareness of global issues has increased, as has the diverse ways in which people become activated to respond to these challenges. Activism can be ignited in all age groups by global social or environmental movements, for example, Fridays For Future (Laux, 2021), or collaborative

fundraisers, for example, Team Trees on YouTube. The following section examines the development of what it means to be a global citizen and considers why it is a contested notion.

WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO BE A GLOBAL CITIZEN?

The definition of ‘global citizenship’ has different meanings in different contexts (Schattle, 2005). Countries’ governing structures, business entities, and environmental and cultural contexts often attribute their interpretation to the notion of global citizenship, making it difficult to identify a clear and definitive meaning. Citizenship, in the global sense, is not the same as citizenship in a national sense (Grimwood, 2018). For example, a national citizen is considered a citizen of a nation and holds a national identity, recognising their nation’s official laws, languages, institutions, culture and values (Fukuyama, 2018). On the other hand, a global citizen is a national citizen who recognises their place within the global landscape. They can extend their awareness beyond national citizenship to relate to people in a global context (Schattle, 2009).

There is some agreement about the key element that underpins the definition of global citizenship: shared humanity. Pashby (2018) argues that the shared humanity of developing relationships and connections with others at local and global levels underpins the concept of global citizenship. This includes building local-global connections at home, school, work and in the community, as well as building communal areas where people can work and think together inter-culturally. These networks and shared areas are important facets of global citizenship (Vander Dussen Toukan, 2018). Engagement with others allows one to reflect on one’s identity and place within global networks (Robinson & Levac, 2018). These global networks can help individuals understand other viewpoints and learn from the experiences of others, as well as enhance their own.

Being reflective of one’s identity within these networks can also contribute to the complexity of global citizenship. Reflection can move individuals from an awareness of interdependence to the ability to think critically and become more active in global and local issues (Pashby, 2018). Connections with others can be established through shared local and global interests and/or action, prompting continued engagement, understanding and a cycle of reflection. Additionally, such connection can also develop empathy, compassion, tolerance, acceptance and an appreciation that other people live in different ways (Gardner-McTaggart & Palmer, 2018). Extending from this foundation of awareness, reflection on multi-culturalism and inter-culturalism, and engagement with others has the potential to develop the global citizen into an activated social justice advocate (Yemini & Furstenburg, 2018). Engaging with community and social justice issues through reflection and understanding can go some way towards activating a critical, responsible and compassionate global citizen capable of the flexibility of living within a global society (Gardner-McTaggart & Palmer, 2018; Robinson & Levac, 2018). Such engagement shows that shared humanity, reflection and action are areas underlying the concept of global citizenship.

However, despite some consensus on the meaning of global citizenship, tensions have been created by the ambiguity caused by countries attributing their interpretation (Yemini & Furstenburg, 2018). From a political outlook, the growing increase in nationalism alongside the interconnectedness of global citizens has further intensified friction between the outplaying of citizenship in the local and global spheres (Barrow, 2017). For example, there were tensions surrounding Brexit when the United Kingdom separated from Europe, which focused politics on nationalistic approaches (Crescenzi et al., 2018). Additionally, COVID-19 has seen nations prioritising their interests to protect economies and develop local rather than international

business locations (Bryson & Vanchan, 2020). There is also a fluctuating balance surrounding health and the economy in the discussions on when national borders should open (Loneragan & Chalmers, 2020). From a nationalist viewpoint, nations aim to govern individuals in a way that places national issues and interests above global concerns, and education focuses primarily on national citizenship development, in preference of a global view (Department for Education, 2013; Millard, 2014). However, globalism also seeks relationality between nations (Rosenboim, 2019) through global governance and intercultural engagement between nations. These differing mindsets create tension because of how individuals, communities and nations perceive their identities.

Even within nations, there are differing perceptions of global citizenship. Such differences can be seen in Canada, where English and French-speaking communities co-exist; however, these communities are also linked to global Anglophone and Francophone communities (Sioufi et al., 2016). Different political outlooks of global citizenship are seen from country to country. For example Norway's social democracy is affected by the context in which citizenship is placed (Hayward et al., 2015). Norway and Aotearoa New Zealand are parliamentary democracies with a constitutional monarchy but have contrasting interpretations of democracy. Norway is a social-democratic state that focuses on state and community rather than the individual, and Aotearoa New Zealand has a liberal, market-driven democracy (Hayward et al., 2015) and a strong bicultural identity. These examples demonstrate that there are different contexts and interpretations of global citizenship between countries based on their internal governance structures pertaining to citizenship. These differences present us with diversity, which offers us a forum to learn about each other, discuss our identities and work collaboratively for a more sustainable and inclusive future. Depending on context and subjectivity, global citizenship has a variety of interpretations. There is a multiplicity of meanings that continues to evolve.

