

ANNETTE SCHEUNPFLUG

Global Citizenship Education – and Its Relation to ‘Research in Cultural, Aesthetic, and Arts Education’

In this contribution, global learning – or global citizenship education, as it is called in some countries and concepts – will be related to ‘cultural, aesthetic, and arts education’ and its research. Multiple questions come to mind: Does an international journal automatically take a global perspective? Are there relationships between global learning and ‘cultural, aesthetic, and arts education’? If so, how can these be described and what do they mean for a research perspective as it relates to this new journal? These questions will be the focus of the following reflections.

I will first (1) briefly describe the characteristics of globalization and (2) then ask what these mean for global learning or global citizenship education from both normative and empirical perspectives. (3) Against this background, what is the program for a journal that deals with ‘research on cultural, aesthetic and arts education’ on an international level?

Globalization – new qualities beyond internationalization

‘Globalization’ is a phenomenon on everyone’s lips today. This makes it all the more important to share an understanding of this signature topic of its era that goes beyond a diffuse everyday meaning. Globalization, following a definition by Niklas Luhmann, refers to the notion that today’s society is to be understood as a global world society since social communication today is no longer possible independently of world social contexts. His central thesis suggests that every society today exists as world society because it is always part of a global context (Luhmann, 1975; 1997, p. 806 ff.). World society does not have the form of a state or a world organization, but consists of the sum of social, political and cultural diversity and its interdependences. Every human being is a part of it and included in it in very different dimensions and segments, even if this is not perceived as such by the individual. Active participation in globalization is

very unequally distributed. Widespread forms of nationalism are not a counter-argument against increasing globalization, but can rather be interpreted as its fearful and defensive attitude towards these evolutions. While some phenomena of globalization may enable joy and well-being (such as worldwide music culture or global medical research), other aspects may lead to fear or overload (such as climate change or the possibilities of manipulation by digital corporations).

This understanding of globalization differs from that of internationalization or internationality. While the understanding of ‘inter-nations’, i. e., the relationship between different nations in the sense of states and cultures, is linguistically accompanied by the understanding of at least two distinct acting entities (in the sense of cultures, states or persons), the view of ‘globalization’ is rather associated with the understanding of cultural hybridity, bounded communication and blurring actors in multiple roles. The British sociologist Roland Robertson saw in this a new form of spatial experience, which he denoted by the term “glocality” (Robertson, 1998). This refers to the new quality with which global contexts are indirectly reflected in local contexts. Glocality thus no longer requires the distinct other but shows itself as a new diffuse quality of being placed out of oneself in everyday contexts. This also means that actions require the compromises of many actors, that the complexity of challenges increases, and that the perspectives of associated responsibility may drift apart. In short, complexity, contingency, and uncertainty are associated with this form of planetary perception.

Global learning and global citizenship education

Global learning is the pedagogical concept that attempts to respond to this challenge. This umbrella term, using the definition of the Maastricht declaration of the GENE/ European Council from 2002, is understood as “Education that opens people’s eyes and minds to the realities of the world and awakens them to bring about a world of greater justice, equity and human rights for all” (Maastricht Global Education Declaration, 2002; Nygaard & Wegimont, 2018). This concept is including “global citizenship education” (UNESCO, 2015) and related concepts, pointing out on the necessity to reflect human relations in a globalized world.

This concept combines normative and empirical perspectives. Normatively, it is about social justice and planetary integrity, about advocacy for people in special situations and about the efforts to prevent progressive climate change. It is about the recognition of the rights of minorities, the enforcement of human rights as a living legal norm as well as the struggle for a permanently peaceful coexistence in the world. In more and more countries, the concept itself or aspects of this concept are being implemented, although still very differently from region to region (see Bourn, 2020 for an overview).

Empirical research on this field focuses primarily on the perspective of conceptualizing the competencies associated with it, for example in meta-analyses on competency

models (Wiek et al., 2011) or in the instrumentation of “global competencies” in PISA 2018, which is clearly too strongly rooted in the intercultural discourse (OECD, 2018; cf. critically Sälzer & Roczen, 2018; Timm & Scheunpflug, 2022). However, studies that focus on the question of learning global connections and ask how the human propensity for authenticity, neighborliness, and personal acquaintance can be translated into a form of abstract global solidarity are still poorly elaborated. Initial findings suggest that a world social learning setting does not naturally lead to a perspective of a joint and solidary understanding of this world. However, structures or ascriptions of supposed superiority or inferiority may be determined. Knowledge about globality and personal experience of globalization does not automatically lead to global competence in the sense of an understanding of symmetrical “unsociable sociability” – or the understanding of “abstract sociality”. People with a world social orientation towards “unsociable socializing” do – following the few existing research – not learn by experience or by knowledge alone, but by the connection of knowledge and experience with their own biography and their own self (Scheunpflug, 2021).

