



universität
wien

DIPLOMARBEIT

Titel der Diplomarbeit

„Generation Globo Sapiens-Global Citizenship
Education and Critical Pedagogy in the (English)
Foreign Language Classroom“

Verfasserin

Tanja Wimmer

angestrebter akademischer Grad

Magistra der Philosophie (Mag.phil.)

Wien, Juni 2011

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt:

A 344 350

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt:

UF Englisch UF Italienisch

Betreuerin ODER Betreuer:

Ao. Univ.-Prof. Mag. Dr. Christiane Dalton-Puffer

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
1. Targeted Learner Group	4
2. The Globo Sapiens in the 21st Century	5
2.1. Global Changes and Citizenship	5
2.2. Defining The Ideal: Global Citizenship and the Globo Sapiens	7
2.3. Global Civic Culture, The Earth Charter and Human Rights.....	9
2.3.1. Challenges to Global Citizenship and Global Civic Culture.....	11
3. Global Education & Global Citizenship Education (GCE).....	13
3.1. Qualification Globo Sapiens.....	16
3.1.1. The Substantive Dimension.....	16
3.1.2. The Perceptual Dimension	17
3.2. GCE & The Role Of The Earth Charter And UDHR.....	19
3.2.1. The Earth Charter, the UDHR and the Foreign Language Classroom.....	22
4. Critical Pedagogy and Global Citizenship Education.....	25
4.1. Neo-Liberalism and the Production of Cynicism.....	26

4.2. The Education System and Possible Limitations to GCE	27
4.3. Understanding Critical Pedagogy	29
4.4. The Potentialities of Critical Pedagogy	31
4.4.1. Paulo Freire.....	32
4.5. Critique of Critical Pedagogy	34
4.6. Critical pedagogy and GCE-What Can They Do For Each Other?.....	35
5. Critical (Cultural) Awareness and Critical Pedagogy	38
5.1. Reflection and Critical Thinking	38
5.2. Dissent and Conflict	40
5.3. Critical Thinking, Conflict and Controversial Issues	44
5.4. Dialogue.....	49
5.4.1. Intercultural dialogue.....	51
5.4.2. Problem-Posing	53
5.5. Empowerment.....	57
5.6. Action and hope.....	58
6. Foreign Language Education, Critical pedagogy and GCE.....	59
6.1. The Intercultural Dimension of GCE	60
6.1.1. The Intercultural Speaker-a Globo Sapiens?.....	60
6.1.2. Cultural Realism	68
6.1.2.1. The Five Shifts.....	70
6.2. Identity Globo Sapiens	77
6.2.1. English as a Foreign Language and GCE.....	77
6.2.1.1. English as a Global Language	78

6.2.1.2. Linguistic Imperialism-The Language of Critique.....	79
6.2.1.3. English Ecology-The Language of Possibility	82
6.3. Global Issues & Motivation.....	85
6.4. Global Issues and Critical Literacy	85
6.4.1. Critical Literacy.....	86
6.4.2. Critical Media Literacy.....	91
6.5. Communicative Competence.....	92
7. Developing Discussion in the GCE Foreign Language Classroom	93
7.1. Definition.....	93
7.2. Learning Objectives.....	94
7.3. Planning	97
7.3.1. The Appropriate Issue... ..	97
7.3.2. Establishment of Ground Rules.....	99
7.3.3. Content and Language Preparation	100
7.3.4. The Classroom Layout	102
7.3.5. The Discussion Format.....	103
7.3.5.1. Discussion cards	103
7.3.5.2. Warm-Up Discussions.....	104
7.3.5.3. Pyramid (or Consensus) Debate	105
7.3.5.4. Panel Discussions	106
7.3.6. Role of the Teacher.....	107
7.3.7. Variation	109
7.4. Online Intercultural Dialogue.....	110

CONCLUSION	115
REFERENCES	118
GERMAN ABSTRACT	130
CURRICULUM VITAE	132

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: The key elements for responsible Global Citizenship.....	18
Table 2: Earth Charter Themes.....	20
Table 3: Critical literacy activities and concepts.....	89
Table 4: Aims in GCE tasks	96

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my mum and dad, who always supported me financially during my studies and also enabled me to do the research for this paper in beautiful Vancouver. I also thank them for believing in me and my ideas.

Secondly, my thanks go to my friends and particularly my boyfriend, who always listened to me when I complained about stress and other accompanying “side effects” of studies and work.

Finally, I wish to express my thanks to Ao. Univ.-Prof. Christiane Dalton-Puffer for her excellent support.

INTRODUCTION

If we take a look at our everyday life, we could assume that we are all global citizens. If in the context of Austria, for instance, we compiled a list of all objects of everyday use we use on a daily basis we would show ourselves to be real citizens of the world. Our sleepy mornings are made more bearable with coffee from Colombia and a croissant from France, our way to work is accelerated with a car from Germany, our tasks in the office are facilitated through the use of a computer from Japan, our company's capital grows on the Swiss account, our break is brightened up with food from Italy, our dinner at the Greek restaurant is more elegant with clothing from China, our evening is more fun with beer from Ireland, and our next day is all over bar the shouting with vodka from Russia.

Actually, we seem to be so international that there is no need to teach us anything about globalization and internationalization, because we are so used to it that we should basically be able to deal with it. Yet, I claim that children and adolescents and ideally also adults should be educated for global citizenship, which is in fact much more than the consumption of goods from countries from all over the world and the interaction with people from different cultural backgrounds. We often tend to forget that all these new products, people and possibilities go hand in hand with more responsibility. Although we have the car at our disposal to go to work in the morning, we could opt for the metro in order to reduce our ecological footprint. Instead of simply drinking cheap coffee from Colombia every morning without questioning the working conditions and the income of the people who work at the coffee plantations far away, we could chose fair-trade coffee in preference to unfair one. If we tried to do all that, we could blithely enjoy our croissant in the morning and our Guinness in the evening.

The fact that goods, capital and also people move across the frontiers of nation-states has a considerable impact on culture. (Sampatkumar 2007: 71) From a certain perspective, internationalization can definitely be considered to be enriching for the individual and cultural communities. Obviously, some cultures and nations also gain a lot from the spread of free market economy and liberalized international trade all over the world, however exactly these benefits have to be looked at critically as they already point to the shortcomings of globalization.

Economic globalization, for example, has fallen into disrepute because of its capitalistic aspirations at the expense of the quality of life of the majority of the world population. (Sampatkumar 2007: 71-73) Natural resources are exploited, the environment is harmed and traditional values are severely influenced by the “monolithic global ethos dictated by giant multinational corporations.” (73) Hence, capitalism goes hand in hand with international inequality.

Another problem associated with globalization can be found in the cultural domain. Multicultural societies that are commonplace in North America and Europe have difficulties to cope with the diversity in their communities. As a result migrants are confronted with racism and social cohesion is disrupted.

Economic, cultural and also political globalization and the accompanying challenges are one of the main subjects of discussion in the 21st century. Though, there are manifold global issues apart from globalization that deserve the attention of the *Earth community* such as global warming or current demographic developments that are also related to the phenomenon of globalization and will sooner or later have an impact on citizens all over the world.

The list of problems is actually inexhaustible; however it is not the intention of this introduction to evoke pessimism and despair. Yet, it is necessary to raise some issues at this point in order to highlight the urgent need for change in the future. Actually, to make a change for the better possible, people have to rethink their identities and begin to view themselves as part of the global collective. (Birch 2009: 41) Making a list of objects of everyday use is definitely a good start to become aware of the interconnectedness of nations in the era of globalization. As a second step this awareness has to further develop into a sense of responsibility that implies the individual’s insight that the actions s/he takes affect the whole world. In a few words, the individual has to see him/herself as a global citizen who cares about the wellbeing of humanity. This sense of global interdependence and universal responsibility find the best expression in the Earth Charter:

We stand at a critical moment in Earth's history, a time when humanity must choose its future. As the world becomes increasingly interdependent and fragile, the future at once holds great peril and great promise. To move forward we must recognize that in the midst of a magnificent diversity of cultures and life forms we are one human

family and one Earth community with a common destiny. We must join together to bring forth a sustainable global society founded on respect for nature, universal human rights, economic justice, and a culture of peace. Towards this end, it is imperative that we, the peoples of Earth, declare our responsibility to one another, to the greater community of life, and to future generations. (Earth Charter: 1)

The main issues discussed in this paper are subdivided into seven main chapters that are organized into further sections. **The first chapter** defines the target learner group for the practical and theoretical suggestions of the paper. **The second chapter** gives a brief overview of the concept of global citizenship (GC), *global civic culture* and the related international documents that transport the values of sustainability and social justice to the so called Earth community. **The third chapter** introduces Global Citizenship Education (GCE) and presents the key competences that ought to be furthered in the GCE classroom. Furthermore, the chapter includes an examination of the educational potential of the Earth Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights with respect to GCE and subsequently provides some practical suggestions for the use in the foreign language classroom. **The fourth chapter** establishes a connection between GCE and critical pedagogy. After a brief outline of the main ideas behind critical pedagogy, its capability of increasing the effectiveness of GCE and the mutual positive effect of combining the two pedagogical strands are investigated. As critical pedagogy is a contested concept, some points of criticism are taken up and commented on. Subsequently, **the fifth chapter** is concerned with the actual methods used by critical pedagogy that should ideally lead to *empowerment* and *action* in the interest of global citizenship. Apart from the promotion of *critical reflection*, critical pedagogy also acknowledges *dissent* and *difference* as useful instruments for nurturing global citizens. A more dialogic approach to teaching (languages) enables students to actively produce knowledge instead of only receiving it, which turns them into empowered and more active subjects that keep up hope and believe in change for a better future. **The sixth chapter** brings together GCE, critical pedagogy and foreign language learning and thereby constitutes the core of the thesis. The chapter provides manifold arguments for the integration of GCE and critical pedagogy in the foreign language classroom. Apart from the popularity of global issues among students, it is pointed to the inherent political nature of language and culture education and its important role in initiating change. The practice of *critical literacy*, as well as a more critical approach to intercultural learning that is in accordance with the cultural realism of our time are the key components of foreign language and culture education that aims at social transformation. To the role of the English language teacher is given particular

emphasis as s/he takes on a strategic position by teaching the global language and preparing students for intercultural dialogue in the global community. As language is one of the most crucial aspects of identity, the international language English plays a vital role in the development of a more global identity and the furtherance of global citizens in the classroom. In the **last chapter (seventh chapter)**, I lay out how dialogue can actually be incorporated in the foreign language classroom. I present various discussion formats and outline which factors have to be considered in the planning of a successful GCE discussion. Moreover, I offer some concrete examples of discussion topics that I consider to be appropriate within the context of GCE. In addition, I elaborate on the idea of online intercultural dialogues that is brought up in the fifth chapter. Ultimately, the main points of the paper are summarized and evaluated in a conclusion that also points to possible future research in the field of GCE.

1. Targeted Learner Group

Although the paper is written in an Austrian context, it does not concentrate on GCE in the specific case of Austria. Due to the global relevance of GCE it rather attempts to stay general and to provide theoretical input that is applicable to schools and classrooms worldwide. Yet, the concrete topics and activities for teaching that are suggested throughout the chapters are adapted to the Austrian context as global issues always ought to be related to the local level. The age group I refer to in my explanations, however, has to be defined more precisely. The work with authentic media and literature, the discussion of controversial issues and the examination of the original versions of the Earth Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as it is suggested in the paper, require an intermediate/advanced language level and therefore this paper refers to upper secondary foreign language students that are on their way to reach level B2 in the target language. However, at this point it has to be pointed out that GCE can indeed be implemented at a lower and even at a beginner level, but unfortunately this paper will not prove useful for those who are interested in this target group.

2. The Globo Sapiens in the 21st Century

2.1. Global Changes and Citizenship

Dealing with the concept of global citizenship entails giving an explanation of the idea of citizenship in general. Firstly, citizenship can be seen as a status in the sense of nationality. This understanding is exclusive as an individual can be a citizen of one or maybe two countries, while being a foreigner in all the other countries of the world. This notion of citizenship conflicts with the idea of universal rights and freedoms for all human beings regardless of their national background. Secondly, citizenship might be thought of as a sense of belonging. This feeling does not necessarily correlate with official status, however legal rights gained through citizenship present a person with this sense of belonging. It is only fully guaranteed on the condition that one has “access to services and resources; legal rights of residence; social and psychological security; an absence of discrimination and/or legal redress if discrimination occurs; and acceptance by others within the community.” (Osler and Starkey 2010: 114) The third option to conceive citizenship is active participation or citizenship as practice. This conception involves the “everyday political, social, economic and cultural” practices of individuals that influence community life on the local or global level. The three concepts must not be looked at in isolation as they are independent. Formal status provides the individual with a sense of security and belonging, which in return inspires the individual to help fashion community life. Nonetheless, it is possible to show a high degree of commitment without having a citizenship status. (114-115) Globalization transforms this possibility even into a necessity and thereby justifies the ideal of global citizenship promoted in this thesis.

Despite this fact, citizenship at the beginning of the 21st century still remains focused on the nation-state. Knowledge about one’s nation’s culture, history and political system, identification with its social, economic, and political practices as well as the duty to protect one’s own country are widely accepted ideas of an ideal citizen. (Osler and Starkey 2010: 115-116) Challenged by social, economic and political reality in the 21st century, this well-established concept of national citizenship shows severe weak spots. A national citizen is a member of a “politically and culturally delimited territory” (Roth 2007: 11) with a government that prescribes the rights and duties of the individual. (Noddings 2005: 2) This form of citizenship implies that the state is politically, economically and culturally

autonomous which in our era of global interdependence cannot be assumed anymore. The global age has threatened the sovereignty of the nation state considerably as problems arising from globalization can simply not be solved remaining solely within the national structures. (Brown and Morgan 2008: 284) Issues such as the unstable financial market, forms of trade and employment, the increase in international conflicts and many other contemporary phenomena provoke global and not only national concern. (Tasneem 2005: 177)

Moreover, nation-states' governments in the present day are influenced by international organizations like the United Nations or regional institutions such as the European Union, who exercise supervisory power. The Maastricht Treaty of 1993, for example, has established a *transnational civil society* (Byram 2008: 196) with "additional political and legal rights" (Sampatkumar 2007: 75) for all EU citizens. These supranational political institutions create a new point of reference for modern individuals' identity formation and can compensate for the failure of nation states to protect human rights that are essential to the wellbeing of every world citizen. (Brown and Morgan: 284) The Universal Declaration of Human Rights can be seen as a milestone in establishing world law (285), although "centralized worldwide government institutions" (Schattle 2008: 2) are still far from reality and are likely to be in the near future.

Another striking argument for the inappropriateness of national citizenship is migration and the emerging diversity within today's countries. A common national identity can no longer be promoted in the age of pluralism, where societies are characterized by ethnic and religious heterogeneity. (Roth 2007: 11-17) Rather than national citizens, a lot of individuals are members of *transnational networks*.

Transnational communities are groups whose identity is not primarily based on attachment to a specific territory. They therefore present a powerful challenge to traditional ideas of nation state belonging [...]. (Castles 2004: 27 quoted in Byram 2008: 195)

These multiple affiliations to different countries do not receive any attention in national citizenship.

Even if the nation-state will undoubtedly remain the primary basis of political membership, allegiance and legal jurisdiction due to a lack of universal law at the present day (Schattle 2008: 2), global interconnectedness and accompanying global problems, the flourishing of alternative citizenship practices like the EU as well as the emergence of hybrid cultural identities call for an extended and more dynamic vision of citizenship, which can be found in

global citizenship. Even though the concept of status cannot be applied to global citizenship, it has the potential to create a feeling of belonging and can definitely be conceptualized as practice.

[...] Understandings of global citizenship [...] often extend notions of political participation and belonging not only outward into the international arena but also inward within the most immediate spheres of domestic politics and local civic life. For many of today's self-described global citizens, the popular adage 'think globally, act locally' has evolved into something more comprehensive: 'Think and act locally and globally.' [...] Global citizenship now emerges frequently as a verb, a concept of action signifying ways of living and thinking within multiple cross-cutting communities [...] (Schattle 2008: 3)

2.2. Defining The Ideal: Global Citizenship and the *Globo Sapiens*

Critics often argue that global citizenship is an unfeasible objective and this skepticism still dominates academic and public discourse, especially in the field of politics and political science. (Schattle 2008: 2) Admittedly, global citizenship as it will be described in this paper, is in fact an ideal, even if public acknowledgement of global interconnectedness grows and a new civic identity is becoming detectable in a variety of different places all over the world. International institutions, activists, some multinational corporations and also a number of schools are the embodiment of this ideal (3) that now has to be defined thoroughly.

Multiple theoretical frameworks have been established to explain the nature of global citizenship and the term *global citizenship* has several meanings, ranging from a vague sense of belonging to an imagined world community to a more precise notion of a global polity like a world government. (Davies, Evans, and Reid 2005: 71-72) Heater's (1997:36-38) spectrum outlines the following four main meanings of global citizenship: "member of the human race, responsible for the condition of the planet, individual subject to moral law and promotion of world government". (Davies, Evans, and Reid 2005: 71) This paper will definitely not be concerned with the discussion of a world government and only partly with moral law and related global governance. The main focus of interest is the rather vague understanding of the responsible world citizen. Accordingly, global citizenship in this context can be defined in the following way: "the rights and responsibilities that citizens have towards others within a global sociopolitical relationship. Global citizenship is pro-human and pro-social: the good of the individual is balanced by the good of the collective and vice versa." (Birch 2009: 41)

Having said that, it has to be clarified what pro-human and pro-social means precisely. Which values and principles should be the source of action of the ideal global citizen? Global citizenship ought to be motivated by certain moral obligations. Consequently, the concept of global citizenship addressed in this paper has an explicit moral character and foregrounds the allegiance to humankind instead of any particular state or grouping. (Sampatkumar 2007: 75) Schattle (2008: 1-2) notes that global citizenship can be traced back to the cosmopolitan ideology that goes back to ancient Greece and therefore exists as a political ideal for approximately twenty-five hundred years. It suggests “[regarding] each human person as worthy of equal respect and concern, regardless of the legal and political boundaries of any existing government jurisdictions.” (Schattle 2008: 2) Recent cosmopolitan thought that is highly critical of current global systems lays the foundations for the understanding of global citizenship in our times. (Cabrera 2010: 3)

Another concept that helps to define the characteristics of the global citizen and bears resemblance to cosmopolitanism is *species identity*, which is described in the following passage:

Whether based on religious or secular-humanist beliefs, there are people in all countries who feel allegiance to a community that in one sense does not exist—the community of humankind. It is this allegiance that we are calling species identity. (Boulding 1990: 65-66)

Cosmopolitan ideas and the concept of species identity alike stress two main ideals in a global citizen. First, s/he needs the ability to identify with human beings around the globe, while simultaneously s/he has to show interest in and respect for differences among cultures. (De Ruyter 2010: 60) These demands imply a certain “moral political capacity” (ibid) that allows the global citizen to be tolerant towards distinct world views and ways of living. (ibid) In her definition of the three main characteristics of the global citizen Noddings (2005) adds a third dimension:

The first is wisdom—the ability to perceive the interdependence of all life. [...] The second is courage—the courage to respect one another’s differences and use them as an impetus to creative living, rather than rejecting or excluding others on the basis of differences of culture, nationality, and race. [...] The third is the ability to empathize with and share the pain of every person and all of life. (Noddings 2005: x)

This above described wisdom is of utmost importance as only the acknowledgement of global interconnectedness gives validity to the other two qualities.

Undoubtedly, *universal concern* and *respect for legitimate difference* or *empathy*, and *courage* are in tension with each other. Showing respect for diversity involves the risk of finding oneself incapable of making any moral judgments because all behavior, as immoral as it might be, is justified and explained by the cultural relativism of values. However, a global citizen does not have to, or rather, must not feel obliged to appreciate all foreign cultural practices because they are simply not all morally acceptable. At the same time, respect for cultural differences is necessary as it keeps us from imposing our own norms and values on other people that might not share our understanding of certain issues. In order to be able to differentiate between right and wrong behavior and also to clearly define *universal concern*, all global citizens have to adhere to the ethic of species identity or the commonly developed *global civic culture* and its principles. (Birch 2009: 39)

[...] [O]ne cannot feel allegiance to an abstraction. That is where the concept of civic culture comes in. It can only become operational through a set of common understandings developed on the basis of interaction in all the ways we have been described in these chapters: between governments, in the United Nations, and between people across national borders. We have to enter into more social interaction and become more consciously linked across national borders, to give substance to that civic culture. (Boulding 1990: 65-66)

2.3. Global Civic Culture, The Earth Charter and Human Rights

This set of common understanding becomes apparent in the Earth Charter, an international declaration of fundamental values and principles for “individuals, organizations, businesses, governments, and transnational institutions.” (Earth Charter: 1) This document is the result of the collaboration of “thousands of men, women, and organizations from all continents, faith groups, and ethnicities” (Birch 2009: 42) and more than 2000 organizations and millions of people all over the world have declared approval for it. (ibid) It directly addresses the imagined world community by using the personal pronoun “we” and thereby includes every single human individual on our planet and not just nation-states and their governments. Holistically, it assumes a sociopolitical participation “of individuals, families, organizations, and communities from the arts, sciences, religions, educational institutions, media, businesses, non-governmental organizations, and governments” (Birch 2009:42-43) working towards the common objective of a sustainable world. (42) The Charter presupposes a *global*

civil society (ibid) that shares universal aims and values, encompassing respect and care for the community of life, ecological integrity, universal human rights, respect for diversity, economic justice, democracy, and a culture of peace.” (Earth Charter International 2009: 1)

The choice is ours: form a global partnership to care for Earth and one another or risk the destruction of ourselves and the diversity of life. Fundamental changes are needed in our values, institutions, and ways of living. We must realize that when basic needs have been met, human development is primarily about being more, not having more. We have the knowledge and technology to provide for all and to reduce our impacts on the environment. The emergence of a global civil society is creating new opportunities to build a democratic and humane world. Our environmental, economic, political, social, and spiritual challenges are interconnected, and together we can forge inclusive solutions. (Earth Charter: 1)

Respect for universal human rights is one essential part of the demands on global citizens mentioned in the Earth Charter. There is not the space here for a detailed description and profound critical analysis of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), so instead it should be emphasized in how far the document is part of *global civic culture*.

The key idea behind human rights is equal dignity and equal rights of all human beings. Human rights are therefore a moral and legal concept with universal validity. (Osler and Starkey 2010: 47-48) Together with the Earth Charter it can serve as a knowledge base for *global civic culture* that “enables people to develop shared understandings of needs and rights across cultural boundaries.” (Tasneem 2005: 181) These two international dimensions offer a point of reference for the “ultimate moral truth in the world” (Birch 2009: 78) on the basis of which actions can be judged internationally. (ibid)

It is important to point out that the ethical principles of the Earth Charter are not to be mistaken for rules, as rules determine how to act in a particular situation, while general principles tell us what to consider before taking an action or making a decision. (Earth Charter International 2009: 3) The status of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, on the other hand, is different because it “inform[s] a universal value system protected by law.” (Huaman, Koenig, and Shultz 2008: 17) Unfortunately, impunity still limits the legal power of human rights, which means that the sovereignty of the International Criminal Court is not fully established yet. Consequently international human rights violations are often not punished. (Evans 2008: 34)

The present situation reveals that ethical principles and human rights do not guide our actions yet and therefore the two documents picture an ideal that has not moved from latency to actuality yet. (Birch 2009: 78) The Earth Charter presumes an imagined community of social responsibility and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights displays a “cosmopolitan utopian vision” (Osler and Starkey 2010: 57) of a just and peaceful world by examining the actions of world society and its inherent injustices, while at the same time providing a model of a better future informed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

[...] recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world, [w]hereas disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people, [...]
(United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948: n. p.)

Utopia in this context must not be interpreted as an unrealistic picture of social reality but has to be regarded as a possibility. Giddens (1990:156) refers to utopia as possibility as *utopian realism* and Rawls (1999:128) uses the expression *realistic utopia* to indicate that “[l]ooking at ideal solutions but relating them to actual social trends and developments may help to address specific social and political problems.” (Osler and Starkey 2010: 46) Mannheim ([1936]1991) believed in the potential of utopia to foster human agency and some argue that through the imagination of another world dominant patterns of thinking and acting are challenged. (45-57)

2.3.1. Challenges to Global Citizenship and Global Civic Culture

The idea of *transitionalism* which assumes that society is on its way to a better future (Birch 2009: 78) encounters resistance from critics of global citizenship. The Earth Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are regarded as insufficient means to encourage transitional thinking.

[It is argued] that in the absence of an international authority to establish boundaries for determining how political decisions are reached on matters of global concern (for example the tension between environmentalism and economic development) there is little evidence that people will act in a manner contrary to their personal preferences and/or sectional interests. (Garratt and Piper 2010: 47)

It is undeniable that despite the existence of a *global civil society* that dedicates itself to the struggle for a sustainable world, people who continue to take short-sighted actions in private

as well as professional life are in the majority. The reason for that can be explained by the concept of legitimacy.

Citizenship in Western democracies is based on the liberal tradition, where a high value is attached to individual rights and freedoms and socio-political autonomy. (Leenders and Veugelers 2009: 24)

Such a citizen does not use rights and duties and responsibilities as a moral, ideological obligation, but as something that serves his or her own interest. Rights are interpreted in terms of protection of the individual and his or her autonomy. Duties are put in the background since they mean a restriction of liberty. (24-25)

Since the first half of the 20th century we cannot talk about liberalism anymore as the new regulating principle of global society has become neo-liberalism. It lays the foundation and legitimizes global economy and capitalism. Market practices are thereby embedded in the individualistic values and practices of liberal nation-states, which helps industries to perpetuate their power in society. The legitimacy is continuously recreated through language and media and this permanent influence reduces the chance for resistance. (Birch 2009: 35) It can be deduced that a lot of principles of the Earth Charter conflict with this form of liberalism. (33) Therefore global citizenship, “a critical democratic citizenship that is based on autonomy and social commitment” (Leenders and Veugelers 2009: 26) needs to be legitimized in order to make change in modern societies possible. The important question that has to be raised at this point is: How can it be legitimized in today’s society of individualization and globalization? This paper suggests a definite answer to this question.

Social and political change needs *transitional thinkers* that operate within important social and cultural networks and are thereby in a good position to question dominant patterns of thinking. Lederach (2005:181) uses the term *critical yeast* to refer to these innovative personalities. The *critical yeast* is a response to the common notion of *critical mass* that says that change is only possible if a certain number of people dedicate itself to the fight for it. The *critical yeast* is “the impetus for the formation of the critical mass.” (Birch 2009: 108) It is argued that the *critical yeast* can be seen in the role of the teacher, as educational systems play a major role in perpetuating

the language, myths, rituals, and ideologies that legitimize the status quo. [...] As the transformative movements achieve legitimacy in their own right, their validation by peers or by accepted authorities appropriates emergent language, values, norms, beliefs, practices, and procedures so that they are available in the culture. (35)

Therefore the teacher can either chose to reproduce the present situation or rather use his strategic position at school to come up with, and legitimize an alternative. The identification of children and adolescents with the concept of a global citizen lies to a high degree in the sphere of responsibility of the teacher. This insight leads to the conclusion that if we take the Earth Charter seriously education for global citizenship ought to be an integral part along the school curriculum.

3. Global Education & Global Citizenship Education (GCE)

If the teacher or the *critical yeast* pursues to work for change together with his students, he has to integrate global education into his lesson plan. Global education can be defined as the pedagogical response to globalization and the implications relative to it that have already been outlined in the previous chapters. It combines the agendas of various educational disciplines: “Development Education, Human Rights Education, Education for Sustainable Development, Education for Peace and Conflict Prevention, Intercultural and Interfaith Education, the global dimension of education for citizenship” (North-South Centre of the Council of Europe 2010: 14) This paper concentrates on Global Citizenship Education (GCE) that is closely related to Education for Sustainable Development. Its focus and methodology is suggested by Osler and Vincent 2002:

[Global citizenship education] is based on the principles of co-operation, non-violence, respect for human rights and cultural diversity, democracy and tolerance [and] is characterized by pedagogical approaches based on human rights and a concern for social justice which encourage critical thinking and responsible participation. (Osler and Vincent 2002: 2 quoted in Tasneem 2005: 178)

It has to be highlighted that GCE is closely linked to the ideal of democracy. A democratic society needs citizens who have the ability and show the willingness to make intelligent choices. The democratic ideal refuses dogma and “arbitrary authority”, which requires democratic citizens to “liberate the mind from dogmatic adherence to ideological fashions, as well as from the dictates of authority.” (De Ruyter 2009: 63)

Informed by this ideal, a GCE-curriculum enables students to learn about their rights and responsibilities and equips them with a critical capacity to evaluate the world and its systems around them. Moreover, it provides them with the necessary competences to actively participate politically at the global and local level alike. (Tasneem 2005: 178-179) Learning about one’s rights and responsibilities involves the examination of the Earth Charter and the

Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Hence, all the areas of global education such as Education for Sustainability, Human Rights Education, Peace Education and Intercultural Education have to be combined in order to fulfill the purpose of providing efficient GCE. Human rights lend themselves perfectly to the furtherance of a more global identity because they cross national borders and represent a “shared heritage to those we live alongside who do not share our citizenship, and to strangers in distant places.” (Osler and Starkey 2010: 120) The fact that they stress our commonality makes them to an efficient teaching tool that helps to nurture a new sense of belonging in young people. However, global citizenship and human rights education has to achieve more than teaching “the myth of harmony, the myth of universality, the myth of equality, and the myth of government lawfulness” (Huaman, Koenig, and Shultz 2008: 11) Dias (1993) points to the following need:

Empowering the victims through organizing countervailing people power; imposition of legal and social accountability through the generation of outrage, indignation and shame regarding gross human rights violations; articulating and living the vision and values of a new humane society founded on the most basic and fundamental of human rights, the right to be human. (Dias 1993: 709 quoted in Huaman, Koenig, and Shultz 2008: 11-12)

This demand already reveals a lot about the high expectations in respect of GCE. It ought to be political education that helps students to envision principle 16 of the Earth Charter: “to promote a culture of tolerance, nonviolence, and peace.” (Birch 2009: 129)

It is obvious that a global culture of tolerance, nonviolence, and peace can only be achieved if global citizenship becomes an acknowledged concept worldwide through education. Hence, ideally all children and adolescents over the world ought to receive GCE, as issues of sustainability and social justice affect all cultures worldwide. In fact, Education for Sustainable Development and therefore also GCE has an official status and has been adopted as an approach to teaching and learning by the United Nations in the year 2002. The UN Decade of Education for Sustainable Development covers the period 2005-2014 and pursues the aim of integrating the principles, values and practices of sustainable development into the curricula of participating countries. In the resolutions of the General assembly governments are encouraged to contemplate the incorporation of measures for the implementation of the Decade in the individual nations’ educational systems. The Member states are invited to enhance the access to education, initiate educational reforms, to raise the public’s awareness of issues of sustainability and to offer training. (UNESCO 2005: 5-7) Austria, for instance,

adopted the Austrian Strategy for Education for Sustainable Development for the organization and implementation of the UN Decade in the Austrian school system. Hence, theoretically, Education for Sustainable Development or GCE is acknowledged on the local as well as the global level.