UNESCO'S ASPIRATIONS FOR GCE

Since the international Education For All (EFA) agenda emerged in 1990 and the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) in 2000, the notion of global citizenship has become increasingly prevalent within the education discipline. The MDGs were the key driver in drawing nations together to take responsibility for meeting global expectations of accessible and quality EFA (United Nations Children's Fund & UNESCO, 2007). The increasingly interconnected global space has re-defined how people engage and interact with education and learning (UNESCO, 2015). In 2015, after the MDG target period, the international community met to recast its global focus, which resulted in the setting of 17 SDGs that were published in September 2015, with a completion date of 2030. SDGs were developed through ongoing conversations with the global community. SDG Target 4.7 encourages the world's governments to promote and engage with GCE. It sets the aim for governments to develop global citizenship through a cultural lens and an appreciation of its diversity in national education agendas and policies by 2030. Specifically, the global citizenship focus of SDG Indicator 4.7.1 (UNESCO, 2018) is:

SDG Indicator 4.7.1

Extent to which (i) global citizenship education...[is] mainstreamed in (a) national education policies; (b) curricula; (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment. (United Nations, 2022a)

This was the first time GCE had been included as part of the international development goals. However, it was difficult for nations to gain a consensus on the meaning of GCE because of the different perceptions surrounding its terminology, the political nature of citizenship and the tensions between national and international, and local and global, as discussed above. Finally,

in December 2019, SDG Indicator 4.7.1's classification was upgraded to Tier II (clear concept, established methodology). The Inter-Agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (IAEG-SDGs) classify all the SDG Indicators using three tiers relating to the availability of data and consideration for methodology development (United Nations, 2022b). Upgrading to Tier II meant that international data collection about the mainstreaming of GCE and Education for Sustainable Development could begin in 2020 (UNESCO, 2019a). Whereas, before the upgrade, SDG Indicator 4.7.1 was classified as Tier III and had no developed methodology for collecting data. Currently, Aotearoa New Zealand is the only country in Oceania with published data for SDG Indicator 4.7.1, albeit it minimal. For Aotearoa New Zealand, The Global Change Data Lab shows no 2020 data available for the mainstreaming of global citizenship into curricula or student assessment, 0.35 for national education policies, and 0.6 for teacher education concerning the global Index of 0 (worst) to 1 (best) (Ritchie et al., 2018).

The aspirational goal outlined in UNESCO's SDG Indicator 4.7.1 invites nations to look at the global issues affecting citizens in the 21st century. Although unknown, the challenges of future global issues will be complex, requiring flexibility, nimbleness and transferable skills as contexts rapidly shift (Pashby et al., 2021). Technology and global events have brought us closer together. UNESCO aims to develop skills to support a progressive, sustainable and more inclusive global future through GCE (Anderson, 2019). However, impacting these aspirations are tensions created by the ambiguity of individual interpretations of language surrounding GCE brought about by context and viewpoint, political outlooks and nationalistic approaches. The following section explores some of the tensions between teachers and students' conceptualisations of GCE and how the political environment may impact those.

TEACHERS' AND STUDENTS' CONCEPTUALISATIONS OF GCE

While research has highlighted confusion surrounding the absence of a widely accepted definition of GCE, being aware of teachers' conceptualisations of GCE can help to bring greater clarity and understanding. Part of the problem is that GCE can be viewed through a multitude of lenses (Adaspayeva & Parkes, 2021). For example, the viewpoints of teachers, students, community and business can bring diverse experiences and expectations to the conceptualisation of GC. Researchers have begun to examine teachers' perceptions (Goren & Yemini, 2016, 2018) and students (Hayward et al., 2015; Yemini & Furstenburg, 2018) in developing and teaching global citizenship. In Israel, Goren and Yemini (2016) compared teachers' perceptions of global citizenship from a local and an international school. They found that students' socioeconomic backgrounds could affect teachers' perceptions. Hayward et al. (2015) compared the perceptions of young citizens in Aotearoa New Zealand and Norway through focus group studies carried out between 2006 and 2013 with students (8 to 12 years old) and young adults (18 to 35 years old) in Aotearoa New Zealand, and students (13 to 19 years old) in Norway. The results noted shared values of responsibility and rights and how communities and schools enhance them. The contrast in perception came from a more collective outlook from Norwegian students compared to an individualistic outlook in Aotearoa New Zealand. However, where Aotearoa New Zealand students had been involved in sports clubs, community action or *iwi hui*, there was a base of collective, public service.