Suggestions for research in arts education from a perspective of global learning

Against this background, the contribution of ‘Global Learning for arts education’ and ‘arts education for Global Learning’ has to be put into this setting.

The knowledge of concepts of Global Learning and Global Citizenship Education sensitizes for the challenges of globalization, the necessity of climate change and the claim to human rights. At the same time, the requirements for an ‘abstract solidarity’ become recognizable, which goes beyond individual fates and opens up structural perspectives.

It is precisely at this point that the possibilities of ‘Cultural, Aesthetic, and Arts Education’ become visible. Art has the possibility to grasp reality, as individual artistic points of view open the view beyond the individual. It opens imaginary and visionary dimensions that stimulate and enable new perspectives on human life. It thus makes it possible to give expression to some overwhelming reality, and to enable possibilities and perspectives through creative appropriation. These two aspects of a global description of reality through ‘individuo-sociality’ (i.e. the connection of individuality with society) as well as the visionary power of art in the imagination of the arts and the energies connected with it are of indispensable importance for Global Learning. In this respect, it is high time to take a closer look at the relation between Global Citizenship Education and ‘Cultural, Aesthetic, and Arts Education’. This is connected with a challenging research program, which in my opinion is fed by the following tasks:

- It is about making visible and describing descriptions of reality and visions as they are expressed in art with regard to their global perspective of glocality and abstract sociality.
- Learning offers of cultural and aesthetic education are to be examined and empirically surveyed with regard to their implicit understanding of global contexts. This means analyzing not only the learning materials for their implicit global perspective, but also the learning arrangements themselves and the implicit beliefs of teachers and learners.
- And finally, the learning processes themselves are of great interest. How are knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs learned that relate positively to global challenges and motivate appropriate action?

Overall, the interplay of these theoretical approaches yields a wealth of stimulating possibilities. I am curious to see how the new journal will take these up and what suggestions will emerge as a result. I wish a huge success!

References

- Bourn, D. (Ed.). (2020). *The Bloomsbury Handbook of Global Education and Learning*. Bloomsbury Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350108769>
- Luhmann, N. (1975). Die Weltgesellschaft. In N. Luhmann (Ed.), *Soziologische Aufklärung* (vol. 2., pp. 51–71), Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Luhmann, N. (1997). *Die Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft*. 2 vol. Suhrkamp.
- Maastricht Global Education Declaration (2002). *A European Strategy Framework For Improving and Increasing Global Education in Europe to the Year 2015*. GENE.
- Nygaard, A., & Wegimont, L. (2018). *Global Education in Europe – Concepts, Definitions and Aims*. GENE.
- OECD (2018). *Preparing Our Youth for an Inclusive and Sustainable World. The OECD PISA global competence framework*. OECD. <https://www.oecd.org/education/Global-competency-for-an-inclusive-world.pdf>
- Robertson, R. (1998). Glocalization: Homogeneity and Heterogeneity in Space and Time. In U. Beck (Ed.), *Perspectives of World Society* (pp. 192–220), Suhrkamp.
- Sälzer, C., & Roczen, N. (2018). Assessing Global Competence in PISA 2018: Challenges and Approaches to Capturing a Complex Construct. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 10(1), 5–20. <https://doi.org/10.18546/IJDE-GL.10.1.02>
- Scheunpflug, A. (2021). Global learning: Educational research in an emerging field. *European Educational Research Journal*, 20(1), 3–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474904120951743>
- Timm, S., & Scheunpflug, A. (Eds.). (2022). Globale Kompetenzen in PISA 2018 – Perspektiven auf eine Weltagenda. *Themenheft der Zeitschrift für Internationale Bildungsforschung und Entwicklungspädagogik*, 45(1). <https://fis.uni-bamberg.de/handle/uni-ba/54874>
- UNESCO (2015). Global Citizenship Education – Topics and Learning Objectives. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002329/232993e.pdf>

Wiek, A., Withycombe, L., & Redman, C.L. (2011). Key competencies in sustainability: A reference framework for academic program development. *Sustainability Science*, 6(2), 203–218. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-011-0132-6>