Although GCE is acknowledged internationally, it has to be admitted that the degree of actual realization will definitely vary from country to country, from school to school and from teacher to teacher. The different point of departure of the individual nations has to be taken into consideration. Some countries may be more prepared than others to identify themselves with the idea of global citizenship and the same applies to schools and teachers.

World Value Surveys reveal that the economic wellbeing of a society increases the willingness to adopt post-materialist and postmodern values as they are represented in the concept of global citizenship. Undoubtedly, poorer nations have to first care for themselves before they can actually look beyond their own state. More affluent societies, who do not suffer from food crises or economic instability, give more prominence to environmental and cultural values, although these objectives are in sharp contrast with the striving for economic growth. (De Ruyter 2010: 64)

Global citizenship should be interpreted as one of the higher-level post-materialist values, which means that it is currently untenable that the majority of the world's inhabitants ought to pursue this ideal. It is a vacuous ideal for those who are not able to attend to their basic material needs. This does not mean, however, that we should reject the universal validity of such an ideal. On the contrary, it suggests that there is an additional ideal, namely that everyone should be in the position to become a global citizen. (ibid)

This implies that GCE does not have to be reduced to education that aims at transforming individuals into moralizers that neglect their own interests. Global citizens ought to work on their own flourishing, while simultaneously keeping in mind the interests and needs of other citizens in the world. (ibid) Accordingly, GCE has to take on different forms in poorer and richer nations, in Northern and Southern as well as Eastern and Western countries. While developing countries, for instance, might be empowered to claim their rights, developed nations might learn to take into consideration the rights of the world community, before they violate them by pursuing their own interests.

Despite the different foci, the core of GCE remains the same and should ultimately lead to social justice, sustainability and peace. This demand calls for specific knowledge, skills and values that I will outline in the following pages.

3.1. Qualification *Globo Sapiens*

The description of the ideal global citizen earlier in the paper pointed to the importance of a global (*universal concern*) as well as a multicultural (*respect for legitimate difference*) point of view when looking at the world. Case, Sensoy and Ling (2008) distinguish between two elements in a global and multicultural perspective: the *substantive* and the *perceptual dimension*. The *substantive dimension* means the ‘object of focus’, so the actual knowledge students should have about global topics, such as world affairs, while the perceptual dimension is concerned with the “point of view”, so the “habits of mind, values, or attitudes” (Case, Sensoy, and Ling 2008: 183) that are associated with a global citizen. “Nurturing the perceptual dimension of a global/multicultural perspective requires developing the mental lenses through which the local and international world is to be understood in more holistic, interrelated, and complex ways.” (ibid)

3.1.1. The Substantive Dimension

Writers have established multiple theories of what the substantive dimension should comprise. The account of Kniep (1986) and Hanvey (1976) suggests five topics that make up the primary subject of global study.

The first are *universal and cultural values and practices* that Hanvey describes with the term *cross-culture awareness*. The concept denotes the knowledge and respect for the diversity of human views and social practices. Kniep stresses that both, commonalities and differences deserve equal attention in the global education classroom. Thus, the teaching of universal values that do not belong to a particular cultural community should be accompanied by the discussion of distinct cultural values. The second topic is referred to as *global interconnections* and means the knowledge about “interactive economic, political, ecological, social, and technological systems operating worldwide”. (Case, Sensoy, and Ling 2008: 185)

The third main object of the substantive dimension is *present worldwide concerns and conditions* and represents the awareness of current and arising global issues and problems. Hanvey uses the term *state of the planet awareness*. Subjects of discussion might include water shortage, ethical and religious conflicts, global warming or health to name just a few of them. The fourth topic, *origins and past patterns of worldwide affairs*, expresses the relevance of global history and embrace the discussion of the provenance of values, present global systems and emerging global issues and problems. Finally, the fifth object, *alternative future directions in worldwide affairs*, is directly connected to the concepts of utopia and

transitional thinking addressed at an earlier point. Hanvey speaks of *knowledge of alternatives* or *awareness of human choices* and emphasizes the importance of making students aware of the possibility of alternative choices to current practices such as turbo-capitalism, war or foreign aid. (ibid)

Oxfam (2006a) refers to the substantive dimension as *knowledge and understanding* and covers the areas “social justice and equity, diversity, globalization and interdependence, sustainable development and peace and conflict”. (Oxfam 2006a: 4) While the overall organization of the ideas differs from the approach of Hanvey and Kniep, for the most part the objects of study remained the same over the last decades. However, peace and conflict is not listed as a separate category in Hanvey’s and Kniep’s account, which may undermine the importance of dealing with this issue explicitly. Knowledge about the impacts and causes of conflicts as well as conflict resolution at a personal and global level are justly highlighted by Oxfam. Ironically, commitment to peace and justice is accompanied by the emergence of conflicts.

A culture of peace will be achieved when citizens of the world understand global problems, have the skills to resolve conflicts and struggle for justice non-violently, live by international standards of human rights and equity, appreciate cultural diversity, and respect the Earth and each other. (Hague Appeal for Peace 2000: 6)

3.1.2. The Perceptual Dimension

Apart from having knowledge about particular subjects, the students also have to become aware of their culturally limited perspectives and learn how to take on “a broad-minded multi-perspective” (Case, Sensoy, and Ling 2008: 186) that enables them to perceive the world from more than only one angle. This is where the perceptual dimension comes in. It can be subdivided into three different mindsets: *open-mindedness*, *full-mindedness*, and *fair-mindedness*. (186)

Open-mindedness can be defined as the willingness to think about new ideas and to try to adopt unfamiliar perspectives that may allow new insights. This *habit of mind* involves not only “recognizing differences in points of view” but also “entertaining various points of view”. (187) The purpose of education for global citizenship consists in awareness-raising of the existence of distinct frame of minds and has to take up the challenge of promoting appreciation for these differences through appropriate activities that will be discussed later in the paper.

The second mindset, *full-mindedness*, means the tendency to look for the “big picture” instead of accepting a simplistic understanding of reality that does not take into consideration the interrelation of issues. *Full-mindedness* requires the following competences: “anticipating complexity, recognizing stereotyping and suspending judgment when warranted” (187) A full-minded person does not accept simplifications of issues but rather makes an effort to deal with its complexity by looking at the interconnection of different aspects. Superficial and naïve views and short-sighted solutions to global problems should be prevented this way. Furthermore stereotypical accounts of people and cultures can be identified as such and rejected as means of representation. Nurturing resistance to stereotypes helps students to notice power relations and the corresponding oppression of certain groups in our society. Finally, *full-mindedness* authorizes persons to be unsure. As issues can be highly controversial it is essential to acknowledge that there is not always an immediate answer to every question raised. (187-189)

The third mindset, *fair-mindedness*, refers to the willingness to listen to different opinions and to reflect upon viewpoints that might first seem alienating and unacceptable through one’s own cultural lenses. Students have to learn to “empathize with others” and to “overcome bias” in order to avoid ethnocentrism and short-sightedness. (190)

The *perceptual dimension* is also reflected in Oxfam’s account of the skills, values and attitudes that have to be acquired through global citizenship education; however Oxfam offers a list that is richer in detail and adds new aspects. The following grid provides an overview of the key elements for global citizenship.

Knowledge & understanding	Skills	Values & attitudes
social justice and equity	critical thinking	sense of identity and self-esteem
diversity	ability to argue effectively	empathy
globalization and interdependence	ability to challenge injustice and inequalities	commitment to social justice and equity
sustainable development	respect for people and things	value and respect for diversity
peace and conflict	co-operation and conflict resolution	concern for the environment and commitment to sustainable development
		belief that people can make a difference

Table 1: The key elements for responsible Global Citizenship (Oxfam 2006a: 4)

3.2. GCE & The Role Of The Earth Charter And UDHR

The Earth Charter lends itself perfectly to being used as a teaching instrument in global citizenship education. It “provides an integrated and coherent framework for developing educational programs and curricula aimed at teaching and learning for a more just, sustainable and peaceful world.” (Earth Charter International 2009: 2) Its effective use in the classroom can help to reach the educational goals identified above. First of all, the Earth Charter has the potential to “raise[...] awareness and understanding for global critical problems.” The document illustrates the interdependence of currently emerging problems and makes the students realize the urgency of change. (5)

The dominant patterns of production and consumption are causing environmental devastation, the depletion of resources, and a massive extinction of species. Communities are being undermined. The benefits of development are not shared equitably and the gap between rich and poor is widening. Injustice, poverty, ignorance, and violent conflict are widespread and the cause of great suffering. An unprecedented rise in human population has overburdened ecological and social systems. The foundations of global security are threatened. These trends are perilous—but not inevitable. (Earth Charter: 1)

Secondly, the input of the Earth Charter is an excellent starting point for “dialogue on values and principles for a sustainable way of life” (Earth Charter International 2009: 5) The Charter puts forward a number of themes that deserve attention in global citizenship education settings. The sub-points to the four main principles (respect and care for the community of life, ecological integrity, social and economic justice, and democracy, nonviolence, and peace) offer a huge variety of topics, ranging from non-renewable resources to nuclear weapons that could be discussed and deliberated on in the classroom. In total, the analysis of the text raises ten different main themes.

Critical global challenges and choices
The interdependence of social, economic, and environmental concerns
A definition of sustainable development and guide to sustainable living
Universal rights and universal responsibilities
The greater community of life
Global ethics
Ecological integrity
Social, economic, and environmental justice
Democracy, nonviolence, and peace
Partnerships, collaboration, and global governance

Table 2: Earth Charter Themes (Earth Charter International 2009: 4-5)

Even though the *global ethics* is based on the agreement of “a broad and multicultural base of global supporters” (2), the often conflicting nature of the principles leaves a lot of room for debate to the students. These discussions necessitate an open-, full-, and fair-minded mindset and the ability to argue effectively. (2) In some cases, the capability to deal with conflicts might be another skill needed.

Thirdly, the Earth Charter is an appropriate resource to stimulate “individuals’ ethical development.” (5) Teaching values that are central to sustainable development and peace is important because values have direction. They can empower individuals to assess results as good or bad, relevant or irrelevant, moral or immoral, attractive or unattractive. They determine the way we think and guide our practices. Moreover, as part of an individual’s belief system, they have “intensity” as they render a certain “issue, action, object [or] situation” (Wenden 2004: 149) important. Values are “predictors of behavior and attitudes” (150) and studies prove that human values are related to the willingness to engage in political activities. Peace educators argue for the teaching of values as an essential element of peacebuilding. (148-151)

Generally, values education is a delicate issue as it raises the question which and whose values can be justified as universally valid. This concern can be easily refuted “when the values being examined represent core values that respect human dignity, are life affirming, and are consistent with those of many cultures around the world.” (Earth Charter International 2009: 2) The principles of the Earth Charter do not belong to anyone specific,

being “the product of a worldwide, decade long, cross cultural dialogue on common goals and shared values.” (1) The document offers a “socially validated” definition of sustainable development that is the product of international consultation and based on the analysis and assessment of environment and development documents. (4) When talking about ethical development, it is important to also point to the relevance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Even though the provenance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is essentially different from that of the Earth Charter, as it was “drafted, approved, and proclaimed by representatives of nations belonging to the UN” (Birch 2009: 42), the fact that respect for human rights is repeatedly highlighted in the Earth Charter makes the document to an important value source in promoting *global ethics*.

Another objective that can be accomplished through using the Earth Charter consists in motivating young people to collaborate, cooperate, and participate. The text is an appeal for responsible political participation, as it encourages people to challenge the status quo by using the document as a guideline. It communicates the belief in human agency. Especially the conclusion, *The Way Forward*, highlights that “every individual, family, organisation, community and government has a vital role to play” (Earth Charter: 4) in changing the present situation. (Earth Charter International 2009: 5) Of course, the applied teaching methods as well as the learning environment have to display the significance of working and learning together. (6) The appropriate teaching methods will be discussed more carefully later in the paper.

Furthermore, the Earth Charter “facilitate[s] an understanding of the relationship between the Earth Charter, public policy, and international law.” (6) It is a possibility to look at the Earth Charter “as an international soft-law document” (ibid) which values and principles could guide the establishment of “hard law” like for example international treaties. Against the backdrop of the Earth Charter, public policy and law could be analyzed critically and ideas for alternative practices could be generated. (ibid)

Finally, the *sense of identity and self-esteem*, a key value of a global citizen, can be influenced positively by the use of the Charter. The language of the Earth Charter’s Preamble that makes use of the personal pronoun “we” evokes this sense of identity as a member of the Earth community. (Birch 2009: 42) Transmitting a sense of community, the document facilitates the identification with the value concepts that are central to sustainable development and peace.

3.2.1. The Earth Charter, the UDHR and the Foreign Language Classroom

The principles of the Earth Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights can be incorporated in every subject in connection with different issues dealt with in the classroom. Furthermore, they should inspire the overall classroom rules that determine how students and teachers treat each other. Especially the English language classroom lends itself perfectly to the inclusion of the document as there are a lot of materials available online in the English language. The Earth Charter Initiative provides teaching materials and also guidelines for teachers on its database and there are also numerous websites that offer lesson plans on topics that are related to the principles of the Earth Charter in the English language. With regard to other foreign languages it is slightly more difficult to find materials that are directly related to the Earth Charter; however global education resources can be found online in a lot of languages. The Earth Charter Initiative offers adapted and simplified versions of the document in several languages and thereby makes it possible to use it with learners that have a lower level in the foreign language.

In order to illustrate how the different principles can be included in the lesson plan of foreign language teaching, it is necessary to have a look at the topics that language learners are expected to be able to talk about in the target language. This requires the reference to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) that determines concrete themes that learners of the target language should be able to talk about. More explicitly, the suggested themes are based on *Threshold Level 1990* that was published by the Council of Europe. In total, the publication lists 14 different themes with corresponding sub-domains. (Reisenleutner 2010: 60) The categories are the following:

- personal identification
- house and home, environment
- daily life
- free time, entertainment
- travel
- relations with other people
- health and body care
- education
- shopping
- food and drink
- services
- places
- language
- weather

(Ek; Trim 1990: 64-92)

As the practical suggestions in the paper focus on the implementation of GCE in the last two grades of the upper secondary level, I will provide some illustrative examples that are appropriate for this learner group. The first example will be more detailed, while the others are definitely just ideas that have to be further developed before they can actually be implemented in the foreign language classroom. I do not offer full lesson plans as this would require a more detailed description of the target group that contains information about the language proficiency level, the age and the background (ethical, social...) of the students and also a more precise definition of the content and language aims. These examples should rather be regarded as suggestions that solely serve the purpose of inspiring language teachers and provide an insight into the potentialities of including the Earth Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and GCE in the foreign language classroom.

In most of the cases the Earth Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights will not be at the foreground. Once the students are made familiar with the document and know the key ideas, it is enough to use it as a reference in discussions about GCE-issues. However, at some point the Earth Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights has to be introduced to the students. With regard to the Earth Charter this can be done, for instance, by presenting the students with the four principles without showing them the individual points of each, and encourage them to come up with at least five ideas that fit the headlines. These ideas are discussed with other groups and afterwards with the whole class in order to agree on some principles that are then recorded on a poster. Only then, the original document is distributed to the learners and read individually. As a post-reading activity the students could be asked to develop some ground rules for classroom behavior on the basis of the Earth Charter.

These introductory activities provide the basis for future work with and reference to the international documents. I will now come to the themes identified in *Threshold Level 1990* and make some suggestions how to relate them to the Earth Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The themes ‘shopping’ and ‘food and drink’ could be related to the principle of ecological integrity, where it is stated that “patterns of production, consumption, and reproduction that safeguard Earth's regenerative capacities, human rights, and community well-being” (Earth

Charter Initiative 2005: 7) should be adopted. As an introduction, students could be asked how often they shop, where they normally shop, which goods they buy most often, and how much money they spend on certain items. Then, the teacher could request the learners to compile a list of ten items that they consume most frequently. Subsequently, they are asked if they know where these products come from. The mentioned countries are all indicated on a huge map that is attached to the wall. Especially with regard to clothing there will most likely be a concentration in Asian countries such as China or Bangladesh. In a next step the adolescents are encouraged to reflect upon the fact, why most of their trousers and shirts are produced in Asian countries. This leads to a discussion of the working conditions and the income of some selected Asian nations and an evaluation of the situation. Afterwards the learners read an article that, for instance, describes the working conditions in a particular country or company or the environmental impact of a corporation. The situation is compared to relevant principles of the Earth Charter or relevant human rights in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. As a follow up activity the students could be asked to form small groups and come up with as many ideas as possible how to shop more sustainably, without violating human rights and ignoring the values of the Earth Charter. This activity could be framed as a competition and the group with the most ideas wins a small prize. As visuals in the classroom should be used to support the core values of the Earth Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the individual groups could create a poster which summarizes their results. Then, they are always visible and the students are constantly reminded of their good intentions. After a couple of weeks the teacher could take up the points on the posters and ask the students if they have managed to realize some of them.

Another potential task is the creation of a more social and sustainable company profile. This can be followed by the discussion of the ‘Gemeinwohl-Ökonomie’ by Christian Felber, who suggests an alternative economic model where competition is replaced by cooperation and social and ecological achievements are the new parameters for economical success. Furthermore, he drafts a new democratic system that is similar to grass-roots democracy, which is definitely a good source of discussion. This book leads us to two other principles of the Earth Charter, namely “democracy, non-violence and peace” and “social and economic justice”. The principles could be compared to his approach and it could be evaluated whether his system is in accordance with the demands of the Earth Charter. Unfortunately, the book is not published yet in English, however this fact can be used for didactic purposes and the

students could be requested to write an article in English about this new system for an international magazine, where they have to incorporate the key ideas with the purpose of informing the global community about this alternative approach.

The topic 'travel' could be related to the principle "ecological integrity" and it can be analyzed which forms of tourism help to protect the Earth's ecological system and which not. 'Language' could be dealt with in connection with the principle "respect and care for the community of life" Language and culture of minority groups in the home country or the position of English as a global language might be interesting topics to talk about.

I do not want to go further into detail here, because inspirations how to include the Earth Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in language teaching can be found on the Internet en masse. I hope this small collection of ideas has fulfilled its purpose of providing an insight into the possibilities of language teachers that just have to be used. I prefer to come now to the theoretical framework necessary for foreign language learning for global citizenship, which leads me to the introduction of a pedagogical approach that I consider to be essential for effective GCE, especially in the foreign language classroom.

4. Critical Pedagogy and Global Citizenship Education

After having explained the knowledge, skills and values crucial to global citizenship and having discussed the role of the Earth Charter in promoting them, the following part of the thesis will deal with the pedagogy needed for efficient GCE and corresponding perspective development. The highly ambitious objective to nurture global citizens calls for a specific way of teaching and a learning environment that provides learners with the opportunity to reflect critically upon global social, ecological, political and economic issues and to learn to deal with the complexity and controversy of today's reality. Instead of offering correct answers, GCE ought to give students the opportunity "to explore, develop and express their own values and opinions, whilst listening to and respecting other people's points of view." (Oxfam 2006a: 2) On the next pages I make clear that traditional school systems and the educational reorientation in times of neo-liberalism make it difficult to fulfill these demands. Hence, the requirements concerning GCE can best be fulfilled if teachers adopt a more critical approach to teaching as it is suggested by critical pedagogy.

4.1. Neo-Liberalism and the Production of Cynicism

Unfortunately, the values of the Earth Charter have “keen competition”, to use the language of capitalism and neo-liberalism. “Faith in social amelioration and a sustainable future appears to be in short supply as neoliberal capitalism performs the dual task of using education to train workers for service sector jobs and produce lifelong consumers.” (Giroux and Searls Giroux 2006: 21) Of course, neo-liberalism is pronounced to various extents in different countries, some more than others. However, it would go far beyond the scope of the paper to go into detail as far as neo-liberal structures and tendencies in individual countries are concerned.

It is certain, however, that neo-liberal forces have a predominant role in global society today. The leading principle is market ethics that places considerable importance on the consumption of goods and services. Its rationality is present “across all economic, political, and social institutions” (Van Herrtum 2010: 213-214)

Neoliberalism thus redefines the role of the citizen in the state. No longer is she an autonomous architect of her reality, but a player in a market that serves as the ultimate arbiter of wants, needs, and desires. Citizens become ‘consumers’ who contribute to society primarily through the work they do and the choices they make. [...] The importance of the nation-state diminishes, and global markets and liberal democracy become accepted as universal, immutable truths. (ibid)

According to Giroux neo-liberalism nurtures a culture of cynicism that is characterized by distrust in “the government, nonprofit public spheres, democratic associations, public and higher education.” (Giroux 2004: 105 quoted in Van Herrtum 2010: 214) Neo-liberalism perceives human beings as selfish, false and voracious and gives no credence to the possibility of change of the present circumstances—all typical features of cynicism. Instead of believing in democracy and its ideals of equality and freedom, people exclusively follow their private interests, aim for profit maximization and regard themselves as human capital that has to find its position in the market economy. (Van Herrtum 2010: 214) “The upshot is that it has become easier to imagine the end of the world than the end of capitalism.” (Giroux 2007: 25)

4.2. The Education System and Possible Limitations to GCE

Education actively contributes to the spread of cynicism by “reinforcing hegemonic ideals, reproducing power relations, and cutting off the channels for resistance and dissent.” (Van Herrtum 2010: 215) Neoliberal educational reforms exploit knowledge and try to “depoliticize” (216) educational institutions under the pretext of providing neutral information. Furthermore, the performance-oriented nature of school that permanently tests students’ knowledge suppresses civics education and thereby young people’s imagination and their capacity to think critically. (215-216)

Education is equated with the pure accumulation of knowledge in the sense of isolated facts and schools do not see their primary goal “in helping children to develop into adults who are able to take over full responsibility for their lives and lead a self-conducted, fulfilled and happy life.” (Haake 2009: 4) Liessmann (2006) sharply criticizes the reorientation of educational goals towards abilities and skills. According to him, education is influenced to a considerable extent by external factors such as the market, employment or technological developments. An educated person in the Knowledge age has to achieve certain standards that are determined by dominant forces in society. The influence of neo-liberalism on the educational sphere in Europe becomes manifest in the Lisbon Strategy. In the year 2000 the European Council set the target to make the European Union the most competitive and knowledge-based Economic Area worldwide. In order to achieve this aim the European Union adopted the Lisbon Strategy that involves educational reforms. (Fuhrmann 2009: 40-41) In the context of Austria, for instance, one of these reforms is observable in the implementation of the competence-oriented ‘Zentralmatura’. From the school year 2013/2014 onwards, the AHS adopts a new, standardized, competence-oriented school leaving examination. (BMUKK 2011: n.p.) The focus on the output degrades education to a competitive factor in the globalized world that fulfills the purpose of ensuring the increase in human capital. The definition of competence on the homepage of the ministry of education reveals a lot about the mentioned reorientation of education.

Schulisches Lehren und Lernen hat sich schon immer an **Zielen** (Bildungszielen, Lernzielen, neuerdings Bildungsstandards) orientiert. Es zielt auf die Vermittlung/den Erwerb von Fähigkeiten, Fertigkeiten, Einstellungen, Haltungen und selbstverständlich auch von Kenntnissen und Wissen ab. Kompetenz stellt die Verbindung zwischen Wissen und Können her und ist als Befähigung zur Bewältigung unterschiedlicher Situationen zu sehen. In der Diskussion ist es üblich,

von Sach-, Methoden-, Sozial- und Personalkompetenzen zu sprechen, die in der Berufspädagogik als Aspekte beruflicher Handlungskompetenz verstanden werden. (BMUKK 2011: n.p.)

The influence of the world of work and the market can actually not be denied. Critical thinking and the promotion of a just and sustainable life is a difficult task in an environment that reproduces neo-liberal ideologies and thereby foregrounds capitalist values. Although GCE is officially acknowledged as an important element in education on the global (UN Decade for Sustainable Development) and local level (Austrian Strategy for Education of Sustainable Development), it is overrun by stronger forces that foster quick progress instead of sustainability, competition instead of cooperation and egotism instead of solidarity. In the traditional school system the implementation of GCE largely depends on the personal commitment of the individual teacher. If teachers have to prepare students for specific topics that are determined from above as it is the case with the 'Zentralmatura', they lose their autonomy in teaching practice to a considerable extent and correspondingly the possibilities to include GCE decrease.

Another difficulty that the implementation or rather the effectiveness of GCE encounters in the traditional school system is the fact that students are under enormous pressure to fulfill the requirements of educational standards and thereby the demands of the market. Students suffer from fear of failure, which does not only inhibit them in their personal development but first and foremost in their capacity to build up resistance against the current system. The values and attitudes promoted in GCE do not help them on the free market, where they have to be competitive.

Furthermore, the traditional school system can also be criticized for its authoritarian and hierarchical structures. Instead of giving the students the opportunity to live democracy at school by granting them rights of co-determination in the educational processes, learners have to obey the rules that are established from above and they possibly do not agree on. (Haake 2009: 5) This school environment gives the learners the feeling that they cannot change anything, even if they are unhappy with the current situation. Exactly this "powerlessness" gives global capitalism and neo-liberalism the chance to flourish, as students get the impression that if they are not even able to contribute their share at school, they are even less capable of changing the big, complex world. The same "powerlessness" applies to

teachers, who are imposed content standards from above and are not involved in top-down educational reforms. Again, the competence-oriented school leaving examination in Austria serves as an excellent example.

All these defects of the conventional school system show that the political dimension of education is not attached the importance it actually deserves and as a consequence school fails to produce critical citizens who are outraged by the social and ecological circumstances of our time. (Giroux & Searls Giroux 2006: 21-22) Therefore, schools and particularly GCE urgently needs critical pedagogy that calls for an alternative, less hierarchical, less authoritative and more dialogical approach to teaching, where students are given a voice that is heard by teachers and teachers can deal with global issues without risking disadvantages for their students in the long-run. Before expanding on the compatibility of the two approaches, it is necessary to present the theoretical framework of critical pedagogy.

4.3. Understanding Critical Pedagogy

The attempt to pinpoint the essence of critical pedagogy is indeed a difficult task as its nature is manifold and its foundation cannot be assigned to one particular theory. Overall, critical theory and postmodernism serve as the philosophical framework. (Guilherme 2002: 22) With regard to education it is essential to narrow down the variety of approaches to a selection of authors whose ideas are applicable in the context of GCE. Before doing that, I would like to pin down the sum and substance of critical pedagogy by first referring to Duncan-Andrade and Morrell (2007) who provide a useful concise summary, describing it as

an approach to education that is rooted in the experiences of marginalized peoples; that is centered in a critique of structural, economic, and racial oppression; that is focused on dialogue instead of a one-way transmission of knowledge; and that is structured to empower individuals and collectives as agents of social change. (Duncan-Andrade and Morrell 2007: 183).

From this short introduction the highly political nature of critical pedagogy becomes already obvious. Freire, one of the most eminent scholars in the field, asserted that education is inherently political and teachers become automatically “political operatives”. (Kincheloe 2008: 70) This idea has already been set out before, when the role of school in perpetuating social standards whatever they may look like in different communities, was mentioned. The

special characteristic of critical pedagogy is to embrace this political dimension of the educator's work in order to bring about social transformation. (ibid)

Critical pedagogy criticizes the traditional school system and correspondingly also the traditional role of the teacher.

[Critical pedagogy] does not uncritically respect the boundaries of power that tell us how the world should be or how we should do our educating. It refuses to entertain regimes of education that operate to serve values of employability, continued 'progress' and growth in the markets, and the so-called 'knowledge economy'. (Phipps and Guilherme 2004: 3)

The critical teacher has to reflect upon the content he teaches as well as upon the actual educational environment s/he finds herself/himself in. Critical educators ought to question their position as authority figures that possess the truth and require their students to simply reproduce it. Accordingly, critical pedagogy criticizes the hierarchical teacher-student relationship, which does by no means mean that the teacher has to abandon his authority entirely. It is naïve to deny the authoritative role of the educator, because it is the teacher who marks the performances of learners and is in charge of their academic work. On this account, the critical teacher has to accept his authority and make use of it in a way that assists students in constructing their knowledge. This demand entrusts the teacher with the task of carrying out research and producing knowledge in order to be able to guide students in their learning. (Kincheloe 2008: 17)

The authority of the critical teacher is dialectical; as teachers relinquish the authority of truth providers, they assume the mature authority of facilitators of student inquiry and problem posing. In relation to such teacher authority, students gain their freedom—they gain the ability to become self-directed human beings capable of producing their own knowledge. (ibid)

Whilst the authority of teachers with respect to students is re-defined, their role as academics is revalued. According to critical pedagogy, they ought to be involved in the implementation of educational reforms and not simply be recipients of contents that are imposed from above. Teachers ought to become scholars that actively contribute to the research on education through their experience. In a more critical school teachers are viewed as learners as opposed to functionaries that simply follow top-down instructions without questioning them. "With empowered scholar teachers prowling the schools, things begin to change. The oppressive culture created in twenty-first-century schools by top-down content standards, for example, is challenged. (Kincheloe 2008: 18)

Concededly, it is impossible to establish the school environment and conditions that critical pedagogy suggests overnight. Unfortunately, I cannot expand on the establishment of alternative school systems, curricula and new standards. For the time being and for the purpose of this paper it is my aspiration to show how the commitment of individual teachers to critical pedagogy can already make a huge difference. It is shown how the remaining freedom of the teacher and especially foreign language teacher ought to be used in order to give peace, sustainability and justice a chance. A more democratic and less hierarchical environment on the small scale, namely within the classroom, already shows students that there is an alternative. Space for the critical analysis and discussion of the world the learners are surrounded by makes them aware of their situation and more open to GC-values. Of course, as long as critical pedagogy and GCE are practiced within the traditional school system, problems like performance-orientation cannot be eliminated. However, I would like to focus on the solutions, before I lose myself in the problems.

4.4. The Potentialities of Critical Pedagogy

After all, critical pedagogy has a concrete answer to the challenges of our time. It has been shown above that the *language of critique* in our age of globalization has to be directed against the ideology of neo-liberalism in order to pave the way for *global ethics*.