The political environment appears to shape the outlook of the participants in the research outlined above. Students' perceptions demonstrated similarities in each context (Hayward et al., 2015) and awareness of global issues (Yemini & Furstenburg, 2018). According to Hayward et al. (2015), communities and schools feed into the development of awareness and education,

influencing behaviours and ownership seen as valuable for engaging and developing citizens with the ability to participate, be responsible and activated. Interestingly, the students in local schools in Israel were exposed to issues outside school, enabling them to become more aware of inclusion, diversity and rights than their counterparts in the international schools (Yemini & Furstenburg, 2018). The social-democratic environment of Norway generated more socially activated students compared to students in the neoliberal Aotearoa New Zealand context; however, there was consensus, in both nations, that students felt teachers enabled safer environments in which to discuss the issues facing global citizens (Hayward et al., 2015). Empowering student discussion increases the opportunities for curiosity, connection with others, and a sense of self and confidence in actively engaging in problem-solving within the local, national and global society.

Teachers offered perceptions and understandings of global citizenship, which differed from their students (Yemini & Furstenburg, 2018). A study by Goren and Yemini (2016) in Israel showed that teachers avoided issues deemed too sensitive, particularly given the experience of a divided political conflict environment. In societies affected by conflict, research shows that teachers are not necessarily avoiding critical discussions, but they are unable to effectively implement them because GCE may not be a curricular priority (Savenije & Goldberg, 2019). Teachers' perceptions of GCE may be mixed due to a lack of understanding or consensus. When working within a society experiencing conflict, there may be complex contexts to negotiate, generating barriers to GCE (Savenije et al., 2019; Yemini & Furstenburg, 2018). Students who are not given the opportunity to evaluate and talk about sensitive issues in an objective learning environment may not be aware of their contexts' cultural or social history (Savenije et al., 2019) or the potential for peace (Yemini & Furstenburg, 2018).

As this section shows, there is a conflict between teachers and differences in understanding between groups of students from different backgrounds and contexts. GCE will also be impacted by business, political, religious, financial and environmental values. Expectations within local, national and international settings will add their dimensions to conceptualisations of GCE, generating more complexity and opportunities for confusion. Having explored the international implications for global citizenship and GCE, the next section looks at the national level. I chose Aotearoa New Zealand because it focuses on my lived experiences and research and the country in which SDG 4 results are being gathered in Oceania.

GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION IN AOTEAROA NEW ZEALAND

Aotearoa New Zealand, as do all nations, has a unique context regarding global citizenship, enhanced by its bicultural identity. The distinctive cultural capabilities of collective thinking, connection to place and sense of identity bring valuable outlooks and skill-sets to GCE discussion. The cultural capabilities can be seen in Hayward et al.'s (2015) reflection on collective public service within a neo-liberal and market-based democracy. Perreau (2019) highlights the need to recognise people's identities in the local context and recognise how those identities project into national and global contexts. *Tūrangawaewae* (a standing place for the feet, identity connected with place) gives a strong connection to place and a sense of belonging to Māori, who have a distinct relationality within Aotearoa New Zealand and global contexts (Macfarlane, 2019). In addition, the importance of the collective and relationship with place, people and the past, and present and future are woven into the fabric of Aotearoa New Zealand's shared space with the Pacific nations. Matapo (2019) discussed how an individual is connected to land and people through ancestors, sustainability and the interdependent nature of the collective. Through the Pacific collective, Matapo (2019) highlighted how the Pacific nations'

existing transnational connections demonstrate how different nations can come together in a larger collective.