Advocates and practitioners of critical pedagogy take a stance on the issue in multiple ways. Peter McLaren promotes a *revolutionary pedagogy* that distances itself from a left-liberal position that is reluctant to challenge neoliberal capitalism. (Leban and McLaren 2010: 111) He sees critical pedagogy as a means of exposing “permanent conditions of oppression and exploitation” under the rule of neo-liberalism (Kincheloe 2008: 86) and argues for the teaching of democratic social values to open up possibilities to fight these injustices. (ibid) The focus on democracy becomes also apparent in Giroux’ work in which he explicitly calls for a *critical or radical democracy* as a cultural politics that reacts to “the current assault on democratic public spheres”. (Giroux 2007: 34) He puts emphasis on social citizenship, liberal freedoms and the equality of resources and entrusts critical pedagogy with the task of bringing fundamental questions such as “What is the relationship between social justice and the distribution of public resources and goods?” or “What are the conditions, knowledge, and skills that are a prerequisite for political agency and social change?” (ibid) into the classroom. (ibid) Giroux calls for critical citizenship education that is able to “emphasize critical

reflexivity, bridge the gap between learning and everyday life, make visible the connections between power and knowledge, and provide the conditions for extending democratic rights, values, and identities” (Giroux 2007: 28) In his writing he coins the term *educated hope* as opposed to “the dystopian hope of neo-liberalism” (33) to refer to the relation of *a language of resistance and possibility*.

The longing for a more human society in this instance does not collapse into a retreat from the world; rather, it emerges out of critical and practical engagements with present behaviours, institutional formations, and everyday practices. Hope in this context does not ignore the worst dimensions of human suffering and exploitation; on the contrary, it acknowledges the need to sustain the ‘capacity to worst and offer more than that for our consideration.’ (Giroux 2007: 32)

Giroux is convinced of the fact that hope is the precondition for civic courage and political engagement. This idea has become central to critical pedagogy that sees the potential for change in a *language of critique* combined with a *language of possibility*. The *language of critique* involves a critical attitude towards society as well as “a deconstructive view of reality and a challenge to fixed interpretative frames” (Guilherme 2002: 34) Moreover, it encourages students to question their position in the local as well as global community. Introducing a *language of critique* to classroom practice ought to lead to critical awareness of current circumstances, which in turn provokes a desire for change. This wish for a better world is the precondition for a *language of possibility* that enables students to come up with alternatives and increases their willingness to actively contribute to this utopian project. (ibid)

4.4.1. Paulo Freire

The centrality of hope in critical pedagogy can be traced back to the ‘spirit’ of Paulo Freire, who can be called “critical pedagogy’s prophet of hope.” (Kincheloe 2008: 72) As he is often cited as the founder of critical pedagogy, scholars in the field, including Giroux and McLaren, based their work on his thought. In fact, critical pedagogy cannot be addressed without making reference to his ideas and concepts because he has gained the reputation of the “inaugural philosopher of critical pedagogy”, (McLaren 2000 quoted in Kincheloe 2008: 70) to use McLaren’s words.

Paulo Freire also offers a theory of education that can cater for the specific pedagogical needs under the prevailing reign of neo-liberalism and corresponding cynicism. Originally, he was concerned with the improvement of the lives of oppressed and marginalized people he was surrounded by in Brazil, his native country. (Kincheloe 2008: 69-70) In spite of the fact that

Freire's ideas developed under these specific circumstances, his later works expound the problem of neo-liberalism and its oppressive force (Mayo 2005: 164) and thereby render his thoughts relevant in the context of global citizenship in the 21st century. His final book *Pedagogy of Freedom* aims at helping teachers as well as learners to struggle against neoliberal hegemony. According to Freire, it is insufficient to inform students about social evil without empowering them to fight against it. He argues that we have to become aware of our "unfinishedness" in the world and accept change as the "only constant in history". (Freire 1998a paraphrased in Van Herrtum 2010: 217) One of his key ideas is that the world has been constructed by human beings and can consequently also be reconstructed by them. All man-made is changeable and therefore hope exists. (Freire 1998b paraphrased in Van Herrtum 2010: 217) He refers to this notion as *critical consciousness* as opposed to *naïve consciousness*. (Kincheloe 2008: 72) He describes individuals as "conditioned" but not "determined" and attributes the power of revolt to humans. He clearly distances himself from the deterministic attitude of neo-liberalism, "founded on a vision of reality dominated by extreme individualism, instrumental rationality, and, though unstated, subjects as essentially passive receptors of the events that surround them." (Freire 1998b paraphrased in Van Herrtum 2010: 217)

Freire proposed different strategies for a more critical approach to learning that developed into key concepts of critical pedagogy due to their generalizability and applicability in different contexts. At this point they should only be shortly introduced, whereas in chapter 5 their meaning becomes more explicit. First and foremost, Freire (1970) sharply criticizes banking pedagogy that sees teaching as the mere transmission of knowledge by the teacher and neglects the integration of the learners' experiences into classroom practices. He calls for a *problem-posing approach* to education that is carried out in the form of *dialogue*. According to him, *dialogue* helps individuals to develop an understanding of the reality that surrounds them and also constitutes an opportunity for the negotiation of transformative ideas. (Van Herrtum 2010: 217-218) Ultimately, *problem-posing* and *dialogue* should lead to *conscientization*-"the act of coming to *critical consciousness*" (Kincheloe 2008: 73) and the production of critical thinkers, who reject a "normalized" future growing out of a "normalized past" and perceive learning and education as a means of social improvement. (72-74) *Conscientization* is also related to *critical or emancipatory literacy* suggested by Freire. He generated a theory of literacy as cultural politics that goes beyond seeing literacy

as the ability to read and write and views it as a practice that either performs the function of empowering or disempowering people. He maintains that texts always have to be examined thoroughly in order to identify whether they aim at reproducing existing social structures or rather promote emancipatory practices. (Patel Stevens and Bean 2007: 5) Even though the concept of *critical literacy* was originally applied in the context of illiterate oppressed groups in Brazilian society, it can be expanded and related to advanced societies and their incapability to read the world critically. (Morrow and Torres 2002: 144)

4.5. Critique of Critical Pedagogy

Surely, a pedagogy that attaches such a high value to a critical attitude must not be excluded from criticism and therefore has to be examined for potential deficiencies. Critical pedagogy has been criticized for several reasons from different sectors. Apart from the accusation that it brings together philosophical theories that are not compatible, critical pedagogy is generally approached with skepticism due to its attempt to combine teaching with critical thinking. Despite of the consistent inclusion of the concept of critical thinking in educational programmes (e.g.: GCE, general didactic principles of the Austrian curriculum of the ‘Gymnasium’), the discussion of the actual implementation in the classroom is accompanied by controversy or even objection. (Guilherme 2002: 57) Freire’s concept of *critical literacy* was criticized by Taylor (1993) for being too vague and not sufficiently defined, which implies the risk that the educator imposes his culture on the student and as a consequence *critical literacy* rather becomes de-culturation. Freire, however, puts emphasis on the fact that *critical literacy* can be expanded to all information available in a culture as long as this information is looked at critically. (58)

Furthermore, critical pedagogy is accused of remaining too theoretical and not applicable to classroom practice. As a defence Giroux (1994) argues that the concrete definition of a theory is indispensable for the educational practice. Critical pedagogy consciously attempts to closely link theory with pedagogical practice as it intends to change theory and teaching alike. (60)

Another point of criticism is that critical pedagogy is too directive and presupposes the intention of every teacher to change the status quo. Moreover, the vision of a new society or global citizenship does not necessarily have to be shared by students. Critical pedagogy theorists are well aware of this potential resistance and also the possible discomfort felt by

learners when they are confronted with the faults of humanity and encouraged to self-criticism. (ibid) However, in order to initiate change, it is indispensable to “dislodge from our ideological comfort zones” (Durst 2006: 113) and therefore a teacher who really wants to move something has to be prepared to take risks and accept occasional failures. If teachers do not want to have this additional responsibility, they have to be at least aware of their choice and should not just opt for the preservation of the status quo unconsciously. (Guilherme 2002: 60-61)

Moreover, critical thinking remains on the agenda of contemporary philosophical authors and of educational programmes in general. If teachers are supposed to teach their learners to be critical, they will first have to find out what this means and get used to doing it. Teachers may still refuse to dare. Nevertheless, it is important that teachers and learners know what and why they are giving up. (61)

Another weakness that has been detected in critical pedagogy is its inability to actually move from a language of critique to a language of possibility as the pedagogy is in fact supposed to do. It has failed to redefine the new objective of school that ought to replace the objected current system in neo-liberal Knowledge Age. In fact, critical pedagogy lacks its substantive vision and up until now has also been incapable of bringing about a pedagogical and curricula reform. Critical pedagogy has missed so far to link reasoning and critical thinking to concrete values and ethical reflection, which is essential for real individual empowerment and a more just society. (McLaren 1995: 32-33)

For that reason I argue for GCE that is informed by critical pedagogy or vice versa because then the language of critique is complemented in an ideal manner. The values inherent to global citizenship provide critical pedagogy with a concrete vision of the future: a peaceful intercultural and sustainable life. There are a number of other reasons why I am convinced of the effectiveness of bringing together critical pedagogy and GCE in the language classroom in general and the foreign language classroom in particular and these reasons should now be looked at more closely.

4.6. Critical pedagogy and GCE-What Can They Do For Each Other?

The admittedly brief outline of critical pedagogy already makes its applicability to GCE visible. Both approaches are concerned with utopian visions of the future as a possibility. Both approaches set the shift from a culture of individualism that is often connected to dominance and suppression to a culture of dialogue and cooperation as their ultimate

objective. Both approaches criticize the status quo in our educational system that is characterized by the reproduction of a culture of inequality and injustice. (North-South Centre 2010: 13) They pursue more or less the same goals; however, as has already been mentioned above, critical pedagogy is not precise enough where this more democratic, dialogical, cooperative society should lead to. It perceives democracy as the ultimate aim and does not enlarge upon its possibilities. Hence, critical pedagogy has to be reinvented for the purposes of GCE to actually serve the needs of our contemporary society. The latter brings very specific contents and foci to the curriculum that are relevant in the 21st century. Moreover, it points to the interdependence of diverse global problems and hence establishes the connection between the local and the world as a whole. It specifies the knowledge, skills and values that ought to be acquired by human beings who want to live peacefully and sustainably together on a global level. Global citizenship education replenishes critical pedagogy by adding these new more global dimensions, including ecological well-being, that definitely have to be considered in the struggle for social justice and peace in our times. Furthermore, GCE informed by the Earth Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights makes the language of possibility more explicit. The ideal solutions suggested in the international documents referred to can call into question the supposedly “natural” realities of the present situation and evoke the desire for enhancement.

In return, critical pedagogy is also profitable for GCE. The language of critique ensures that GCE is not degraded to an additional skill in the curriculum that exists within the neo-liberal orientation of the school. The critical analysis of present circumstances lays the foundation for a more complete understanding of GCE and its aspirations. Critical pedagogy makes the students more open for new values as they are empowered to see the faults of the current system and are more prepared to move towards another, more sustainable direction.

In order to reach this required critical awareness in the learners and thereby improve the effectiveness of GCE, GCE has to apply the strategies provided by critical pedagogy. The development of critical thinking is an integral part of the GCE methods and also the curriculum of schools in Austria.

Global education should help learners to approach issues with an open, critical mind, reflect on them and be willing to consider their opinions in light of new evidence and

rational argument. They should be able to recognise and challenge bias, indoctrination and propaganda. (North-South Centre 2010: 22)

Although the ability to interact critically with the world obviously constitutes an essential quality of global citizens, GCE remains too imprecise about the actual methods to foster critical thinking and much less it offers ideas for applying critical approaches in the foreign language classroom. For that reason, the practice of *critical literacy* and *problem-posing* are elements of critical pedagogy that should definitely be borrowed from GCE practitioners as they supply the concept of critical thinking in GCE with a substantive theory.

Moreover, it is a missing element in the Oxfam curriculum to make clear how the defined GC-knowledge, skills, values and attitudes can be used to become active at school and also within the larger community. (Tasneem 2005: 181) The concepts of empowerment and action of critical pedagogy clarify this connection.

Finally, I have already touched upon the fact that critical pedagogy is particularly useful with regard to GCE in foreign language teaching. It offers concrete alternative, more critical approaches to language and culture education that stress the political nature of language and its power to bring about change. Practitioners of critical pedagogy have developed models of language and culture learning that are perfectly suitable to promote sustainability and social justice. The insights of critical pedagogy have the potential to transform intercultural competence into a tool of promoting *global civic culture*. Correspondingly, the intercultural dimension of language learning as it is defined by the Council of Europe can be enriched and more directed towards GCE if the foreign language classroom is inspired by critical pedagogy.

To sum up, GCE and critical pedagogy are brought together in this paper because a successful change of the status quo is more likely if elements of both are combined. Secondly, a more complete and rich line of reasoning can be offered for the incorporation of the global perspective into the foreign language classroom. Critical pedagogy does not fail to take into consideration the political dimension of language use and its relevance for GC.

After having emphasized the effectiveness of bringing GC and CP together in the classroom, I would like to present the concrete tenets of critical pedagogy that GCE can make use of. From the work of authors such as Paulo Freire, Giroux, McLaren and other advocates of critical pedagogy crystallize seven useful concepts for the production of global citizens that are both, critical towards cultures and the world in general. These pedagogical processes are reflection, dissent, difference, dialogue, empowerment, action, and hope. (Phipps and Guilherme 2004: 3)

5. Critical (Cultural) Awareness and Critical Pedagogy

5.1. Reflection and Critical Thinking

The first indispensable tool for critical pedagogy is reflection in the sense of critical thinking. Critical thinking “consists of continuous pondering over the justification and consequences of convictions or statements.” (Guilherme 2002: 37) It can be subdivided into “habits of thought, insight, interaction, and judgment” (Birch 2009: 102) Chapter 3 already provided an insight into the mindsets that need to be adopted by a global citizen. They were referred to as *open-mindedness*, *full-mindedness* and *fair-mindedness*. *Habits of insight* denote the capability to identify egocentricity or sociocentricity¹ of oneself and others, the ability to form an opinion of the credibility and motivations of oneself and others as well as the capacity to pinpoint authoritarian personalities², who lack open-mindedness, are dogmatic and cannot cope with complexity and ambiguity. The *habits of interaction* include interactions with texts and speakers alike and involve capacities such as the identification of intentions, attitudes, biased language and prejudices. This is where *critical literacy* comes in. Besides, the critical thinker interacts by carefully listening to an argument and analyzing it from different aspects. S/he is able to distinguish between relevant and irrelevant information and questions for further information if it is required. Moreover, critical *habits of interaction* entail the comparison and contrasting of people’s statements or actions. The *habits of judgment* represent the skill to recognize “the relationship between emotions, beliefs, and reason to explore and question personal, social, and cultural beliefs, values, standards,

¹ „Embedded individuals [that] are so enmeshed in their sociocultural network that they cannot oppose, resist, or even speak out against their group. “(Birch 2009: 40)

² „The cognitive factors associated with authoritarian personalities were mental rigidity, closed-mindedness, and dogmatism; intolerance of ambiguity; ethnocentrism; decreased cognitive complexity; decreased openness to experience; uncertainty avoidance; and need for cognitive closure. This means that people with this way of thinking look to authorities to explain and resolve problems.” (Birch 2009: 99)

arguments, assumptions, and theories”. (103) It also stands for the practice to compare and contrast different cultures and for the capability to think of “solutions, actions and policies” (ibid) and evaluate them. Finally, *habits of judgment* refer to the inclination to thoroughly investigate evidence and facts. (Birch 2009: 102-103) This overall intellectual ability can bring about *critical consciousness* needed in the realization of global citizenship and the fight against the neo-liberal ideology that hinders us from imagining a sustainable world. It also furthers *critical/global cultural consciousness* by helping us to comprehend the multicultural and pluralistic nature of our contemporary cultural reality.

Ultimately, critical reflectivity should empower individuals to perceive cultural communities and their practices more objectively and also enable them to challenge tendencies of culture-specific ideology that prevent global citizenship from coming into being. (Birch 2009: 103) *Critical reflection* automatically leads to the examination of ethical and political issues connected to cultures and has the reassessment of ethical principles as an ultimate objective. (Guilherme 2002: 38) Critical thinking needs a well-defined moral ground it can refer back to in order to enable the individual to know where criticism of cultures has to start. The principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Earth Charter offer culture-universals that can guide the analysis of one’s own and foreign cultures. Of course, the students also have to reflect critically upon these international documents which as a consequence leads to the discussion of incompatible ideas such as the claim to equal rights as opposed to the right to difference, the aim at consensus vs. the inevitability of disagreement, the desire for individual emancipation vs. the need for solidarity and the striving for progress vs. the “potentialities of relativism”. (Byram and Guilherme 2000: 70)

In consequence, foreign language-and-culture education becomes involved in the discussion about the complexities of the interaction between culture-universals and culture-specifics that make issues of human rights and citizenship more difficult today. By being placed within these general frameworks, foreign language-and-culture education will foster the development of critical cultural awareness of both target and native cultures. (Byram and Guilherme 2000: 70)

The confrontation with this ambiguity and ambivalence fosters complex thinking that allows the individual to accept uncertainty and more than only one valid argument or one single truth. It gives the learners the possibility to consider multiple perspectives and they learn to avoid precipitate conclusions and reject simplifications of complex issues. (Birch 2009: 64)

Overall, reflection avoids “memorisation and interpretation of facts [and makes aware of] cultural generalizations or even stereotyping.” (Phipps and Guilherme 2004:3) and foregrounds the learners’ own experiences and knowledge by giving them the opportunity to critically share intercultural events. The “other” world is not simply presented to them but they are actively involved in the construction of it. (Byram and Guilherme 2000: 69) In order to be able to do this they have to set up contacts with members of the target community and occupy themselves with the corresponding cultural products that are at their disposal.

5.2. Dissent and Conflict

Another distinguishing feature of critical pedagogy is the promotion of a culture of dissent. Modern multicultural societies, who strive for social equality, tend to overemphasize the importance of consent and harmony. This naïve harmonization does not take into consideration the distinctiveness of cultures and is thereby exclusive. Guilherme (2002:40) notes that a pedagogy of dissent should by no means lead to cultural relativism and therefore “[...] contradiction, contestation, or opposition should be given legitimacy, voice, space and time. These should not be looked down as something unnatural or bad, to be kept private, or to be quickly controlled” (40-43)

Instead conflicts, which are unavoidable in a world where people with diverse cultural backgrounds live side by side, should be dealt with creatively and effectively. This approach requires a completely new understanding of conflicts. (Fördergemeinschaft zur Gründung einer Friedensuniversität 2000:113)

The issue is not the presence of absence of conflict but rather how people respond to it. It is not the denotation of the word “conflict” (differences of needs, wants, values, or resources) that is the problem; it is the connotations (avoidance, disruption of relationship, disharmony, anger, fear, threat, suspicion, violence, ethnic cleansing) that are problematic. (Birch 2009: 141)

Thus, *dissent* as promoted by critical pedagogy can be equated with *conflict transformation* that starts with the insight that conflict exists as a natural component of social existence and considers it to be a learning opportunity that enables learners to reflect upon moral issues. (140-141) A pedagogy of dissent opens up the possibility to transform admittedly often painful contentions into productive processes, namely dialogues. (Fördergemeinschaft zur Gründung einer Friedensuniversität 2000:113) According to this view, conflict has the potential to contribute to a better cultural understanding or *critical cultural awareness* as conflict dialogues gives learners the chance to reflect critically upon their own and other

cultures and given socio-political circumstances. In the course of the dialogue the learners get to know the subjective experiences and perceptions of other people or cultures and thereby they develop an understanding for the value systems and expectations of the others even if they are left unsaid. (121) The promotion of a culture of dissent leads to a more dynamic understanding of cultural identity. According to critical pedagogy, identity is always in process, never finalized and therefore should not be regarded as something that is impossible to change. (Kincheloe 2008: 73)

Conflict can be handled in a conversation where the participants share their opposing viewpoints in a critically but productively. This type of discourse should form an integral part of education in general and foreign language education in particular. It prepares for the disagreement that will most likely be encountered in intra-as well as intercultural dialogue in the future lives of students. I should record the fact that diverging opinions are common in all social situations and definitely also among culturally homogenous groups and therefore conflict dialogue can also take place if the learners share a common cultural background. However, indisputably the initiated discussions become more interesting and effective if the classroom composition is culturally heterogeneous.

Conflict dialogue can only bring about results if the teacher prepares the ground well. First of all, students have to analyze the specific situation in which the conflict occurs thoroughly and should throw light on it from multiple perspectives in order to understand a conflict's complex and multidimensional character. Additionally, the teacher ought to dedicate some time to the consideration of affects and emotions that come into play when dealing with conflicts. Specific activities should help learners to handle feelings such as anxiety, jealousy or guilt. If a situation evokes negative feelings, the parties are often not willing to change their attitude and behavior. As long as emotions are not given the attention they actually deserve in the classroom, it remains impossible to deal with objective questions. The foreign language classroom lends itself perfectly to the discussion of xenophobia that is caused by sensations such as insecurity and fear. Being in contact with "strangers" can provoke ambiguous feelings and this natural phenomenon should not be made a taboo subject. Diversity is often glorified and people are under the pressure to accept and like the alien, which is of course a high moral demand that often asks too much of humans. It is essential for the understanding of conflicts, to discuss fear and to openly talk about cultural differences

without playing them down. (Fördergemeinschaft zur Gründung einer Friedensuniversität 2000: 113-117)

The process of analyzing “facts, feelings, and events involved in the conflict” (Birch 2009: 149) is called *discovery* and takes place in the form of open-ended discussions, role plays, word cards, storyboarding and narrative analysis, just to mention a few ideas. (ibid) In this phase the learners also have the opportunity to share their real-life experiences and reflect upon their behavior in certain conflict situations. They are asked to define conflict for themselves and to come up with ideas how to solve them. (149-150) Unfortunately, more practical suggestions cannot be given as this would exceed the scope of this work.

Understanding the complicated nature of conflicts, the acknowledgement that fear of difference is natural as well as the insight that emotions determine the way we act and react are the preconditions for successful conflict dialogue. Apart from that students have to adopt a new attitude towards conflicts and to learn to adhere to certain basic communicative norms. An efficient way to work through dissent is to view the interlocutors involved separate from the conflict and foreground the interests and behaviors it is about. The needs, aims and interests of the partners are more relevant than the position that is taken by the individual speakers. (145) This attitude prevents the persons involved from taking statements too personally and to control negative feelings. Furthermore, it is helpful not to focus on the polarizations and to emphasize common interests that can lead to common action. (Fördergemeinschaft zur Gründung einer Friedensuniversität 2000: 121) In the context of GCE a common goal can be found in the Earth Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that represent the interests of humankind.

Besides, students have to be made familiar with new *pro-social* and *pro-human* forms of communication that have already been mentioned in a previous chapter. The preparation for conflict dialogue includes empathy-enhancing and anger-management activities and the practice of listening to others actively. (Birch 2009: 144) I would now like to give a detailed account of the norms of individualist style conflict dialogue:

1. Active listening:
 - a) Decide if you really want to hear what the other has to say.
 - b) If so, clear your mental agenda.
 - c) Show understanding and acceptance by authentic verbal and non-verbal behavior such as nodding or saying 'yes' or 'I understand.'
 - d) Try to empathize with the other.
 - e) At appropriate times, restate what the other person said with a paraphrase. 'In other words, you want to use the computer for homework.'
 - f) At appropriate times, ask an open-ended question-that is, a question with a 'wh-' word: 'What have you already tried to resolve the problem?'
 - g) When listening, do not judge, evaluate, interpret, advise, predict, or analyze.
 - h) Careful active listening will often reveal hidden offers, apologies, common ground, or positive intentions to explore as resources for working through conflict.
2. Clear speaking: know what you think and state it clearly by using I-statements. Do not start sentences with 'you'.
3. A second statement may be added following the I-statement, not as an ultimatum, but rather as the beginning step in a negotiation. The second statement should be clear and specific about your wishes for the other person or for a change in the status quo. (Birch 2009: 145)

These rules cannot be seen as conflict avoidance but rather as *conflict proactivity*. The speakers understand that they cannot change the attitude of the person opposite, while they can definitely change themselves and the situation. They realize that the only possibility to arrive at a desirable result is interdependent agency without influence and pressure. It can be observed that once one person in the conflict shows pro-social behavior, the other one often adapts. This reciprocal *proactivity* helps to reduce the frequency as well as the intensity of conflicts, which is the ultimate aim of GCE. (147)

At this point it has to be said that individualist conflict dialogue is only one approach for *conflict transformation*. Individual cultures have different ways to handle conflicts and it can be argued that the teaching of one particular method is cultural imperialism. On the other hand, exactly because of the fact that every culture has its own way it is essential to establish a common ground because cultures who avoid conflicts like the Japanese are more likely to give in than those cultures who approach conflicts with aggressive behavior and as a consequence one party will not be satisfied with the result in the end. The individualist style

can become part of a *cultura franca* for global citizens, however this status can only be achieved if the pro-social and *pro-human* elements of conflict resolution of diverse cultures are accommodated and together make up the *cultura franca*. Lederach (1995), who originally suggested individualist conflict dialogue, later suggested the development of a so called *glocalized conflict dialogue*. The process is referred to as *elicitive approach* and means that learners examine their own local culture for useful strategies of *conflict transformation*. (148-149) The knowledge of the students serves as a source for global civic conflict culture and therefore it might be a good idea to determine communicative norms within the group. However, it is the task of the teacher to bring in his knowledge and to combine outside prescriptive with inside elicited resources in order to optimize *conflict transformation*.

5.3. Critical Thinking, Conflict and Controversial Issues

In order to integrate conflict into the lesson, teachers have to choose appropriate classroom content that gives rise to disagreement. Local as well as global controversial issues are suitable tools as they have a political, social or personal impact and evoke feelings, which is a source for dissent and conflict. They differ from other issues because of their complicated and often ambiguous nature that make it difficult to find the right answer or to arrive at a conclusion. Another distinguishing feature of controversial issues is the fact that people hold widely divergent opinions that can be attributed to “different sets of experiences, interests and values.” (Oxfam 2006b: 2)

The discourse about controversial issues helps young people to explore their values and develop important skills they need as global citizens. They learn to take part in arguments and debates, to judge reasonably, to acknowledge the opinion of others as well as to consider various perspectives, and finally to deal with and transform conflicts. (Oxfam 2006b: 3) Overall, it can be said that controversial issues nurture critical thinking skills and the capability to handle disagreement, which are important qualities in intra-as well as intercultural communication.

Academic controversies comprise a whole variety of different domains such as history, ethics, science, politics, and many more. (Hess 2009: 38) These fields are all relevant for GCE and are often intertwined with each other so that it is impossible to look at them in isolation. In her book *Controversy in the Classroom: The Democratic Power of Discussion* Hess (2009) emphasizes the role of *controversial political issues* that address “questions of

public policy at the local, state, national, and international level.” (39) The author explains that she uses the term ‘political’ instead of ‘public’ consciously with the intention to revitalize the word in times where it has taken on negative connotations. She stresses the traditional meaning of the word ‘political’ and relates it to the making of governmental policy in a democracy, where the public has the power to make decisions. Thereby she narrows down the concept of controversial issues and excludes history as a topic. She defines *controversial political issues* as “authentic, contemporary, and open”. (ibid) They include questions such as “How should Austria approach the new challenges of immigration?”, “Should marriage between members of the same sex made legal or be prohibited?”, “Should the debts of developing countries be remitted?” “Should plastic bags be prohibited?” or “Should separation of waste be made obligatory?” (Hess 2009: 38-39) Although history constitutes an important component of GCE and should by no means be taken out of the curriculum, I argue that particularly these *controversial political issues* help students to explore their values and develop the skills they need as global citizens. They are able to bring the global and local together as national governmental policy can be compared to the practices of other countries and the principles of the Earth Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The international documents become relevant in the local context young people come from if they are related to local political problems and also the discussion of real life problems on the international level is the perfect opportunity to deal with *global ethics* and human rights. These international rights and duties have to be considered in the search for the best solution to a public problem and therefore GCE obtains authenticity because a link is established between abstract values and real-life situations.

However, the definition of controversial issue is surrounded with significant controversy and therefore it has to be clarified what I actually regard as legitimately controversial. I follow the ideas of Hess (2009) who distinguishes topics, problems, current events and other types of issues from rightful *controversial political issues*-a distinction which is necessary in order to achieve the desired learning outcome. A controversial issue is often mistaken for a topic, which does not lend itself to discussions because it is too general. A topic can be a specific event (Korean War) or a place (South Africa) as well as an act or process (immigration or the implementation of the comprehensive school). In the lesson it can only serve the purpose of introducing the focus of a particular lesson or learning unit. Overall topics are frequently associated with specific problems, like it is the case with immigration that is often related to

racism and discrimination. Problems definitely offer plenty to talk about as it can be discussed whether foreigners are treated equally in public institutions or whether the migrants' native languages are suppressed by the state, yet the discussion should by no means end there. They ought to be followed by the identification of actual policy proposals or issues that address particular problems. The focus on *controversial political issues* increases the quality and effectiveness of the discussion because it makes it possible to go more into depth and prevents people from meanderings and talking past one another. Topics and problems are equally important as they contextualize the issue and thereby provide a better understanding of the whole set of factors that have to be considered when a problem should be solved. (Hess 2009: 39-41) Due to the complexity of some issues it would be overtaxing and also counterproductive to expect a solution to every problem. Therefore it is legitimate not to be able to arrive at a conclusion sometimes. These difficult cases show learners that there is not always a straightforward answer to every question and that further dialogue is necessary.

Furthermore, Hess (2009) stresses the difference between current events and issues, which erroneously are often used as synonyms. In some cases this equating is accurate as current events might be issues and vice versa, even so, in many instances current events as they are presented in the media are rather topics than controversial issues. Newspapers inform about events, places, acts and processes but staying informed about popular news does not raise awareness of the challenges that society is confronted with. Knowledge about current events is certainly indispensable but can only be the first step in the process of creating more politically interested citizens. Thus, teachers have to include activities that foster *critical literacy* and make students more aware of what they actually read. Hess argues that it is wrong “[...] to think that the questions of *what is* happening is the same as the question of what we should do about it.” (Hess 2009: 41-42)

Then, Hess further differentiates between a case issue that “emanates from a specific controversy in a particular time and place” (43) and *perennial issues* that transcend time and place and are likely to arise in the future. Students have to learn how to deliberate on *perennial issues* and to cope with the value tensions involved. This task is facilitated if there is a focus on a specific case that can be referred to. If a general question such as “Under what circumstances should the government intervene in the economy?” (ibid) is asked by the teacher, discussions tend to remain superficial and to fall flat. On that account, it is most efficient if the teacher selects specific *controversial political issues*, which deal with

problems that occur repeatedly in our societies. (Hess 2009: 42-43) An excellent example is the discussion whether nuclear power plants ought to be switched off.