However, the lack of clarification and definition of what global citizenship means increases the complexity surrounding the conceptualisation of GCE and how it is taught in Aotearoa New Zealand (Shephard et al., 2017). Although the *New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 2007) sets the vision for its students to connect with their position as citizens living within a global society (Ministry of Education, 2007, 2013), there are no specific references to GCE in the *New Zealand Curriculum*. For example, the ‘Key Competences’ section briefly mentions the discussion around belonging to local, national and global communities, and relationality is seen as an underpinning value of the school curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007), but these mentions do not explicitly connect to GCE (Adaspayeva & Parkes, 2021). It is possible that because the *New Zealand Curriculum* was published in 2007, prior to the global focus on GCE, the curriculum does not reflect the recent emphasis on GCE. However, there is scope to teach GCE within the social studies curriculum, such as where global contexts are discussed in Level 7 (Ministry of Education, 2017), yet, teaching GCE remains flexible (Ministry of Education, 2007; Peterson et al., 2018). This flexibility is intended to allow teachers to decide how GCE is defined and how it is taught. On the other hand, it could mean less focus on GCE specifically and more emphasis on the broader associated concepts.

This lack of specific direction for GCE within the *New Zealand Curriculum* couples with a lack of research within the GCE field. There are few available studies on GCE in Aotearoa New Zealand. One study researched the implementation of global citizenship concepts at Aotearoa New Zealand universities but did not examine the primary or secondary education sectors (Grimwood, 2018). The study explored the online promotional material of three Aotearoa New Zealand universities to gain an understanding of global citizenship in Aotearoa New Zealand. Analysing graduate profiles and exchange programmes, Grimwood (2018) concluded that the universities did not clearly define global citizenship because each considered global citizenship from their own contexts. There are more competitive aspects to higher education when compared to primary and secondary education, generating a drive by higher education institutions to focus on the employability of their students and funding for their institutions. It was this area that Grimwood (2018) concluded could be skewed towards an inauthentic view of global citizenship rather than one that was authentic in its approach towards educating *tamariki* (children) to become aware, participate and responsible. However, Jaufar (2021) explored the lived experiences of young global citizens in Aotearoa New Zealand and the Maldives to gain a deeper awareness of their commitment to sustainable and environmental citizenship. Grimwood (2018) and Jaufar (2021) highlighted two sides of global citizenship, one driven by market forces and outputs and the other through personal experiences and reflection. The different facets of global citizenship impact how GCE is conceptualised and, therefore, how it is presented and taught as part of the social studies curriculum.

There is a need to view different perceptions of GCE to gain an understanding of what is being taught in Aotearoa New Zealand, and where and how it is being taught. This highlights an urgent need to gain a deeper understanding of GCE within the Aotearoa New Zealand context. One area future research could examine is the perceptions of key stakeholders to gain their interpretations of global citizenship and GCE and how these might or might not impact the *New Zealand Curriculum*. Currently, the *New Zealand Curriculum* is undergoing a ‘refresh’. The new Social Sciences learning area references aspects of global citizenship without defining global citizenship or overtly naming it. The draft consultation document (Ministry of Education, 2022) includes references to local, national, and global levels of connections between people and communities, economic interdependence, global processes such as climate change, and

global challenges and consequences. Future research could investigate whether the curriculum's implicit GCE content and flexibility are successfully developing global citizenship awareness or confounding the learning through a lack of explicit consensus.

Another area for future research is to do with identity and how local and global identities are understood, assisting our *tamariki* (children) to find their place and have confidence in their relationship with others, locally and globally. However, before we can identify GCE more explicitly in the *New Zealand Curriculum*, there needs to be a clear, concise and thoughtful shared understanding of global citizenship.

One evolving description of global citizenship from an Aotearoa New Zealand context draws on the work of Gardner-McTaggart and Palmer (2018), Pashby (2018), Robinson and Levac (2018), and Clifford and Montgomery (2017). It describes a global citizen as being interconnected with others, objective, curious, empathetic and engaged, with the ability to work collaboratively and problem solve in response to global challenges and issues while being aware of their *tūrangawaewae* (a standing place for the feet, identity connected with place) and foundations in a global society (Beckwith, 2021). It is evolving because there needs to be further work done to explore people's perceptions of global citizenship. Māori, Pacific, rural and children's voices often remain unheard, though they have meaningful experiences that will add much to the discussion surrounding the future of global citizenship and GCE in Aotearoa New Zealand.