In addition, Hess points out that *public issues* have to be clearly distinguished from *private issues* if the aim is public well-being and not personal interest. An example of the latter might be the question of whether a person should join the military in the US. In this case it is up to the person concerned to make a decision that suits his needs best. In contrast to this, the question whether the military service should be compulsory is one of public interest and consequently also calls for the discussion among the public in order to be able to arrive at an appropriate solution that is beneficial for the whole community involved. (Hess 2009: 43-44)

There is a critical distinction that needs to be made between what an individual might do in a situation and what the society writ large should be allowed or forbidden from doing. Focusing only on personal or private issues masks that difference and could lead students to believe that whatever they decide to do is what everybody should do. (44)

The discussion of public issues in GCE helps learners to consider not only their own interests but those of the wider community or the global population. However, I maintain that also private issues should find space in the classroom as individual decisions can have a considerable impact on the public. Especially in a liberal democracy, where citizens are endowed with a high degree of autonomy and freedom, and where the state does not stipulate a particular conception of good to the people, students have to be stimulated to reflect critically upon the personal choices they make. (De Ruyter 2009: 62-63) They have to learn to base their decisions on a certain interpretation of the objective good, which in my opinion are the ideals of GCE. Students have to become aware that to opt for the train in preference to the plane when going on holidays is a choice that also influences their fellow men positively. Global citizens ought to possess the moral disposition that allows them to think of their actions' possible consequences on other people's life. They are interested not only in their personal flourishing, which should by no means be neglected, but in the well-being of the broader community. (De Ruyter 2009: 60) The discussion of *personal issues* within the framework of GCE can help students to develop this capacity.

Finally, there are two remaining issues that Hess (2009) distinguishes from each other, namely *public policy* and *constitutional issues*. Discussions about the latter aim at making students familiar with the Constitution and assists them in obtaining a better understanding of the meaning of particular parts of the document. In a public policy discussion the content

knowledge has to go beyond constitutional understanding and is concerned with the fairness or the enforceability of a policy. This kind of discourse requires the consideration of different perspectives, including the ethical, economical, sociological and many other standpoints. The nature and history of the problem dealt with should be analyzed thoroughly and by weighing up advantages against disadvantages of the public policy it ought to be determined whether the target set regarding a particular issue can be achieved with this policy. (Hess 2009: 44-46) Within the framework of GCE the policies selected are about sustainability and social justice. It will for example be looked at policies on foreigners or climate protection policies at a local and global level, which will then be compared to the principles of the Earth Charter and the fundamental rights of humans in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This strong political element draws attention to the fifth object of GCE, namely *alternative future directions in worldwide affairs*, as students become not only aware of global problems but are also encouraged to think of policies to improve the situation.

As this type of *controversial political issues* necessitates profound political background knowledge, I have to point to the need to integrate *controversial political issues* not only in the foreign language classroom but in subjects such as geography, history and political education. If these lessons are used for the teaching of the content of the constitution and other important specialized knowledge, the work of the foreign language teacher is more efficient as he can reduce the preliminary work when he plans a discussion. Generally, the successful implementation of GCE depends on the collaboration of teachers of different fields not only because the knowledge of the global citizen is interdisciplinary but also because the acquisition of this knowledge and the moral development of students take more time than one single teacher has at his/her disposal for his/her lessons.

Although Hess (2009) exclusively focuses on political issues, I argue that in GCE social, ethical and moral issues are equally efficient, yet, they all might be related to politics or might have political implications. Whatever the issue may be, it has to be controversial and provide ample discussion material.

However, the inclusion of controversial issues into the classroom demands particular teaching skills in order to avoid the reinforcement of stereotypes, the rise of tensions between learners and even more confusion. Teachers have to make sure that he/she keeps the balance and objectivity in his/her lessons. They have to be prepared for unexpected controversies as it can

never be predicted how the learners react to the topics they are asked to deliberate about. Their distinct experiences, learning styles and level of emotional intelligence may result in totally different responses. (Oxfam 2006b: 6) A number of factors, such as the classroom environment or the role of the teacher are responsible for the success or failure of controversial issues discussions. What has to be considered when a teacher plans to discuss important political, social or ethical issues in the classroom, will be elaborated on later in the paper.

5.4. Dialogue

In any case, it is not a good idea to use didactic approaches to tackle controversy as adolescents do not want to be told how to live and what to think. On the contrary, prescriptions from part of the teacher close their minds to alternative ideas and turn GCE into an absolutely hopeless undertaking. The learning outcome is significantly higher if the teacher creates a dialogic and dialectic learning environment, where students are offered enough time to unfold discussions and debates about controversial issues. (Oxfam 2006b: 8)

Dialogue creates oral interactions between participants that seeks to stimulate the exchange of ideas. It works as a bridge between people and creates a friendly space for developing thoughts, reflections and proposals even if they are opposed or different. Dialogue helps develop communication and listening skills, so it promotes understanding of different issues and points of view. It is one of the most important methods in global education. (North-South Centre 2010: 31)

More active approaches to learning contribute to *critical awareness* and *critical cultural awareness* and thereby help students to develop and improve the skills, values and attitudes of global citizens. Dialogue needs to have certain characteristics in order to have this positive effect on the development of learners. Critical pedagogy defines these essential qualities in detail and in the following passage I will outline the main points.

According to advocates of critical pedagogy, teachers have to distance themselves from the idea that education is mere transmission of knowledge. Teaching should be an interactive process, in which “problems are posed and answers collaboratively sought”. (Peterson 2003: 375) Therefore it is an emancipatory educational process that challenges the prevailing educational discourse and empowers students to “become subjects of their world.” (15) The history, experiences and the culture of the learners have to be an essential part of classroom

content. Instead of only receiving, they also contribute to their education and consequently students learn from teachers, while teachers simultaneously learn from students. Lived experiences “must be incorporated as part of the exploration of existing conditions and knowledge in order to understand how these came to be and to consider how they might be different.” (ibid) The promotion of dialogue in the lesson demonstrates that the teacher does not possess knowledge and that textbooks and other sources do not simply produce facts which are then transmitted to the learners. Through dialogue students have the opportunity to construct knowledge themselves as they reflect upon the object of study intensively by discussing it with other people. (375) Wink stresses the dialectical character of critical dialogue that he describes as the “backing and forthing of thoughts, ideas, values, beliefs” (Wink 2000: 46) A dialectic can be seen as the process of learning from the oppositional standpoint of the interlocutor, in which the multiple dimensions of the “other” or the “opposite” are comprehended fully. (47)

Freire emphasizes the value of critical discussion and collective action as a means of finding solutions to political and social problems. He warns about the risk to mistake dialogue for permissive talk and describes it as a “conversation with a focus and a purpose”. (Peterson 2003: 375) Talk with focus and purpose leads to new insights and makes it possible that individuals perceive reality differently and more comprehensibly.

Dialogue is change-agent chatter. *Dialogue* is talk that changes us or our context. *Dialogue* is profound, wise, insightful conversation. *Dialogue* is two-way, interactive visiting. *Dialogue* involves periods of lots of noise as people share and lots of silence as people muse. *Dialogue* is communication that creates and recreates multiple understandings. It moves its participants along the learning curve to that uncomfortable place of relearning and unlearning. It can move people to wonderful new levels of knowledge; it can transform relations; it can change things. (Wink 2000: 47-48)

Dialogue triggers a process called *conscientization* by which students obtain a new understanding of the social realities they are surrounded by. They become aware of the fact that they are able to change the world themselves, as social realities have been constructed by human beings. (Darder, Baltodano, and Torres 2003: 15) Through dialogue students learn to think creatively and critically alike, as they have to critically evaluate the standpoint of others, while they also acquire the capacity to think outside the box and come up with alternative solutions to problems. (Wales and Clarke 2005: 27) Consequently, dialogue is an effective means to change the status quo, which makes it an indispensable tool for GCE.

Apart from facilitating critical thinking, a dialogical approach to teaching helps students to develop “an interactive dialogic attitude” (Guilherme 2002: 47) that they need as responsible and active global citizens who want to participate in democratic society. In the first instance, the integration of discourse can be seen as an opportunity to practice public talk as a form of “trial performance” for adult life. The classroom community represents society on a small-scale as it is composed of individuals from diverse backgrounds. However, students are not only future citizens; they are already part of both, the local and global community and therefore have the right to say what they think about certain issues and make suggestions for future directions. (Huddleston and Rowe 2003: 121) Therefore it can be said that pupils do not only learn *with* but also *for* dialogue. (Hess 2009: 55)

5.4.1. Intercultural dialogue

In GCE; where respect and interest for foreign cultures is fostered, particular importance is attached to intercultural dialogue. Intercultural encounters are the ideal setting to expand and improve one’s own knowledge because individuals are confronted with different worldviews that eventually widen their horizon. Culturally embedded conceptions of the world can be questioned and altered when the individual gets to know alternative views through intercultural dialogue.

[...] intercultural dialogue is understood as a process that comprises an open and respectful exchange of views between individuals and groups with different ethnic, cultural, religious and linguistic backgrounds and heritage, on the basis of mutual understanding and respect. It requires the freedom and ability to express oneself, as well as the willingness and capacity to listen to the views of others. Intercultural dialogue contributes to political, social, cultural and economic integration and the cohesion of culturally diverse societies. It fosters equality, human dignity and a sense of common purpose. It aims to develop a deeper understanding of diverse world views and practices, to increase co-operation and participation (or the freedom to make choices), to allow personal growth and transformation, and to promote tolerance and respect for the other. (Council of Europe 2010: 23)

Intercultural dialogue is a transformative tool that can serve the purpose of promoting respect for human rights. Engaging in a dialogue with people from other cultural backgrounds alone already furthers integration and social cohesion and if the dialogue is used to address social concerns it is an efficient means for the change and the improvement of present conditions. Intercultural dialogue helps to maintain democratic stability, combats prejudice and stereotypes and consequently can prevent violent conflicts-all objectives of GCE. (23-24)

The school with its frequent multicultural character is the ideal place to cultivate space for intercultural dialogue in multiple forms. It can take place in the form of school assemblies, where all children and adolescents have the right to state their opinion and share their ideas with the school community. Additionally, intercultural dialogue has to be integrated into education itself and space should be engendered in a variety of subjects across the curriculum.

The safe environment at school has to be seen as a possibility to discuss delicate cultural issues with the participation and under the guidance of the teacher. The articulation of problems and fears that affect the personal lives of girls and boys naturally evokes emotions or probably even aggressions. In the classroom the students are not left to their own resources to cope with these feelings and therefore intercultural dialogue avoids that existing tensions between cultural groups develop into severe conflicts. (Byram 2008: 149)

I argue that foreign language teaching and especially English language teaching at an advanced stage offer ideal settings for the incorporation of intercultural dialogue on the local and more global level for several reasons. First of all, the taught language can serve as a neutral tool for communication, in which the learners have similar levels of competency. The power relations between migrants and natives can be reduced because the privilege to use their mother tongue to express their ideas is withdrawn from the natives. By using the foreign language for the discussion of local and global controversial issues both groups are given equal chances to give voice to their interests and needs.

Furthermore, in countries where there are tensions about identity, like it is the case in Latvia or Ex-Yugoslavia, questions of national identity can be addressed more easily in the “neutrality” of the language classroom. (Byram 2008: 148)

If intercultural dialogue takes place in the culturally heterogeneous national school of a multicultural country, GCE is brought down to the local level because the global is intertwined with the local. Social justice and equity, diversity and peace, some of the key elements for global citizenship, become relevant in the world of children and adolescents and this is where GCE has to start in a context where young people can share their own experiences. Technology in the 21st century even allows students to expand their intercultural encounters beyond the classroom. Online intercultural dialogues between language learners

of different countries ought to be fostered by the language teacher. I will come back to this idea in the form of practical suggestions in the last chapter.

Online intercultural dialogues and especially classroom discussions should develop into a critical discourse as it is promoted by critical pedagogy. This means that they should be related to *critical reflection*/thinking and action. (Phipps and Guilherme 2004: 4) However, it cannot be denied that the inclusion of dialogue either involves the risk that classroom talk develops into a casual conversation or transforms into a monologue on the part of the teacher with the intention to inform learners. The latter could even take the shape of indoctrination, even if the educator pretends to be neutral. The critical pedagogue should be aware of this danger and adopt dialogue as a form of attitude that prevents him/her from delivering speeches. (Guilherme 2002: 47) Freire developed a *problem-posing approach* to dialogue. (McLaren and Kincheloe 2008: 204) I argue that this method is the best means of ensuring a dialogic relationship between teacher and student in the sense that both can contribute equally to the discourse. (Darder, Baltodano, and Torres 2003: 15) In an online forum the guidance of the teacher is rather limited and therefore the *problem-posing approach* described above does only apply to discourse that takes place in the classroom.

5.4.2. Problem-Posing

Problem-posing as it is promoted by Freire can be classified under the category problem-based learning, which is suggested by global education experts as a suitable tool for nurturing global citizens. It is defined as follows:

Problem-based methodologies encourage people to ask and answer questions, making use of natural curiosity about specific events or themes. Participants are invited to reflect on issues that do not have absolute answers or easy developments and that reflect the complexity of real-world situations. Problem-based learning opens the way for an active, task-oriented and self-controlled approach to the learning process. (North-South Centre 2010: 30-31)

We gain our knowledge mainly through experience. “We create meaning as much from efforts to answer our own questions as from what we read or hear. In that sense, it is often said that our greatest challenges become our greatest learning experiences.” (Delisle 1997: v) This is the main idea behind *problem-based learning*. *Problem-based learning* originally was developed in a medical context and was used to train doctors how to solve medical problems. It should make it easier for students to put theory into practice and enable them to

apply the huge amounts of memorized information to clinical situations. (2) *Problem-posing*, however, has its origins in critical pedagogy and its primary concern is the transformation of society. For that reason I decided to concentrate on Freire's *problem-posing approach* in the form of dialogue, which in my opinion meets the requirements of GCE best.

In *problem-posing education* "people develop their power to perceive critically *the way they exist* in the world *with which* and *in which* they find themselves" and where "they come to see the world not as a static reality, but as a reality in process, in transformation." (Freire 1997: 64) *Problem-posing* is an act of inquiry that leads to emancipation and action. (Freire 2003: 67) It triggers a process called *conscientization*, where taken-for-granted circumstances are questioned and ultimately delegitimized. (Birch 2009: 65) "[...] [C]onscientization is defined as the process by which human beings, as empowered subjects, achieve a deepening awareness of the social realities that shape their lives and discover their own capacities to re-create them." (Darder, Baltodano, and Torres 2003: 15) This learning process opens up a new perspective that gives people the opportunity to imagine "other legitimate preferred futures" (Birch 2009: 65) and increases their willingness to question their own attitudes and to recognize their responsibility to bring about change. Resignation is replaced with the wish for transformation and the drive for inquiry. Without being in control of the movement of inquiry, humans are not capable of reasoned decision-making and are therefore rather objects than subjects. *Problem-posing education* prevents the production of objects at school. It avoids that the educational process develops into an act of oppression, in which students only have to study facts and accept them as given in order to function in society. As soon as the teacher permits the student to question not only Who?, What? When? Where? but also Why?, they are liberated from their oppression and are able to act as emancipated subjects. (Freire 2003: 67)

Problem-posing brings interactive participation and critical inquiry into the existing curriculum and expands it to reflect the curriculum of the students' lives. The learning is not just grounded in the prepared syllabus, the established, prescribed curriculum. Problem-posing opens the door to ask questions and seek answers, not only of the visible curriculum, but also of the hidden curriculum. Problem posing is very interested in the hidden curriculum, which is why many are uncomfortable with it. Problem posing causes people to ask questions many do not want to hear. (Wink 2000: 60)

It is exactly these questions that enable individuals to resist the subordination to the dominant system and its values. *Problem posing* helps to raise the boys' and girls' awareness of their

cynical attitude towards life that hinders them to imagine an alternative to the present situation and inhibits them from questioning the knowledge they uncritically accumulate in our so called Knowledge Age. They start to think critically and to make informed choices about their lives and the lives of their fellow men. Through *critical consciousness* they are free to act as global citizens according to the needs of wider humanity because they are able to distance themselves from the idea to only go to school in order to learn how to serve economy best. Apart from the development of critical consciousness, *problem-posing* has a huge potential for *critical cultural consciousness*. It helps to reveal eurocentric perspectives, to disclose power relations between cultures as well as languages (English as a global language) and to overcome fear of the other or even xenophobia.

Only if students become aware of certain circumstances they can become active to modify them. Action is the key word that clearly differentiates *problem-posing* from *problem-solving*. The objective of problem-solving education is a definite answer or solution. As opposed to *problem-solving*, *problem-posing* allows individuals to be unsure about certain issues, which teaches them that it is simply not possible to always have an immediate response when taking into account the complex nature of some situations. (Birch 2009: 65-66) If the students get the task to solve an ethical, social or political problem through dialogue, *problem-posing* prevents them from arriving at overhasty and rash conclusions that do not really bring about an improvement of the situation. This implies that in some cases it will not be possible to solve the problem instantly due to the complexity and ambiguity involved. *Problem-posing* opens up a lot of room for creative and complex thinking and does not recoil from “dilemmas, uncertainty, ambiguity, and acknowledging ambivalence.” (65) This approach to learning differs substantially from the one taken in contemporary educational systems, where “the focus is on facts, evidence, and forming firm opinions.” (64)

After having discussed the opportunities of *problem-posing education*, I have to describe how it actually works. At the beginning, teachers select the issues that should be discussed, in order to guarantee that they are controversial and offer plenty to talk about. (65) It is the task of the teacher to “problematize situations” (Freire 1985:22) by confronting students with situations that they already know, yet presenting them in a way that encourages them to reflect upon it from a new perspective. However, I claim that the involvement of the students in the selection of the issues is essential in order to avoid hegemonic and hierarchical structures in the classroom, where the teacher determines everything by himself/herself.

Shor (1987:93) describes *problem-posing* as a method that makes it possible to “re-experience” and “re-perceive” the ordinary. *Problem-posing* is guided by Socratic open-ended questions that remind of the famous ‘why’ questions which parents of young children frequently have to find answers to. As opposed to closed questions that have only one correct answer, these critical questions have probably several right answers. (Wales and Clarke 2005: 26) In order to illustrate how *problem-posing* could look like in practice I would like to quote a passage of Freire’s work, where he documented a conversation between him and a group of Chilean farmers:

[...] “Right, I’m a doctor and you’re not. But why am I a doctor and you’re not?”
 “Because you’ve gone to school, you’ve read things, studied things, and we haven’t.”
 “And why have I been to school?”
 “Because your dad could send you to school. Ours couldn’t.”
 “And why couldn’t your parents send you to school?”
 “Because they were peasants like us.”
 “And what is being a peasant?”
 “It’s not having an education...not owning anything...working from sun to sun...having no rights...having no hope.”
 “And why doesn’t a peasant have any of this?”
 “The will of God.”
 “And who is God?”
 “The Father of us all.”
 “And who is a father here this evening?”
 Almost all raised their hands and said they were.
 [Freire asks one of the farmers how many children he has and the man answers three].
 “Would you be willing to sacrifice two of them, and make them suffer so that the other one could go to school, and have a good life...? Could you love your children that way?”
 “No!”
 “Well, if you...a person of flesh and bones, could not commit an injustice like that-how could God commit it?” Could God really be the cause of these things?”
 A different kind of silence [ensued] A silence in which something began to be shared. Then:
 “No. God isn’t the cause of all this. It’s the boss!” (Freire 1992: 38-39)

This passage shows how Freire’s manner of asking questions enables the farmers to question their fatalistic perception of reality. By posing them problems he encourages them to reflect upon the given fact that he is a university professor, while they work on the field and did not have the possibility to undergo any education. (Monchinski 2008: 124) Their naïve understanding of their situation gives way to a more critical objective perspective on reality.

In the same way the teacher can use *problem-posing* to stimulate the learners’ true reflection about the world they live in. S/he could ask for instance why English is the global language,

why some cultures are superior to others, why some topics are included in the curriculum, while others are not, why some jobs have more prestige than others, although they are equally important for society, why some people earn as much money in one single month as others earn in a whole year, and much more. These are just some examples that in GCE are surely worth thinking about; however it is important that the problems posed always fit the content dealt with in the classroom. These questions should not simply be asked out of any context but ought to be integrated into the discussion of a wider controversial issue. On the one hand, the problems posed keep the conversation going, while, on the other hand, they can also lead to speechlessness as there often is no straight-forward explanation for the conditions we find in our world. In this case, the critical educator has to use his knowledge in order to pose more problems that guide the students in constructing their own knowledge and gain insights.

As soon as learners are familiar with the act of *problematizing*, they will use *problem-posing* themselves because they start to reflect upon the assumptions of their colleagues and learn to approach the perspectives of others more critically. (Wales and Clarke 2005: 26)

5.5. Empowerment

If the teacher manages to integrate discussion and dialogue that stimulates critical thinking into the foreign language classroom and gives *dissent* and *difference* enough space, the students reach a more critical state of mind or *critical consciousness* that leads to *empowerment*. *Empowerment* can be defined “as the individual or collective process of taking control over one’s life and context.” (Guilherme 2002: 50) Giroux (1992) expands upon this idea by pointing to the capability of thinking and acting critically. He maintains that the individual’s *empowerment* ought to be connected to democracy, assuming that personal growth is the precondition for a change for the better. The understanding of *empowerment* as individual and social alike makes it an essential part of citizenship education. “[...] [T]he concept of *empowerment*, as understood by critical pedagogues, entails the development of the individual in her/his quest for the improvement of society and, therefore, implies an ethical and political perception of the exercise of citizenship.” (Guilherme 2002: 50)

The paper shows clearly that the critical foreign language teacher plays a particularly important role in the accomplishment of *empowerment* as s/he teaches for *critical literacy* and thereby helps the learners to see through the intentions of marketing planners and to be critical towards the distorted versions of reality presented in the media. *Critical literacy* and

the general ability to reflect critically upon issues give young people a “social, ethical or political voice” (52) that they need in order to initiate change. (ibid)

Secondly, it has been explained that teachers of language and culture are equally important for *empowerment* in a culturally diverse, globalized environment as they teach for *critical cultural consciousness*. *Critical cultural consciousness* enables students to interact with and not merely adapt to the cultural, ethical and political challenges of the 21st century, which makes them to active global citizens. (Guilherme 2002: 51)

5.6. Action and hope

If the students actually reach the stage of *empowerment* through critical pedagogy and GCE, they are prepared for *action* and *hope*. As a result of critical interaction with the world, students start to intervene in the world around them. A pedagogy of action can be equated with a pedagogy of praxis and means practice that is based on theory and results in transformative action. It has to be acknowledged that theory influences the nature of practice even if teachers are not always aware of this. (52-54)

The articulation between action and theorising offers the ‘possibility of disidentification’ (Ball, 1995), that is, of re-evaluating and reforming prevailing practices formerly taken as natural or inevitable, and also the prospect of ‘an engaged pedagogy’ which means an active commitment to the teaching/learning process under way (hooks, 1994) (54)

However, practice embedded in theory does not necessarily lead to transformative processes. It is essential that pedagogy is clearly political and concerned with ethical issues. (54) Guilherme (2002: 54-55) notes that teachers and students have to acknowledge their role as cultural, social and political agencies in order to bring about social as well as educational change. It has been outlined in how far GCE can meet this demand, especially in the foreign language classroom. *Critical cultural consciousness* ideally results in the transformation of intercultural encounters into “culturally, socially and politically active, productive and transformative events.” (55)

Ultimately, critical pedagogy and GCE generate hope. Rationality and emotion are unified by combining “desire, dream, conscious risk, programming, reasoning, critical analysis and agency” (56) in one educational theory and practice. Freire stresses the importance of being critical towards hope in order to avoid disappointment and desperation if circumstances are not changing in the direction that the individual actually wishes them to change. With his

concept of *critical hope* he proposes that the *language of critique* and the *language of possibility* ought to be interdependent. (ibid)

Critical pedagogy in combination with GCE in the foreign language classroom can bring about the *critical hope* that is needed in the fight against discrimination and racism. Global citizens are capable of constructive intercultural interactions that have the potential to renew democratic society. (Guilherme 2002: 56-57)

In the next chapter I present in detail the core arguments for introducing critical pedagogy and GCE in the specific context of the foreign language classroom. In the preceding chapters I have already pointed to some possibilities how to bring the global dimension into foreign language teaching and now I would like to make explicit why it is especially language and culture education that can contribute its share to the development of critical global citizens.

6. Foreign Language Education, Critical pedagogy and GCE

Critical pedagogy and global citizenship education are both meant to be interdisciplinary and holistic. (Birch 2009: 123) A dialogic and critical approach to learning is useful in every subject as is also the integration of a global perspective. However, there is one particular subject in the curriculum that occupies a strategic position in teaching for a global peaceful and sustainable life-foreign language teaching in general and English as a foreign language (EFL) in particular. Foreign language education contributes its share to the *perceptual dimension* of global learning, while in return GCE and its *substantive dimension* are beneficial for foreign language education. The relationship of foreign language education and GCE is absolutely complementary and enhances the overall quality of language education.

GCE in foreign language education can only achieve its full potential if the teacher adopts a more critical approach to foreign language teaching that connects language learning to the concerns of the wider world. In language teaching, critical pedagogy is “about connecting the word with the world. It is about recognizing language as ideology, not just system. It is about extending the educational space to the social, cultural, and political dynamics of language use”. (Kumaravadivelu 2006: 70 quoted in Akbari 2008: 277) Moreover it “implies a critical use of language(s), a critical approach to one’s own and other cultural backgrounds and a critical view of intercultural interaction.” (Phipps and Guilherme 2004: 3) If the language teacher internalizes this idea GCE becomes far more than the incorporation of new topics into

the lesson (although this aspect should definitely not be underestimated), and can exploit the possibilities of language and culture learning for creating a better world.

6.1. The Intercultural Dimension of GCE

Global citizenship education comprises a strong intercultural component in the sense that apart from promoting respect for the environment and our planet, it furthers respect for difference and diversity. This becomes manifest in the first principle of the Earth Charter, where it says: “Affirm faith in the inherent dignity of all human beings and in the intellectual, artistic, ethical, and spiritual potential of humanity.” (Earth Charter: 2)

In a globalised and internationalised world where young people and future citizens will have a quite different experience of belonging, a different sense of national and international identities, language teaching will be ‘useful’[...] for a better understanding of other people. (Byram 2008: 147)

A global citizen requires “a better cognitive understanding of ‘self’ and ‘other’ and a more refined affective capacity for a desirable relationship to ‘otherness’ ”. (145) There is no better educational environment to foster these competences than the foreign language classroom, because of its possibilities to contribute to the learners’ *critical cultural consciousness* which makes them think critically about both, their own and foreign cultures and its values, norms and practices. In return, global citizenship education adds to foreign language education because it makes available a universal value system or an “anti-relativist standpoint” that is absolutely helpful in “the study of and encounter with other cultural values, meanings and behaviours.” (Byram and Guilherme 2000: 63) Hence, the relationship between these two forms of education can definitely be seen as reciprocal. (ibid)

6.1.1. The Intercultural Speaker-a *Globo Sapiens*?

In order to be able to reflect critically upon one’s own and others’ culture, it is necessary to get in contact with diverse cultural groups by engaging in a conversation in a foreign language. When people use a foreign language, however, linguistic competence alone is not enough to be successful in a communicative situation because “communication is not just a matter of passing information or obtaining goods and services, but of interacting with other human beings in socially complex and rich environments.” (Byram and Guilherme 2000: 71) Communicating with members of different cultural backgrounds requires specific competences that can be found in the model of the *intercultural speaker* who masters the art of *intercultural communicative competence*.

This *intercultural speaker* possesses some of the qualities such as linguistic/grammatical competence of the native speaker in order to enable him/her to make linguistically comprehensible utterances. (72) Also the acquisition of communicative discursive skills and strategic competence is a precondition for the capability of entering into meaningful conversations with interlocutors from other cultures. Only these competences empower foreign language users to get across the message of their proposition, and prevent them from reducing their personality in front of the other speaker. (House 2008: 18) In addition, s/he is endowed with skills that are specific to speakers of foreign languages, who take part in exchanges that transgress cultural and linguistic borders. (Byram and Guilherme 2000:72) Intercultural speakers can be regarded as hybrid identities “who negotiate between the universal and the particular, create transitional cultural ‘borderlands’, and combine a sense of belonging with a sense of detachment.” (Guilherme 2002: 125) In other words, by using a foreign language they cross cultural borders, which enables them to adopt alien elements that they encounter in intercultural conversations into their own culture. In this process the individual gets access to “different underlying language and culture specific conceptual sets and entire ‘Weltanschauungen’.” (House 2008: 18) The appropriation of these new cultural items does not make the person’s L1 and other previously learned languages subordinate, on the contrary, in this hybrid procedure the already existing language repertoire modifies the newly acquired linguistic and mental system and thereby adds to it. Hence, intercultural communication carried out by the *intercultural speaker* can be regarded as a learning process in which they collect diverse cultural capital but never become fully immersed in the new culture(s). (18-19)

The model responds to contemporary notions of cultural identity as a dynamic entity that is constantly re-constructed and altered by experience. (Guilherme 2002: 125)

The *intercultural speaker* has the capacity to discern how cultures are related to each other and to which degree they are similar or different. S/he takes on the role of an *intercultural mediator* by moving between the cultures and between herself/himself and the others. Acting interculturally involves being able to distance oneself from one’s own culturally embedded perspective in order to recognize where modifications of one’s own behavior, values or attitudes would be desirable. In fact, *intercultural speakers* must be willing to suspend the native value system they identified with since their early childhood at least temporarily, in order to allow them to enter into the world of the other that at first may seem to clash with

their own. (Byram 2008: 68-69) Furthermore, they understand that by freeing themselves of their “cultural baggage” and by getting to know alternatives they become aware of the dynamic nature of their own cultural, social, and political identity. (Guilherme 2002: 125)

It is important to stress the multiplicity of worldviews *intercultural speakers* are confronted with over their lifetime and therefore it is a whole “range of experiences and competences that allow them to relate a variety of combinations of cultures so that the relationships are not just binary but plural.” (Byram 2008: 68) Over the years, individuals have the opportunity to familiarize themselves with a variety of different interpretative frameworks that throw light on the world from various angles and can be useful tools to fall back on according to the social situation they find themselves in. (59)

Before a person can take advantage of this multi-perspective s/he has to acquire specific attitudes, knowledge and skills. In his book *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence* Michael Byram suggests a model of *intercultural communicative competence* that is outlined below. However, it should be noted right away that this model shows deficits as it does not take into account cultural reality as it is experienced in the age of cultural globalization. Before I come to the shortcomings, I would like to provide an insight into Byram’s notion of *intercultural communicative competence*.

Originally Byram’s model consisted of four factors that are also cited in the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*, the basis for European foreign language curricula. In a later work he added a fifth dimension (Guilherme 2002: 141) that is actually the most important within the scope of GCE and critical pedagogy and will therefore be the focus of my explanation. Nonetheless, to get a complete picture it is necessary to provide an abbreviated version of the first four features of Byram’s framework.

He separates between *attitudes (savoir être)*, *knowledge (savoirs)*, the *skill of interpreting and relating (savoir comprendre)*, the *skill of discovery and interaction (savoir apprendre/faire)* and finally *critical cultural awareness/political education (savoir s’engager)*. (Byram 1997: 34)

Curiosity and openness towards other cultures as well as the willingness to give up one’s doubts about and disapproval of unfamiliar cultural ideas is subsumed under the category of *attitudes*. Factual knowledge about the cultural products and practices of one’s own and one’s

interlocutor's social community and an understanding of the nature of social interactions in general is classified under the generic term *knowledge*. (34-35) This domain is very demanding as it expects learners to know a lot about historical, geographical and contemporary issues concerning the cultures they deal with. I would like to provide a short extract of the objectives Byram lists in order to illustrate the complexity and richness of detail of his account.

- historical and contemporary relationships between one's own and one's interlocutor's countries; [...]
- the national memory of one's own country and how its events are related to and seen from the perspective of one's interlocutor's country; [...]
- the national definitions of geographical space in one's own country and how these are perceived from the perspective of other countries; [...] (51)

As a third element Byram takes in the capacity to interpret and explicate foreign documents and events and establish a connection to one's own cultural context under the name *skills of interpreting and relating*. The recognition of ethnocentric perspectives and the identification of reasons for misunderstanding are some of the set objectives within this category. The fourth factor *skills of discovery and interaction* can be summarized as the ability to obtain knowledge through the contact to another culture and its practices and "the ability to operate knowledge, attitudes and skills under the constraints of real-time communication and interaction." (52) These skills enable the individuals to quickly orientate themselves towards the new cultural environment, and give them the possibility to engage in interactions with people of distinct cultural origins. Last but by no means least, I arrive at the core of the definition of *intercultural communicative competence*, namely *critical cultural awareness*. Byram (1997: 53) offers the following definition: "an ability to evaluate critically and on the basis of explicit criteria perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures and countries." (49-54)

Critical cultural awareness comprises the following objectives:

- identify and interpret explicit or implicit values in documents and events in one's own and other cultures;
- make an evaluative analysis of the documents and events that refers to an explicit perspective and criteria;
- interact and mediate in intercultural exchanges in accordance with explicit criteria, negotiating where necessary a degree of acceptance of them by drawing upon one's knowledge, skills and attitudes. (53)

By emphasizing the centrality of the concept of *critical cultural awareness* in *intercultural communicative competence* Byram unquestionably is aware of the role that foreign language education plays with regard to political education. He regards *critical cultural awareness* as a possibility to make the students question their "identifications and representations of the Self and Other" (Byram 1997 paraphrased in Guilherme 2002: 143) and in a next step make them aware of the social and political consequences. The author claims that *critical cultural awareness* is applicable in the study of any culture because one always has to approach all social groups, including one's own, critically, irrespective of its historical and social background. (ibid) The main potential of *critical cultural consciousness* consists in the encouragement to attempt to set up contact with people of other ideologies in order to discover similarities and differences and negotiate a common ground in some cases and accept difference in others. (Byram 2008: 165) Students learn that agreement is not always possible and can often only be achieved to a certain degree or sometimes not at all. (179) This insight is of utmost importance in today's multiethnic societies where a number of different social groups have to get along with each other. (174)

However, Byram's model shows some deficiencies as far as both, conceptualization and realization are concerned. The author admits that the goals set for *intercultural communicative competence* are characterized by high complexity and might go beyond the limits of the work that can be done in the foreign language classroom. (Byram 1997: 64) Open-minded attitudes towards otherness require a specific degree of psychological development especially with regard to morality. Besides, the appropriation of the defined skills and knowledge has a certain stage of cognitive development as a precondition because the capacity to abstract is needed. Young people and adults can improve their moral development through experience and reflection, while young children are simply not able to

reach the required level and can therefore not act interculturally competent if *intercultural communicative competence* serves as a model. (54)

Additionally, I would like to complete the criticism with regard to the knowledge dimension of Byram's model. In our globalized world where we engage in intercultural dialogues with a huge number of different cultural groups via English but also other languages, it is not always possible to know everything about the cultural communities we get in contact with and unfortunately there is not enough room in the foreign language classroom to provide students with this knowledge. Especially, in the case of English it would be narrow-minded to equip students with particular knowledge about the Anglophone speech community in order to foster their *intercultural communicative competence*, although in their intercultural encounters they are rarely confronted with people who have English as their actual mother tongue. In connection with other languages than English this argument is equally valid, as in the 21st century the likelihood that the cultural identity of the interlocutor is complex and does probably not correspond to the mono-cultural idea of the target community is relatively high, which immediately leads to the next point of criticism.

Apart from these restrictions concerning the implementation, Byram himself draws attention to the weakness of his model with regard to the presentation of culture as a stable entity with shared 'beliefs, meanings and behaviors.' This perception does not take into consideration the constant process of identity re-construction that takes place within an individual's lifetime. Moreover, the reference to culture as a homogeneous community involves the risk of accepting the meanings shared by the dominant group in a society as the only ones, ignoring the cultural heritage of minority groups. (Byram 1997: 39)

In the publication of the Council of Europe *Developing the intercultural dimension in language teaching: a practical introduction for teachers.* , which is inter alia based on the theoretical work of Byram, the author's model is revised and takes the more dynamic nature of cultures into consideration.

Those cultures are themselves constantly changing; one cannot know with whom one will use a specific language since many languages are spoken in more than one country. Similarly there are in any one country many different cultures and languages. And thirdly any language can be used as a lingua franca with anyone from any country. So it is not possible to anticipate the knowledge language learners need and this has been the main failure of the emphasis on knowledge in *civilisation*,

Landeskunde etc, because whatever is taught it is inevitably insufficient. (Byram, Gribkova, and Starkey: 11)

Also the knowledge dimension of the model is slightly altered and it is explicitly pointed out that knowledge does no longer mean primarily knowledge about a specific culture but rather knowledge about how social communities and identities and intercultural communication work.

As a critical response to Byram's model of *intercultural communicative competence*, Christensen (1994) suggests generally distancing oneself from the idea of "encounters between different languages and culture systems", and replacing it with the notion of "encounters between individuals with their own meanings and cultural capital". (Byram 1997: 40) Although he acknowledges the connection between geographical and social closeness, he does not consider it to be a necessity. (ibid)

This idea can also be found in the guidelines of the Council of Europe.

In contrast the '**intercultural dimension**' in language teaching aims to develop learners as **intercultural speakers** or **mediators** who are able to engage with complexity and multiple identities and to avoid the stereotyping which accompanies perceiving someone through a single identity. It is based on perceiving the interlocutor as an individual whose qualities are to be discovered, rather than as a representative of an externally ascribed identity. Intercultural communication is communication on the basis of respect for individuals and equality of human rights as the democratic basis for social interaction. (Byram, Gribkova, and Starkey 2002: 9)

This consideration questions the idea that there is a fundamental difference between *intracultural* and *intercultural* communication and foregrounds the social competence of the speaker. (Byram 1997: 40) In my opinion it cannot be negated that dissimilarity exists to a certain degree because culture-specific viewpoints could provoke disagreement and conflict. Yet, ideas which are in conflict with each other are also common in *intracultural* exchanges and need to be handled by falling back upon one's social competence. Psychological literature points to the close relationship between general social competence and intercultural competence.

The interrelatedness between these two constructs is already evidenced in the fact that every intercultural interaction is at the same time a social interaction depending on how narrowly the definition of culture is defined. Already existing social skills add certain other perspectives to an intercultural situation and can be seen as partial competencies of a more encompassing ability, which could be defined as "applied social competence in intercultural contexts" (Hatzer and Layes 2010: 129)

Consequently, I claim that foreign language teachers should set *pro-social communicative competence* as a preliminary aim instead of overtaxing students with the excessive demands of *intercultural communicative competence*. *Pro-social communicative competence* definitely helps to cope with issues of power and dominance and questions of fundamental values and principles that characterize intercultural interactions. *Pro-social communication* is not concerned with the truth and validity of ideas, attitudes or opinions but rather with the way they are articulated. (Birch 2009: 162) A non-violent form of dialogue consists of the three elements *voice, attention and acknowledgement*. “*Voice* is when the participants offer, articulate, legitimate, and become vulnerable. *Attention* is when they listen, accept, understand, and give legitimacy and acknowledgement. *Acknowledgement* is their recognition of what another sees as a truth.” (65) Only if students learn to get involved in unfamiliar and possibly alienating ideas and opinions and have to work on their ability to respect other worldviews they can become global citizens.

Naturally, *pro-social communicative competence* is only the first step and is the prerequisite and preparation for the ambitious aims of the global citizen. Of course, intercultural competence has to be furthered by the language teacher but with a focus on *critical cultural consciousness*, the fifth element of Byram’s model. The importance of *critical cultural awareness* in GCE consists in its potential to introduce moral issues as well as questions of belonging and identification with international communities or the imagined community of *global civil society*. (Byram 2008: 141)

In response to the demands of cultural globalization and the complex and dynamic nature of cultural reality, *critical cultural consciousness* needs to be extended to *global cultural consciousness*, as it is suggested by Kumaravadivelu (2008). Like *critical cultural consciousness*, the concept also stands for a critical and reflective approach to one’s own and foreign cultures and stresses the possibility to choose the best characteristics of the individual influences in order to enrich one’s personality and develop a new, more global identity. (Birch 2009: 49)

What lies behind my lived experience, and that of a multitude of others, is a complex process of creating critical cultural consciousness through constant and continual self-reflection. What guides us in such critical self-reflection is our inherited culture derived from the time-tested traditions of the cultural community into which each of us is born. Our learned knowledge and lived experience of other cultural discourse

domains not only expand our cultural horizon but also clarify and solidify our individual inherited cultural heritage. This critical self-reflection helps us to identify and understand what is good and bad about our own culture, and what is good and bad about other cultures. In other words, in understanding other cultures, we understand our own culture better; in understanding our own, we understand other cultures better. This is the hallmark of an individual's complex cultural growth. (Kumaravadivelu 2008: 5-6)

According to Kumaravadivelu the goal of this critical approach to culture consists in cultural transition because it asks learners to evaluate “personal identity, collective identities, society and culture, and stereotypes.” (Birch 2009: 50) *Global cultural consciousness* helps people to understand the cause of social injustice and inequality and empowers them to address these social issues. Thus, Kumaravadivelu's concept subsumes Staub's notion of *critical consciousness* and *critical loyalty* under one term. (ibid)

[...] [C]ritical consciousness is the capacity to evaluate information independently rather than simply adopting group or authority opinions. Critical loyalty is a commitment to balance local welfare with universal welfare, instead of loyalty to group policies despite conflict with universal principles. It means that people balance their good with the good of other people in the world, leading to constructive patriotism, and therefore adds another dimension to global cultural consciousness, the dimension of species identity. (ibid)

In his book *Cultural Globalization and Language Education* Kumaravadivelu outlines five major changes that have to take place in teaching and learning culture in the 21st century in order to foster global cultural consciousness. Before I come to these five points, I first have to describe the cultural reality we are exposed to today.

6.1.2. Cultural Realism

The first fundamental factor that needs to be considered when dealing with cultures in the 21st century is *cultural connectivity*. This term refers to the fact that cultures cannot be looked at in isolation as they are interconnected and influence each other substantially. Rigid cultural borders are a social construct and are permanently transgressed by individuals. (Kumaravadivelu 2008: 170)

Furthermore, culture is complex as it cannot be clearly defined and therefore remains an elusive concept that results in cultural stereotyping of the self and the other and cultural “Otherization”. It is a frequent phenomenon that members of one culture consider themselves to be superior to other cultures. (ibid)

Another important factor is *cultural globality*. Through the process of globalization cultures are shaped by each other with very high speed. These changes of the cultural capital give rise to two parallel processes of cultural homogenization and cultural heterogenization, which is a source for unpleasant tensions and even serious conflicts. On the one hand, individuals regard the cultural influences of global information systems, the World Wide Web and through migration as an enrichment, while, on the other hand, they fear the loss of their cultural heritage. (Kumaravadivelu 2008: 170-171)

Cultural reality is characterized by four realities: the global reality that makes the world seem smaller and close-knit; the national reality that is marked by the return to nationalism as a response to cultural homogenization; the social reality that is established and preserved by families and communities; and finally the individual reality that portrays “the individual as complex, contradictory, and dynamic.” (171) These realities are interrelated and this relationship has caused more “ethnic, racial, religious, and national consciousness as well as tensions among the people of the world.” (ibid)

Naturally, the above described realities influence the formation of *cultural identity*. The impact differs from person to person as well as within an individual. It should not be forgotten that culture is also commodified by global free-market economy and its production of artificial identities. “In these circumstances, the individual is both a sufferer and a doer, sometimes succumbing to the pressures brought on by controlling realities and sometimes succeeding to exercise a degree of agency in the formation of self-identity.” (ibid) If personal agency is sustained, the individual is able to appropriate cultural capital in order to contribute to individual cultural development but also to bring about cultural change in wider society. (Kumaravadivelu 2008: 172)

These five factors lay the foundation for culture learning and teaching in the era of globalization. Foreign language education cannot ignore the effect globalization has on the cultural identity of the individual as well as the whole nation. These current circumstances call for certain pedagogical priorities that help to promote *global cultural consciousness* in learners. (ibid)

6.1.2.1. The Five Shifts

Kumaravadivelu suggests five principal shifts in the practice of culture and language teaching and learning that comprise several elements of language education. (Kumaravadivelu 2008: 172) Although Kumaravadivelu is no practitioner of critical pedagogy, some of his ideas can directly be related to it. The shifts are the following:

- a) from target language community to targeted cultural community,
- b) from linguistic articulation to cultural affiliation,
- c) from cultural information to cultural transformation,
- d) from passive reception to critical reflection, and
- e) from interested text to informed context. (Kumaravadivelu 2008: 172)

(a) From target language community to targeted cultural community

As opposed to the traditional focus on the culture associated with the target language community, the foreign language classroom has to expand the cultural capital dealt with. The exclusive occupation with the target language community's culture does not take into account contemporary cultural change and also disregards the learner's need for the development of *global cultural consciousness*. The exposure to a second culture is definitely not sufficient to prepare students for the challenges of economic and cultural globalization. The intercultural competence is restricted to one new cultural reality that stands opposite the huge variety of realities in the world.

Consequently, the teacher, together with the students, has to determine a so called *targeted cultural community*, a selection of diverse cultural communities from around the globe that become the focus in the foreign language classroom. As it is impossible to introduce the learners to all the cultures that exist on planet Earth, it is necessary to choose a cluster of cultural groups and the corresponding norms that play a role in the everyday life of the respective students. Language policy planners as well as teachers may determine certain criteria for the selection that are based on national, regional and also global developments. (172-174) In order to provide an illustrative example, in Austria it might be useful to include cultural communities from Eastern Europe, as they make up the major group of migrants.

Additionally, it might be interesting to talk about cultures in the United States due to their global importance, China due to its growing economic role as well as Islamic cultures due to their increasing relevance in the European context. (Kumaravadivelu 2008: 174) As far as the global importance of the United States is concerned, I would like to point to the possibility to deal with the neo-liberal ideology. Neo-liberalism can be associated with the United States that succeeded in enforcing their cultural norms on a global scale. (Shah 2010: n.p.) It is the ideas of American individualism and consumerism that have been widely accepted by people worldwide-by some more than by others. Economic globalization can therefore be attributed to cultural homogenization and the supremacy of American values and lifestyles, which is often referred to as “Westernization”. (Kumaravadivelu 2008: 39) Accordingly, the origin of neo-liberalism might be an interesting aspect to look at in the English language classroom with regard to the dominant cultural group.

Although the target language community should constitute an essential part of culture teaching, its diversity should not be neglected by exclusively concentrating on the dominant group. Taking only the US and Great Britain as a representative example of the English speaking world is definitely not appropriate. Asian and African cultures as well as minorities in the US and UK have to be discussed in order to allow a broader and more realistic picture of this language community. (Kumaravadivelu 2008: 174-175) It can be asked how “Africans” are portrayed in the media and as a countermovement to these representations, the students should get the possibility to occupy themselves with positive developments on the continent and the cultures, literature and everyday life of the different countries and communities. The traditional value system of Hindu India, for instance, with its values of asceticism, renunciation and the striving for being in harmony with the larger cosmic landscape is another interesting topic in GCE and its striving for peace, justice and sustainability. Naturally, in this context, it has to be avoided that India is represented as a monolithic and homogeneous country that is the complete opposite to the Western system. India’s religious and cultural diversity as well as the impact of the processes of globalization on the country’s culture and traditions are subjects that lend themselves perfectly to the discussion in the English language classroom. Furthermore, teachers have to be careful not to glorify India or any other country/culture. It is essential to also always make those aspects of a culture subject of discussion that do not correspond to the values of the Earth Charter. In the case of India, for instance, the class could talk about the rigorous caste-system, a social

system that divides people according to their social status, which conflicts with the idea of equal dignity of all human beings.

These ideas are in accordance with the notion of *difference* in critical pedagogy. Giroux (1991, 1992) responded to the postmodern idea of *difference* with the establishment of a so called *border pedagogy* that calls for the integration of non-Western content in the curriculum. This approach puts particular emphasis on formerly subordinate cultural communities. Furthermore it negates the notion of a stable and unchangeable cultural identity and highlights its dynamic nature in evolving society that is characterized by multiculturalism and corresponding racial and ethnic hybridity. The *pedagogy of difference* reacts to this social reality by bringing new knowledge and perspectives into the classroom. “It aims at legitimising students’ identities and expanding the range of possible options by promoting their critical experience of different cultural codes, in sum, at enabling them to make full use of their capabilities.” (Guilherme 2002: 44) These other perspectives are not only included in the lesson plan to talk about new topics but to critically reflect upon foreign cultures’ underlying ideologies, their portrayal, and their social conventions. The close examination of foreign cultural codes should permit students to relate unfamiliar “meanings and interests” (46) to their own context. Guilherme (ibid) notes that the new concepts will mirror their own ideas and feelings and “by becoming critically aware of them, students will identify and clarify their own struggles, points of view, predispositions, which are likely to help them make more enlightened choices.” (43-46)

This idea is crucial in foreign language education as it completely changes its basic characteristics and its content. Language teaching based on critical pedagogy has to distance itself from “linguistic and cultural canons and standards” (Phipps and Guilherme 2004: 4) and ought to be open to *difference*. (ibid)

(b) From linguistic articulation to cultural affiliation

The second shift in foreign language teaching is characterized by the move away from models of intercultural competence that solely focus on the cultural capital of, and conversations with the target language community, like Byram’s model for instance does. Kumaravadilevu uses the term *cultural affiliation* to indicate the effort of people to establish connections with members of different cultural groups. The concept draws attention to the dynamic nature of cultural identity formation and stands for the recognition of multiple

identities, the acknowledgement of the social construction of ethnicity and race and the acceptance of the creation of new communities. (Kumaravadivelu 2008: 175-177)

Affiliation as cultural performance is consistent with the demands of cultural realism aimed at developing global cultural consciousness in our learners. Such a consciousness [...] requires the cultivation of a critically reflective mind that can help learners change their basic attitudes toward their own and toward other cultures. (177-178)

The modification of the students' countenance calls for the following third alteration in foreign language teaching and learning:

(c) From cultural information to cultural transformation

It is a fact that in the foreign language classroom information-oriented approaches to culture prevail. Learners are provided with information about the cultural values and practices of the target language community, which can be criticized for perceiving cultures as "static products or facts that may be collected, codified, objectified, and presented to learners in discrete items." (178) This approach to culture runs the risk of promoting stereotypes as it does not take into consideration cultural variation with regard to individuals and regions. (ibid)

In the age of cultural globalization and the information age adolescents have experiences with information technology, the mass media and contact to peers of different cultural background and therefore bring a certain cultural knowledge and awareness but also flexibility to the classroom. In their daily lives they get in contact with diverse cultural knowledge that they process in their interaction with different social groups. They show the ability "to negotiate very effectively the intricate relationship between language, culture, and group membership." (Kumaravadivelu 2008: 180)

For that reason it is the task of the teacher to use the learner's prior knowledge as a basis for the development of *global cultural consciousness*, which turns cultural information into *cultural transformation*. *Cultural transformation* can be defined as a constant renegotiation of one's own identity during which the "other" is integrated into the "we" and the old "we" is questioned critically. "This transformation process opens up new pathways to the exploration of new meaning to our world of experience." (ibid)

Cultural transformation requires a fourth shift with regard to pedagogic priorities:

(d) From passive reception to critical reflection

If the students should be given the possibility to explore cultures for themselves they have to be endowed with the capability of *critical cultural reflectivity* that enables them to apprehend and evaluate:

- how global, national, social, and individual realities shape personal identity formation in complex and sometimes contradictory ways;
- how affective and cognitive demands of critical mind engagement will challenge one's conception of self and society;
- how multiple subject positioning according to gender, age, class, ethnicity, etc.. are shaped by the social, political, and cultural environment one is accustomed to;
- how cultural stereotypes determine the way people perceive themselves and others; and
- how difficult and sometimes disturbing dialogues can bring about a change of basic attitudes towards one's own culture and toward other cultures. (Kumuravadivelu 2008: 181)

In the language classroom both, teachers and learners, become cultural informants that support each other in their attempt to comprehend culture in the age of globalization. Doing this, they can make use of critically reflective techniques such as *critical ethnography*. Ethnography can be defined as a scientific research strategy that can be applied to investigate cultural groups. While conventional ethnography describes cultural behavior on the basis of observations, interviews and data analysis, *critical ethnography* goes beyond description, being mainly reflective. Critical ethnographers acknowledge that cultural identity is socially constructed and therefore "their task is not merely to discover and describe cultural life as it exists, but to interrogate and interpret it critically in order to bring out the multiplicity of meaning associated with it." (183) Beside observation, interview and discussion *critical ethnography* also comprises *thick description* and *thick explanation*, the process by which the investigator analyzes the same data again and again in order to take into consideration all influencing factors and ultimately grasp the complex nature of cultural identity. (182-184) This is a relatively complex and time-consuming undertaking that is probably not easily applicable to the classroom. On that account I advocate critical dialogue as a means of analyzing the learners' cultural experiences thoroughly.

In my opinion *critical ethnography* has to be embedded in critical pedagogy, where learning takes on a more dialogical character and the students have the opportunity to share and discuss their findings with the whole group and the teacher. Through this dialogue the

learners can more deeply reflect upon the cultural identities they deal with and gathered information about because the contribution of the peers and the teacher, who are also cultural informants, help to consider more factors in the analysis. Consequently, I argue that *thick description* and *thick explanation* could be replaced with *critical dialogue* as it is suggested by critical pedagogy. How this dialogue looks like exactly and in how far it triggers *critical reflection* was already discussed in detail in chapter five.

Critical ethnography and *critical dialogue* enable learners to approach cultures and their representations more critically and to question cultural information that can be found in “interested texts.” This leads to the last shift necessary for the foreign language classroom’s adaptation to cultural globalization. (Kumaravadivelu 2008: 186)

(e) From interested text to informed context

This change is related to the teaching materials used in the classroom. The teachers should opt for authentic materials in preference to textbooks. Authentic materials are produced for real-life communication and are not produced for pedagogical purposes. (Tomlinson 1997: viii) Teachers and students tend to adhere too much to the textbook and as a result it often happens that teachers simply pass on cultural information that frequently is absolutely uninteresting for pupils and does not at all challenge distorted student images. Furthermore, textbooks are definitely not neutral, reflecting a certain perspective that is implicitly or explicitly imposed on teachers as well as learners. Sometimes carefully selected or designed materials and methods do also convey subtle messages (the hidden curriculum) that may have unintentional effects on the students. (Kumaravadivelu 2008: 186) Of course, authentic materials may have the same undesired effect on learners since spoken and written texts are never completely neutral. However, if the teacher manages to integrate materials from a variety of different authentic sources, the students get to know multiple perspectives and can form their own opinion more easily, as they are not continuously confronted with the same viewpoint or the same foci.

There are numerous textbooks on culture on the market that focus on the cultural practices of the mainstream culture and compare these practices with those of cultural minority groups. Some deal predominantly with the target language culture, while others again are designed in a culturally neutral way and aim at representing the culture of the learners. This separation of language and culture is not adequate as language and culture are closely connected and

cannot be looked at in isolation from each other. Yet other alternatives are the mix of native culture, target culture and a selection of cultures of the speech community of the target language and the inclusion of global issues such as racism, human rights and the environment. (Kumaravadivelu 2008: 188)

According to Kumaravadivelu, these various possibilities do not prepare students properly for the challenges of *cultural realism* in the age of globalization. He maintains that the promotion of *global cultural consciousness* can only be successful if the materials challenge the learners' "taken-for-granted" assumptions about the native culture and foreign cultures. The internet is an inexhaustible source of authentic information and has the advantage that the learners are familiar with it. It can be claimed that the first step in the direction of *global cultural consciousness* has been already completed due to the excessive use of the WWW and the experience of and confrontation with cultural "otherness". The new generation that has access to the global information network is privileged compared to the older generation as it does not have to deal with old prejudices. Newspaper articles, magazines but also encyclopedias are at the students' and teachers' disposal and provide an insight into the everyday cultural lives of other cultural communities. A reasonable selection of materials from the World Wide Web enables teachers and students to get a more realistic picture of the targeted cultural community they occupy themselves with. (188-189)

If the foreign language teacher tries to adhere to these pedagogic principles, foreign language teaching already makes a big step towards GCE. However, in order to make GCE in the foreign language classroom complete, it has to be based on critical pedagogy. Although Kumaravadivelu is not a practitioner of critical pedagogy, his five shifts reflect some of its key tenets such as *critical reflection* and the inclusion of other cultural groups than the target language community (difference). While he exclusively focuses on *global cultural consciousness*, critical pedagogy has the potential to nurture an overall critical attitude in learners, including *critical (global) cultural consciousness*.

Apart from developing a more critical attitude towards culture and *cultural realism*, global citizenship also requires students to identify with *global civic society* and to recognize their corresponding global responsibility. I argue that language and culture education plays an essential role in the achievement of this aim.

6.2. Identity *Globo Sapiens*

Foreign languages and especially the English language are essential for GCE as language is one of the most important aspects of social identity and therefore could also be a means by which individuals identify themselves as global citizens. (Byram 2008: 131)

Language acquisition and the corresponding acquisition of shared concepts which are inherent to the language are part of *primary socialization*. Through the process of *secondary socialization* the individual gains a sense of national belonging. Learning foreign languages and acquiring the concepts and values of these particular languages resembles both *primary* and *secondary socialization*. An additional language can start a third stage of socialization, namely so called *tertiary socialization*, which might lead to a different understanding of reality and to the identification with international groups. (133-141)

Within the framework of GCE *tertiary socialization* could lead to the acquisition of a more global identity. English makes an important contribution to the formation of a global citizen as the language is in a special position. On the one hand, it reflects the culture of English-speaking countries, but on the other hand, it is a global language that is often used in intercultural communication and therefore actually mirrors concepts and values of a lot of different cultures. Hence, the English language has the potential to bring aspects of diverse cultures together and can constantly be enriched with concepts and values but also words that derive from a whole range of dissimilar cultural communities. It provides an efficient means to compare *culture-specifics* with *culture-universals* (cf.: Byram and Guilherme 2000: 70) such as responsibility for our planet and respect for human rights. English language learning has to focus on the global dimension of the English language in order to make clear what a crucial role it plays for the establishment of cross-cultural understanding, global sustainability, peace and justice and therefore global citizenship.

6.2.1. English as a Foreign Language and GCE

Pennycook (2001:7), who established a model for the *critical pedagogy of English* within the framework of learning English as a global language, calls upon applied linguists such as foreign language teachers to get acquainted with the social and cultural significance of their work. (Guilherme 2002: 144; Birch 2009: 3)

[...] Critical applied linguistics is an approach to language-related questions that springs from an assumption that we live amid a world of pain and that applied linguistics may have an important role in either the production of or the alleviation of

some of the pain. But, it is also a view that insists not merely on the alleviation of pain but also the possibility of change. (Pennycook 2001: 7)

Global issues are especially worthy of the English language teacher's attention as the context of their work is global. The notion of English language learning as mere acquisition of a linguistic system to communicate is limiting and ignores the new responsibilities the language teacher has to his students and the world considering the global crisis we are facing in the 21st century. (Birch 2009: 4) It needs to be avoided that "[t]he social reality of language learning and teaching is represented from a narrow perspective where social context is only treated as who is talking to whom about what." (Akbari 2008: 278)

6.2.1.1. English as a Global Language

Global communication and information transfer is facilitated by linguistic homogeneity and the use of English as a lingua franca. (Birch 2009: 13) It is the world of international business, science, technology and aviation as well as the world of popular music that is distinctly dominated by English. (Lochtman and Kappel 2008: 32) English is a language that is needed and learned by all social classes because in most countries English language instruction starts quite early at school and it is a requirement in many professions. (Birch 2009: 130) Although English has developed into a global or international language, up until now there is no lingua franca educational standard and therefore its use is based on the national norms of Anglophone countries. (45) Consequently, the teaching of English as a global language becomes a disputed practice that provokes controversy among scholars.

On the one hand, there are those who focus on the potential of English as a global language and hold an attitude that is frequently referred to as *English ecology*. This positive outlook on the diffusion of English is supported by people who value languages as an additional resource they can make use of. This perspective gives prominence to the additive form of language learning that equips learners with a new instrument for communication. Language is considered to be a possibility to bring people and their ideas closer together. (Birch 2009: 16-17)

On the other hand, global English runs the risk of developing into an act of *linguistic and cultural imperialism*. (14) Language teachers who are informed by critical pedagogy are mindful of the political dimension of language education.

[...] [A]ny language is part of the wider semiotic system within which it was shaped and is infused with ideological, historical, and political symbols and relations. The identity of a language is shaped by what has happened to it, and what it has done to others; if we look back upon the history of English and its close connection with the spread of colonialism, we find ourselves pausing, pondering, and admitting that English is not an innocent language. (Akbari 2008: 277)

6.2.1.2. Linguistic Imperialism-The Language of Critique

“A working definition of *English linguistic imperialism* is that *the dominance of English is asserted and maintained by the establishment and continuous reconstitution of structural and cultural inequalities between English and other languages.*” (Phillipson 1992: 47)

With regard to *English linguistic imperialism* it needs to be distinguished between a strong and a weak form. First, there are those people who opted themselves for the acquisition of English as their second or foreign language. In this case the learning of English can be called additive, as it provides the speaker with an additional communicative system for self-representation. Even though this form can be regarded as a linguistic and cultural enrichment of the individual, English can still be seen as a means of preserving the political and economical hegemonic status of English-speaking countries. In the context of colonialism, there are those individuals on whom the English language was imposed and who were either forced to completely give up their original mother tongue or managed to keep their linguistic heritage as bilingual identities. This process is subtractive as the speech community was deprived of its language and culture. As a member of the dominant speech community imperialists do not see any point in learning a second or foreign language as they can perfectly get through everywhere in the world with their native tongue. Furthermore, as native-speakers they believe that they possess the language, while non-native speakers can only borrow it and in their opinion the official standards of English (British and American) are superior to nonstandard or foreign varieties. This *linguistic imperialism* is also detectable on the market and in the service sector, where the instruction of English as a second or foreign language runs at enormous profits. The worldwide circulation of textbooks spreads consumerism and materialism by representing an image of international English that is built on the values of wealth, leisure, and individualism. (Birch 2009: 13-15) All told, the diffusion of English as a global language definitely involves negative aspects that cannot be ignored by teachers and have to be made subject of discussion in the classroom.