While Aotearoa New Zealand has taken an implicit approach to teaching GCE, other bicultural nations, such as Wales and Canada, are more explicit in their positioning of GCE within their curricula. For example, Wales has an Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship (ESDGC) Development Framework (EDF) (Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru Welsh Assembly Government, 2008). ESDGC is approached holistically and embedded within all curriculum areas. There is an expectation that all educational settings and educators participate. In addition, ESDGC extends beyond the classroom and should engage with all stakeholders, including parents, carers, and other communities to ensure its success and sustainability. Canada's reference to GCE begins in kindergarten and continues to the 12th grade. Chanicka et al. (2018) discuss additional challenges to education because different motivations and the evolution of what it means to be a global citizen have transformed traditional teaching methods. Critical awareness is being developed through strengthening students' sense of self within the world. As Canadian education is governed by provinces or territories, local awareness feeds into policy modifying a national blanket-type approach (Engel & Siczek, 2018).

Within Aotearoa New Zealand, the flexible and implicit approach to GCE has given it a lack of clarification, focus and identity. This vagueness is compounded by the lack of consensus in the global understanding of global citizenship. With clearer definitions of global citizenship and GCE, Aotearoa New Zealand could harness its existing strengths of cultural capability and collective identity to become a purposeful leader in this field.

CONTEXTUALISING GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP TO GROW

Clarification and clearer definitions would better support the teaching of global citizenship. Without this shared understanding, global citizenship is a phenomenon interpreted by others in a spectrum of ways, making it challenging to select one of the multiple understandings to use as a foundation for teaching global citizenship. The diversity of perceptions and interpretations means that GCE lacks consistency at a national level, which is compounded internationally.

It does not appear to be possible to constrain the meaning of global citizenship to suit all purposes, nations and people. Global citizenship, as a phenomenon, is constantly evolving, and each stakeholder, from individual to global governance entities, will have different perceptions that also change over time. However, before teaching a subject, educators need to be aware of their conceptualisations of citizenship (global and national), their context, what they are teaching and its foundations. To be able to incorporate GCE into teaching frameworks, with specific targets to achieve the SDG targets by 2030, nations need to know what GCE means, what it arises from and what its purpose is.

If Aotearoa New Zealand cannot clarify a national meaning or identity surrounding global citizenship, then a more consistent approach to teaching GCE and SDG Indicator 4.7.1 becomes an unachievable target. It would benefit educators for global citizenship to be defined within the nation's cultural, political, and social landscape. This proposal echoes the call made by Adaspayeva and Parkes (2021) who reviewed the *New Zealand Curriculum* and recommended that a definition of 'global citizen' be incorporated. A clearer definition of global citizenship would support the development of curriculum learning areas, education policies, schools' interpretation of GCE and how universities identify their graduate attributes and connect with their learners (Borkovic et al., 2020). Contextualising global citizenship and identifying how Aotearoa New Zealand perceives global citizenship will provide a stronger and more explicit and transparent foundation from which to grow GCE. It will allow other nations to strongly recognise Aotearoa New Zealand's identity in the global citizenship landscape.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this article has contributed to the discussion surrounding global citizenship and GCE through an Aotearoa New Zealand context. It demonstrates an increased interest in global citizenship and makes the case that the overall definitions of global citizenship flex with context and mindsets, making consensus inconsistent and contested. Few studies that have examined global citizenship from an Aotearoa New Zealand context. This article highlights the gap in this field, providing a basis for future research to build on to gain a greater understanding of how Aotearoa New Zealand defines global citizenship and how this translates into effective GCE.

The lack of research into GCE in the school sector in Aotearoa New Zealand makes it difficult to understand if the flexible *New Zealand Curriculum* is aiding or hindering the teaching of GCE. Additionally, as the *New Zealand Curriculum* does not clearly address GCE, it raises questions about how it is understood and interpreted by key stakeholders such as teachers, children and parents. Further research is needed to address both these gaps in current knowledge.

The unique cultural context of Aotearoa New Zealand offers a strong identity for leadership on the world stage. However, in addition to the individuality of Aotearoa New Zealand, there is strength in the historical and spiritual local identities that are shared by other nations. Researching how local is intertwined with global and how shared interests and issues can unite communities, would elevate the idea of connectivity and provide opportunities to collaboratively develop the notions of global citizenship and GCE while gaining a deeper understanding of GCE within the Aotearoa New Zealand context. In the current global context, there is some urgency to further examine GCE to ensure that Aotearoa New Zealand retains productive relationships with other nations and has the ability to develop grounded *tamariki* (children) who are actively aware of their local and global identities and those of other people.