A considerable part of the work of critical pedagogy has been dedicated to the exposition of the underlying values of the diffusion and the furtherance of English and the criticism towards assumptions regarding the practice of English language teaching that are still based on the ideal of the native-speaker. (Akbari 2008: 277)

The discourse of CP, however, is the discourse of liberation and hope; it is the discourse of liberation since it questions the legitimacy of accepted power relations and recognizes the necessity of going beyond arbitrary social constraints; it is also the discourse of hope since it provides marginalized groups to explore ways of changing the status quo and improve their social conditions. In applied linguistics, CP is an acknowledgement both of the socio-political implications of language teaching and at the same time the possibility of change for both students and teachers. [...] For these people, critical pedagogy is liberating in the sense that it legitimizes the voices of practitioners and learners, and gives them scope to exercise power in their local context. (ibid)

There is an alternative to language teaching that bases its contents on the culture of the target language and determines the linguistic competence of the native-speaker as the ultimate objective.

As has already been indicated earlier in the chapter (6.1.1.), the task to define a native speaker is terribly contentious because “[n]ative speakers are multifarious, have competences that differ from each other and vary over a lifetime and are often multilingual.” (Byram 2008: 57-58) For instance, in the UK but also in many other places worldwide new linguistic varieties emerged as a result of the fusion of elements of a regional language with “Standard-English (SE)”. (Birch 2009: 13) It is problematic to assign the status of the native-speaker to dominant speech communities such as US-Americans or Brits, while refusing so called linguistic varieties this prestige. Besides, the norms and traditions of the many native cultures, be it Canada, the US; Scotland or rather the Caribbean and Africa, differ significantly in many respects and it is not only impossible but also useless to become a specialist on specific cultural habits and customs if the learned language is needed in a variety of different contexts that do not necessarily involve encounters with native speakers. (Lochtman and Kappel 2008: 32-33)

This leads to another problem that uncritical language teaching poses, apart from the difficulty that arises from defining a native-speaker. The argument that individuals acquire English and learn about the culture of the target culture, whatever it may be, in order to be able to communicate with the members of the Anglophone speech community is absolutely

outdated. Of course, this justification is valid with regard to people who have the intention to settle in the UK or North America either temporarily or forever, whereas to the majority of language learners this reason does evidently not apply. (Akbari 2008: 278) It is the emergence of English as a global or international language that gives English language teaching a new meaning and requires its practitioners to redefine the identity behind the language they teach.

English has now turned into an international language, and due to the scope of its application both geographically and communicatively, it has developed certain features which are not part of any specific national character. In other words, English has become de-nationalized and re-nationalized as a result of its spread as the world lingua franca. (Akbari 2008: 278)

It can be inferred that the linguistic standards represented by those in the “inner circle” of English language users may lose their validity in a post-colonial, multicultural reality where there is a predominance of English language users who belong to the “outer and expanding circles” by a ratio of more than two to one”. (Savignon 2007: 210) There is a much greater likelihood that learners of English will engage in conversations with speakers whose native language is not English (Lochtman and Kappel 2008: 32) Proficiency in English in this context can be described with the term *expert speaker* to avoid the expression native-speaker like that is simply inappropriate. (Birch 2009: 14)

However, talk in an international environment is only successful if there is a mutually understandable standard at work and thus some argue that particularly in the case of English language learning stands in need of a linguistic standard that prevents the appearance of a range of “mutually incomprehensible Englishes” (Byram 2008: 58) that in the end lose their practicality in the international sphere. Undeniably, this argument is strong and valid and leads to the conclusion that as long as there is no official standard of English as a lingua franca, *linguistic imperialism* will prevail to a certain extent, namely with regard to linguistic competence. (ibid) Nevertheless, the fact remains that the model of the native speaker has to be challenged by language teachers if learning English should lead to the adoption of a new, more global identity.

The native speaker, perhaps in some idealised form, can be the model in one competence but need not be in all. For if the native speaker were taken as a model for socio-cultural competence, then the ultimate consequence would be an identification with a particular ‘context’, the acquisition of the ‘conventional meanings’ of native

speakers in that context, and the complete familiarisation with the use of those conventional meanings in that context. (ibid)

Using language in the way it is used by the native speaker implicates that the knowledge of the language learner takes on a subordinate role to that of the native speaker. (ibid) The neglect of the non-native speaker's knowledge prevents him/her from the communication of his/her own cultural values and conceptualizations, which is one of the major needs in most communicative situations. People have the desire to present themselves and their cultural background in a conversation and therefore it is totally misguided to foreground the target culture in language teaching. Especially in international language schools and culturally heterogeneous high school environments in Europe and North-America, the language classroom could develop into an interesting "intercultural forum" as a whole range of different cultures come together and enter into a dialogue with each other. Accordingly, the English/foreign language classroom should focus on the furtherance of the competence that enables students to give voice to their own culture. (Akbari 2008: 279)

6.2.1.3. English Ecology-The Language of Possibility

Pennycook's model (1994) of the *critical pedagogy of English* stresses the importance of making the global language a means of representation for different individuals and cultures in order to account for "the plurality of cultural realisations in the global language." (Guilherme 2002: 144) He thinks of English as a global language as a possibility that allows people to be heard on a global scale. (ibid)

Pennycook develops the potential for a critical pedagogy to the full since he links the concept of 'voice' to 'agency' by empowering students/speakers of English as a global language into subjects who perform their own representations and by understanding a critical pedagogy of English as cultural politics. (145)

By using the term *worldliness of English* Pennycook (1994: 71) makes clear that English is "globally general" while simultaneously being "locally specific". (Birch 2009: 17) This so called *glocalization* becomes apparent when looking at colonial history, where English was part of colonial practices, while at the same time it was re-invented as a *language of resistance and transformation*. For that reason, language has to be regarded as a dynamic and performative force that does not only mirror culture and society but has the potential to actively shape it. Pennycook believes that language gives humans the possibility to envision and consequently follow the path for a better future. His expression *worldliness* of English

denotes “people’s use of English in a deep way that balances respect for diversity of other cultures and languages with universal concern and responsibility.” (18)

“Worldly English” contrasts with simplistic notions of English as an International Language (EIL): that English is simply a way for people to communicate with each other and that thing will magically turn out well. It is a way to resist English that assumes values like consumerism and materialism. Instead, the worldliness of English has a potential linkage to global citizenship, to the dialogue for sustainable peacebuilding. (ibid)

This linkage is not only potential but already part of reality. English is used as a means of communication by *global civil society*, the set of institutions, including non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that disapprove of capitalism which is accompanied by economic exploitation and dedicate themselves to the enhancement of human rights and ecological integrity. Beside other languages, English plays an essential role in the dialogue between many different cultures in this circle. It helps to strengthen shared attitudes and behavior and facilitates global political action. (12 & 36) It is this *global civil society* that was involved in the development of the Earth Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and thereby provided a *global civic culture* or *global ethics* that constitutes an integral part of global citizenship education. This “international altruistic community” (36) embodies a new image and a new attitude of English speakers that can solely be furthered by critical and *glocalized pedagogy*. This kind of pedagogy connects the local and the global in the sense that it uses the learners’ cultural knowledge and experiences as a point of departure, while concurrently questioning it through the comparison with other cultures. The indigenous culture is examined for elements that could serve as a source for *global ethics* but also for components that might require modification. *Global ethics* as it is exhibited in the Earth Charter is at the students’ disposal for comparison but always has to be specified and possibly slightly altered in the local context concerned. “Thus, the global is expected to form and inform the local culture.” (134) Birch (2009: 134-135) notes that this creative interrelation of the global and the local should also be reflected in the language system, which means that the teacher should permit and even encourage students to avail themselves of “local cultural and linguistic resources, borrowing and code-switching as needed so as to contribute to the worldliness of English.” (Birch 2009: 135) This flexibility does not come without any risks as students might abuse this granted freedom by overusing their native tongue in the foreign language classroom. However, this danger has to be accepted if cultural hegemony is to be eliminated in learning English.

The integration of and respect for the learner's culture could surely have a positive influence on their *integrative motivation*. The ideal of the global citizen is probably more attractive to language learners, who have severe difficulties identifying with the Anglophone culture and its inherent values. The fact that one's own culture is appreciated and preserved in the EFL-classroom because it is a vital constituent of *global civic society* could be a strong motivational factor that eventually makes the language learning process easier. (Birch 2009: 36-37)

All in all, the English language classroom definitely offers an appropriate environment for engaging in GCE. Firstly, the global language that gives voice to all cultures helps students to identify with the image of the global citizen who contributes to *global civic culture*. The *worldliness* of English makes available a language of possibility in the literal sense that can perform the function of a *glocalized* tool for dialogue about and reflection upon both, themes from the wider society and the students' everyday lives. Therefore it bridges the gap between the local and the global, which is essential for the effectiveness of GCE.

Secondly, the contents taught in the English lesson reach a large number of people with different social backgrounds, which is of utmost importance for the spread of *global ethics* and *pro-social behavior*. Our future presidents and diplomats are not the only ones who are responsible for a just and peaceful society as peacebuilding needs to be a bottom-up process initiated by the core of society. It is the public in its whole plurality, hence the future builders, policemen, secretaries, and parents, to mention just a few, that can contribute to a more sustainable life. (Birch 2009: 130)

In addition to the possibility to use the foreign language classroom for *critical reflection* upon cultures, the identification with more international groups and the preparation for productive intercultural dialogue, there are some more arguments for the integration of GCE in language and culture education that must not be neglected.

6.3. Global Issues & Motivation

A further reason for the applicability of foreign language education to GCE is the simple fact that the foreign language teacher is constantly under the pressure to select topics for his/her lessons that are interesting for young people in order to motivate them to speak and give them the possibility to practice their language skills. The integration of current worldwide affairs can certainly help out with finding authentic and attractive topics to talk about. Each year Market and Opinion Research International (MORI) carries out a poll of approximately 3500 adolescents who are between eleven and sixteen years old on behalf of the Department for International Development (DfID). The report of 2004, which is the latest report available to me, displays that the majority of young people is interested in global issues. 79% want to get more information about the events in developing countries, 54% are of the opinion that global issues should be covered at school and 65% were worried about the poverty in developing countries. (Oxfam 2006b: 4)

6.4. Global Issues and Critical Literacy

This interest in global affairs is gratifying and alarming at the same time. The above mentioned report also shows that 89% of young people get the information about developing nations from TV, 66% from the newspaper and 42% from the internet. In the age of global mass media it is important to teach students to be critical about what they read. (ibid) Every day young people are bombarded with sensational news from all over the world and stereotypical representations of other countries and cultures. While some nations are usually depicted in a very negative light, as the perpetrators and the root of all evil, others are constantly pictured positively, as the savior or the victim. These images transmit a distorted version of reality that has to be looked at critically and calls for a critical teacher, who opens the students' eyes for the world behind the word.

Teaching *critical literacy* is not exclusively the task of the foreign language teacher but rather that of teachers in general, however it is left to the foreign language teacher to bring in new perspectives by making use of foreign journalism. Especially the English language teacher can take advantage of the numerous sources that are available on the internet in English and can occasionally opt for the *Times of India* or the *Mail & Guardian* of South Africa to get a more diversified picture of global affairs. This way, students become aware how representation differs substantially from country to country and learn that they are often

biased in order to serve certain interests and sustain power relations. Of course, in order to enable students to get a new perspective on a matter, it is not enough to simply bring these texts to the classroom and put the focus on reading comprehension and new vocabulary. It is the engagement in *critical literacy* that can bring about attitudinal changes in the learners. Education for *critical literacy* does not exclusively focus on mass media but also on literary works, such as novels, short stories, poems or plays as it is often used in the foreign language classroom. The following passage first deals with *critical literacy* in general and then enlarges upon *critical media literacy* and its possibilities for foreign language learning within the framework of GCE.

6.4.1. Critical Literacy

Lenski (2008) offers a straightforward definition of *critical literacy*, stating: “Critical literacy is developing a set of beliefs about reading that focus on examining a text’s social and cultural implications.” (Lenski 2008: 229 quoted in Shanklin 2009: 44) *Critical literacy* regards reading not only as the mere understanding of an author’s message but views a text as a representation of reality from a specific context. (Shanklin 2009: 44) The need to engage learners in *critical literacy* can be explained by critical educators’ fundamental assumptions about language, society and power. First of all, the supremacy of any social or cultural group is sustained by means of convincing individuals of the “normality” and inevitability of the status quo. Language is crucial to this kind of persuasion because the respective ideologies and current discourses are transmitted through texts. These texts reflect a “partial and interested” (Morgan 2004: 105) version of reality and prompt the recipient (reader, listener or viewer) to accept this interpretation of the world, which, in fact, is only a construction. Yet, language also has the potential to challenge prevailing power relations and cultural dominance, which is the motivation for *critical literacy*. Furthermore, it has to be kept in mind that “texts are constructed from a range of possible language options.” (ibid) The choice of the language is definitely a social one as certain rules and norms correspond to the literary practices of the dominant social/cultural community.

That is, such rules of use are social conventions, not natural, proper or superior, since language and the texts made with its resources are constructed within a culture or subculture and for a society in a particular place and time and with particular relations of power between people. This context influences what is said and how-and what remains unexpressed. (ibid)

Furthermore, these texts withhold the voice of some groups of society. Their partiality and incompleteness keep certain matters secret. These issues are regarded as so obvious that they do not have to be articulated. Recipients make use of their so called “commonsense”, an unconscious ideological opinion, in order to deal with these matters. (Morgan 2004: 106)

Finally, *critical literacy* is based on the assumption that meaning is produced by readings. According to this view, a text reflects a certain ‘Weltanschauung’ that is related to the social, cultural, and political convictions of the author. Students or other recipients interpret the author’s words from their own perspective and context. One single piece of information read by two different people can therefore convey two totally different meanings. (Shanklin 2009: 44)

The inclusion of *critical literacy* into the foreign language classroom practice requires the shift from analysis to critique. There is a set of questions that have to be considered in the planning of a critical literacy unit. These questions are not intended to be put directly to the learners, yet they ought to serve as a guide when the teacher prepares a text and designs activities surrounding this piece of writing. The consideration of these questions guarantees that students get the opportunity to reflect critically upon “the word-world relationships”. (Morgan 2004: 106) It follows a list of these questions:

- Where does this text come from? (This deals with the historical and cultural context of the text.)
- What kind of text is this? (This asks about intertextuality-how texts resemble other texts in their genre and conventions and draw on them for their meanings.)
- What social functions does this text serve? (We note here not only the text’s overt purpose to get certain things done within a social context, but also the covert ideological work that the text does. This is further elicited by the next question.)
- How does this text construct a version of reality and knowledge? And what is left out of this story? (As noted above, the resources of language offer us particular, partial, knowledges and ‘truths’, and texts therefore do certain kinds of social, cultural and political work.)
- How does the text represent the reader (or viewer or listener) and set up a position for reading? And what other positions might there be for reading? (Any text offers readers a particular perspective on its subject: ‘Stand here’, it says, ‘and see how the world makes sense. Be this kind of person, who sees things in this way.’)
- How does this text set up its authority and encourage your belief? And how might its authority be deconstructed and challenged, where its ethical stance is at odds with yours? (All texts in one way or another seek to persuade us, through the resources of language, that they should be listened to. We may

listen and look, with delight in some cases-while negotiating how far we will concur with their views.) (106-107)

Paulo Freire sharpened the mind of illiterate farmers in Brazil with an approach to *critical literacy* that can easily be transferred to the first world context. I would like to give a brief overview of this work in order to provide teachers with some ideas how to include *critical literacy* in the foreign language classroom.

First of all, the students have to identify key words, concepts and artefacts in texts and then codify them. Codification is the concept recorded in many different forms such as “photographs, drawings, collages, stories, written dialogues, movies, songs.” (Wallerstein 1983: 19-20 quoted in Wink 2000: 44) They can be defined as actual physical expressions that include all the aspects of the issue into one single representation. Codes must not be degraded to mere visual support for teaching, as they can trigger critical thinking. This code “codifies” into one statement a problem or contradiction that individuals face in their lives. (Wallerstein 1983: 19-20 paraphrased in Wink 2000: 44)

Shor (1980) worked with the concept of the common hamburger in order to explain the reality and forms of life that are inherent to these key concepts. In the case of the hamburger it is the global economics of the beef supply, the environmental degradation caused by grazing cattle and packaging materials, “the working conditions of employees, the lifestyle ideologies promoted in advertising campaigns, the cultural effects of a fast food culture, the health consequences of such foods on people who consume them regularly, and so on.” (Morgan 2004: 107)

The close investigation of these various realities and their complex nature triggers *conscientization* that can basically be described as “enlightened consciousness”. This process of *conscientization* is followed by social action such as parodying commercials or adverts, the designing and circulating of informational leaflets, launching campaigns in order to make sure that the school canteen offers healthy food and also informs about the positive effects on the individual’s body and mind. (ibid)

There are various other approaches with a focus on critical analysis from a social justice stance, ranging from ethnographic research on the literary practices of cultural communities to the focus on intertextuality as it appears in specific works of literature. I do not intend to elaborate on these different types, as I prefer to talk about how the reconstruction of textual meanings and social relations can be used as an efficient means to nurture more critical global citizens. (Morgan 2004: 108)

There are a great number of activities where students can intervene in texts in a playful way and thereby get to know important concepts. These activities have to be accompanied by reflection in order to ensure that students fully comprehend the “constructedness of texts and the consequences of such constructions.” (ibid)

The following chart lists several possible activities and explains their implications for the learners’ better understanding of the nature of texts.

Activities	Concepts
(re)writing the end; stopping short, concluding differently	Constructedness of the text; what issue is taken to be resolved by the given ending?
Retrieval chart, listing words used of the participants or significant settings or objects	Representations through discourses and language resources
The other side of the story; rewriting a section to change the reader’s allegiances, sympathies	Gaps and silences; text as someone’s story; revealing invited reading positions
Changing the narrative viewpoint or focalisation: first person, or third person	Different language choices position readers differently
Gendered character: considering the effect of switching the protagonist’s gender	Revealing discourses about masculinity and femininity (absent from the story)
Telling counter-narratives and stories from other cultures	Voicing alternative discourses: representing someone else’s knowledges, interests

Table 3: Critical literacy activities and concepts (Morgan 2004: 109)

The rewriting of texts can, if not even should, take on the form of satire or parody. *Critical literacy* does not necessarily have to be skeptical as frequently the most efficient means of criticizing society are funny texts. They draw attention to the faults of people and institutions in a witty manner and as a consequence weaken the naturalness of our unjust system. This kind of creative activity is a form of socio-political critique that reveals the hidden intentions behind texts. In combination with critical analysis it enables students to recognize and put up resistance against “social abuses” (ibid), which is a useful competence that young individuals definitely need in their lives outside the school building. (ibid)

By incorporating such activities into the foreign language classroom, *critical literacy* teachers strengthen the young girls’ and boys’ social imagination that makes it possible to use emotions and attitudes in a productive way in the interest of social justice. *Critical social imagination* is based on a profound understanding of the purpose of texts and discourses to tell us what is valuable, feasible and obligatory for us. Furthermore, it encompasses the personal quality of sensitivity that permits the learners to put themselves in the individuals’ position, whose lives are affected and formed by respective representations. Finally, social

imagination requires a “hopeful imagination” (Morgan 2004: 110) of the possibilities of dealing with those texts, of reconstructing them by the production of one’s own versions and of actually redefining what is desirable and manageable. (ibid)

It is the task of the foreign language teacher to render the work done in classrooms as varied, imaginative, critical, inventive, aesthetic, performative and productive as possible.

Especially the role of aesthetics must not be underestimated by educators as it plays an essential role in *critical literacy*. ‘Aesthetic’ stands for the receptor’s “affective, cognitive, appreciative engagement with the structures and features of texts”. (ibid) Apart from the political dimension, the texts used in the foreign language classroom ought to be selected for the pleasures and contentment that can be derived from them. On that account the teacher has to work with the critical and aesthetic alike in order to reach his aim to nurture critical citizens. It is necessary to comprehend how and why readers get totally involved in texts, irrespective of their ideological acceptability. Moreover, aesthetic has to be valued for providing “access to imagined experiences, to our appreciation of craft, to ways of knowing which are different from the purely rational-analytical.” (ibid) Finally, it is of utmost importance to develop an understanding for how individuals evaluate texts from an ethical perspective while they simultaneously show an intense emotional reaction to it. (ibid)

Although the examination of the aesthetic of a text differs substantially from the objective and analytical stance that should preferably be adopted within the context of education for *critical literacy*, it should not be totally eliminated from the foreign language classroom. The two modes of approaching texts have to be combined to fully grasp the complexities of the individuals’ responses to texts and other social entities. (Morgan 2004: 111)

At the root of evaluating is valuing. Our judgments (including our assessment of what is just or unjust inclusive or prejudicial) are founded on what we value; our political commitments and acts of thinking are based in our feelings and preferences. The critical and the aesthetic both need to be valued-and worked with-in a critical literacy practice that is adequate to our humanness. (ibid)

Admittedly, the question remains whether it is within the realms of possibility to encourage students to read for resistance, while at the same time, they should have the opportunity to read for pleasure. This criticism implies that the practice of *critical literacy* in the language classroom is limited and only partially complete. “Our teaching will inevitably be a practice shot through with contradictions and tensions, contingencies, self-sabotage and resistances from within us and from beyond.” (ibid)

6.4.2. Critical Media Literacy

Since the 21st century is a “media-saturated culture” and GCE has to make use of this media in order to bring global issues to the classroom, *critical media literacy* has to be emphasized at this point. The students need to comprehend how corporate for-profit media do their business and reflect certain political and economic interests. It ought to be discussed who possesses information and who controls the news. Kozolanka (2007:19-20) notes that the critical literacy classroom has to consist of critical reflection upon questions such as how the needs of citizens can be met when media is guided by “the profit-making and ideological imperatives of corporations.” (Kozolanka 2007: 20) Articles in the newspaper or magazines, television programs and other forms of mass media have to be examined for neo-liberal ideologies and interests, cultural stereotypes and discriminatory tendencies in order to make students aware how citizens are manipulated on a daily basis and in how far this manipulation prevents them from imagining a diverse reality.

Furthermore, the teacher has to make the learners familiar with alternative, non-profit media that really serves democratic purposes and the interest of the public. (Kozolanka 2007: 19) Lithgow highlights the importance of blogging in developing literacy skills for cultural citizenship. He claims that blogging and other forms of alternative media can affect our cultural and political reality and allow its users to regulate themselves which information is included and which is left out. (23) Reading as well as writing blogs is an activity that can easily be incorporated in the foreign language classroom. Doing this, the teacher has to stress the significance of this kind of media for democracy and active democratic citizenship. Another option are projects, where students have the opportunity to create their own newspaper or magazine or to write at least some articles. In the context of GCE, it would be the right thing to ask learners to write about local and global social and sustainability issues. They could, for instance, write a report on the ecological footprint of their school and make suggestions how to reduce it or they could conduct a survey, in which they find out about the difficulties that migrants encounter in Austria and subsequently summarize the results in an article. Another idea might be the design and distribution of leaflets in the school building, where students are, for example, invited to use reusable bottles at school in order to reduce packing material. These are just three examples of an inexhaustible pool of possible activities that can be selected according to the interests and knowledge of the students. The shift from mere reception to production of media helps learners to recognize the voice they have and to learn to use this voice to bring about change.

6.5. Communicative Competence

Another and probably the most straight-forward reason for the inclusion of GCE in foreign language teaching is the substantial role of language in citizenship education. In my short introduction to critical pedagogy it has already been indicated that social issues should best be dealt with through dialogue because problems of universal concern cannot be solved alone in silence. Secondly, talk is crucial to citizenship education as the capacity to participate in debates on local and global issues of public interest is crucial in order to be able to make use of one's voice in the democratic state. (Huddleston and Rowe 2003: 113)

Hence, if GCE is combined with foreign language learning it can contribute its share to the development of the *communicative competence* of students. The engagement in free discussions and debates helps learners to become more fluent speakers of the target language and to develop the needed competences in conversational use of language. (Hedge 2000: 277)

First of all, in discussions language learners have the opportunity to practice their *discourse competence*. They learn “how to perform the turns in discourse; how to maintain the conversation, and how to develop the topic.” (51) Strategies such as “initiating, entering, interrupting, checking, and confirming” (51-52) can be acquired through taking part in classroom discussions.

Since Hedge (2000) mentions ‘interrupting’ as an element of discourse competence, it has to be clarified that within the framework of GCE interruption is not seen as desirable communicative behavior and should rather be reduced than furthered. Additionally, GCE discussions foster the development of *strategic competence* that is needed in communicative situations, where the learners are not capable of expressing their ideas because they lack the linguistic competence to do so.

They will frequently have to use *achievement strategies* such as code-switching, paraphrasing or implicit appeals for help, when they participate in discussions. (Hedge 2000: 53)

Finally, discussions naturally also support the acquisition of *pragmatic competence* and in particular *sociolinguistic competence*. This is especially important in intercultural dialogue, where students have to adapt their contributions to the cultural setting they find themselves in. (48-49)

It becomes obvious that the integration of GCE in foreign language learning is extremely useful as far as language fluency is concerned, as citizenship education is largely based on guided as well as free discussions that require students “to link units of speech together with

facility and without strain or inappropriate slowness, or undue hesitation.” (Hedge 2000: 54) in order to keep the conversation going.

My explanations in the previous chapters clearly demonstrate the usefulness of introducing GCE and critical pedagogy in the foreign language classroom in the era of globalization. Apart from developing *critical cultural awareness* as well as *critical literacy* and the adoption of a more global identity, in the critical GCE classroom learners additionally have the possibility to enhance their *communicative competence* in the target language as critical pedagogy relies on dialogue in education. Dialogue in the form of free discussion and debates surely contributes to the improvement of the learners’ fluency in the target language, while simultaneously making students more aware of reality and their role in it. While, in chapter five I have already provided the theoretical foundation for the inclusion of dialogue into the classroom, now I would like to make some practical suggestions that can easily be adopted in foreign language lessons.

7. Developing Discussion in the GCE Foreign Language Classroom

7.1. Definition

Defining discussion is not an easy undertaking, as the concept is contested in theory and in practice alike. Within the context of GCE, I have stressed the importance of controversial issues discussions that deal with authentic political, social as well as ethical issues. Scholars advanced a variety of different definitions with diverse foci. There are some common features of all these definitions that distinguish discussion from other forms of classroom talk. First, discussion can be described as

[...] a dialogue between or among people. It involves, at a minimum, the exchange of information about a topic (e.g., a controversy, a problem, an event, a person, etc.). Second, discussion is a particular approach to constructing knowledge that is predicated on the belief that the most powerful ideas can be produced when people are expressing their ideas on a topic and listening to others express theirs. Moreover, [...] it takes many forms and is used for many purposes. (Hess 2009: 14)

GC-discussions are enriched by *exploratory talk*, which is realized “when speakers engage critically but constructively with each other’s ideas, usually in the form of statements and suggestions offered for joint consideration, leading to new forms of understanding.” (Huddleston and Rowe 2003: 124) *Exploratory talk* distinguishes itself from *disputational*, which is competitive, and *cumulative*, in which the interlocutors solely strive for a

relationship of solidarity and uncritically accept what the other says. *Exploratory talk*, however, is characterized by critical solidarity and aims at cooperation to solve a common problem. (ibid) In *exploratory talk* participants work themselves through conflict and dissent and use the Earth Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a common ground that facilitates the solution of the problem. This form of discussion lends itself perfectly for *controversial political issues* discussions, where policy proposals are identified.

7.2. Learning Objectives

Discussion employed for the purpose of GCE aim at fostering a sense of community on the global scale, while at the same time it cultivates dissent and conflict. It should help learners to internalize certain values and principles and simultaneously teaches them that ideas that they not share have to be respected. Discussion represents democracy and supports the idea that all human beings have the right to take part in public discourse and decision making. (Hess 2009: 15)

Additionally, students learn how to take part constructively and cooperatively in an interaction, which comprises critical thinking skills as well as debating skills. The competence to listen carefully to the contributions of others without interrupting as well as the capability to speak relevant and clearly are essential qualities of democratic global citizens, who engage in conversations with their fellow men in numerous contexts of everyday and professional life. (Ur 1981: 3)

Beside these important purposes, discussions are equally beneficial for content learning, which is an essential element of GCE and its knowledge and values domain, as during conversation new knowledge can be acquired and new viewpoints considered. (ibid)

It is obvious that if GCE is integrated in the foreign language classroom it also has to fulfill the purpose of catering for *efficient fluency practice*. Language learning in the interest of GCE combines social, content and language learning and therefore the teacher has to determine clear social, content and language goals in his lesson plan.

Overall, the organization of a purposeful discussion encompasses three conditions:

- A *content objective* that includes criteria for successful task completion
- A *language objective* that teaches and provides practice in the academic language needed for the task

- A *social objective* that defines the nature of the interaction (Fisher, Frey, and Rothenberg 2008: 45)

In the context of GCE, the teacher has to determine additional GCE skills that are fostered through the activity. This could be the ability to argue effectively or respect for people and things.

At first the GCE teacher decides on the skill, content and language objectives and afterwards reflects upon the social requirements of the communicative task in order not only to find a social format that enables a successful completion of the interactive activity but also to guarantee a fruitful collaboration among the learners. Table 4 gives some examples of the connection between content, language and social aims in different GCE tasks.

Activity	GCE skills	Content Purpose (GCE knowledge and attitudes)	Language Purpose	Social purpose (applicable to all three activities)
Compilation of a list of rights for the peaceful coexistence on a newly discovered planet in small groups. Comparison with the rights defined in the UDHR.	Ability to argue effectively Respect for people and things Co-operation and conflict resolution Critical thinking	Occupation with human rights as they are defined in the UDHR. Value and respect for diversity Commitment to social justice and equity	The use of “would” to talk about the conditions on your fictional planet e.g.: On our planet every human being would have the right to sleep in a warm bed. The use of the verbs “correspond, relate, compare...” e.g: Our right corresponds to right ... in the UDHR.	Adherence to the previously collectively established ground rules (e.g.: careful listening, no interrupting...)
Elaboration of a company profile on the basis of the principles of the Earth Charter in small groups.	Ability to argue effectively Critical thinking Ability to challenge injustice and inequalities Respect for people and things	Application of the ideas of the Earth Charter in a real-life context. Repetition and consolidation of the knowledge about the principles of the Charter. Social justice and equity, diversity, sustainable development	Repetition and consolidation of the Earth Charter’s vocabulary (key words) in order to be able to use it in conversations and discussions in diverse contexts.	
Controversial issue discussion in small groups, identification of actual policy proposal: Should corporations be obliged to work for the common good instead of working for their own profit? How could this goal be achieved?	Critical thinking Ability to argue efficiently Ability to challenge injustice and inequalities Respect for people and things	Application of knowledge about sustainable development, social justice and equity	The use of different phrases to express one’s opinion (In my opinion..., I think..., I’m convinced of the fact that..., I believe..., etc.	