REFERENCES

- Adaspayeva, N., & Parkes, S. (2021). Global citizenship education conceptualisation in curriculum guidelines of the New Zealand Curriculum. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, 25, 57–75. <https://doi.org/10.26686/nzaroe.v25.6935>
- Anderson, A. (2019). Advancing global citizenship education through global competence and critical literacy: Innovative practices for inclusive childhood education. *SAGE Open*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019826000>
- Baek, K. (2018). The geographic dimension of citizenship in digital activism: Analysis of the relationships among local and global citizenship, the use of social networking sites, and participation in the Occupy Movement. *The American Behavioral Scientist (Beverly Hills)*, 62(8), 1138–1156. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764218764242>
- Barrow, E. (2017). No global citizenship? Re-envisioning global citizenship education in times of growing nationalism. *The High School Journal*, 100(3), 163–165. <https://doi.org/10.1353/hsj.2017.0005>
- Beckwith, V. (2021). Parents' perceptions of global citizenship education in rural Aotearoa New Zealand. *Waikato Journal of Education*, 26(2), 38–51. <https://doi.org/10.15663/wje.v26i2.828>
- Borkovic, S., Nicolacopoulos, T., Horey, D., & Fortune, T. (2020). Students positioned as global citizens in Australia and New Zealand universities: A discourse analysis. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 39(6), 1106–1121. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2020.112677>
- Bryson, J. R., & Vanchan, V. (2020). COVID-19 and alternative conceptualisations of value and risk in GPN research. *Journal of Economic and Social Geography*, 111(3), 530–542. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tesg.12425>
- Chanicka, J., Mahari de Silva, R., & Merkle, K. (2018). An inclusive design vision for Canada: Schooling as a process for participatory democracy and responsible citizenship. *Intercultural Education*, 29(5–6), 632–646. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2018.1508620>
- Clifford, V., & Montgomery, C., (2017). Designing an internationalised curriculum for higher education: Embracing the local and the global citizen. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 36(6), 1138–1151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2017.1296413>
- Crescenzi, R., Di Cataldo, M., & Faggian, A. (2018). Internationalized at work and localistic at home: The 'split' Europeanization behind Brexit. *Papers in Regional Science*, 97(1), 117–132. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pirs.12350>
- Department for Education. (2013). *National curriculum in England: Citizenship programmes of study for Key Stages 3 and 4*. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-curriculum-in-england-citizenship-programmes-of-study/national-curriculum-in-england-citizenship-programmes-of-study-for-key-stages-3-and-4>
- Dill, J. (2018). Global citizenship education: A critical introduction to key concepts and debates. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 66(4), 559–560. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2018.1529954>

- Engel, L. C., & Siczek, M. M. (2018). A cross-national comparison of international strategies: Global citizenship and the advancement of national competitiveness. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 48(5), 749–767. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2017.1353408>
- Fukuyama, F. (2018). Why national identity matters. *Journal of Democracy*, 29(4), 5–15. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2018.0058>
- Gaertner, D. (2016). World War II in American movie theatres from 1942–45: On images of civilian and military casualties and the negotiation of a shared experience. *Mediaesthetics - Journal of Poetics of Audiovisual Images*, 1. <https://doi.org/10.17169/mae.2016.50>
- Gardner-McTaggart, A., & Palmer, N. (2018). Global citizenship education, technology, and being. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 16(2), 268–281. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2017.1405342>
- Goren, H., & Yemini, M. (2016). Global citizenship education in context: Teacher perceptions at an international school and a local Israeli school. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 46(5), 832–853. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2015.1111752>
- Goren, H., & Yemini, M. (2018). Obstacles and opportunities for global citizenship education under intractable conflict: The case of Israel. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 48(3), 397–413. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2016.1273096>
- Grimwood, R. (2018). Producing global citizens?: How New Zealand universities implement the concept of global citizenship. *New Zealand Sociology*, 33(1), 97–120.
- Hammond, C. D., & Keating, A. (2018). Global citizens or global workers? Comparing university programmes for global citizenship education in Japan and the UK. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 48(6), 915–934. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2017.1369393>
- Hayward, B., Selboe, E., & Plew, E. (2015). Citizenship for a changing global climate: Learning from New Zealand and Norway. *Citizenship, Social and Economics Education*, 14(1), 19–27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2047173415577506>
- Intrator, M. (2019). *Books across borders: UNESCO and the politics of postwar cultural reconstruction, 1945–1951*. Palgrave MacMillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-15816-3>
- Jaufar, S. (2021). Shaping of sustainable citizenship among young people of Kulhudhuffushi, Maldives and Hamilton, New Zealand: Context, conditions and experiences. *Sustainable Earth*, 4(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42055-020-00040-3>
- Kefauver, G. N. (1944). Education an important factor in achieving an enduring peace. *School Review*, 52(1), 16–25. <https://doi.org/10.1086/440992>
- Laux, T. (2021). What makes a global movement? Analyzing the conditions for strong participation in the climate strike. *Social Science Information*, 60(3), 413–435. <https://doi.org/10.1177/05390184211022251>

- Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru Welsh Assembly Government. (2008). *Education for sustainable development and global citizenship: A common understanding for schools*. <https://hwb.gov.wales/api/storage/eaf467e6-30fe-45c9-93ef-cb30f31f1c90/common-understanding-for-school.pdf>
- Loneragan, M., & Chalmers, J.D. (2020). Estimates of the ongoing need for social distancing and control measures post-‘lockdown’ from trajectories of COVID-19 cases and mortality. *European Respiratory Journal*, 56(1). <https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003.01483-2020>
- Macfarlane, S. (2019). *He raraunga o te ao*: Global citizenship: A Māori perspective. *Curriculum Matters*, 15, 99. <https://doi.org/10.18296/cm.0039>
- Matapo, J. (2019). A Pasifika perspective on global citizenship education. *Curriculum Matters*, 15, 104. <https://doi.org/10.18296/cm.0040>
- Millard, G. (2014). The jealous god: A problem in the definition of nationalism. *Ethnicities*, 14(1), 3–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796813484724>
- Ministry of Education. (2007). *The New Zealand national curriculum*. <https://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/The-New-Zealand-Curriculum/>
- Ministry of Education. (2013). *Annual report 2013*. <https://assets.education.govt.nz/public/Documents/Ministry/Publications/Annual-Reports/MOEAnnualReport2013FullWeb.pdf>
- Ministry of Education. (2017). *Curriculum achievement objectives by level*. <https://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/The-New-Zealand-Curriculum>
- Ministry of Education. (2022). *The New Zealand Curriculum Refresh: Vision for young people and Te Ao Tangata / Social Sciences*. <https://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/content/download/169493/1250587/file/The%20New%20Zealand%20Curriculum%20Refresh%20%E2%80%93%20Social%20Sciences%20DRAFT.pdf>
- Pashby, K. (2018). Identity, belonging and diversity in education for global citizenship: Multiplying, intersecting, transforming, and engaging lived realities. In I. Davies, L.-C. Ho, D. Kiwan, C. L. Peck, A. Peterson, E. Sant, & Y. Waghid (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of global citizenship and education* (pp. 277–293). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-59733-5_18
- Pashby, K., Costa, M. d., Stein, S., & Andreotti, V. d. O. (2020). A meta-review of typologies of global citizenship education. *Comparative Education*, 56(2), 144–164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2020.1723352>
- Pashby, K., Costa, M. d., Stein, S., & Andreotti, V. d. O. (2021). Mobilising global citizenship education for alternative futures in challenging times: an introduction. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 19(4), 371–378. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2021.1925876>
- Perreau, M. (2019). Global citizenship education as education for social justice. *Curriculum Matters*, 15, 109. <https://doi.org/10.18296/cm.0041>