Table 4: Aims in GCE tasks

7.3. Planning

Once the objectives are determined, the teacher has to plan and prepare the discussion carefully, if it should lead to satisfactory learning results. It frequently happens that teachers expect too much too soon and overtax the boys and girls with discussion tasks that exceed their concentration span as well as their social maturity. (Huddleston and Rowe 2003: 122) In the foreign language classroom, there is the additional risk that students simply lack the linguistic competence required for the participation in the respective discussion, if the teacher does not adapt the speaking task to the competence level of the learners. In order to avoid these and other potential problems, multiple factors have to be taken into consideration that I would like to outline on the following pages.

7.3.1. The Appropriate Issue...

Before teachers bring a specific issue to the classroom for discussion, they have to consider, whether the students really have a reason to talk and the suggested subject does not fail to initiate genuine discourse. The learners' motivation to speak increases considerably, if there is a purpose behind the discourse. If this is not the case it might happen that the students fall silent. (Ur 1981: 5-6) In a GCE context, I advocate controversial issues discussions on social, political and ethical subjects as they were described in detail above. In the previous chapter (6.3.) I have also outlined the popularity of global issues among students and therefore I have already provided the reader with an idea, on the basis of which criteria the issue has to be selected by the teacher or the students.

It is recommendable to start with easier tasks that do not ask too much of the learners. Although discussions should definitely be challenging, the students need some time to get used to deal with controversial issues. Critical pedagogy has been criticized for the overwhelming tasks it often confronts learners with. *Problem-posing* tends to overtax adolescents with questions they do not have an answer for. (Birch 2009: 67) It has to be made clear that an immediate response is not expected from them but that the learning aim consists in gaining new insights with regard to certain aspects of a broader issue. They have to be told that complex problems need to be approached cautiously and require a lot of dialogue until they can actually be fully understood, let alone solved.

7.3.2. Understanding the Learner Group

Before teachers plan a discussion, they need to analyze the learning group they are working with. The discussion issues ought to be selected in accordance with the age, language competence, social and cultural background, cognitive ability and background knowledge of the students. Understanding the class is especially important when dealing with delicate controversial issues. The North-South Centre has compiled a useful list of sample questions that facilitates the analysis of the learner group.

- Who are the people in this group (educators and learners)?
- Where do they come from? (cultural background, etc.)?
- How are their cultural identity/identities perceived in the group and the society they live in?
- Why are they here?
- How do they feel in this group?
- How do they behave towards each other?
- How does each one react to the educator's behaviour?
- How does the educator feel and react to the learners' behaviour, as individuals and as a group? (North-South Centre 2010: 29)

The teachers' research of their students is a fundamental aspect of critical pedagogy. Freire suggested that educators have to seek dialogue with the girls and boys on a regular basis. In these research dialogues teachers ought to listen carefully to what learners tell about their communities and the problems they have to face there. It is the critical teacher's task to put these problems into a wider social, cultural, and political context in order to be able to find a solution. During these conversations educators discover issues that are relevant to the young people's everyday life and that are based on their emerging knowledge and socio-cultural background. They get a deeper understanding of the learner's perception of themselves, the humans they are surrounded by and their social reality. These insights help critical teachers to find out how students actually make meaning of the world. "This enables teachers to construct pedagogies that engage the impassioned spirit of students in ways that moves them to learn what they don't know and to identify what they want to know." (Kincheloe 2008: 20) Apart from dialogues, teachers can also use student diaries and interviews as a means to get to know their students better. These so called action research projects show students that their opinion and perception is appreciated, which makes it possible to understand and address their feelings. (20-21)

Especially in GCE action research has an important role to play. In a school, where waste is not separated, paper is wasted by teachers and advertisements inside the school building promote beverages in plastic bottles, the intentional curriculum will surely not be credible. If sustainability and social justice are only preached but not lived, students perceive GCE lessons as hypocritical and as a consequence they lose their motivation to discuss local as well as global issues. Anger, hopelessness and passivity in the face of local and global problems are the result of this inconsistency. Action research can be used to uncover these perceptions and has the potential to improve everyday classroom practice and thereby also the quality of discussions. If the students, for instance, criticize the sustainability management at school, the teacher can use this criticism as a starting point for a discussion. The students could be asked to discuss what could be done to improve the situation. The fact that their criticism is accepted and analyzed to make improvements gives the boys and girls the feeling that their voice is heard and that they have the power to change something. Through action research it is possible to relate GCE closely to the “life-world” of the pupils, which significantly increases the motivation to participate in a discussion.

7.3.2. Establishment of Ground Rules

Even if the educator finds out that the pupils get along with each other perfectly and that they feel no anger or hostility towards the teachers or the school, s/he has to establish some ground rules together with the students that guarantee a comfortable environment in which all participants dare to state their opinion. (Oxfam 2006b: 6) The effectiveness increases considerably if the learners negotiate the norms themselves and put them on show somewhere in the classroom, where they are visible for everybody. (Huddleston and Rowe 2003: 122) The students also have to think of sanctions they want to impose on their colleagues in case they do not respect the rules, otherwise they might not be taken seriously. It is desirable that these *pro-social communicative norms* are not only respected during particular activities but develop into general social manners that determine the way school colleagues treat each other. Apart from the rules that govern a “respectful” discussion (e.g.: no interruptions, no shouting, no offending etc.) the conversation also has to be based on certain values. Wegerif (2000) has identified the following implicit guiding principles for exploratory talk:

- All relevant information is shared;
- The aim is to try to reach group agreement;
- The group takes responsibility for any decision made;
- Participants are expected to give reasons for their suggestions;

- Challenging is accepted;
- Alternatives are discussed before a decision is taken;
- All members of the group are encouraged to talk by the other members of the group. (Wegerif 2000 paraphrased in Huddleston and Rowe 2003: 125)

Although group agreement is mentioned as the ultimate aim, the teacher has to make clear that *dissent* and *conflict* are constructive elements in a discussion and have to be given voice and space. However, in discussions on local/global social and political issues the Earth Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are useful instruments that in some but definitely not in all cases may help to bring about agreement. It is an option to entrust one or two students with the task to function as experts of the international documents. It is their responsibility to draw attention to the principles in order to make sure that the group's decision is grounded in the values of global citizenship. In some cases it will not be possible to reach agreement at all, which is absolutely legitimate.

7.3.3. Content and Language Preparation

Skillful teaching of controversial issues discussions requires careful preparation from part of the teacher. The success and learning outcome largely depends on how s/he builds the background knowledge of the learners before they are requested to engage in these tasks. Background has to be built in content and language alike. Students need a certain degree of prior knowledge about the topics, problems, and concepts that are dealt with in the classroom and additionally they need to be equipped with the language they have to apply in order to be capable of linguistically fulfilling the task. Preparation for discussions can take on various forms and ranges from writing, reading and listening activities to the teaching of new vocabulary and language structures, to mention just a few ideas. In some cases it might be useful to provide the learners with sentence starters and linguistic frames that help to enhance their linguistic performance. (Fisher, Frey, and Rothenberg 2008: 48-49)

In her book *Controversy in the classroom: the democratic power of discussion* Hess (2009) presents three case studies of good practice that provide an insight into how discussions have to be prepared in order to arrive at satisfactory results. Two of the three teachers she reports on requested their students to do a lot of reading before they could take part in the discussion. After the first class period of instruction on the affirmative action initiative, one of these teachers together with the learners determined the roles that have to be involved in the upcoming discussion. Afterwards, every student chose a role and received a specialized

reading packet that provided the information necessary to argue for their position. In addition, they were given a sheet that asked them to present their viewpoint and to compile a list of pro and con arguments. The next three lessons were used for preparation purposes and the students worked either individually or in pairs to read the articles. Besides, they had the possibility to carry out research on the internet, to watch videos, to hear speakers and to call advocacy organizations. The discussion was framed as a town meeting and therefore constituted a big event. On the day of the meeting the furniture was rearranged and the participants had to sit in a large circle on places that were assigned by the teacher. (Hess 2009: 58)

Clearly, this example represents an extraordinary situation as it is very time-consuming and also requires appropriate infrastructure in the classroom, which is not given in many classrooms. Nevertheless, every once in a while this effort could be really worth it, especially in the case of controversial global issue discussions that are frequently very complex and actually need sufficient preparation in order to enable an interesting discussion. The teacher might book the computer room for the respective days in order to enable the students to make use of the online sources on the World Wide Web. This kind of learning is characterized by a high degree of autonomy, which is extremely beneficial for the development of citizenship skills. It is definitely also a good idea to sometimes create a formal and professional atmosphere as the learners might take their preliminary work more seriously because they do not want to disgrace themselves in the public (in front of the classroom). Participating in this kind of panel discussion, students get used to speak in front of more people, which is an important skill as an active citizen.

However, as time in the foreign language classroom is unfortunately restricted and small group discussions in an informal and more confidential setting offer clear advantages in comparison to the panel format, the above described procedure is only one of many options. Yet, it is certain that as soon as the issues discussed move from personal to academic, preliminary instruction, listening, reading or research at home or at school has to be done to guarantee a richer and more dynamic exchange between the students and the teacher.

Apart from the materials and amount of information provided by the teacher, the success of a free discussion also depends on the phasing of the activity by means of carefully instructions. It is often helpful to include a couple of minutes for the students' individual brainstorming on

a topic, problem or issue. This silent phase meets the needs of learner types, who prefer to first think carefully about what they want to talk about before they share their ideas with their peers and the teacher. Furthermore, the teacher has to determine and inform the students about the objective of the discussion and has to specify if and in which way the individual groups have to report their outcome to the rest of the class. (Hedge 2000: 277) The phasing of the activity is closely connected to the next aspect that has to be considered in planning GCE discussions: the classroom layout and the discussion format.

7.3.4. The Classroom Layout

Moreover, the teacher also has to think through the classroom layout and the actual discussion format because the way the classroom is structured and the activity is set up largely influences the overall participation of the students.

Overall, discussions can either be carried out in groups or with the class as a whole. The optimal structure cannot be determined because what works best always depends on the class itself. Small groups most probably will sit together in a circle for their conversation. If the discussion involves the whole class, there are multiple options. A formal structure, in which students sit in rows and face the teacher at the front mirrors the traditional hierarchical structure at school and reminds more of didactic approaches. This might inhibit the pupils from participating in the discussion. They are not able to look in each other's face, which prevents them from learning through watching the responses of their colleagues. A matrix is more effective because it allows the students to see and hear each other better. Moreover, the discussion does no longer take place under the chairmanship of the teacher, who in this form of organization takes on the role of a facilitator and guides the discussion by posing problems or applying other methods. The large open space in the centre is a drawback as it might be intimidating for some learners. (Wales and Clarke 2003: 24)

The classroom atmosphere can invite even more to dialogue and discussions if the teacher divides the class into smaller groups in order to create confidentiality and give silent learners the opportunity to contribute their ideas to the discussion in a more private and "less-pressured environment". (Oxfam 2006b: 6) Moreover, it has to be considered that discourse in a foreign language is a complex process. Initially, the learners hear a statement or question, subsequently they reflect upon the exact meaning of this linguistic input and possibly translate them into their native language in an attempt to fully comprehend the statement.

Then they think of an appropriate response and a way to express their ideas, before they actually articulate an answer. These individual steps are extremely time-consuming and therefore small group work and pair work is a definite advantage in comparison to whole-class discussions. This format can be seen as a rehearsal for the whole-group activity. (Fisher, Frey, and Rothberg 2008: 49) However, if the class is split into separate groups, teachers cannot fully exercise their role as *problem posers* as they have to move from one group to the next and might miss important points. This problem can be solved by letting the individual groups present the outcome of their discussion to the whole class and making this result subject of discussion in the big group. Furthermore, the students should be encouraged to take on the role of *problem posers* themselves in order to guarantee a critical dialogue.

Whole-class discussions, work in small groups as well as pair work are the common patterns in which discussions are organized. In order to become more specific and practical, I would like to present some proven discussion formats at this point. The suggested ideas have to be regarded as a sample of the innumerable possibilities that are out there in the teacher's world.

7.3.5. The Discussion Format

7.3.5.1. Discussion cards

One option is the preparation of a set of cards for each group that provide the participants of the discussion with controversial statements or questions concerning the respective issue. Within the small groups, one student picks a card and reads it out loud to his/her colleagues and afterwards the issue is discussed for a certain period of time, until the next card is taken and the same procedure is followed. The aim does not consist in having discussed all the statements or questions and it is the task of the teacher to end the ongoing debates when s/he thinks it is appropriate. The groups that finish earlier could be encouraged to summarize the outcome of their discussion and share the result with the rest of the class in order to start a whole-class discussion. (Thornbury 2005: 102) In the context of GCE the statements and questions are related to social and intercultural as well as environmental and sustainability issues. It is essential that they are clearly controversial and encourage learners to think critically. One problem that might lead to several controversial issues is the global waste and CO₂ problem. Possible questions and statements could include the following:

Questions:

Should the plastic bag be prohibited nationwide or even on an international level?

Should the amount of flights per capita be regulated and restricted in order to reduce CO² emission?

Should it be made obligatory that people bring their own containers to the supermarket in order to put in cheese and 'Wurst' they buy?

Statements:

People should have the freedom to use plastic bags whenever they need them.

Corporations should be sanctioned for selling goods that are produced under unfair conditions. etc.

7.3.5.2. Warm-Up Discussions

The introduction of a new topic, problem or issue as well as the lexical preparation for a reading comprehension can be done by means of warm-up discussions. The teacher prepares several questions for pair or group work and requests the students to report on the outcome to the whole learner group. These discussion questions activate prior and general knowledge about the topic or involve a more personal approach to it. (Thornbury 2005: 6) The questions dealt with in this phase of the lesson do not necessarily have to be controversial. One concrete example of potential topics are dating practices across different cultures, ethnicities and faiths. Below I give an example of a warm-up discussion task in this context.

What does dating actually mean to you?

“What exactly is the purpose of dating? Is it just a mechanism to flirt, to have fun, or to get to know a person better?” (Kumaravadivelu 2008: 195)

What are some general “rules” that have to be followed in order to have an enjoyable and successful date?

Are there some dating partners that are more desirable than others? What are the preferences?

(after the first discussion round)

Are interracial and interfaith dating possible and desirable? What kind of problems could be involved? (Kumaravadivelu 2008: 195)

The suggested questions are an ideal introduction for the subsequent more profound discussion of different cultures' regulation of dating and marriage. One possible problem that could be discussed after the warm-up is the phenomenon of opposition to interracial dating in

the USA or the practice of arranged marriage in Asian cultures. In the case of the former it would be a good idea to talk about Americas ethnic communities' different attitudes towards interracial relationships. Historical, sociological, political as well as personal factors should be made subject of discussion. After that the students could be asked to do some research on the Internet to collect some information about the dating and marriage practices of a particular religious community, its general idea of dating and marriage and its standpoint on a multicultural relationship. The result of the investigation should be shared with the other learners in the form a discussion that is organized and moderated by the girls and boys themselves. (Kumaravadivelu 2008: 196) Hence, a warm-up discussion should never stand alone but always be followed by a more intense and sophisticated examination of the respective subject. It may bring up some stereotypical opinions about certain cultural groups, which can possibly be refuted at a later stage.

7.3.5.3. Pyramid (or Consensus) Debate

The name already reveals that the main idea behind this format is the achievement of consensus. As a first step the learners have to discuss an issue in pairs with the purpose of reaching agreement. Afterwards this pair joins another pair and tries to convince these two persons of their opinion. Then the different groups of four go together again and this procedure is followed until the whole class comes to an agreement. This format lends itself perfectly to the determination of ground rules that should be respected during discussions and that generally regulate behavior in the classroom and at school. It is an option to request students to think of eight principles which are subsequently compared to the list of the other group. The discussion of the guidelines leads to the composition of a new list, which is revised again in the next round. This process undoubtedly involves a lot of discussion and negotiation and potentially gives rise to dissent and conflict. (Thornbury 2005: 103-104) Another possibility is the establishment of ground rules for the life on planet Earth. The students could be told that a new planet has been discovered that stands in need of principles that enable the peaceful coexistence of all inhabitants. They are asked to come up with rules human beings have to obey and rights they should be granted. The first draft is improved with every single round and the final result is then compared to the Earth Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The activity shows the individuals how democracy actually works and in how the collaboration of all parties involved leads to a better outcome. Of course, the teacher has to

make clear that disagreement is not forbidden and simply needs more time and space for discussion. This is the time where *conflict transformation* comes into play. In some but definitely not all cases the Earth Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights provide an excellent source of reference that can assist in arriving at a result that makes everybody happy. The teacher and also the students (as soon as they are familiar with the practice of *problem posing*) take on the role of *problem posers* and thereby help the group to reflect critically upon their decisions in order to enhance the ultimate outcome.

7.3.5.4. Panel Discussions

This kind of discussion takes on the format of a television debate in which the students adopt different roles and represent diverse perspectives on the issue discussed. The conversation takes place under the guidance of a so called chairperson that is responsible for the equal distribution of turns, the monitoring of the individuals' speaking time and the adherence to the established ground rules. (Thornbury 2005: 104) I claim that this role should ideally be allocated to one or more students most of the times and not always to the teacher as this would lead to the false impression that the teacher is always in control of the processes in the classroom which is absolutely not in accordance with the ideals of critical pedagogy and GCE. The teacher can bring himself/herself in as a participant and act as a *problem poser* in order to share his advanced knowledge on some issues with the learners.

One suggestion for organizing this discussion format is the preliminary work in pairs or small groups which serves the purpose of preparation. The learners have the opportunity to come up with arguments they need on the panel. After this initial preparatory phase one representative of each group joins the panel and takes a stance on the respective issue. The audience, which consists of the remaining students and the teacher (if s/he is not on the panel), has to pose questions/ problems that stimulate further, possibly more reflected contributions. The discussion's authenticity increases if the organization of the classroom furniture resembles an actual panel discussion as it is known from television. Furthermore, in a lot of cases it is recommendable to give students the possibility to state their own opinion or to select their standpoint themselves instead of allocating roles to them they can absolutely not identify with. Yet, if extremely delicate and sensitive issues are discussed, clearly defined fictional roles are an advantage, because the learners can hide behind their roles and are therefore less inhibited. (Thornbury 2005: 104-105) Moreover, some argue that taking on a

different perspective furthers critical thinking skills. A teacher interviewed by Diane Hess states:

I think a real important critical thinking skill is the ability to take a different position and to argue it with credence and credibility. I think it's an incredible skill for citizens, enlightened citizens in a democracy, because it's rare that issues are completely black and white. It's important to give minority voices a really serious airing in the classroom. Because then people will give their true opinion. I think it's also real important to have kids take on different viewpoints as a way of better understanding their own viewpoints...Doing the work of seminars is trying in ideas. (Hess 2009: 63)

This statement coincides totally with my convictions and is also in accordance with the principles of critical pedagogy, where giving voice to minority groups and critically reflecting upon one's own perspective is essential.

7.3.6. Role of the Teacher

Another important factor that has to be considered is the role the teacher adopts during the discussion. Is it best if the teacher conceals his own opinion, or if he discloses what he thinks? Should the educator be a facilitator or rather a contributor?

Pedagogues have to be capable of assessing when, if and how it is appropriate to express their own viewpoints. According to Harwood (1998), teachers can actually take on eight different roles during classroom discussions. (Huddleston and Rowe 2003: 125) They have to be able to change their position according to the given situation and depending on the subject, the age of the learners, preparatory activities done and a range of other factors. (Oxfam 2006b: 7) Harwood (1998) notes that some roles should be applied more frequently than others and he declares the *Impartial facilitator* as the most important of the following roles:

- Participant-is free to express ideas, opinions, and feelings just like any other member of the group
- Devil's Advocate-tries to stimulate participation by deliberately taking oppositional stances
- Impartial/Neutral facilitator-chairs the discussion by organizing and facilitating pupils' contributions and by maintaining rules and limits; does not express personal viewpoint; does not give positive or negative feedback after pupils' contributions
- Instructor-explains and clarifies relevant information, concepts and ideas; asks task questions to assess understanding; gives positive or negative feedback of students' contributions
- Committed Instructor-uses the instructor role, as above, in a sustained way, to propagate own viewpoint on controversial issues
- Interviewer-questions individuals to elicit their ideas, feelings and opinions

- Observer-observes the pupils during their discussions, but does not intervene
- Absent leader-withdraws from the group after the initial organisation of work. (Huddleston and Rowe 2003: 126)

Harwood (1998) recommends using the role of *Devil's Advocate* rather rarely and exclusively in situations where the students do not come up with crucial arguments or objections or have generally difficulties to take a stance on the respective issue. In his opinion, the *Committed Instructor* is eminently suitable in circumstances in which classroom discussion is actually used to deal with incidents at school that violate the boys' and girls' human rights, while in other respects the role is inappropriate. (Huddleston and Rowe 2003: 125)

I argue that in the critical pedagogy classroom the roles of the participant, instructor, interviewer and facilitator are especially important. Critical pedagogy clearly foregrounds the contribution of the teacher, who becomes a *problem poser* and possesses the capacity to pick up on the knowledge s/he and her/his learners produce during the discussion in order to construct questions that lead to a more profound reflection on the issues dealt with. (Kincheloe 2008: 16) It is essential that teachers share the knowledge they have with students and vice versa and therefore I regard the role of the absent leader and the observer as inappropriate for critical pedagogy and GCE.

Critical teachers have the responsibility to carry out research and produce knowledge that they can then use to support their students in constructing their own knowledge. "The authority of the critical teacher is dialectical; as teachers relinquish the authority of truth providers, they assume the mature authority of facilitators of student inquiry and problem posing." (Kincheloe 2008: 17) The role of the facilitator is altered in the context of critical pedagogy and differs from the neutral facilitator in so far as s/he questions the contributions of the learners with the purpose of leading them to new insights. However, it has to be pointed out that teachers and students have equal rights to question each other's contributions because they both acknowledge the incompleteness of all knowledge and ask "please support us in or explorations of the world." (Kincheloe 2008: 17)

Apart from the fact that the teacher ought to take on specific roles during a discussion, there are some other factors that the educator has to consider.

Although teachers should contribute to the dialogue they have to be careful not to talk too much. Research demonstrates that excessive teacher talk inhibits learner thinking and talk. Moreover, teachers tend to leave their students insufficient time to answer their questions. On average, after one second of silence they start speaking again, which considerably reduces the

speaking opportunities of pupils. Studies show that waiting a bit longer, approximately three seconds, enables the teacher “to elicit more frequent, relevant, thoughtful and ‘higher level’ responses.” (Huddleston and Rowe 2003: 126) In addition, it is essential to give the students the opportunity to construct their own questions. The teacher’s role as a *problem poser* should not lead to a discussion that is dominated by the teacher and that forces the students into a particular direction. (ibid) The learners are allowed and encouraged to ask questions and pose counter-questions to teachers and colleagues alike.

Besides, *problem posing* should be combined with citizenship questions. This kind of questions is related to the principles and types of arguments that are characteristic for citizenship education. (Huddleston and Rowe 2003: 127) Examples are the following:

- Do you think it is fair?
- Can you agree on (what course of action is best?)
- Who should have a say?
- Who should decide?
- Should there be a law about it?
- What would you say to persuade someone?
- What would be best for society?
- Is that a good thing or a bad thing?
- What would make the situation fairer?
- Who in society has responsibility for it?
- Does that right bring any responsibilities with it?
- Who do you feel most sorry for in this situation?
- What would be a good compromise?
- Who in society should pay for it?
- Does x have a right to do this?
- Where does that right come from? (ibid)

Finally, it is essential that the teacher is a role model for how contributions are made. According to Vygotsky, students are influenced by the way the teacher talks. For that reason teachers have to exhibit the skills needed for effective discussion by, for example, providing reasons for their opinion and expecting from others to justify their viewpoints. Research proves reflective reasoning is more easily adopted by learners, if the teacher uses it consistently. (ibid)

7.3.7. Variation

Despite of the fact that discussion should play an important role in education and especially language classrooms, it should be interspersed with other activities. As excessive dialogue might be exhausting for the learners, it is advisable to include other tasks. (Huddleston and

Rowe 2003: 122) In a foreign language classroom variation is essential anyway in order to give the students the opportunity to practice all four skills to a relatively equal extent. Furthermore, a high-quality discussion requires some prior preparation that takes place in the form of reading, listening and writing tasks.

Also Freire is convinced of the benefits of using a number of formats in the lesson and even voices his support for occasional lectures. He argues that sometimes lectures can be justified as factual knowledge is needed for discussions and debates in order to increase their quality and depth. (Peterson 2003: 375) However, I maintain that lectures in the classroom should remain limited in number, as factual knowledge can equally be acquired in more learner-centred approaches to teaching. I consider open-learning, project work and task-based learning to be most appropriate for GCE in general and preparations for discussions in particular.

7.4. Online Intercultural Dialogue

In order to cater for variation, GCE in foreign language education also has to bring young people who are resident in different countries closer together. The technological developments of the last decades and especially the internet enable human beings from all over the world to communicate with each other. This possibility should not be ignored by language teachers, who cannot offer their students sufficient practice to speak, write, listen and read in the few language lessons they teach. Apart from the improvement of the linguistic competences, the World Wide Web can also extend culture learning beyond the classroom. “Culture learning needs to be experiential and experience of difference has to be at the centre of learners’ and teachers’ attention.” (Byram 2008: 97) New communication technologies help to overcome the distance and give learners the opportunity to be in contact with native speakers of the target language or, in the case of English, with the global community. (ibid) Email contacts, social networks and internet calls can be used to form and cultivate a friendship with young people with diverse cultural backgrounds. Emails, chats and facebook messages dominate the everyday life of adolescents but the “virtual exchanges” are often restricted to conversations with school colleagues and friends from the local community. The teacher should encourage students to take advantage of the services of the WWW in order to make friends all over the world. Although this possibility might be attractive to some of the individuals, it is rather unlikely that this advice is taken by a lot of learners, if it is not an actual part of foreign language education. Therefore, it is necessary that the language teacher

includes such online activities as homework. In my opinion, it could work if regular conversations in the form of emails, facebook messages or other written formats have to be printed out and shown to the teacher on a monthly basis. The teacher only corrects these written pieces if the student wishes him/her to do so, otherwise he/she only checks the date and the amount of emails that were sent within this period of time. The frequency of the exchange and the length of the texts are assessed and contribute to the grade of the learner. In the language lessons the students are asked to share their experiences with the class. It is an option that the teacher determines a particular focus each month that guides the learners in what they talk about with their friends. Towards the end of the year students could for instance be entrusted with the task to find out if and how their friends celebrate Christmas and New Year's Eve, provided that their friends are no Muslims, where this question would be inappropriate. During the lesson the knowledge gained is presented to and discussed with the whole learner group. This form of culture learning allows the students to form their own opinion about certain cultural groups and prevents them from relying on the representations of textbooks or other sources that are often stereotypical.

There are numerous pages on the internet where adolescents can register for free and therefore the learners should not encounter any difficulties when looking for a friend. However, it has to be admitted that this approach to culture learning and intercultural dialogue has its limitations. Apart from the risk that the learners come across bad people, who in the worst case abuse the contact to the boys and girls in any form or simply do not take the exchange seriously, the regularity of the exchange also depends on the consistency of the friend. It could happen that the students do not receive an answer regularly and in this case the project would not fulfill its purpose. Furthermore, the communication most probably takes on a very personal and informal character and meaningful and critical talk about social concerns might be neglected. Nevertheless, they have the potential to foster critical cultural awareness.

An intercultural dialogue between members of different cultures has to go beyond informal talk to function as an instrument for sustainability and social justice. The possibility to engage in a more purposeful conversation with the global community as part of language education requires a lot of commitment from part of the schools and the foreign language teachers. In a globalized world it is relatively easy to get in contact with schools from other countries. It is the task of the headmaster and the teachers to cultivate these contacts and to

establish strong school partnerships that carry out projects together. One of these projects could be an intercultural forum, a platform, where students of partner schools have the possibility to discuss problematic issues that face humanity with each other. There are some variants how to manage this global online dialogue and these different forms should be combined. It is an option to organize specific events where students participate in an international conference on a given topic. The experiences are then discussed within the classroom and the outcome is summarized in reports that are written by the learners. The organization of these virtual ‘meetings’ is a lot of work and therefore they can only take place every once in a while.

However, an intercultural forum does also offer other possibilities, which ought to be considered in innovative language education for global citizenship. It can be used by teachers to upload articles or other sources as input for online controversial issues discussions. There are always several issues offered in order to give the students the option to choose what they are most interested in and also to share out the learners between the individual issues. The discussion topics are changed monthly and the students can contribute to it whenever they find the time.

The educator poses some open-ended questions on the platform in order to provide some scaffolding. The learners have to make comments and respond to the comments that have been written by their colleagues. They have to react to the viewpoints of the others, have to agree or disagree and underpin their opinion with strong arguments. It is the aim to develop a discourse, in which the adolescents learn to pay attention to what others have to say and to deal with new ideas. They cannot simply state their opinion without taking into consideration the context and the already ongoing discourse, if they want to gain points from the teacher. The teacher has access to what has been written and evaluates the contributions of the students according to explicit criteria that have been determined together with the students. One essential guiding principle is the adherence to pro-social communicative behavior. Attacking or causing offence to other members of the platform is forbidden and is punished with a penalty that has been agreed on by the class. It is important to mention that grammatical errors, spelling mistakes and wrong vocabulary use should not reduce the amount of points assigned by the teacher as the main learning objective consists in engaging in meaningful conversation and as long as the participants are capable of making themselves understand this target is achieved. Even though accuracy is not the primary learning aim of

this activity, it might be useful if the teacher notes down some errors and mistakes and talks about them with the whole group during the foreign language lesson.

I got my inspiration for the idea of this form of online intercultural dialogue at school from *Global Pulse 2010*, the first global dialogue in history. It was a three day online discussion in March 2010 about the greatest global challenges that our society is confronted with. Approximately 7000 people participated and shared their thoughts about the future with the international community. Not only individuals but also organizations took part, which made it possible that innovative ideas reached the authorities that possess the required resources for their implementation. (USAID 2010: n.p.) The intercultural dialogue at school would not bring together people from so many countries and does not enable students to get in touch with authorities that have the power to change the present situation; yet it fulfills the purpose of connecting adolescents from different parts of the world in order to reduce prejudice and stereotypes. Moreover, the learners get to know new perspectives on the world from cultures that are not at all or only minimally represented in their home country. Additionally, the learners' identity as members of *global civil society* is strengthened as they have the chance to actually get in touch and interact with other members of the global community and thereby overcome the distance to this imagined community that is promoted by GCE. The discussion of global issues shows them that people from other countries care about society and the planet as well, and as a consequence their hope for a better future is increased. The new insights they gain during the exchange make them aware of the fact that the world's problems can be solved best if different cultures with their diverse cultural capital work together. English, the global language, takes on the role of a *language of possibility* that permits to give voice to representatives of all cultures with the ultimate aim to change the status quo.

Admittedly, this project is an ambitious aim that certainly cannot be achieved without a lot of effort from part of very motivated teachers. However, I am convinced of the fact that in our globalized world it is by no means an unfeasible objective. Whether or not language teachers succeed in integrating online intercultural dialogue into their language education, it is beyond any doubt that dialogue has to play an essential role. If students learn to deal with conflict and controversial issues, they are automatically prepared for the challenges of intercultural communication. Consequently, culturally heterogeneous classes/schools and online intercultural dialogue have a lot of potential for GCE but are not a prerequisite as dialogue itself helps a lot to improve and develop not only the learners' *critical consciousness* but also

critical cultural consciousness provided that the teacher makes cultural issues a subject of discussion.

CONCLUSION

This diploma thesis has dealt with the implementation of GCE and critical pedagogy in the foreign language classroom in general and the English foreign language classroom in particular. I have shown that our social, ecological and cultural reality calls for new foci in the foreign language curriculum. Accordingly, I have claimed that the intercultural dimension of language learning as it is defined in the Council of Europe's *Common European Framework of Reference* is an approach that can be improved by critical pedagogy and more global approaches to culture learning that take into account the multiplicity of intercultural encounters of today's individuals. The promotion of a culture of *dissent, difference* and *dialogue* is essential for a more sustainable and peaceful culturally diverse world. The handling of conflicts by means of *conflict transformation* can be best practiced through controversial issues discussions that deal with local as well as global social, moral and political issues. I have argued that *difference* in the foreign language classroom makes formerly marginalized cultural groups an integral part of culture education and thereby liberates them from their inferior role with respect to more dominant cultures. *Difference* is especially important in the English language classroom, where North America and Great Britain tend to be the focus of culture learning. *Difference* should ideally lead to a shift from the focus on the target culture to a selection of cultural groups in culture education that are of interest for the learner group, as this is the only appropriate answer to the cultural plurality and complexity caused by globalization. Furthermore, I have elaborated on the fact that dialogue is not exclusively beneficial for the *communicative competence* of the language learners, but is an important instrument for change. I have demonstrated how dialogue can be included in the interest of GCE in the foreign language lesson in order to arrive at *critical (cultural) consciousness* and *empowerment*.

Apart from *dialogue*, I have also promoted *critical literacy* that helps young people to recognize bias and "interested perspectives" in texts and especially in the media and to discover possibilities how to use media for democratic purposes. Some examples of possible activities provide an insight into the practice of *critical (media) literacy* in the foreign language classroom.

Moreover, I have highlighted the additional responsibility of the English language teacher as the teacher of the language of the global community. It is outlined, in how far s/he can use

this strategic position to promote *global civic culture* and to help students to identify with a more global identity.

GCE as well as critical pedagogy are the complete opposite of value-free concepts and are strongly political. Accordingly, especially critical pedagogy has a long history of criticism that I have briefly outlined above. However, education is inherently political and will never be free of values. At the moment the underlying values of the educational system are not transparent and not made explicit to learners. Nevertheless, they influence the ideological attitude of young people and covertly transform them into human capital for market economy. GCE makes values a subject of discussion and gives learners the opportunity to decide themselves which values they can identify with and which not. Through *critical reflection* critical pedagogy simply makes them aware of the system they live in and thereby enables them to opt consciously for or against it. The values of the Earth Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights offer an alternative, however critical GCE encourages learners to also critically reflect upon these seemingly universal values. The active construction of knowledge in the form of dialogue and the critical stance towards GCE itself avoids the possible risk of ideological indoctrination. However, I believe that most young people are attracted by the idea of a more just and sustainable world and as a consequence they will develop the desire to change something.

If GCE alone is integrated into the traditional school system as it exists at the moment, it is extremely difficult to evoke a desire for change in the students. Adherents to the traditional school system define the aim of education totally different from the aim that critical pedagogy and GCE attempt to achieve, namely more self-determined, democratic individuals, who are able to decide consciously for a more sustainable life and are willing to become active in order to achieve this goal. Critical pedagogy becomes an indispensable part of GCE. The implementation of critical pedagogy, again, implies the adoption of an alternative school system that could be inspired by progressive education that is likewise rooted in cultural criticism. (Haake 2009: 3) There are already a number of alternative progressive schools in Austria that have their own curriculum and their own approach to teaching. The progressive educational concept stands for “freedom, autonomy, self-guided learning, absence of a marking system, democratic lifestyle and self-determination.” (4) The presented methodological approaches of critical pedagogy and GCE that attach a high value to problem-based learning and dialogue ought to be complemented with open learning, task-

based learning, project work, free choice and interdisciplinary approaches such as CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning). These guiding principles of alternative education, which unfortunately cannot be elaborated on, are definitely compatible with the aims of GCE and critical pedagogy. With critical pedagogy and GCE alternative education as it already exists could develop into a new progressive educational model that is the right answer to economic and cultural globalization. However, this new educational model and the corresponding curriculum first have to be established and once they are, they will constitute the minority. Hence, in the meantime it is up to individual teachers to commit themselves to bringing more democracy, sustainability and social justice into school, by starting with their lessons. Teachers have to be aware that GCE is more than the mere integration of global issues into their lesson plans and basically have to live what they teach. One single critical foreign language teacher at school might not make a considerable change, yet s/he is the *critical yeast* that has the power to transform existing structures at school and therefore contributes her/his share to the gradual development of schools into more democratic and sustainable institutions from within. The revision of the curriculum and the corresponding school reforms might eventually follow. However, this is already the *language of possibility...*

It becomes obvious that we clearly have a long road ahead of us. Future work has to focus on the requirements in terms of teacher training and the investigation of the necessary modifications in the educational system as a whole. It is furthermore essential to take a closer look at the potential of open learning, task-based learning, project work and CLIL in the context of GCE. Consequently, this paper is incomplete as it only deals with a selection of issues that are relevant with regard to teaching global citizenship at school. I hope that the ideas that I contributed to the academic discourse fulfill their purpose of generating further discussion about GCE itself and particularly about its combination with critical pedagogy. Still having a lot to say, I would like to conclude my diploma thesis with two quotations that reflect my strong belief in GCE and critical pedagogy.

„Nur indem man das Unerreichbare anstrebt, gelingt das Erreichbare. Nur mit dem Unmöglichen als Ziel, gelingt das Mögliche.“ Miguel de Unamuno

"Der beste Weg die Zukunft vorauszusagen, ist, sie zu gestalten." Willy Brandt

REFERENCES

- ABDI, Ali A.; SHULTZ, Lynette. 2008. *Educating for human rights and global citizenship*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- AKBARI, Ramin. 2008. "Transforming lives: introducing critical pedagogy into ELT classrooms". *ELT Journal* 62, 3, 276-283.
- ALCÓN SOLER, Eva; SAFONT JORDÀ, Pilar. 2008. *Intercultural language use and language learning*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- BANKS, James A. 2004. *Diversity and citizenship education: global perspectives*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- BIRCH, Barbara M. 2009. *English language teacher in global civil society*. New York: Routledge.
- BM: UKK. 2011. *Standardisierte, kompetenzorientierte Reifeprüfung an AHS Schuljahr 2013/14*: 28 February 2011
<http://www.bmukk.gv.at/medienpool/19913/reifepruefung_ahs_pr.pdf>
- BOULDING, Elise. 1990. *Building a global civic culture: education for an interdependent world*. Syracuse; New York: Syracuse University Press.
- BROWN, Eleanor J.; MORGAN, W. John. 2008. "A culture of peace via global citizenship education". *Peace Review* 20, 3, 283-291.
- BYRAM, Michael. 1997. *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon; Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- BYRAM, Michael; GUILHERME, Manuela. 2000. "Human rights, cultures and language teaching". In OSLER, Audrey. *Citizenship and democracy in schools: diversity, identity, equality*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham, 63-78.
- BYRAM, Michael; GRIBKOVA Bella; STARKEY, Hugh. 2002. *Developing the intercultural dimension in language teaching: a practical introduction for teachers*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

- BYRAM, Michael. 2008. *From foreign language education to education for intercultural citizenship*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- CABRERA, Luis. 2010. *The practice of global citizenship*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- CASE, Roland; CLARK, Penney. 2008. *The anthology of social studies*. Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press.
- CASE, Roland; SENSOY, Özlem; LING, Michael. 2008. "Embedding global and multicultural perspectives". In CASE, Roland; CLARK, Penney. *The anthology of social studies*. Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press, 183-192.
- CASTLES, S.2004. "Migration, citizenship and education". In BANKS, J.A. (ed.). *Diversity and citizenship education: global perspectives*. San Francisco, CA:Jossey-Bass, n.p.
- CHRISTENSEN, J.G.1994. „Sprog og kultur i europæisk integration”. In LIEP, John.; OLWIG, Karen Fog (eds.). *Komplekse liv: kulturel mangfoldighed I Danmark*. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag.
- COTÉ, Mark; DAY, Richard J.F.; GREIG, De Peuter. 2007. *Utopian pedagogy: radical experiments against neoliberal globalization*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE. 2010. *White paper on intercultural dialogue: living together as equals in dignity*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- DARDER, Antonia; BALODANO, Marta; TORRES, Rodolfo D. 2003. *The critical pedagogy reader*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- DAVIES, Ian; EVANS, Mark; REID, Alan. 2005. *Globalising citizenship education? A critique of 'global education' and 'citizenship education'*. 6 September 2010
<http://cie.fc.ul.pt/seminarioscie/coloquio_%20educacao%20global/texto-GlobalisingCitizenship.pdf>
- DAWN, Oliver; HEATER, Derek. 1997. *The foundations of citizenship*. New York; London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- DELISLE, Robert. 1997. *How to use problem-based learning in the classroom*. Alexandria, Va., USA: ASCD.

DE RUYTER, Doret. 2010. "After all, how small is the world? Global citizenship as an educational ideal". In RALEY, Yvonne; PREYER, Gerhard. *Philosophy of education in the era of globalization*. New York: Routledge, 51-66.

DIAS, Clarence. 1993. Rural development: grassroots education and human rights: some Asian perspectives. In MAHONEY, Kathleen; MAHONEY, Paul (eds.). *Human rights in the twenty-first century: a global challenge*. Dordrecht; Boston; London: Martinus Nijhoff, n.p.

DUNCAN-ANDRADE, Jeff; MORRELL, Ernest. 2007. "Critical pedagogy and popular culture in an urban secondary English classroom". In McLAREN, Peter; KINCHELOE, Joe L. *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?* New York: Peter Lang, 184-199.

DURST, Russel K. 2006. "Can we be critical of critical pedagogy?". *College Composition and Communication* 58, 1, 110-114.

EARTH CHARTER INITIATIVE. 2005. An Earth Charter guidebook for teachers. The Earth Charter Initiative International Secretariat. 23 February 2011

<<http://www.earthcharterinaction.org/invent/images/uploads/ECTG%20ENG.pdf>>

EARTH CHARTER INITIATIVE. 2008. The Earth Charter. 23 September 2010

<http://www.earthcharterinaction.org/invent/images/uploads/echarter_english.pdf>

EARTH CHARTER INTERNATIONAL. 2009. A guide for using the Earth Charter in education. 15 September 2010

<http://www.earthcharterinaction.org/invent/images/uploads/EC_Education_Guide_2%20APRIL_2009.pdf>

EDWARDS JR., D. Brent. 2010. "Critical pedagogy and democratic education: possibilities for cross-pollination". *Urban Rev* 42, 221-242.

EK, Jan Ate van; TRIM, John Leslie Melville. 1991. *Threshold Level 1990*. Cambridge: CUP.

EVANS, Derek G. 2008. "Human rights: four generations of practice and development". In ABDI, Ali A.; SHULTZ, Lynette. *Educating for human rights and global citizenship*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 25-38.

- FISCHMAN, Gustavo. 2005. *Critical theories, radical pedagogies, and global conflicts*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- FISHER, Douglas; FREY, Nancy; ROTHENBERG, Carol. 2008. *Content-area conversations: how to plan discussion-based lessons for diverse language learners*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- FREIRE, Paulo. 1970. *The pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group, Inc.
- FREIRE, Paulo. 1985. *Politics of education: culture, power, and liberation*. Hadley, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey.
- FREIRE, Paulo. 1992. *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: Continuum.
- FREIRE, Paulo. 1997. *Pedagogy of the heart*. New York: Continuum.
- FREIRE, Paulo. 1998a. *Pedagogy of freedom*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & LittleField Publishers, Inc.
- FREIRE, Paulo. 1998b. *Politics and education*. Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center Publications.
- FREIRE, Paulo. 2003. „From pedagogy of the oppressed“. In DARDER, Antonia; BALODANO, Marta; TORRES, Rodolfo D. *The critical pedagogy reader*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- FUHRMANN, Silvia. 2009. “Bildung im Spiegel österreichischer Tageszeitungen“. MA thesis, University of Vienna.
- GARRATT, Dean; PIPER; Heather. 2010. “Heterotopian cosmopolitan citizenship education?”. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice* 5, 43-55.
- GEARON, Liam. 2003. *Learning to teach citizenship in the secondary school*. London; New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- GIDDENS, Anthony. 1990. *The consequences of modernity*. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press.

GIROUX, Henry A. 1992. *Border-crossings: cultural workers and the politics of education*. New York: Routledge.

GIROUX, Henry A. 1994. *Disturbing pleasures*. New York: Routledge.

GIROUX, Henry A. 2004. *The terror of neoliberalism: authoritarianism & the eclipse of democracy*. London: Paradigm Publishers.

GIROUX, Henry A. 2007. "Utopian thinking in dangerous times: critical pedagogy and the project of educated hope". In COTÉ, Mark; DAY, Richard J.F.; GREIG, De Peuter. *Utopian pedagogy: radical experiments against neoliberal globalization*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 25-42.

GIROUX, Henry A. 2007. "Democracy, education, and the politics of critical pedagogy". In McLAREN, Peter; KINCHELOE, Joe. L. *Critical pedagogy: where are we now?*. New York: Peter Lang, 1-6.

GIROUX, Henry A.; SEARLS GIROUX, Susan. 2006. "Challenging neo-liberalisms' new world order: the promise of critical pedagogy". *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies* 6, 21-32.

GUILHERME, Manuela. 2002. *Critical citizens for an intercultural world: foreign language education as cultural politics*. Clevedon; Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.

HAAKE, Rebecca. 2009. "Alternative education and ELT: the SchülerInnen Schule". MA-thesis, University of Vienna.

HAGUE APPEAL FOR PEACE. 2000. The Hague agenda for peace and justice in the 21st century. 25 September 2010

<http://www.haguepeace.org/resources/HagueAgendaPeace+Justice4The21stCentury.pdf>

HANVEY, Robert G. 1976. *An attainable global perspective*. New York: Global Perspectives in Education.

HARWOOD, D. 1998. "The teacher's role in democratic pedagogies". In HOLDEN, C.; CLOUGH, N. (eds.). *Children as citizens: education for participation*. London: Jessica Kingsley, 154-70.

- HATZER, Barbara; LAYES, Gabriel. 2010. "Applied intercultural competence". In THOMAS, Alexander; KINAST, Eva-Ulrike; SCHROLL-MACHL, Sylvia. *Handbook of intercultural communication and cooperation: basics and areas of application*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 121-130.
- HAYDEN, Mary; LEVY, Jack; THOMPSON, Jeff. 2007. *The Sage handbook of research in international education*. London; Thousand Oaks; Calif: Sage Publications.
- HEDGE, Tricia. 2000. *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- HESS, Diana E. 2009. *Controversy in the classroom: the democratic power of discussion*. New York: Routledge.
- HOUSE, Juliane. 2008. "What is an 'Intercultural Speaker'?" In ALCÓN SOLER, Eva; SAFONT JORDÀ, Pilar. *Intercultural language use and language learning*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer, 7-22.
- HUAMAN, Hilaria Supa; KOENIG, Shulamith; SHULTZ, Lynette. 2008. "A call and response: Human rights as a tool of dignity and transformation". In ABDI, Ali A.; SHULTZ, Lynette. *Educating for human rights and global citizenship*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 11-24.
- HUDDLESTON, Ted; ROWE, Don. 2003. "Citizenship and the role of language". In GEARON, Liam. *Learning to teach citizenship in the secondary school*. London; New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- KINCHELOE, Joe L. 2008. *Critical pedagogy primer*. New York: Peter Lang.
- KNIEP, W.M. 1986. "Defining a global education by its content". *Social Education* 50, 437-446.
- KOZOLANKA, Kirsten. 2007. "Reading between the lines and crossing borders: critical media literacy, good citizenship and democratic media". *Our Schools, Our Selves* 17, 1, 17-25.
- KUMARAVADIVELU, B. 2006. "TESOL methods: changing tracks, challenging trends". *TESOL Quarterly* 40, 1, 59-81.

KUMARAVADIVELU, B. 2008. *Cultural globalization and language education*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

LEBAN, Sebastjan; McLAREN, Peter. 2010. "Revolutionary critical pedagogy: the struggle against the oppression of neo-liberalism-a conversation with Peter McLaren". In MACRINE, Sheila; McLAREN, Peter; HILL, Dave. *Revolutionizing pedagogy: education for social justice within and beyond global neo-liberalism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 87-116.

LEDERACH, John Paul. 2005. *The moral imagination: the art and soul of building peace*. New York: Oxford University Press.

LEENDERS, H el ene; VEUGELERS, Wiel. 2009. "Different perspectives on values and citizenship education". In ZAJDA, Joseph; DAUN, Holger. *Global values education: teaching democracy and peace*. Dordrecht: Springer, 21-34.

LENSKI, Susan Davis. 2008. "Teaching from a critical literacy perspective and encouraging social action". In LENSKI, Susan Davis; LEWIS, Jill (eds.). *Reading success for struggling adolescent learners*. New York: Guilford, 227-248.

LIESSMANN, Konrad Paul. 2006. *Theorie der Unbildung: die Irrt umer der Wissensgesellschaft*. Zsolnay: Wien.

LIEP, John.; OLWIG, Karen Fog (eds.).1994. *Komplekse liv: kulturel mangfoldighed I Danmark*. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag.

LOCHTMAN, Katja; KAPPEL, Jenny.2008. *The world a global village: intercultural competence in English foreign language teaching*. Brussels: Vubpress.

MACRINE, Sheila; McLAREN, Peter; HILL, Dave. 2010. *Revolutionizing pedagogy: education for social justice within and beyond global neo-liberalism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

MAHONEY, Kathleen; MAHONEY, Paul (eds.). *Human rights in the twenty-first century: a global challenge*. Dordrecht; Boston; London: Martinus Nijhoff, n.p.

MANNHEIM, K. [1936]1991. *Ideology and utopia: an introduction to the sociology of knowledge*. London: Routledge.

MAYO, Peter. 2005. "Education for radical humanization in neoliberal times: a review of Paulo Freire's later work". In FISCHMAN, Gustavo. *Critical theories, radical pedagogies, and global conflicts*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 164-184.

McLAREN, Peter. 1995. *Critical pedagogy and predatory culture: oppositional politics in a postmodern era*. London; New York: Routledge.

McLAREN, Peter. 2000. *Che Guevara, Paulo Freire, and the pedagogy of revolution*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

McLAREN, Peter; KINCHELOE, Joe. L. 2007. *Critical pedagogy: where are we now?*. New York: Peter Lang.

MONCHINSKI, Tony. 2008. *Critical pedagogy and the everyday classroom*. New York: Springer.

MORGAN, Wendy. 2004. "Critical literacy". In SAWYER, Wayne; GOLD, Eva. *Reviewing English in the 21st century*. Melbourne: Phoenix Education, 103-113.

MORROW, Raymond Allen; TORRES, Carlos Alberto. *Reading Freire and Habermas: critical pedagogy and transformative social change*. New York: Teachers College Press.

NODDINGS, Nel. 2005. *Educating citizens for global awareness; developed in association with the Boston Research Center for the 21st Century*. New York: Teachers College Press.

NODDINGS, Nel. 2005. "Global citizenship: promises and problems". In NODDINGS, Nel. *Educating citizens for global awareness; developed in association with the Boston Research Center for the 21st Century*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1-21.

NORTH-SOUTH CENTRE OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE. 2010. *Global education guidelines: a handbook for educators to understand and implement global education*. 4 September 2010 <<http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/nscentre/ge/GE-Guidelines/GEguidelines-web.pdf>>

OSLER, Audrey. 2000. *Citizenship and democracy in schools: diversity, identity, equality*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham.

OSLER, Audrey; STARKEY, Hugh. 2010. *Teachers and human rights education*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham.

OSLER, Audrey; VINCENT, Kerry. 2002. *Citizenship and the challenge of global education*. London: Trentham.

OXFAM DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION PROGRAM. 2006a. *Education for global citizenship: a guide for schools*. 26 September 2010

<http://www.oxfam.org.uk/education/gc/files/education_for_global_citizenship_a_guide_for_schools.pdf>

OXFAM DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION PROGRAM. 2006b. *Teaching controversial issues*. 23 September 2010

<http://www.oxfam.org.uk/education/teachersupport/cpd/controversial/files/teaching_controversial_issues.pdf>

PATEL STEVENS, Lisa; BEAN, Thomas W. 2007. *Critical literacy: context, research, and practice in the K-12 classroom*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

PENNYCOOK, Alastair. 1994. *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. Harlow, Essex, England: Longman Group UK; New York: Longman Pub.

PENNYCOOK, Alastair. 2001. *Critical applied linguistics: a critical introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

PETERSON, Robert E. 2003. "Teaching how to read the world and change it: critical pedagogy in the intermediate grades". In DARDER, Antonia; BALODANO, Marta; TORRES, Rodolfo D. *The critical pedagogy reader*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

PHILLIPSON, Robert. 1992. *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

PHIPPS, Alison M.; GUILHERME, Manuela. 2004. *Critical pedagogy: political approaches to language and intercultural communication*. Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.

FÖRDERGEMEINSCHAFT ZUR GRÜNDUNG EINER FRIEDENSUNIVERSITÄT. 2000. *Projekt: Friedensuniversität: von der Konfrontation zur dialogischen Kultur*. Wien: Fördergemeinschaft zur Gründung einer Friedensuniversität.

- RALEY, Yvonne; PREYER, Gerhard. 2010. *Philosophy of education in the era of globalization*. New York: Routledge.
- RAWLS, J. 1999. *The law of peoples*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- REISENLEUTNER, Sandra. 2010. "Global and intercultural learning (GIL) in the EFL classroom". MA thesis, University of Vienna.
- ROTH, Klas; BURBULES, Nicholas C. 2007. *Changing notions of citizenship education in contemporary nation-states*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- ROTH, Klas. 2007. "Cosmopolitan learning". In ROTH, Klas; BURBULES, Nicholas C. 2007. *Changing notions of citizenship education in contemporary nation-states*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, 10-29.
- SAMPATKUMAR, Rajagopalan. 2007. "Global citizenship and the role of human values". In HAYDEN, Mary; LEVY, Jack; THOMPSON, Jeff. *The Sage handbook of research in international education*. London; Thousand Oaks; Calif: Sage Publications, 70-78.
- SAVIGNON, Sandra J. 2007. "Beyond communicative language teaching: what's ahead?". *Journal of Pragmatics* 39, 207-220.
- SAWYER, Wayne; GOLD, Eva. 2004. *Reviewing English in the 21st century*. Melbourne: Phoenix Education.
- SCHATTLE, Hans. 2008. *The practices of global citizenship*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.
- SHAH, Anup. 2010. "A primer on neoliberalism". Global Issues. 25 October 2010
< <http://www.globalissues.org/article/39/a-primer-on-neoliberalism>>.
- SHANKLIN, Nancy. 2009. "Using critical literacy to engage learners: what new teachers can do." *Voices from the Middle* 17, 2, 44-46.
- SHOR, Ira. 1980. *Critical teaching and everyday life*. Boston: South End Press.
- SHOR, Ira. 1987. *Critical teaching and everyday life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- TAYLOR, P.V.1993. *The texts of Paulo Freire*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

- TASNEEM, Ibrahim. 2005. "Global citizenship education: mainstreaming the curriculum?". *Cambridge Journal of Education* 35, 2, 177-194.
- THOMAS, Alexander; KINAST, Eva-Ulrike; SCHROLL-MACHL, Sylvia. 2010. *Handbook of intercultural communication and cooperation: basics and areas of application*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- THORNBURY, Scott. 2005. *How to teach speaking*. Harlow, England: Longman.
- TOMLINSON, Brian. 1997. *Materials development in language teaching*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- UNESCO. 2005. *United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (2005-2014): International Implementation Scheme*. Paris: UNESCO. 24 September 2010 <<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001486/148654e.pdf>>
- United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. 1948. 15 September 2010 <<http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html>>
- UR, Penny. 1981. *Discussions that work: task-centred fluency practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- USAID. 2010. 7 January 2010 <<http://www.globalpulse2010.gov/contact.html>>
- VAN HERRTUM, Richard. 2010. "Empowering education: Freire, cynicism, and a pedagogy of action". In MACRINE, Sheila; McLAREN, Peter; HILL, Dave. *Revolutionizing pedagogy: education for social justice within and beyond global neo-liberalism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 211-234.
- WALES, Jenny; CLARKE, Paul. 2005. *Learning citizenship: practical teaching strategies for secondary schools*. London; New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- WALLERSTEIN, Nina. 1983. *Language and culture in conflict: problem-posing in the ESL classroom*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co. .
- WEGERIF, R. 2000. "Learning to talk, talking to learn". *Teaching Thinking*, 1.
- WENDEN, Anita. 2004. *Educating for a culture of social and ecological peace*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

WENDEN, Anita. 2004. "Value-based perspective development". In WENDEN, Anita. *Educating for a culture of social and ecological peace*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 145-168.

WINK, Joan. 2000. *Critical pedagogy: notes from the real world*. New York: Longman.

ZAJDA, Joseph; DAUN, Holger. 2009. *Global values education: teaching democracy and peace*. Dordrecht: Springer.

GERMAN ABSTRACT

Diese Diplomarbeit setzt sich mit "Global Citizenship Education (GCE)" und „Kritischer Pädagogik“ im internationalen Fremdsprachen- und Englischunterricht der Sekundarstufe auseinander. Kapitel 1-6 stellen theoretische Überlegungen zur Thematik dar, während das letzte Kapitel (Kapitel 7) sich mit der praktischen Umsetzung der Ideen befasst.

Nach der Definition der Zielgruppe der in der Arbeit vorgestellten Vorschläge für die „Erziehung zum Weltbürgertum“ (GCE) wird ein kurzer Überblick über das Konzept „Weltbürgertum“ (Global Citizenship), „globale Bürgerkultur“ (Global Civic Culture) und die dazugehörigen internationalen Dokumente, in welchen sich die „weltbürgerlichen“ Werte der Nachhaltigkeit und sozialen Gerechtigkeit manifestieren, gegeben. Danach wird die Erziehung zum „Weltbürgertum“ (GCE) eingeführt und die Kernkompetenzen, die im Zuge einer solchen Unterrichtsausrichtung gefördert werden sollen, vorgestellt. Außerdem wird das erzieherische Potential der Erdcharta und der Allgemeinen Erklärung der Menschenrechte erörtert und anschließend durch konkrete Unterrichtsvorschläge für den Fremdsprachenunterricht auf die praktische Ebene gebracht. Das vierte Kapitel stellt den Bezug zwischen der „Erziehung zum Weltbürgertum“ und der „Kritischen Pädagogik“ her. Es wird untersucht, inwiefern die beiden Ansätze sich gegenseitig ergänzen und demgemäß zu einer effektiveren Gestaltung der GCE im Fremdsprachenunterricht beitragen. Da es sich bei der „Kritischen Pädagogik“ um ein umstrittenes Konzept handelt, wird kurz auf die häufigsten Kritikpunkte eingegangen. Im Anschluss werden die Methoden der „Kritischen Pädagogik“ präsentiert, die im Idealfall zur Emanzipation und zum Handeln der Lernenden im Interesse des Weltbürgertums führen sollen. Sowohl kritische Reflexion als auch Konflikt und Differenz werden als effektive Instrumente für ein globaleres Bewusstsein genannt. Ein dialogischer Zugang zum Lernen verbessert nicht nur die kommunikative Kompetenz der SchülerInnen in der Zielsprache, sondern ist auch gleichzeitig eine wichtige Voraussetzung für die kritische Auseinandersetzung mit der Welt und der eigenen Rolle darin. Im Kern der Arbeit findet sich die Antwort auf die Frage, warum gerade der Fremdsprachenunterricht bzw. Englischunterricht sich besonders für GCE und „Kritische Pädagogik“ eignet. Die Argumente reichen von der interkulturellen Dimension von GCE, die die kritische Auseinandersetzung mit der eigenen und fremden Kulturen fordert, über die Identifikationsmöglichkeiten der Lernenden mit der Identität des „Globo sapiens“ über die globale Sprache Englisch, bis hin zur Motivationssteigerung und Verbesserung der

kommunikativen Kompetenz durch den vermehrten Einsatz von freier Diskussionen und Debatten im Unterricht, wie sie die „Kritische Pädagogik“ vorsieht. Im letzten Kapitel der Arbeit wird gezeigt, wie Diskussion im Fremdsprachenunterricht effektiv und abwechslungsreich gestaltet werden kann und welche Faktoren bei der Planung berücksichtigt werden müssen.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Tanja Wimmer
Beckmannngasse 22/4/15
1140 Wien
Tel.: 0664 42 44 347
Email: signorina.wimmer@hotmail.com

Persönliche Daten

Geburtsdatum: 15.06.1987
Nationalität: Österreich
Familienstand: Ledig

Schulbildung

2005- Universität Wien- Lehramt Englisch/ Italienisch
1997-2005 Wiedner Gymnasium Wiedner Gürtel 68 1040 Wien
Abschluss mit Matura: Juni 2005
1993-1997 Volksschule Phorusgasse 4 1040 Wien

Berufserfahrung

2008- DeutschAkademie- Deutschlehrerin
07/2010 Kinderfreunde Niederösterreich- Ferienmitarbeiterin
07/2008-10/2008 BEST-Projektmitarbeiterin
2005-2007 Team plus-Nachhilfelehrerin

Auslandserfahrung

2/2008-6/2008 Universität „La Sapienza“, Rom
8/2010-12/2010 Wissenschaftliches Arbeiten „University of British
Columbia“, Vancouver

Sprachen

Englisch in Wort und Schrift-C1
Italienisch in Wort und Schrift-C1

Zusätzliche Kenntnisse

Gute PC-Kenntnisse-Microsoft Office (Word, Power Point)

Persönliches

Diskutieren, Singen, ein wenig Gitarre, Radfahren, Reisen