- Peterson, A., Milligan, A., & Wood, B. E. (2018). Global citizenship education in Australasia. In I. Davies, L.-C. Ho, D. Kiwan, C. L. Peck, A. Peterson, E. Sant, & Y. Waghid (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of global citizenship and education* (pp. 3–20). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-59733-5_1
- Reilly, J., & Niens, U. (2014). Global citizenship as education for peacebuilding in a divided society: Structural and contextual constraints on the development of critical dialogic discourse in schools. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 44(1), 53–76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2013.859894>
- Ritchie, H., Roser, M., Mispy, J., & Ortiz-Ospina, E. (2018). *Measuring progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals*. <https://sdg-tracker.org>
- Robinson, A. A., & Levac, L. (2018). Transformative learning in developing as an engaged global citizen. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 16(2), 108–129. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1541344617722634>
- Robinson, T. D., Oliveira, T. M., & Kayden, S. (2017). Factors affecting the United Nations' response to natural disasters: What determines the allocation of the Central Emergency Response Fund? *Disasters*, 41(4), 631–648. <https://doi.org/10.1111/disa.12226>
- Rosenboim, O. (2019). State, power and global order. *International Relations*, 33(2), 229–245. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117819840803>
- Savenije, G. M., Brauch, N., & Wagner, W. (2019). Sensitivities in history teaching across Europe and Israel. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 27(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2019.1566163>
- Savenije, G. M., & Goldberg, T. (2019). Silences in a climate of voicing: Teachers' perceptions of societal and self-silencing regarding sensitive historical issues. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 27(1), 39–64. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2019.1566162>
- Schattle, H. (2005). Communicating global citizenship: Multiple discourses beyond the academy. *Citizenship Studies*, 9(2), 119–133. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621020500049077>
- Schattle, H. (2009). Global citizenship in theory and practice. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad: Higher education and the quest for global citizenship* (pp. 3–20). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203876640>
- Shephard, K., Bourk, M., Miroso, M., & Dulgar, P. (2017). What global perspective does our university foster in our students? *Environmental Education Research*, 23(3), 398–414. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2015.1126806>
- Sioufi, R., Bourhis, R. Y., & Allard, R. (2016). Vitality and ethnolinguistic attitudes of Acadians, Franco-Ontarians and Francophone Quebecers: Two or three solitudes in Canada's bilingual belt? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 37(4), 385–401. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2015.1072205>
- Spijkers, O. (2019). Sustainable management of freshwater resources: Linking international water law and the Sustainable Development Goals. *Gaia*, 28(2), 135–142. <https://doi.org/10.14512/gaia.28.2.12>

- Truong-White, H., & McLean, L. (2015). Digital storytelling for transformative global citizenship education. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 38(2).
<https://doi.org/10.2307/canajeducrevucan.38.2.11>
- UNESCO, (2015). *Rethinking education: Towards a global common good?*
<https://en.unesco.org/news/rethinking-education-towards-global-common-good-launched-4-november>
- UNESCO. (2018). *UNESCO and Sustainable Development Goals*.
<https://en.unesco.org/sustainabledevelopmentgoals>
- UNESCO. (2019a). *A stepping stone towards measuring progress towards SDG 4.1*.
<https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/stepping-stone-towards-measuring-progress-towards-sdg-47>
- UNESCO. (2019b). *Global citizenship education*. <https://en.unesco.org/themes/gced>
- United Nations. (2022a). *Sustainable Development Goal 4: Targets and Indicators*.
<https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal4>
- United Nations. (2022b). *IAEG-SDGs: Tier classification for global SDG Indicators*.
<https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/iaeg-sdgs/tier-classification/>
- United Nations Children's Fund, & UNESCO. (2007). *A human rights-based approach to Education For All: A framework for the realization of children's right to education and rights within education*. UNICEF. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000154861>
- United Nations Environment Programme. (2020). *Building resilience to disasters and conflicts*.
<https://www.unep.org/regions/asia-and-pacific/regional-initiatives/building-resilience-disasters-and-conflicts>
- United Nations Joint Inspection Unit. (2019). *Review of the integration of disaster risk reduction in the work of the United Nations system in the context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*.
https://www.unjiu.org/sites/www.unjiu.org/files/jiu_rep_2019_3_en.pdf
- VanderDussen Toukan, E. (2018). Educating citizens of 'the global': Mapping textual constructs of UNESCO's global citizenship education 2012–2015. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 13(1), 51–64. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1746197917700909>
- Yemini, M., & Furstenburg, S. (2018). Students' perceptions of global citizenship at a local and an international school in Israel. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 48(6), 715–733.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2017.1418835>
-



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA.

Authors and readers are free to copy, display and distribute this article with no changes, as long as the work is attributed to the author(s) and the International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives (IEJ: CP), and the same license applies. More details of this Creative Commons

license are available at. The IEJ: CP is published by the Oceania Comparative and International Education Society (formerly ANZCIES) and Sydney Open Access Journals at the University of Sydney. Articles are indexed in ERIC, Scimago Journal (SJR)Ranking / SCOPUS. The IEJ:CP is a member of the Free Journal Network: