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Global Citizenship Education (GCE) has received increasing attention as a means of supporting children and young people in developing their knowledge and understanding of multiple global issues (Bourn, 2015; Fricke & Gathercole, 2015). Despite this increasing prominence, it is apparent that GCE remains a highly contested notion (Marshall, 2005; Hartung, 2017; Jooste & Heleta, 2017).

The report draws on an analysis of nine Global Citizenship Education teacher education programmes across four EU countries: Austria, Czech Republic, Ireland and Italy. The methodology adopted is a multiple-site case study design (Yin, 2014), using ethnography as main method. The research employed a qualitative framework, seeking a description of practices and meaning making to behavioural patterns. Within each country, the research focused on an analysis of two typologies of settings: a) a training course for in-service primary school teachers organized by the project partner in the framework of the project, b) a training course organized by a different organization on themes related to Global Citizenship Education. The selection of the second setting was based on extreme case sampling. This setting was selected for being as different as possible from the initial one, in terms of approach, goals, teachers’ trainers and organization (but on the same or related theme). The theoretical assumption behind this choice is that being organized by a different institution the ideas behind course implementation are more likely to be different.

Based on this the report argues that the teacher education programmes examined present an argument as to how teacher education programmes at the focus of this research present a transformational approach to GCE, where the concepts of critical thinking and self-reflection are perceived as the foundations towards action for a more just and sustainable world. This conception echoes aspects of Freirean pedagogy, itself an important GCE theoretical framework (Scheunpflug & Asbrand, 2006). However, less evident was the ‘critical’ approach to GCE, illustrated in the work of Andreotti (2006).
The report begins by providing an overview of each national case study (omitted in the digest) before moving on to consider the key thematic areas derived from the comparative analysis of data. In the first section, the report explores the question of how GCE is conceptualised as a framework for teacher education. Interdisciplinarity emerges as a key component of teacher education, where the aim of changing teachers’ perspectives through learner-centred dialogic pedagogies is of importance.

In the second section, the report explores the teaching approaches employed in teacher education for global citizenship across value-based contexts. Here the importance of fostering teacher agency through values-based approaches appears pivotal to meaningful teacher education for GCE. In the final section, the report explores the contrasting cultures involved in teacher education programmes and considers how, whilst tensions between the content, methods and broader philosophical positions of actors may present a challenge, collaborative and cooperative approaches to teacher education offer important opportunities in this field.

The report then considers how these conceptualisations might frame the political and potentially transformative aspects of sustainable development. In this conclusion, the integration of GCE is proposed as an interdisciplinary matter. GCE teacher education appears not only as a vehicle for the development of skills but also as a process which may underpin attitudinal change. Learner-centred dialogical methodologies are perceived to offer a gateway for the introduction of GCE, across multiple thematic areas, into teachers’ classroom practice. Finally, the report considers practitioners’ belief in the potential of GCE teachers as participants in transformative modes of education.
One of the major outcomes of the first Global School research report on comparative policy analysis in 10 European countries stressed that: “Given the centrality of the teacher’s role in the effective introduction of the GCE in primary school it is of great importance to both study the process of GCE teachers’ education and to experiment new training paths” (Tarozzi & Inguaggiato, 2016, p.224).

The Global school project shows that, besides all policy elements that can trigger or hamper GCE integration, teachers are key agents of change. The policy documents on which GCE implementation is based are mostly recommendations and therefore are the actors involved that are the real policy makers. Furthermore, also in countries where the normative framework is more advanced, the implementation can be defective if not adequately supported by teacher education. Teachers create the link between policy and practice and their attitude is often a barrier to the introduction of GCE in their teaching practice. Therefore, teacher education plays a crucial role in implementing GCE policy, as highlighted by UNESCO (UNESCO, 2015).

In reviewing recent literature on GCE implementation in school worldwide, Goren and Yemini observe that teachers attribute vagueness to the term GCE. This can be a consequence of scholarly ambiguity, but also regarding vagueness of the term “GCE”; but also of the fact that goals associated with GCE are too often unclear (Goren & Yemini, 2017). Other studies outline teachers’ concern regarding inadequate teaching tools and resources (Appleyard & McLean, 2011; Carr et al., 2014), while others point to teachers perceiving themselves as not well-prepared to handle GCE related issues and therefore tending to avoid them (Niens et al., 2013). Based on their systematic literature review, Goren & Yemini conclude that “teachers and educators recognize the importance of GCE; however, they often feel trapped between curricular goals encouraging its incorporation in the classroom and cultural norms of nationalism or lack of practical resources that hinder their ability to actually teach it” (Goren & Yemini, 2017, p.179).

This overview seems to confirm what emerged from the first part of the research and shows that further research on teacher education is required to provide empirical evidence on a new field of education which is not well established in practice yet.
The comparative policy analysis also confirms that NGOs play a significant role as political actors in GCE policy-making, while at the same time providing in-service teacher education and stimulating initiatives for pre-service teacher education. This results echo an emerging debate in current literature about NGOs role as a “new global civil society” (Castells, 2008) and in particular in GCE policy (Witteborn, 2010). However, these results also hint at some challenges and conundrums (Jaeger & Jaeger, 2007; Marshall, 2005; Tota, 2014). The second part of the research helped exploring NGOs role, together with other actors, in the implementation of teacher education practices.

This review confirms that global school research is definitely timely and necessary. The broad purpose of the study was to analyse GCE teacher education practices in order to identify success factors, conditions for failure, promising and innovative practices. In particular, after the comparative policy analysis, the link between teacher education practice and policy implementation became more evident and meaningful.

The main research questions were:
1. Who, how, when, where, under what conditions are GCE teachers’ training programs provided?
2. On which (if any) pedagogical ideas, educational approaches, theoretical patterns are these practices (1) rooted?
3. To which (if any) policies are these practices related?

However, after the first steps of data collection and analysis, more focused questions were formulated according to emerging themes:
- What drives teachers to attend GCE training courses?
- Where are the points of intersection and friction between the cultures of the actors involved in GCE teacher education?
- How is Global Citizenship Education conceptualised as a framework for teacher education?

In other words, we wanted to describe how and under which conditions these courses take place, the pedagogical ideas behind the observed practices and possible links between this practice and educational policies.

Massimiliano Tarozzi was the main researcher, supported by Carla Inguaggiato, who was also researcher for Italy. Other members of the international researchers’ team were Debora Antonucci (Italy), Martina Novotná (Czech Republic), Ben Mallon (Ireland), Sandra Altenberger (Austria).

We decided to analyse two types of settings: a) internal to Global Schools project: a training course for in-service primary school teachers organized by the project partner in the framework of the project, b) external to Global Schools project: a training course organized by a different organization on themes related to Global Citizenship Education.

The selection of the external setting was based on extreme case sampling. The external setting was to be as different as possible from the internal one, in terms...
of approach, goals, teachers’ trainers and organization (but regarding the same or related theme). The main criteria for in-service training course identification were: a) Accessibility; b) Different typology of organization (the theoretical assumption behind this choice is that being organized by a different institution, the ideas supporting the course implementation are more likely to be different; c) Similar to GCE in topic, or related issues; d) Addressing primary school teachers; also a pre-service, if this allowed us to analyse a course implemented by a different organization; e) Similar number of hours, possibly not one-shot course or single seminar.

For each of the 9 cases analysed (2 per country except for Italy where we have 2 internal and 1 external case). We collected 5 (plus 1) types of data:

1. Field notes of teachers training sessions and of planning sessions of course organizers;
2. Formal interviews with both trainers and course promoters;
3. Informal interviews with key informants;
4. Project documents such as course leaflets, key resources used for the course, description of the course made by the course organizers;
5. Visual data (if available) collected during the training sessions;
6. Trainees’ questionnaires administered before and after training;
7. Researcher’s self-reflexive memos.

All these data were systematically categorized and stored in a shared online platform, accessible to all researchers. The different types of data have been stored using a shared system in order to guarantee the identification of information and at the same time to ensure the anonymity of research participants.

The data collection process was organized in four steps (see box 1).

First, identification of the internal and external courses and gaining access to the field (April - May 2016). After the identification of the case study, the very first step was the identification of the gatekeeper and negotiation of access and role.

The second step was the “preliminary round” (May-June 2016). This phase included the process of getting acquainted to settings to be analysed, collecting documents, mapping the resources in the area with the help of the key informants and other sources of information.

The third step was “open observation” (June–December 2016). The objective of this open observation was to allow us to understand how to focus our attention on the crucial unit of analysis (for example planning meetings) and to define more focused research questions.

The fourth step was the “focused observation” (December 2016-April 2017), i.e. to focus on specific elements that were considered as the emerging tensions characterising the different case studies and referring to the four initial research questions.
• Identification of the internal and external course and gaining access to the field (April - May 2016)
• Based on extreme case sampling
  I. “Preliminary round” (May-June 2016)
  II. First round: “open observation“ (June –December 2016)
• Guided by broad research questions
  III. Second round: “focused observation” (December 2016 –July 2017)
• More focused research questions
  • Sample data content analysis
  • Definition of common codebook (emerging from data) (July-August 2017)
  • Content analysis of all data collected (Aug-Sept 2017)
  • Drafting of the national case studies (October 2017)
  • Comparative analysis (mid-November 2017)
  • Final report (end of December 2017)

Table 1 summarizes the amount of data collected which represents the database for the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># interviews</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of training &amp; planning sessions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># hours of observation</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># words of transcripts</td>
<td>15,865</td>
<td>9,399</td>
<td>33,700</td>
<td>65,027</td>
<td>123,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># documents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># document pages</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>1,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># emails exchanged</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># photos</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># questionnaires</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># memos</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,058</td>
<td>9,656</td>
<td>34,676</td>
<td>66,341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This huge amount of data was examined based on several lines of analysis:

1. Inductive analysis producing a codebook encompassing the main emerging themes conceptually organized
2. Descriptive analysis (national case studies)
3. Self-reflexive interpretation (memos)
4. Deductive analysis: survey analysis of questionnaires submitted to courses’ participants

First of all, a content analysis was carried out on a significant part of data taken from all the nine case studies. After a thorough cross-check by the team members of the codes and themes emerged, to ensure reliability and credibility of the results, a common codebook was created to analyse all the data collected. The codebook was then tested by independent coders. This common codebook is an inductive result in itself. It provides a definition of every broad category, thus guiding all researchers in the content analysis of all data. The codebook is a sound methodological basis for a comparative analysis between nine very different case studies, as analysed by five different researchers.

Please find below the main themes and subthemes that the researchers agreed to share across all the investigated settings:

A. Reasons to attend
   1. Barriers
   2. Intrinsic motivation
   3. Extrinsic motivation
   4. Expectations

B. GCE implementation in school
   1. Opportunities
   2. Threats

C. Contrasting cultures
   1. Different actors in GCE training
   2. Trainer profile
   3. In methods
   4. In contents
   5. In ethics/politics

D. Course organization
   1. Course evaluation
   2. Information on the course
   3. Trainee profile
   4. Resources
   5. Planning

E. Teaching approaches
   1. Aims and goals
   2. Trainee assessment
   3. Classroom atmosphere
   4. Teaching methods
   5. Pedagogical/theoretical approaches
Every theme and subtheme was described using a definition carefully discussed and approved by the research team, and examples for each one of them were provided.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>LABEL</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reasons to attend</td>
<td>Factors influencing the attendance and participation of teachers in teacher education programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td>Factors that either limit or prevent the participation of teachers in teacher education programs</td>
<td>“We understand that schools are very busy places and it can be challenging” (IE-D-10-25.04.2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>Teacher’s intrinsic motivation for engaging with teacher education programs (decision to attend the course: the teacher enjoys the activity itself or the inspiration for acting on intrinsic motivation can be found in the action itself)</td>
<td>“The teacher will feel confident teaching human rights education” (IE-D-05-25.04.2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Extrinsic motivation</td>
<td>Teacher’s extrinsic motivation for engaging with teacher education programs (decision to attend the course is taken for the sake of some external outcome)</td>
<td>“provided with a certificate on completion confirming attendance and completion of the course” (IE-D-06-27.04.2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Teacher’s expectations for the teacher education program</td>
<td>Post-Questionnaire - Question A1 - ‘To what extent has this course met your expectations?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>GCE Implementation in schools</td>
<td>Issues that are perceived to influence GCE practice in classrooms or schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>Issues that are perceived to represent a positive opportunity for GCE practice within classrooms or schools</td>
<td>“The teacher education program...for teaching citizenship across the curriculum” (IE-D-01-08.06.2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Threats</td>
<td>Issues that are perceived to represent a threat to the GCE practice in classrooms or schools</td>
<td>“The CEC directs all members to cease cooperation with school self evalation” (IE-D-06.07.2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Contrasting cultures</td>
<td>Different perspectives, worldviews, beliefs among stakeholders’ culture also highlighting intergroup conflicts and tensions</td>
<td>NGOs are presumptuous and they always think they know everything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Different actors in GCE training</td>
<td>List of key educational stakeholders cited as institutions (e.g. University), function (e.g. Principals) or proper name (e.g. Trocaire)</td>
<td>The group splits into three different subgroups (Teachers/NGO/university)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Trainer profile</td>
<td>Knowledge, skills and experience that a GCE trainer is expected to have according to a specific actor</td>
<td>(Teachers) think NGO representatives don’t have a real experience in school activities nor an adequate teaching preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>In methods</td>
<td>Differences among actors in teaching and learning methodologies</td>
<td>In the photo of a training session all teachers are working in small groups and other trainers take part in the groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>In contents</td>
<td>Differences among actors in GCE definitions and related issues</td>
<td>We (course organizers) believe differently from Prof. C. who has instead a value approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>In ethics/politics</td>
<td>Differences among actors in values, beliefs, ideologies and political commitment in teaching GCE</td>
<td>“Globales Lernen ...als... Grundprinzip.” Global learning as basic principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Course organization</td>
<td>Description of the general information on the training course</td>
<td>New, 3-month training path more focused on competences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Course evaluation</td>
<td>Methods or tools that educators use to assess and evaluate, that document both formative and summative outcomes (including the assessment of trainees’ expectations)</td>
<td>“a table through which the trainees can evaluate themselves”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Information on the course</td>
<td>Description of features of the course (such as requirements to obtain the certificate, maximum number of participants) or general information on the course</td>
<td>“Präsentation eigener Praxisprojekte” “It takes 6 hours”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Trainee profile</td>
<td>Description of the expected and observed characteristics or general information on the trainees</td>
<td>During the break I speak to T (m, 60+) and he tells me about some of the environmental projects he has been involved in at school which includes tree planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Concrete tools/devices/materials used to carry out the training</td>
<td>“everyone has a self-introduction sheet to present him self”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>The process of making a plan to achieve aims and goals through proper and coherent methods (including syllabus and organization in topics)</td>
<td>“In the meeting they planned the content of the course”; “Developing whole school approaches?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Teaching approaches</td>
<td>The general principles, pedagogy and management strategies used for classroom instruction</td>
<td>It is didactics by competence and not by knowledge and ability. Therefore it is not a problem to tackle issues of climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Aims and goals</td>
<td>The results the trainers intend to achieve with their teaching action</td>
<td>Responsibility and ethos of ideal teacher (competence of today’s teachers). Definition of ideal teacher: what are the competences of today’s teachers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Trainee assessment</td>
<td>The results the trainers intend to achieve with their teaching action</td>
<td>Evaluation questionnaire and prosecution of meetings with trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Classroom climate</td>
<td>Social and environmental atmosphere encompassing emotional aspects of the classroom</td>
<td>Laugh of participants, Spontaneous clapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>E4</td>
<td>Teaching methods</td>
<td>A systematic and intentional way of arranging the teaching action according to some principles or pedagogy</td>
<td>Role play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>E5</td>
<td>Pedagogical/theoretical approaches</td>
<td>The reference to a pedagogical approach or theory adopted</td>
<td>C’è al centro il bambino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>E6</td>
<td>Classroom setting</td>
<td>How the spatial structure of the classroom is organized</td>
<td>The trainees are set at a round table but the setting is fixed and does not change during the training session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>E7</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>The work designed or deployed by the teacher to create the conditions for learning and to achieve an aim</td>
<td>The traveller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GCE Conception</td>
<td>How is GCE conceived? What the different actors that contribute to the organization and implementation of the course had in mind</td>
<td>Importance of change, importance of interdisciplinarity, inclusive and multidimensional citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>The underlying assumptions that define GCE conception</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Reference to GCE issues</td>
<td>Migration, ecology, human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Terminology</td>
<td>Terms used to refer to what one calls GCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>GCE competences</td>
<td>GCE competences of both teachers and students that are seen as important</td>
<td>Creativity, Critical Thinking, Empathy, Responsibility, Foreign language knowledge, Knowledge of other cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>F5</td>
<td>GCE teacher profile</td>
<td>The ideal GCE teacher’s profile according to the different actors that contribute to the organization and implementation of the course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>GCE policy</td>
<td>Political process that has an impact on the integration of GCE in formal primary education system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Normative documents</td>
<td>Mit dem vorliegenden Lehrgangscurriculum legt die PHT in Kooperation mit Südwind einen Grundstein für eine stärkere Verankerung von GCE an Schulen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>In einem vom BMBF in Auftrag gegebenen Strategiepapier …werden Fortbildungen zu GCE ausdrücklich empfohlen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>GCE values</td>
<td>Eigene Werte und Haltungen reflektieren und Respekt und Toleranz im Umgang mit Wertpluralismus und Diversität entwickeln.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Empathisch auf die Lage von Menschen mit verschiedenen Hintergründen reagieren.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GCE ist demnach eine ‘Querschnittsaufgabe für alle Bildungsprozesse’ / / GCE is therefore a cross-section purpose for all educational processes

Mit dem vorliegenden Lehrgangscurriculum legt die PHT in Kooperation mit Südwind einen Grundstein für eine stärkere Verankerung von GCE an Schulen. / / With the current curricula the college of education and Südwind laid a cornerstone for the implementation of GCE in schools

In einem vom BMBF in Auftrag gegebenen Strategiepapier …werden Fortbildungen zu GCE ausdrücklich empfohlen / / In the strategy paper of the ministry of education GCE teacher trainings are explicitly recommended

Eigene Werte und Haltungen reflektieren und Respekt und Toleranz im Umgang mit Wertpluralismus und Diversität entwickeln. / / Reflecting own values and attitudes and developing respect and tolerance in dealing with value pluralism and diversity

Empathisch auf die Lage von Menschen mit verschiedenen Hintergründen reagieren. / / To react with empathy to the situation of people with different backgrounds
The codebook was then used to systematically code all the data collected in each country, and all the data were imported in the qualitative analysis software Nvivo, where they were processed. Additionally, the most relevant quotes in each theme were translated into English to allow comparative research. The following table summarizes the number of occurrences for every theme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>H2</th>
<th>Politics</th>
<th>Political GCE values – mainly focusing on the structures and political issues</th>
<th>Mit dem Leitbild globaler Gerechtigkeit und nachhaltiger Entwicklung, Menschenrechten und Grundwerten der Demokratie identifizieren zu können. // To be able to identify with the policy of global justice and sustainability, human rights and core values of democracy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Local contextual codes</td>
<td>Aspects that emerge as very relevant for the specific (national or regional) context analysed across the 4 countries (IT, AT, CR, IE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes’ coding</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Given the nature of data, predictably the highest number of occurrences refers to the theme “course organization”. On the other hand, “I” stands for Local codes (Contextual issue). It is an additional theme, which refers only to issues that are very important in that specific context and not so important for the rest of the researchers. Given the small number of occurrences, we considered this irrelevant for the comparative analysis.

Quantitative data such as frequencies are not very meaningful in qualitative research. Nevertheless, the number of codes for each theme is a kind of evidence that should be somehow taken into account. The themes with the highest number of occurrences after the description of the course were F (GCE conception), E (Teaching approaches) and C (Contrasting cultures). Since ethnographic intensity and conceptual density were more important in our analysis, we asked each researcher as ethnographer to indicate the 3 most relevant themes in their analysis.

A cross scrutiny of the self-reflexive memos compiled by researchers after their coding revealed that all the researchers agreed that E, F, and C are the most relevant themes.

Moreover, from codebook analysis the same 3 main categories emerged as the most relevant ones:

(C) Contrasting cultures: different perspectives, worldviews, beliefs among stakeholders’ culture, also highlighting intergroup conflicts and tensions
(E) Teaching approaches: the general principles, pedagogy and management strategies used for classroom education
(F) GCE conception: the different conceptualizations that actors contributing to the organization and implementation of the course have in mind.

In Part II, we will focus in particular on each one of them by elaborating the comparative analysis of these key issues.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reasons to attend</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>GCE Implementation in Schools</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Threats</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Contrasting cultures</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Different actors in GCE training</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Trainer profile</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>In methods</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>In contents</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>In ethics/politics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Course organization</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Course evaluation</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Information on the course</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Trainee profile</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>262</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>1711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Teaching approaches</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Aims and goals</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Trainee assessment</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Classroom climate</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>Teaching methods</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>Pedagogical/theoretical approaches</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>Classroom setting</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total E</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>283</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>1289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>GCE Conception</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Terminology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>GCE competences</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>GCE teacher profile</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total F</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>310</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>GCE policy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Normative documents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total G</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 - Common meaningful themes. N. of occurrences
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H</th>
<th>GCE values</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>H</strong></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the following chapter, four national cases will be presented. National researchers provided a thorough description of the two cases ethnographically observed and some common patterns of analysis discussed among the team and deriving from the investigation of the categories of information available.

Moreover, in part two we will also provide some results of the survey carried out in the 9 settings where we administered a questionnaire to the participants at the end of the training course. It should be noted, however, that this kind of data was very difficult to collect in all the settings, given the organizational diversity of the 9 contexts which did not allow to use this tool in a standardized way.

On top of that, the distribution of the survey faced quite a lot of resistance in some contexts. Though considering such limitations, results are still relevant and they will be presented in II.6.

Finally, some caveats about the limitations of these results are necessary. While outcomes are grounded in a huge amount of data, the qualitative framework does not allow generalisations. This is in line with the main purpose of the research, aimed at providing in-depth understanding of practices of GCE teacher education to illuminate patterns of behavior, communicating styles, different values and beliefs, shared educational cultures.

Given the nature of these results, data analysis does not allow to draw up any immediate evidence-based policy guidelines. Yet, some suggestions from policymakers and practitioners arise and we will summarize them in the final part of this report.

For the same reasons, the present work does not measure efficacy and impact of the proposed training course. Yet it provides in-depth exploration on ideas, visions and course design which could be useful to practitioners and course organizers.
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The four national case studies presented in this section are based on the evidence and data collected from the documents in the framework of the ethnographic participant observation.

Documents were used to describe the case studies and as evidence to support claims on course characteristics [e.g. “the course is mostly composed by middle-aged primary school teachers (participants’ sheet records)].

The main categories of documents identified are the following:

- Program planning (including syllabus and promotional material among others)
- Implementation (including material supporting teachers and resources for trainees)
- Reflection (including material used by course organizers to assess the course implementation)

The two cases within the same country are described together, using the same structure based on the same key sources of data shared after a discussion among the research team:

- Description of cases
- Participants
- Aims and goals
- Methods
- Activities
- Evaluation and assessment
- Category of the actors
- Description of the main categories of the case

Documents also allowed us to eventually identify the gap between what we observed and what was done in practice.

Another important way to carry out the ethnographic research was to look carefully at several categories of persons: we integrated several lists of persons to elicit the most relevant, recurrent and meaningful ones to address our research questions.

The following four tables provides a comparative summary of key information which allows to look simultaneously at data comparing the institutional contexts, scopes, participants, actors involved etc.
### Table 5 - Case Study Austria. General overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>“AT” programme A</th>
<th>“AT” programme B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration</strong></td>
<td>Two runs of: 9 weekends, 4 afternoons, 2 day final seminar</td>
<td>Four afternoons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding body</strong></td>
<td>DEAR</td>
<td>College of Education Tyrol _ Erasmus+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of hours</strong></td>
<td>136h each run</td>
<td>13h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of trainees</strong></td>
<td>14 each run</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place</strong></td>
<td>Innsbruck</td>
<td>Innsbruck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Typology of organization promoting the training</strong></td>
<td>Non governmental organisation, LA, Austrian development association</td>
<td>College of education, Erasmus+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of schools involved in the training</strong></td>
<td>Schools were mainly represented by teachers/trainees</td>
<td>Pre-service teacher – no schools involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizations/actors involved in training</strong></td>
<td>NGO’s, college of education, university, practitioners</td>
<td>College of education, university professor, Erasmus+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of trainers involved</strong></td>
<td>8 plus different representatives of local NGOs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6 - Case Study Czech Republic. General overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>“CZ” Programme A</th>
<th>“CZ” Programme B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration</strong></td>
<td>4 one-day seminars</td>
<td>3 one-day seminars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Body</strong></td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>Czech Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Hours</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Trainees</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place</strong></td>
<td>Regional Education and Information centre, Ostrava</td>
<td>National Institute for Further Education, Ostrava and Prague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Typology of organization promoting the training</strong></td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>State – funded national expert institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of schools involved in the training:</strong>*</td>
<td>10 (originally 12, then 2 left) partner schools – 3-year cooperation, 11 other schools. Together 21 schools</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizations/actors involved in training</strong></td>
<td>NGOs (organizer + 2 guests from 2 other NGOs)</td>
<td>2 Universities, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of trainers involved:</strong></td>
<td>6 teacher educators</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7 - Case Study Ireland. General overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>“IE” Programme A</th>
<th>“IE” Programme B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration</strong></td>
<td>Five consecutive days</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Body</strong></td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>Irish Government (Irish Aid – Department of Foreign Affairs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Hours</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1-2 hours per session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Trainees</strong></td>
<td>18 primary teachers</td>
<td>14 primary teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place</strong></td>
<td>Third Level Institution Dublin</td>
<td>Schools &amp; Education Centres across Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Typology of organization promoting the training</strong></td>
<td>Third Level Institution in collaboration with NGO</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of schools involved in the training</strong></td>
<td>15 (teachers participating)</td>
<td>No data on numbers – Some sessions conducted for whole school staff and some for participants from different schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizations/actors involved in training</strong></td>
<td>Third Level Institution (2 teacher educators) &amp; NGO (1 teacher educator)</td>
<td>NGO (Education officer &amp; facilitating teachers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of trainers involved</strong></td>
<td>3 teacher educators</td>
<td>15 teacher educators per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8 - Case Study Italy. General overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IT course A</th>
<th>IT course B</th>
<th>IT course C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding body</strong></td>
<td>DEAR</td>
<td>Erasmus +</td>
<td>DEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of hours</strong></td>
<td>16 lessons + work on educational resources &amp; institute program + 4 hours added</td>
<td>8 lesson + 2 training in blended mode + 4 hours added</td>
<td>48 hours of lessons and 24 hours online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of trainees</strong></td>
<td>29 teachers</td>
<td>14 teachers + 10 NGOs</td>
<td>21 in-service teachers + 1 pre-service teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place</strong></td>
<td>Trento</td>
<td></td>
<td>Porto San Giorgio-Ancona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Typology of organization promoting the training</strong></td>
<td>Local hub for NGOs</td>
<td>LAs – dep. Foreign affairs</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of schools involved in the training</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations/actors involved in training:</td>
<td>Training officer + 4 teachers provided by Local Authority’s Education Department + LA Dep. Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>2 university professors + 2 research fellows + 7 NGOs</td>
<td>1 trainer officer, 1 retired teacher member of the NGO training staff, 4 NGO educators and 1 external counselor educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of trainers involved:</td>
<td>3 external trainers + 3 internal</td>
<td>1 university prof + 3 research fellows as tutors</td>
<td>1 internal trainer supported by 5 internal assistants + 1 external trainer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AT</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>IT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration</strong></td>
<td>28 meetings</td>
<td>7 one day seminars</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding body</strong></td>
<td>EU funds</td>
<td>EU &amp; Czech Government</td>
<td>EU &amp; Irish Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of hours</strong></td>
<td>149</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of trainees</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place</strong></td>
<td>Innsbruck</td>
<td>Ostrava &amp; Prague</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Typology of organization promoting the training</strong></td>
<td>NGO’s, college of education, university, practitioners, College of education, university professor, Erasmus+</td>
<td>NGO, State – funded national expert institution</td>
<td>Third Level Institution Dublin, Schools &amp; Education Centres across Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of schools involved in the training</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of trainers involved</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 - General overview
Chapter 2: The national case of Austria

Sandra Altenberger

Within the project *Global Schools: EYD 2015 to embed Global Learning in primary education* it was possible to hold two runs of GCE teacher trainings (programme A) in the Austrian region Tyrol. Even though the analysis mainly focused (in a quantitative and qualitative way) on the second run, some data of the first run were crucial. This programme was part of the GS project and was held in cooperation with the Non Governmental Organisation *Südwind* and the college of education Tyrol. On top of that programme we also studied a second one (B), that was organised outside the GS project by Erasmus+ and carried out at the college of education Tyrol. Therefore, this section provides an overview of the Austrian GCE teacher education research results of both programmes. The following table shows all the data collected from both programmes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Programme A</th>
<th>Programme B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># informal interviews</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># formal interviews</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># training sessions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># hours of observation</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># words of transcript</td>
<td>12,226</td>
<td>3,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># documents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># document pages</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># photos</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># memos</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># questionnaires</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,363.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,661.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the Austrian case two Global Citizenship Education (GCE) programmes, here described as A and B, were observed and analysed. The two courses feature major differences. For example, differences were observed in terms of participants, duration of the courses, as well as institutional embedding and implementation. Therefore, aspects such as participants, aims and goals, methods, activities and evaluation/assessment are also different to a certain extent. The description is based on the data collected throughout the whole research process. Formal and informal interviews, observations and questionnaires as well as pictures and relevant course documents are the basis for the research output.

Programme A and B had different target groups. Concerning programme A, precisely defined information was found in the curriculum on admission requirements, target group and criteria to attend. For example, one attendance requirement was the degree in (primary) education. As a consequence, the target group was made of in-service teachers with a full qualification.

The amount of participants was limited to 25 persons. The admission was open also to non-teachers (e.g. social-workers, youth-workers or people with a qualification in similar fields). (AT-D-in-02-03.09.2015, p.13) Eleven in-service teachers, one pre-service teacher as well as two non-teachers, most of them women, took part in programme A.

The participants’ age ranged between mid-twenty and sixty. (AT-Q-in-02-10.07.2017) Most of them, as the observations and interviews showed, had a strong interest and past experiences with GCE issues before attending the course. Their past experiences and their interest were basically derived from private (for example travelling) and educational reasons. (AT-P-in-03-23.09.2016) Trainees stated a desire to transform their personal interest into their daily practice. (AT-li-in-01-04.02.2016).

In contrast to that, programme B was an elective subject for pre-service teachers organised by Erasmus+.

The sixteen participants, mainly women, came from nine different countries including the Czech Republic, Turkey, Belgium, Italy, Ireland, the UK, Austria, Switzerland and Hong Kong. Therefore, this group was highly international. The average age of the participants was 23 years. GCE was generally new for the participants, who nevertheless developed a strong interest in GCE-related issues and their implementation in classroom. Although some participants of both programmes are located in the countryside, most of them were living and teaching in the city. (AT-Q-in-02-10.07.2017, AT-Q-ex-01-30.07.2017)
Both different and overlapping aims and goals were observed in the two programmes. Programme A laid down its aims and goals in the curriculum, which required by the college of education Tyrol, because trainees graduate with ECTS points. The curriculum can be seen as a key document for the programme itself, as well as for the research process. The content design and its realisation was curated by Südwind Tyrol in cooperation with the college of education Tyrol. The well-structured curriculum represented a highly important foundation for a stronger embedding of GCE in Tyrolean schools. (AT-D-in-02-03.09.2015, p.3). The overall goals emerging from the curriculum are the following:

a) gaining GCE based knowledge
b) getting to know the competences, didactics and methods of GCE
c) implementing the dimensions of GCE in the classroom practice. (AT-D-in-02-03.09.2015, p.4)

Therefore, the trainees should get an overview about the principles, contents and methods of GCE as well as the practical implementation in classroom. GCE, is understood here as a cross sectional purpose for educational processes and consequently as a core principle for schools.

Firstly, following the question ‘What is GCE?’ these elements were reported as important:

- change of perspectives
- interconnection of GCE issues
- bringing together approaches related to peace, human rights, environment and development education (AT-D-in-02-03.09.2015, p. 4f)

Secondly, the aim was to build up a reflexive agency grounded in crucial GCE competences, like:

- critical thinking
- reflecting own values
- finding creative solutions
- dealing with complexity and ambiguity
- identifying with issues like global justice, sustainability, human rights, democracy and intercultural learning. (AT-D-in-02-03.09.2015, p.5f)

Thirdly, one of the established aims was to learn GCE didactics and methods to implement GCE in the classroom. Central pedagogical approaches were:

- open learning
- social learning
- Montessori-pedagogy
- dialogue and experience (AT-D-in-02-03.09.2015, p.7)
In the end, mention was made of what a ‘global teacher’ needs— *which competences do teachers need to have?* Three major points were reported as crucial:

- teacher’s attitude, which means to be open and reflexive about the global interconnected world
- the global teacher needs to be knowledgeable about globalisation, migration, world economy, environment and development, human rights, peace and non-violence
- didactic competence is highly important to implement the approaches and knowledge in the classroom, to build on the living environment of the children, to produce a motivating and creative learning environment with participation and dialogue. (AT-D-in-02-03.09.2015, p.7f)

All in all, as the core trainer and director of the programme reported, it is very important to achieve a reflexive view on one self and the world. In order to achieve the established aims and goals and to focus on content and reflection, long-term teacher programmes are seen as more beneficial than short term events. (AT-If-in-02-08.09.2017)

Programme B, which has been embedded in the college of education Tyrol for more than six years, was mainly focused on European citizenship, although several discussions and inputs were related also to global citizenship. Furthermore, the programme was part of a wider course with an international focus (it consists of four courses), organised within the framework of the Erasmus+ programme (AT-If-ex-01-30.06.2017).

In comparison to programme A national, European and international identity-building was central in programme B. The aim was to (re)value issues related to the European Union but also to GCE and to show that these issues affect us in our daily (personal and work) life. The expansion of the whole module to GCE contents and issues was seen as a central aim for future courses. Equally relevant was the ability to reflect and think critically. Intercultural learning, language awareness and GCE are considered critical skills for teachers in a globalised world. As far as the practical implementation of the programme in the classroom is concerned, it is very important to give teachers a number of appropriate methods, enabling them to put in practice what they learnt. (AT-If-ex-01-30.06.2017)

The importance of **implementation** in school as well as **self-reflexivity** and **critical thinking** can be described as a common aim in both programmes.

In both programmes, knowing and testing different methods was seen as highly beneficial for a sustainable implementation in the classroom. The intersection of theory and practice can be described as an essential approach (concerning content and methods) of programme A. It is important to note that in programme A also methods of a non-European context were used for the planning and implementation stages.
As far as aims and established goals are concerned, programme A contained different learning strategies and methods (AT-If-in-02-08.09.2017):

- lectures
- seminars
- theory-practice units
- excursions
- literature reading
- praxis-project
- ‘critical-friend’
- portfolio (AT-D-in-02-03.09.2015, p.9)

The teaching team, as well as external lecturers, gave inputs on central issues of GCE. The seminar focused mainly on activities, discussions in small and large working groups settings and on testing provided educational material of Südwind. The excursions were considered important to get to know the local structure and the landscape of NGOs and other important actors dealing with GCE issues. Networking and collaboration between local actors and schools were seen as vital for further implementation plans. The individual search of literature and reading as well as the trainees’ own projects were also methodologically crucial. The core teaching team supervised these individual projects. The concept ‘critical friend’ was seen as a tool for exchanges - the trainees benefit, from the knowledge and experiences of others. In addition to that, the ‘critical-friend’ concept was important to learn the approach of a ‘joint-consultation’ and consider it as an important component of project planning. The portfolio served as an important tool for the documentation of the trainees’ individual learning processes. (AT-D-in-02-03.09.2015, p.9f)

The international character of participants in programme B and the fact that the spoken language during the training was English had an influence on the methods used during the training. (AT-If-ex-01-30.06.2017) The methodological focus in programme B was mainly to use feasible methods. Given the trainees’ different nationality, they did not share the same teaching ‘culture’ and experiences. Some trainees were definitely used to interactive methods, like working in groups or discussions, while other trainees were more used to theoretical inputs. The sharing of knowledge in the programme focused on open learning strategies and can be described as dialogue-oriented. (AT-N-ex-01-26.05.2017) Trainees were encouraged to discuss, reflect and think critically about European Union issues, as well as GCE issues.

Therefore, what is important in both programmes is the use of diversified methods, which guide their practical implementation. Programme A, as a long-term course, still shows more possibilities and time resources to exhaust all the variety of methods.
The diversity of methods becomes apparent in the activities that were carried out. Programme A provided a high range of different activities. A mixture of lining-ups, quizzes, games, workshops, body-activities and individual activities were used. *Energizers* were frequently used in the beginning of the course or in between to activate after a break. At the beginning, activities like ‘Hello’ helped trainees as well as trainers to get to know each other, to collect expectations and experiences of the group. On the first day an activity called ‘impulse-postcards’ was used to focus on the individual GCE connection of trainees.

In this case, trainees selected postcards helping them to explain their personal connection with GCE or globalisation. (AT-D-in-05-20.09.2016) A socio metric lining-up was used to reflect one’s own origin – geographically, professionally and concerning interests and motivation. (AT-N-in-01-23.09.2016)

The activity ‘my world map’ was important to reflect on the global track that everybody leaves behind in the places where ones lives or goes on holiday, or where friends or family members live. (AT-N-in-03-14.11.2017)

Other activities, like the ‘world-game’, the ‘apple-method’ or ‘meal-conversations’ focused on central GCE issues like globalisation, world-population, distribution of agricultural land or change of perspectives. (AT-N-in-04-25.02.2017)

In this case trainees tried to take up different viewpoints about a given theme. The activity called ‘Flower-Power’ was used to realise one’s own entanglements in power-relations from an intersectional perspective. (AT-If-in-02-08.09.2017)

A ‘reflexive walk’ in pairs or small groups was used to reflect and review one’s own learning process throughout the whole teacher training. After the walk, each group made a creative feedback poster. (AT-N-in-08-10.07.2017)

In all activities it was very important to experience different roles and to step out of this role again and reflect on the process. So, a truly sensitive management of activities and methods by the teching team was seen as highly important. (AT-If-in-02-08.09.2017)

Activities used in programme B were mainly focused on EU topics. As a start, an individual activity was used to highlight the trainees’ knowledge of the EU. All trainees were asked to write down all possible words they associated with the EU. They later discussed about it in a joint session. Another activity was a quiz about EU myths, which also was connected to global issues. A group activity called ‘learning spaces’ focused on topics like history of the EU, educational material (EU and GCE) and institutions of the EU. In general, the activities were interactive and were very diverse. (AT-N-ex-01-26.05.2017)

GCE issues arose mainly as parts of inputs, readings and discussions.

The assessment of programme A was based on three pillars. Firstly, attendance (75%), as well as the active cooperation in the course were necessary – also because the programme was marked by a high grade of interactivity. Secondly, the trainees had to write an individual portfolio. The whole process of writing was supervised by the teaching team. Thirdly, the implementation of the trainee’s
own project in their classroom as well as the presentation of its results were necessary to complete the course and get credits (ECTS). All these processes were supervised by the teaching team and benefited from an exchange with the so called ‘critical-friend’. (AT-D-in-02-03.09.2015, p.10)

The activity ‘reflexive walk’ and their creative presentations, as well as the questionnaires, gave an insight into what the trainees thought of the course and therefore contained important evaluative information for assessment. Trainees mentioned knowledge about GCE among the beneficial results of the course, together with deeper interest, more inspiration, more motivation and more awareness about GCE issues. Also the organisation and in particular the supervision provided by the teaching team throughout the whole process were described as outstanding. (AT-Q-in-02-10.07.2017)

The selection of many different lecturers and trainers, the balance between theory and practice and therefore the balance between input and activities were described as highly positive – especially for the implementation in school. Trainees stated that the programme was “highly useful for practice” (AT-li-in-01-04.02.2016). In addition, the classroom atmosphere and the respect, trust and empathy within the group throughout the months were seen as tremendously important for the learning process as well as for the wellbeing of the group. (AT-li-in-01-04.02.2016)

Furthermore, trainees stated that it would be highly beneficial to organise follow-up meetings to have an exchange, after the teacher training course. Some of the graduated trainees already met at the Südwind library to exchange their thoughts, materials, ideas etc. (AT-If-in-02-08.09.2017)

As far as programme B is concerned, attendance was also obligatory to complete the course. Additionally, trainees had to do a poster presentation as well as a presentation of one of their personal stories related to their specific school context. At the end of the programme, trainees reviewed the course in an informal setting and talked about their learning processes. To hear others' opinions and to have valuable discussions and exchanges was described as highly useful. Trainees completed the course with more motivation, more awareness about global issues and acquired more competences to implement GCE and they valued the course as beneficial for future teachers. (AT-Q-ex-01-30.07.2017)

In both programmes the main actors were certainly teachers and learners as well as the enabling and hampering actors. Programme A was carried out within the GS project and therefore the European Commission with the section DEAR (Development Education and Awareness Raising) was the funding body. The Austrian partners were the local authority (Land Tyrol), Südwind and the Austrian Development Agency (ADA). Programme B, which was embedded in the college of education Tyrol and organised by Erasmus+, was funded by the Austrian Ministry of Education.

3. Actors involved in the Austrian case
As stated in the curriculum of programme A, trainers and as a consequence teachers can have two roles - on the one hand they are knowledge givers and on the other hand they are facilitators. (AT-D-in-02-03.09.2015, p.7) Furthermore, especially in the context of a teacher-training programme, the practices of teaching and learning cannot be described separately. Indeed, they make up a mutually influenced process, where teachers can be learners and learners can be teachers at the same time.

The core teaching team of Südwind consisted of four trainers who were teaching and facilitating. They were mainly responsible for the content design and its implementation during teaching activities (seminars, workshops, interactive methods, etc.); they also made available (educational) materials. In addition, they selected the external trainers and lecturers. This selection was based on a careful balance of theory and practice as well as on the inclusion of all GCE dimensions. To have different theoretical backgrounds and gender balance were also vital for the selection of trainers. Some trainers had an academic background and therefore focused on theoretical access to GCE issues. Others had a more practical background and paid more attention to methods and interactive learning settings. Also guests from local NGOs functioned as trainers by presenting their work and their GCE dimensions and ideas. (AT-If-in-02-08.09.2017)

The learners (trainees) were mainly primary school teachers (in-service) or even head teachers of primary schools. Additionally, some trainees with different (non-school) backgrounds also took part in the course. This was necessary to get enough enrolments and furthermore it was highly beneficial for the course to have an exchange with participants from a non-school context. As already mentioned, participants in programme A were mainly women. Learners showed great openness right from the start of the programme and many of them already had experiences with GCE. (AT-N-in-01-23.09.2016)

They described the group dynamics – including teachers and learners - as highly positive and characterised by respect, tolerance and a shared curiosity for the topic. (AT-Q-in-02-10.07.2017) Teachers and learners also shared emotions like amazement, satisfaction, trust, thoughtfulness, helplessness, curiosity, outrage, uncertainty, awareness, respect and understanding. (AT-N-in-04-25.02.2017, AT-N-in-05-24.03.2017, AT-N-in-06-06.05.2017, AT-N-in-07-09.06.2017, AT-N-in-08-10.07.2017) Especially understanding, according to Edgar Morin, is considered essential for future education. Morin speaks about the ethics of understanding and highlights two important elements, which support understanding. Firstly, the “good thinking”, which allows to think in a complex and interconnected way and to think in a collective way about the text, the context, the individual, the environment, the local and the global, the multidimensional or the complexity. Secondly, the critical “self-observation” as a mental practice to permanently proof and therefore reflect on yourself. (cf. Morin 2001: 123) In this respect, many of these elements were observed in programme A. As a consequence, the teacher-learner relationship, that is based on openness and awareness, can be seen as highly beneficial for future GCE teachers.

Programme B was held mainly by one core trainer who was responsible for organising and teaching. The fact that the programme was observed by a researcher was seen as motivation for making GCE a subject in the course. A professor of the University Pretoria – South-Africa was invited as a guest
speaker to give an insight into different educational and political topics as well as into the South African school system. Following these lectures, a discussion starting with the trainees about the different national school contexts. Further discussions focused on what a professional (GCE) future teacher needs. (AT-N-ex-01-26.05.2017) A mutual enrichment was observed for teachers (trainers) and learners (trainees). All the trainees were pre-service teachers, mainly women in their twenties. As already mentioned, the trainees had different national backgrounds, including the Czech Republic, Turkey, Belgium, Italy, Ireland, the UK, Austria, Switzerland and Hong Kong. (AT-N-ex-01-26.05.2017)

Most of the trainees were talkative and communicative and the interactions can be characterised as informal. Trainees themselves described the group atmosphere as beneficial for the learning process. (AT-N-ex-01-26.05.2017)

In sum, teachers and learners of both programmes can be described as crucial actors within their different roles. Based on mutual learning processes, GCE issues and values can be internalised in a sustainable way.

The planning process of programme A was based on an exchange with experienced colleagues of other Austrian Südwind offices, who had already organised GCE teacher trainings. This cooperation was highly enabling for the conceptual development of the curriculum. This experience of planning and implementation was regarded as highly beneficial. A written curriculum was requested by the college of education Tyrol, because the graduation of trainees was based on ECTS points and therefore an official curriculum was compulsory. Even though it is challenging and somehow hampering when an official educational authority cooperates with a Non Governmental Organisation, because their logic and needs are totally different, the process itself was described as definitely beneficial for both sides. (AT-If-in-02-08.09.2017)

The networking with local NGOs can be seen as helpful, because it really deepened the alliance between Südwind and other NGOs, as well as the alliance between schools/teachers and NGOs. This cooperation with different actors created a well-established foundation also for the next teacher trainings. Furthermore, the trainees themselves, with their motivation and ideas, were described as beneficial factors for the success of the course. Time pressure was reported as the most hampering or constraining element both during the planning processes and during the course itself. (AT-If-in-02-08.09.2017)

The curriculum for Programme B was drafted by the international programme. As a consequence, the core trainer of the programme had a lot of freedom in designing the contents of the course. It was thus possible to implement GCE issues in the course and select relevant guest speakers, although the course was focused on EU and citizenship. (AT-If-ex-01-30.06.2017)

The organisation and implementation of a long-term GCE teacher training programme requires the involvement of many actors who are somehow forced to cooperate. Therefore, the different or contrasting perspectives, cultures, logics and structures of different actors are at the same time challenging and beneficial.
One of the most important questions in this analysis are the teachers’ (trainees) motivation, participation and expectations about the programme. So what drives teachers to attend a GCE training course? To look at the motivation and expectations of teachers can be very helpful for the implementation of the programme itself, for further planning of GCE teacher trainings, as well as for the further implementation of GCE in basic teacher training.

Right from the start, a strong motivation of trainees for an engagement with GCE issues was reported in both programmes. As one of the core trainers of programme A said, many more people were interested in a GCE teacher training than those who actually enrolled on it. But what are the reasons for the non-enrolment, despite the interest shown? First of all the fact that such teacher trainings should be attended outside regular school hours. The teacher trainings took place on several weekends for two semesters and therefore for some trainees, especially those with family responsibilities, it was difficult to participate. (AT-If-in-02-08.09.2017).

A trainer of programme B stated that it is highly problematic that GCE teacher trainings are placed in further training settings. That is why only people with a well-established interest in GCE would attend. It is hard to reach other people and GCE issues remain invisible. “This should not be the idea” (AT-If-ex-01-30.06.2017).

The motivation of trainees who attended one of the programmes can be described as predominantly intrinsic. Most of the trainees in programme A said that they already had some experience with GCE topics. They mentioned experiences related to personal interests (travelling) or higher education. So some of them said that they were truly happy when they heard about the GCE teacher training. (AT-li-in-O1-04.02.2016)

One trainee said, that he/she feels a responsibility to discuss in classroom the interconnectedness between wealth in the so called ‘global-north’ and the exploitation of the so called ‘global-south’. Also the broad range of topics related to GCE was mentioned as a motivating factor. Exchange with other GCE interested teachers in such a specific teacher training was a highly motivating reason to attend, in order to get new ideas, new impressions and new inspiration. (AT-li-in-01-04.02.2016)

The attendance of trainees was therefore supported by the will to be part of a change in this global world and to bring this change into the classroom was highly important for trainees. It was very important for trainees to be given the opportunity to reflect about their own position in a global world, to change perspectives from a local to a global scale and think critically about learning processes and education itself. (AT-N-in-02-13.11.2017)

So all in all, it can be stated that trainees had a strong intrinsic motivation and enthusiasm from the beginning till the end of the course.

But which expectations did trainees have towards a GCE teacher training? In this case, questionnaires and field notes were particularly useful. The main expectations reported by trainees were to increase their knowledge of GCE, of the tools/methods to improve the knowledge in the classroom. For trainees it was equally important to be able to have a broader view, to ‘look over the plate’ and to get new perspectives of global interconnectedness as to be able to change their own attitudes. Gregor Lang-Wojtasik describes ‘looking over the plate’ as a
grounded worldview – to have a broader view beyond one’s own situation and institution. In conjunction to this, Lang-Wojtasik also explains the orientation on living environment, transdisciplinarity, networking and worldwide thinking as important factors for a grounded worldview. (cf. Lang-Wojtasik 2014: 4)

The expectations reported by the trainees merge with the competences mentioned in the relevant GCE literature. For example, expectations concerning networking were mentioned several times; it was good to have the opportunity to know new people with similar interests and start networking with diverse NGOs and other teachers/schools. Participants appreciated the assistance they could take advantage of, in order to know where to get resources and teaching material for their individual education and also for the classroom.

The following expectations, as reported by trainees, are very significant:

- foresight
- information
- new perspectives and approaches
- global interconnectedness
- more knowledge to be competent in classroom
- tools and methods
- knowledge for me
- sharing knowledge – how?
- change attitudes
- new thinking for me and others
- critical acting
- get to know new people
- implementation in school
- getting competent in arguing
- didactic methods and materials


At the end of programme A, trainees made statements as to how and to which extent their expectations were fulfilled or not in the programme:

“The course is characterized by competent lecturers and provides participants with original teaching materials, which stimulate for implementation in practice. Complex topics are illuminated and critically interrogated from different perspectives. An enrichment not only for my lessons, but also for my personal surrounding.” (AT-D-in-01-10.09.2016)

“This course impresses, makes one thoughtful, removes blinders and makes one more competent as a “world citizen”. The variety of topics, workshops, courses and lecturers allows a multitude of perspectives on global issues.” (AT-D-in-01-10.09.2016)
The Austrian Ministry of Education reacted to the global challenges with the establishment of a ‘strategy group global learning’ in 2003. This strategy group is made of representatives of the Ministry, researchers, practitioners of educational organisations and schools, and it focuses on the implementation of GCE in schools. A strategy paper, mandated by the Ministry of Education, presents important recommendations for the implementation of GCE. This paper recommends the establishment of a GCE teacher training. Looking at the composition of the strategy group but also at the different actors in the teacher training programmes, it is appropriate to ask where the points of (cultural) intersections and frictions of GCE actors are. As already mentioned the written curriculum serves as a key document for the whole analysis and furthermore can be seen as normative document, which is and will be relevant for the implementation of GCE in schools of Tyrol.

The logic and needs of the cooperating actors for programme A were described as different and therefore can be seen as elements of friction. (AT-If-in-02-08.09.2017). As far as the central actors are concerned, like scholars and practitioners from NGOs, a different teaching was observed. Therefore, scholars focused more on inputs and knowledge and practitioners focused more on interactive methods and activities. (AT-If-in-02-08.09.2017) This difference in perspective and teaching culture was mainly described as positive. Moreover, this is connected with the theory-practice approach of programme A.

The diverse methods and materials used especially by practitioners had positive influence on the attention of trainees during the course, although also scholars tried to relate to the reality of a classroom setting. Programme B in turn had a strong focus on EU topics and the development of national and supranational identities. The linguistic friction among the trainees had a strong influence on the selection of methods and activities. (AT-If-ex-01-30.06.2017) Also in programme B a combination of theory and practice was observed. Therefore, having different actors with different backgrounds can be considered very useful to achieve a holistic GCE approach. Scholars tend to focus more on the distribution of GCE knowledge and practitioners of NGOs focus more on GCE competences. As a consequence, policies should focus on the combination of knowledge and shared competences.
The analysis of the conception and framing of GCE teacher trainings will focus on teaching approaches, including its aims, classroom atmosphere, teaching methods and pedagogical/theoretical approaches, of both Austrian programmes. This chapter will therefore focus on the question of how GCE is developed as a framework for teacher education. One of the most relevant teaching approaches is the theory–practice transfer, which is characteristic of both programmes but is critical in programme A. In programme B, the professionalization of (future) teachers through GCE was a central approach.

Programme A was held twice in two modules. The first module focused on the basics of globalisation and GCE, while the second one focused on GCE knowledge and methods. The modules themselves included sections of human science, teaching methodology and school experiences. (AT-D-in-02-03.09.2015, p.14,16).

By way of example, the seminar sessions of the first semester were organised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seminar 1</th>
<th>From global education to GCE: concepts and perspectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seminar 2</td>
<td>Worldview and self-image: change of perspectives as core competence in GCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar 3</td>
<td>Theory-practice transfer I: fair-trade and ethical consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory-practice afternoon I</td>
<td>City walk ethical consumption and reading discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar 4</td>
<td>Understanding globalisation: realising world interconnectedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar 5</td>
<td>Identity, values and colonialism through the lens of GCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory-practice afternoon 2</td>
<td>Planning guide and cooperatively exchange of projects; definition of learning in GCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast, programme B was embedded in an international module of the college of education Tyrol and was held on four afternoons. Two afternoons focused on EU topics and the two focused on global exchange and GCE. The following section provides an overview of teaching approaches and GCE implementation in school, which was a fundamental issue for both programmes and for its trainees.
The established overall goal of programme A was to enable trainees to expand their own classroom practice to the dimensions of GCE: social justice, diversity and interculturalism, human rights, sustainability, peace and democracy (AT-D-in-01-10.09.2016). Trainees should therefore get an overview of principles, contents and methods of GCE and learn how to implement them in their classrooms. Additionally, GCE is organised as a core principle for classrooms and therefore as a cross-section task which should regard all people in school. GCE knowledge and competences were seen as an appropriate reaction to the development of a global society. (AT-D-in-02-03.09.2015, p.4) The educational approach includes aims and goals, which are the result out of an intensive planning process:

- gain the core principles of GCE
- deepening knowledge on the causes and effects of globalisation
- dialogue about GCE competences
- reflection on one’s own values and representations concerning globalisation, human rights and peace
- experience a change of perspective
- reflection on identity and values, get to know methods and didactic principles
- gain knowledge concerning human rights and peace
- tools for the planning of one’s own project
- get to know the diversity of methods
- implement GCE as a cross-section theme
- deal with media in a critical way
- get to know the concept of sustainability (economy – ecology – sociology)
- get to know possibilities to act
- get to know methods for classroom
- discuss about intercultural learning
- reflect on diversity and migration
- get an understanding of north-south interconnectedness
- experience and implement methods of GCE
- get to know instruments to analyse and reflect on classroom practice

(AT-D-in-02-03.09.2015, p.17/19)

The development of programme A as a long-term course is certainly useful to achieve the set goals. As one of the core trainers said, short-term teacher trainings are useful and important, although they provide only a partial overview. Another strong aspiration was to expand the focus on non-European methods, so to overcome a Eurocentric perspective. For example, the book *Interactive training methods* by Sivasailam Thiagarajan and Samuel Van Den Bergh was very important, as were the methods of the *Popular Education (educação popular)* – the so-called education from below. (AT-If-in-02-08.09.2017)

The theory-practice approach was fundamental for planning, selection of trainers, contents and methods. Trainees should get an insight in the theory of GCE but also get to know the tools to implement this knowledge in their classrooms. Therefore, it was stated that it was not only an approach to know the tools, but also to experience the methods and the roles so as to be able to reflect on the methods before implementing them in classroom. On the
other hand, it was reported that the organising and teaching team had to face very demanding tasks, that required a lot of time and efforts and this led to a highly rough timetable. **Team teaching** as well as team planning was central for an informed implementation of the course. This focus on **exchange** was also evident in the concept of ‘**joint-consultation**’, where trainees had the possibility to exchange advice. Additionally, **networking** with NGOs and other actors was useful to know the landscape of GCE actors they can refer to after completing the course. As far as teaching methods are concerned, as already mentioned the close interconnection between theory and practice affected the selection and use of methods. The planning and implementation focused on the diversity of methods, on processes, different social forms and diverse resources (like pictures, materials, movies, games, etc.). (AT-If-in-02-08.09.2017)

Therefore, methods of social learning, open learning as well as Montessori pedagogy were used. These methods, in line with the notion of constructivist pedagogy, were based on **dialogue, participation** and **experience**. (AT-D-in-02-03.09.2015, p.7)

Very significant was the opportunity to reflect about one’s own position and discuss about certain specific issues. Creative methods like theatre pedagogy, movie workshops or open learning and dialogue-oriented methods like working in different group settings or role-playing were observed. (AT-D-in-02-03.09.2015, AT-If-in-02-08.09.2017) The theoretical inputs were varied and prompted positive discussions. The ‘**seminar-reporter**’ method was a well-conceived example of the active involvement of trainees. They summarized a two-days seminar and were expected to share their thoughts with others at the end of each seminar unit. (AT-N-in-01-23.09.2016)

The classroom atmosphere can be described as informal; the interpersonal relationships within the group can be described as beneficial for the learning processes. The group was able to deal with delicate or sensitive situations also because right from the beginning there was a strong focus on group-building processes. The development of a framework of **respect** enabled trainees to tackle tricky questions in a sensitive way, thus contributing to the learning process. (AT-If-in-02-08.09.2017)

Programme B focused on EU topics and partly on GCE topics. The fact that the trainer was free to design the course from the viewpoint of contents and methods made it possible to discuss GCE issues. As far as GCE is concerned, the general goal was to raise awareness about the fact that global issues affect each one of us in our daily life. **(Self) reflexivity** and **critical thinking** on a global level were key approaches to GCE, as well as language awareness and intercultural learning. In particular, GCE was considered important to enhance the professional skills of teachers worldwide. Another important question was how identity (both national and supranational) is developing on a national or global level. (AT-N-ex-01-26.05.2017)

Equally important were issues such as **changing perspective** from a national to a global one, seeing the **interconnectedness** of the world and developing a **political engagement** as a teacher. (AT-N-ex-01-26.05.2017)

Topics such as racism, gender relations as well as colonialism and its current consequences were also reported as fundamental for GCE. The past and current relations between ‘the global north’ and ‘the global south’ and the related consequences were discussed during the course, based on current
representations and different world maps. (AT-N-ex-02-30.06.2017)

Therefore, although the main focus of programme B was on EU, European citizenship, the history and political structures of the EU, it was widened so as to include global questions such democracy and human rights. (AT-N-ex-01-26.05.2017, AT-N-ex-02-30.06.2017)

In addition to that, the development of competences – *so how to act* – was an important approach. During the course, the group discussed about the development of joint actions. Reflecting on one’s own position and one’s own school organisation was reported as an important skill for teaching GCE. (AT-N-ex-02-30.06.2017)

As participants stated, the course raised their awareness about how children and teachers are affected by global issues and how important it is to take up responsibility for acting. (AT-Q-ex-01-30.06.2017)

According to participants, a GCE teacher should have the following characteristics:

> “be open minded, curious, show empathy, be neutral, be aware of differences, patient, feel responsible, etc.”

(AT-Q-ex-01-30.06.2017)

The fact that the group members spoke different languages had an influence on the methods used. In working groups, trainees could choose the language they wanted to talk, the only requirement being that every group member should be able to understand. The methods used were: working in groups, guided discussions and individual activities. These methods were based on dialogue, participation and open learning and the use of different material - such as flipcharts, videos, books and educational material.

Trainees described the *“interactions as interesting”* (AT-Q-ex-01-30.06.2017) and stated *“it was a good atmosphere, because everyone gave his/her best”* (AT-Q-ex-01-30.06.2017). At the end of the course trainees expressed their own GCE concept:

> “*Global education is learning how your actions have a much broader impact than you can imagine*” (AT-Q-ex-01-30.06.2017)

> “*Educating children about all different types of living, rather than just live as they ‘know/believe’ it.*

> *Opening their eyes to different cultures, races, religions, ways of thinking*”

(AT-Q-ex-01-30.06.2017)

> “*It is something which will always be relevant, people will always be moving and migrating*” (AT-Q-ex-01-30.06.2017)

> “*It’s an every day subject*” (AT-Q-ex-01-30.06.2017)
GCE implementation in classroom or school emerged as an important element in both programmes. The analysis highlighted both opportunities and threats related to implementation. The theory-practice approach in both programmes showed that implementation in school had a great significance in any case. Teacher education, ‘new’ in Austria, led to a limited success of GCE as a comprehensive topic. But GCE as cross sectional topic is found only occasionally. A broad implementation of GCE in basic teacher education is still missing – traditional subjects still have priority. Consequently, there are several short-term GCE training courses, but they do not serve as holistic and useful for practice. Therefore, time restrictions can be seen as a threat for implementation of GCE in classroom.

“I see the temporal component as constraint for this subject”
(AT-If-in-01-29.01.2016)

Additionally, financial constraints in the educational system and personal constraints were reported as hampering factors. (AT-If-in-01-29.01.2016) Nevertheless, internal teacher trainings in schools are on the rise. According to this fact, GCE could gain more weight in internal trainings for the future. (AT-If-in-01-29.01.2016)

The framework of programme A, with its diverse methods and inputs as well as the implementation of a dedicated project of trainees in their schools, can be considered very positive for the implementation process of GCE in school. For example, one trainee introduced GCE in her school as a ‘school-quality-theme’, that is an initiative of the Ministry of Education to develop and ensure more pedagogical quality and therefore make sure that children have the best conditions for learning.

Attitude change was reported as very important for classroom implementation, because attitude change allows teachers to deal differently with children’s questions and to spread awareness among colleagues. (AT-If-in-02-08.09.2017) But implementation in school does not only focus on pupils. Trainees stated that also colleagues and children’s parents should be involved. Trainees also said that networking and exchanges with other schools would be important and desirable – locally and globally. Trainees also stated that follow-up meetings, for those who attend a GCE teacher training, would be important for further and deeper implementation. In such meetings, they could exchange knowledge but also experiences and ideas. A few trainees also commented that teachers “have a responsibility to act, inform and raise consciousness”. (AT-II-in-01-04.02.2016)

The competences of trainers as well as the diversity of methods and materials were reported as inspiring for the implementation process.

Another important factor was that the trainees experienced the methods themselves and that they had to carry out their own projects in school. All in all, the teacher training was described as ‘highly useful for practice’. (AT-II-in-01-04.02.2016)

Trainees said that the teacher training was inspiring and motivating for the implementation process in school, although they are confronted with financial
and time restrictions as well as personal constraints in the educational system. (AT-li-in-01-04.02.2016, AT-Q-in-02-10.07.2017) The lack of networking and communication in school and between schools and the lack of GCE integration in the curriculum are seen as a threat for implementation. Trainees stated that networking and follow-up meetings would be very useful (by the way, the first follow-up meetings had already been organised). (AT-li-in-01-04.02.2016, AT-N-in-08-10.07.2017)

Implementation was a relevant issue in programme B, too. Trainees discussed implementation in the different national contexts. Despite the differences they all agreed on the fact that there is a capitalization, an ongoing focus on financial and entrepreneurial issues, of the school systems going on in all countries. Trainees also discussed how to achieve a greater professionalization of teachers worldwide and how this professionalization could look like. Everybody agreed on the important role GCE plays for primary schools. As one trainee stated:

“Primary schools are preparing kids to live in the world. As the world evolves and gets more global, so should the content of the courses.“

(AT-Q-ex-01-30.06.2017)

The discussions within the group “provided a lot of valuable discussions and resources which I will definitely like to adopt in my own classroom.” (AT-Q-ex-01-30.06.2017) Self reflection and the discussions on racism and stereotypes were seen as greatly important for developing a critical and reflexive attitude, which was seen as foundation for teaching GCE. As one trainee stated, ‘you have to know yourself before teaching GCE’ (AT-Q-ex-01-30.06.2017).

The methods used were perceived as visual, memorable and therefore useful to carry out active and interactive lessons. Overall, trainees saw the GCE teacher training as ‘very beneficial and worthwhile for future teachers’. (AT-Q-ex-01-30.06.2017)

This national case description provided an overall picture of the GCE teacher trainings observed and analysed in Austria (Tyrol), including descriptions of participants, aims and goals, methods, activities and put a central focus on motivation and expectations of trainees, cultural intersections and frictions and GCE concept and elaboration within the programmes.

In conclusion, both programmes focused on theory–practice transfer which is perceived as highly beneficial for the learning processes and therefore crucial for future teacher trainings, especially in programme A.

Long-term teacher trainings seem to provide a more holistic and sustainable GCE integration in teacher education. The approaches used in both programmes were reflexivity, reflecting on the world, critical thinking and changing perspectives. These approaches can be considered critical for future teachers and a professionalization of teachers nowadays. Trainers as well as trainees felt the need to discuss GCE issues, values and competences and to make an effort to reduce temporal, personal and financial constraints and maximise beneficial opportunities for GCE implementation.

7. Conclusion
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Chapter 3: The National Case of Czech Republic

Martina Novotná

Observations in the Czech Republic took place within two different institutions and three settings. Within the case A, an observer participated in the GCE seminars organized by the body that was a part of a research team (four observations). Within the case B, an observer explored the field of GCE providers and asked them to be allowed to participate and observe their seminars (three observations).

The case A – internal - was easy to access as the organizers of the GCE seminars are an observer’s colleagues, with whom they have a close cooperation. A pre-observation took place in June 2016. Afterwards, three other seminars taking place in the Moravian Silesian region and within the Global Schools project were selected for observation between September 2016 and January 2017. One of the seminars booked for December was cancelled due to a lack of interest of teachers, but it was again reopened in January. Finally, all three observations took place within given period – one in October 2016 and two in January 2017.

Case B – external - was surprisingly quite easy to access, despite concerns by an observer, whether the external institution would agree with external observations. After the case investigation, three institutions were addressed – the University, a regional institution active in the field of CPD education of teachers (at the same time closely cooperating with the People in Need Organisation, one of the organizers of the research project– KVIC) and a regional branch of the state institution responsible directly for CPD of teachers - NIDV.

Finally, it turned out that only the latter had seminars that can be described as GCE seminars in the period when the observation phase would take place. NIDV kindly agreed to allow the observer to participate in and observe the courses. They were very cooperative in providing an overview of NIDV approach to the organization of the GCE seminars and selected three courses that could be considered as part of GCE in the Moravian-Silesian region.

One seminar was observed in November 2016. However, external factors interfered and two other observations were finally carried out in the same institution, but in another region. The reason for this change was the cancellation of a previously identified seminar due to a lack of interest by teachers, while in the second case there was a misunderstanding, possibly caused by understandable distress of a trainer who complained about being observed by the member of an organisation that was a part of a broader political debate and could not be defined as an independent observer.

As a result, the HQ of the National Institute were contacted in January 2017 with a detailed explanation of the research goals. Other GCE seminars taking place in other regions and organized by regional branches of the Institute were identified. One of them was again cancelled due to a lack of interest by teachers and finally two other observations took place in the Prague region in March and April 2017. Altogether seven one–day seminars (4 internal seminars, with a pre-observation
phase in one case, and 3 external seminars) lasting from 4 to 8 hours were
observed, with a total number of 48 hours of observations. Furthermore,
there were 6 formal interviews with organizers and lecturers of the GCE
seminars, lasting from 20 minutes to 1 hour, and 7 informal short interviews.
57 questionnaires (both pre and post questionnaires) were returned (out of 111
participants), 38 from internal cases and 19 from external ones. Photos (4),
drawn images (7) and documents advertising the seminars (7) were also part
of the detailed analysis. Further documents such as those given to participants
were also taken into account.

Generally, GCE continual professional development (CPD) seminars were open
to different types of target groups, although primary schools teachers were
mainly invited. In the Czech case, a primary school comprises the first (primary,
age 6-11) and secondary (age 11-15) level. In the internal case, this condition
was determined in the project’s proposal.
It is important to note that in case A two out of four observations were done
in a long-term GCE course for 11 primary school teachers (both levels, age of
pupils between 6 and 15) taking place over three years and starting before
the beginning of the ethnographic research. They received altogether around
70 hours of support. The two observed seminars took 8 hours each. There are
specific features that will be described separately in individual chapters.
In the case B, the target group was wider, ranging from preschool teachers to
primary school teachers to high school teachers. In one case also employees
from school advisory centres, teachers’ assistants and teachers responsible for
drug prevention were involved.
In both cases there were around 15 people participating in the seminar, with the
lowest number being 11 participants and the highest 21 participants. Women
outnumbered men, thus reflecting the gender composition of teachers in the
Czech education system\(^2\). Out of 100 participants, 85 were women and 15
men\(^3\). Based on observation, most participants were middle age. Based on 57
questionnaires (out of 111 participants) the average age was 39 years and these
findings match the observation.

Aims and goals are very diverse in GCE seminars, as is the field itself. Three
categories of GCE seminars were observed – thematic, methodological and their
combination. The aim of thematic seminars is primarily to present a specific GCE
issue, through various methods such as a lecture or an interactive seminar. The
aim of methodological seminars is to primarily acquaint interested teachers
with a specific method that should be helpful in presenting GCE to children. The
combination occurred within seminars that were part of a long-term three-year
course. Five out of seven seminars were short-term seminars, lasting 4 hours
(1), 6 hours (2) and 8 hours (2) and they took place in one day. Three of them
were thematic, two methodological and two combined both aims.

---


\(^3\) In one seminar an observer did not mark the gender composition, but also in this seminar women outnumbered men
Furthermore, it was observed that the overall aims included multiple aims, at least those of the organisers, and the aims of trainers. A high degree of autonomy was given to trainers, but they were selected by the organiser so that they reflected their aims. An organizer claimed: “Already for some time we have felt like they (trainers) could conceive this issue (GDE) in a cross-cutting way. We are happy when we discover abilities of trainers to conceive the GDE courses like that (CZ-If-ex-01-29.8.2016, p.1).” Another organizer said: “I choose trainers among colleagues...but I also plan to invite people from another organization... We know them as trainers, so I am sure there will not be a conflict in content or methodology in a way we understand GCE (CZ-If-in-03-22.3.2017, p.1).”

Exclusively thematic courses appeared within case B (three observed courses, plus two that were cancelled), reflecting the organizer’s perspective: We suppose that (participants) would be able to transform information into their activities. We provide ideas, views and inspiration.” (CZ-If-ex-01-29.8.2016, p.1). The general aim included the aims of different actors: firstly, the Ministry of Education that set the direction within GDE (CZ-If-ex-01-29.8.2016, p.1), secondly, the National Institute of Further Education, both HQ and regional branches, that created, with consultation of the Ministry, the offer of CDP courses (CZ-If-ex-01-29.8.2016, p.1), and thirdly, individual trainers that were selected by the Institute in the different regions. The general aim was closely related to the national curriculum (the Framework Educational Programme), where so called cross-cutting issues were set as obligatory for schools. GCE/GDE was one of them, being called Education toward Thinking in European and Global Context and specified here and within another document called Recommended expected results4.

The emphasis on cross-cutting character was observed, as confirmed in the above mentioned organizer’s quotation. He also added: “Cross-cutting issues are not strictly defined and they therefore interfere into other tasks, so (under GDE CPD tasks) various courses are offered to teachers such as foreigners in the Czech education system from 2014 or ethical education ... (CZ-If-ex-01-29.8.2016, p.1).” As a result, seminars considered to fulfil GCE/GDE goals and offered for observation were very diverse.

Case A included methodological and combined seminars. Although thematic seminars were also offered by the NNO, they did not take place within the observation period. Based on the overall NNO programme offer, in a broad sense, the thematic seminars followed the framework given by the national curricula and the National GDE strategy, approved by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (CZ-If-in-03-22.3.2017, p.4). The organizer commented: As far as short-term courses are concerned, I leave the aim upon trainers, each seminar has its specific goal, what they have in common is that teachers leave seminars with some partial understanding of any GDE issue ... For example, if it concerns migration, they will leave

---

4 The aim of GDE was specified in the document called Recommended expected results – support for teaching of cross-cutting issues in basic education, issued by the Ministry-directed National Institute for Education: The conception and content of the cross-cutting issue Education toward Thinking in European and Global context should focus on the world’s current issues and changes, from the perspective of the world’s interconnectedness, when what is happening in some place has an impact in another place. It is important to understand economic, social, political, environmental and cultural processes that influence our lives. It is necessary to look closer and at the overall context, at problems of inequalities, global problems and relations between developed and less developed countries...
with understanding of facts, reasons and consequences of migration, and also some activity (CZ-If-in-03-22.3.2017, p.2)."

Thematic parts, however, formed a substantial part of combined seminars within a long-term three-year course (duration of the project, each seminar, one or two-day long took place semiannually) and so the aim stated above could be easily transferred, though it needed to be seen in the context of a general aim of the course, as the organizer explained: “The aim differs for those (teachers) that are part of long-term cooperation and others (short-term seminars). For “ours” there are more goals, though each seminar has its own goal. But everything should be oriented towards a general goal - that will become a regular thing for teachers to incorporate global development education issues in their classes, ideally not only to civic education, but also into other subjects and the (GDE/GCE) issue will become a part of an overall school’s thinking and planning. I know it is ambitious, but it is an ideal....For me it is also connected to teachers’ ability to reflect and ability of teachers to serve as an example. If they speak about children’s cooperation, responsibility or recycling, they speak also about teachers’ or school’s cooperation or responsibility, or recycling in school. And there is one more goal, that the teachers (alumni of our course) can pass on (what they have learnt) to their colleagues (CZ-If-in-03-22.3.2017, p.2)”.

In a broader sense, the aims of a long-term course corresponded to the aims of the project within which it was organized.

The presence of methodological seminars in the offer of GCE CPD seminars to teachers suggests that for this organizer (NNO) the way in which the GCE issues are presented to children is vital. It corresponds to a specific concept of GCE, which claims that we built understanding of surrounding world in our mind and that there does not exist one general truth (pedagogical constructivism – more about it under Methods section). The aims of methodological seminars were to present a specific methodology through which teachers can “grasp” difficult GCE issues and pass them on to children (CZ-If-in-01-23.1.2017, p.1), or to offer another perspective over GCE, to find a way to learn about changes in children’s attitudes (Cz-D-in-04-24.1.2017, p.1).

The combined seminars reflected pedagogical constructivism in all its content. There is something else that can be found behind an offer of methodological seminars, and weight is assigned to them. It is the organizers’ belief that GCE includes information and facts, but also their interpretation which is embedded in everybody’s values and attitudes, as one of the trainers claimed: “teachers should understand that they do not transfer only facts, but also attitudes (CZ-If-in-02-31.01.2017, p.1).”

This is simultaneously connected with the overall approach to GCE, as explained by the organizer: “For me, it is a long-life process, .... I think that we have to learn throughout our whole life about global issues, as well as ability to critically judge information and perceive them in the overall context. Besides, it is important for me to be able to create my own attitude, to actively look for facts and information, understand links between them and to evaluate them in some way, and also to be able to create a responsible attitude and to know why I have this attitude ... and I understand consequences of my decisions. ... And I also believe I have power to

---

change things... “. (CZ-If-in-03-22.3.2017, p.4). On the other hand, the organizer of the external seminars was cautious about the attitudinal approach and the question of values, even confirming that: “Here we do not provoke discussions, we provide facts (CZ-If-ex-01-29.8.2016, p.1).

However, all thematic seminars, as announced, contained value-based or attitude-based aims, such as for example presentation of one religion through a specific paradigm.

From the point of view of the methods used, seminars can be divided into two categories: lecture-type seminars and interactive seminars.

The lecture-type seminars are based on transmissive pedagogy. The trainer is at the centre of attention, participants address him/her when they want to ask or add something. The trainer shares his/her knowledge and experience. The arrangement of chairs and tables in school-like rows is suitable for this type of seminar and it was prepared before the start of the lecture (CZ-N- ex-02-17.03.2017, p.1, CZ-N-ex-03-03.04.2017, p.1, CZ-If-ex-01-30.11.2016, p.1).

In two cases, participants faced the front wall, in one case the tables and chairs were put at the room’s sides, in two rows. The seminars were content-oriented. In two cases the presentation was factual and concerned history and legislation, in one case it presented the holistic approach towards nature, agriculture, environment and upbringing of children. In the lecture-type seminars, a previously prepared electronic presentation, projected onto the wall of the room, played an important role.

Time left for participants, however, varied considerably within lecture-type seminars. In one case the presentation was very dense, consecutive slides were presented and commented by a trainer, and a little space was left for participants’ questions or a small debate around some doubts: “The participants are (all the time) sitting and writing (Cz-N-ex-01-30.11.2016, p.3).” In two other cases the presentation served only as a helping tool for trainer’s explanation and more space was left for participants: “(The trainer) switched on the presentation. She speaks a lot beyond what is on slides.” (CZ-N-ex-03-03.04.2017, p.2). In these cases, trainers addressed participants with questions, asking them to share their experience (CZ-If-ex-03-3.4.2017, p.3) The participants in these seminars could discuss with the trainer, but also partially among themselves, and they shared some experience with others. The participants in any of these cases moved, with the exception of breaks.

Interactive seminars are based on intensive interactivity among participants, including exchange of ideas and experience, although some elements of transmissive pedagogy were always present in the form of a short explanation by a trainer or a lecture delivered by a guest. The prevailing pedagogical approach behind interactivity is pedagogical constructivism. It was explicitly mentioned by the organizer (CZ-If-in-03-22.3.2017), a trainer (CZ-If-in-02-31.01.2017), it
was observed as a basis for different activities in the seminars that were part of a long-term course (CZ-N-in-01-09.06.2016, p.4, CZ-N-in-03-17.01.2017 p.5) and it was a part of a learning content itself (CZ-N-in-02-13.10.2016, p.5 and p.6). This approach emphasizes that we built the understanding of the surrounding world in our minds. In the Czech environment, this approach is reflected by the influential movement called Reading and Writing for Critical Thinking (RWCT) and many participants were already acquainted with it (CZ-N-in-02-13.10.2016, p.5). A three-phase model of learning is applied: evocation – realization – reflection, where a student works with his/her inner pre-concepts that he/she compares with new knowledge and leaves the process with a different understanding. The issues approached by RWCT methods were the following: human rights in connection with the Bangladesh factory catastrophe in 2015, ethical consumption and the issue of virtual water. The specific methods observed methods were: use of pictures for evocation (CZ-N-in-01-09.06.2016, p.5), working with text, opinion scale and discussion (CZ-N-in-01-09.06.2016, p.5), diamond (CZ-N-in-01-09.06.2016) and others being scrutinized through discussion about this approach (CZ-N-in-02-13.10.2016, p. 5 and 6).

Another method observed within interactive seminars was that of “Philosophy for Children”. One of the observed seminars was devoted solely to this method. It has many common elements with the RWCT movement, such as focus on critical thinking (plus caring, creative and cooperative thinking) or several-step learning process, or inquiry as it is called. The organizer must have been persuaded about the benefits of this method when the seminar was offered to teachers in the framework of GDE/GCE courses. The trainer confirmed: “One of the basic things in PfC is that there exists no one right answer. It works with different perspectives, opinions and arguments, that perfectly suit GDE. The basis of thinking about the world is that students learn to discuss, to argue, and also to listen to views of others. An important emphasis is on development of cooperative and caring thinking and we think that from the point of view of different approaches this is vital for GDE.” (CZ-If-in-01-23.1.2017, p.1).

An issue treated by this method in the observed seminar was “security vs. freedom”. The specific observed methods were: use of picture as stimulus, discussion and argumentation, opinion scales, philosophical party, work with text, mind mapping, reflection through triangles (CZ-N-in-03-17.01.2017, p. 3, 4 and 5).

The last observed methodology was called “quality or quantity”, and its inclusion, both as a specific seminar and as part of a long-term course, suggests the importance the organizer assigns to it. It is a methodological tool for finding the possible shifts in students’ attitudes throughout the learning process towards different GDE/GCE issues. Again, the inner processes of students are at the core of learning. “The importance is shifted towards a student... who is also responsible for what is happening in the class” (CZ-If-in-02-31.01.2017, p.1)” The students’ attitudes are taken into account and they serve as a basis for specifying the learning goal of the teacher. Issues treated by this method were: the best ways an individual can protect the environment; reasons why somebody

---

feels more like a Czech citizen and somebody else feels more like a global citizen; reasons for (not) supporting international charity actions; reasons for deciding what kind of tomatoes you buy; and reasons on the basis of which you judge somebody. Specific observed methods were: discussing the statement, group work, agreeing on a common view, work with tables, discussion (CZ-N-in-01-09.06.2016, p.4).

Besides, other interactive methods were observed that cannot be classified specifically under any of the approaches described above, such as world cafés treating issues such as “How should reflection look like? How should a GCE teacher be like?, Should GCE issues be discussed with little children? What should a GCE lesson be made of?, or role game” (CZ-N-in-01-09.06.2016, p.5).

Moreover, as stated above, part of the seminars was devoted to presentations (CZ-N-in-01-09.06.2016, p.3) or explanations (CZ-N-in-02-13.10.2016, p.5 and 6, CZ-N-in-02-13.10.2016, p.3), but they were short and served as a complementary element. Besides, two invited guests to a seminar, that was part of a long-term course, used lectures as a method for explaining relations between water, food, agriculture, environment and ethical consumption, decent wage and working conditions in cloth factories in developing countries (CZ-N-in-01-09.06.2016, p.5).

Based on observation, the interactive seminars were lively and included lot of movement (CZ-P-in-04-24.01.2017, p.1). By different means, participants were invited to discuss and argue. In PfC the inclusion of all children in discussion is one of the main goals, and methods are adapted for that, such as “it is started by an individual, so that he/she has time to think it over, then in small groups and after that in a big group” (CZ-If-in-01-23.1.2017). Also, in other seminars of this type trainers tried to engage all participants in different discussions. There were discussions concerning reflection (CZ-N-in-01-09.06.2016, p.2), stimulus (CZ-N-in-03-17.01.2017, p. 2 and 3), maps (CZ-N-in-01-09.06.2016, p.5), different RWCT methods (CZ-N-in-02-13.10.2016, p.6), spontaneous discussions (CZ-N-in-03-17.01.2017, p.3), GCE issues (CZ-N-in-04-24.01.2017, p. 4), discussion over text’s main ideas (CZ-N-in-02-13.10.2016, p.4), a step in PfC methodology when a common question under discussion had to be agreed (CZ-N-in-03-17.01.2017, p.3), global citizenship (CZ-N-in-04-24.01.2017, p.2) and others. In short, the aim of trainers was to offer any kind of stimulus in order to make participants express their ideas, bring arguments, discuss and listen to one another. Participants actively engaged in discussions and debates.

However, there were also certain difficulties. Sometimes, the whole group seemed to pull out, either they were tired or the issues were too difficult (CZ-N-in-03-17.01.2017, p.3), but this did not last long and soon another activity “re-activated them” (CZ-N-in-02-13.10.2016, p.3). Diversity of methods was considerable (CZ-N-in-01-09.06.2016, p.4). In one case, a participant had not expected such an approach. He came to the seminar, sat aside and asked if he could stay like that. However, other participants invited him to come and finally, he became an active debater. (CZ-N-in-03-7.01.2017, p.2).

Both types of seminars have something in common. A secure environment in which different views could be expressed, although the space that would enable participants to express it differed. In both types of seminars, participants were observed expressing their disagreement or doubts. For example, a participant defended youth in the Czech specific case against a trainer’s opinion (CZ-
N-ex-01-30.11.2016, p.5), a participant disagreed with a trainer over her judgment on the pupils-foreigners’ parents (CZ-N-ex-03-03.04.2017, p.5) or a participant openly admitted that she did not agree with all GCE ideas (CZ-N-in-04-24.01.2017, p.2).

Naturally, activities were observed only within the interactive seminars. In general, two kinds of activities were observed. The first often took place at the beginning of the teaching units. The aim was to create a friendly, open and receptive atmosphere in classrooms without an educational aim. The second type of activities observed mainly aimed to engage and involve participants in in-depth elaboration over specific issues by different means.

The first type of activities is generally known as icebreaker or warm-up activities. One of these activities consisted in a person standing in the middle of the circle made by participants sitting on their chairs who said: “The place will be changed by those, who…” and added a certain simple characteristic such as “prefer cats over dogs”, or progressively went more in-depth and thus prepared participants for the topic of that teaching unit. However, the aim was to learn something about others and find commonalities (CZ-N-in-03-17.01.2017, p.1).

A similar activity was an icebreaker done at the beginning of a seminar that was a part of a long-term course, when participants mostly knew each other. In this case, a participant said “I invite to sit next to me (a name), who...” and completed a sentence with information he/she knew. (CZ-N-in-02-13.10.2016, p.1). Another example of this activity is supported by photos: each participant should grab a photo that best suits his/her character and then describe it to another participant. Finally, everybody should introduce himself/herself or his/her partner to the others (CZ-N-in-04-24.01.2017, p.1). The warm-up activities were more physical and aimed at strengthening participants’ concentration, such as trying to catch a neighbour’s finger and escape neighbour’s palm with one own’s finger at the same time (CZ-N-in-03-17.01.2017, p.4).

In lecture-type seminars, participants were asked by the trainer to introduce themselves and/or to share their motivation for attendance. The ice-breaker activity seemed to go a little bit further, forcing participants to reveal more about themselves, but, at the same time, nobody showed a notice of discomfort. These activities did not interfere with participants’ comfort zone, everybody was free to express as much as they wanted. And, it seemed to bear fruits in terms of open, friendly, receptive and also secure atmosphere, with lot of discussions and also a lot of fun (CZ-N-in-03-17.01.2017, p.1, CZ-N-in-02-13.10.2016, p.2, CZ-N-in-01-09.06.2016, p.5, CZ-N-in-04-24.01.2017, p.1).

The second type of activities were focused around specific learning subjects, such as working conditions, ethical consumption, environmental protection and also GCE. In some cases, activities organized separately as teaching units composed of evocation, realisation and reflection (CZ-N-in-01-09.06.2016, p.5). In other cases they formed part of a broader methodological approach, such as a unit containing group work with discussions and elaboration of a trainer-prepared scale of freedoms that each group considered the most important/most difficult to surrender and the least difficult to surrender, in the Philosophy for children approach (CZ-N-in-03-17.01.2017, p.3).
In both cases, in one-day seminars participants got certificates of attendance at the end of the day. In the case of two seminars that were part of a long-term course, the certificate was delivered at the end of the school year and it will be delivered at the end of the project in 2018 for three years of participation. In all seminars, participants got evaluation forms that should serve as a feedback for trainers and organizers.

At the end of four seminars, time for a final discussion was reserved. Participants gathered and talked about the ideas that emerged during the seminar; ideas they were mostly touched by, or that they wanted to further develop or about the inspiration they wanted to implement in their classrooms.

“The trainer is asking: What was interesting for you? A participant is answering: I think that GDE is like a string of beads and the beads can be threaded in all subjects. Children would be interested in being engaged in something in their life, but it demands cooperation with other teachers. Other participants say they were interested by the method „diamond“, by an activity called Virtual water.” (CZ-N-in-01-09.06.2016, p. 6)

In another case, the reflection at the end of thematic activity was done in a deeper way and in a form of an opinion scale. This is one of the described steps of the Philosophy for Children methodology.

Participants should reflect upon the following questions: “Has the lesson forced you to think? Has it helped to think deeper about the issue? Have you participated in a discussion in a constructive way? Have you experienced a sense of common creating? Do you feel like there was a respectful atmosphere in the group?” (CZ-N-in-03-17.01.2017, p. 3)

The background of trainers was very diverse. Out of seven trainers, three were university-based, three were NGO-based and one works as therapist. Two trainers combined work for university and NGO. Three trainers were originally school teachers: one had working experience with young people in informal educational settings; two guests were invited to hold a lecture about their field of activity in GCE. They were both NGO-based professionals.

**Participants’ observed characteristics**

Throughout our research work we observed many characteristics of the participants of GCE CPD courses, who had already decided to attend. They all shared one characteristic: they wanted to know more about different aspects of GCE, ranging from individual issues to new teaching methods and legislation, thus considering it as an important part of today’s education. They can all be labelled as “teachers interested in GCE”.

Inside this group a visible subgroup emerged, that of “highly interested GCE teachers”. Almost all the groups of teachers participating in a long-term course could be labelled in this way. The involvement in the course was highly demanding: 70 hours of education and lot of additional work for teachers, implementation of three school projects each school year, and also training for colleagues. When recruiting partner schools and cooperating teachers, the strategy of the organizer was to address teachers “who seemed to be internally motivated” (CZ-
It worked, as there were 24 teachers at the beginning and only “a few teachers left or were substituted by a colleague for various reasons” (CZ-If-in-03-22.3.2017, p.3).

Besides, there was a group of teachers who belonged to the same category, based on their activities in the field of GCE, such as a teacher who the observer knew from another GCE project (CZ-N-in-01-09.06.2016, p.1), a teacher from a GCE seminar from the same organization that took place before (CZ-N-in-04-24.01.2017, p. 1), a teacher who was responsible for the school parliament and inclusion (CZ-N-in-02-13.10.2016, p.1), a teacher who organized the leisure time of children in 100% Roma schools (CZ-N-in-03-17.01.2017), a teacher who also worked in the outdoor preschool (CZ-li-in-01-17.01.2017, p.1), a teacher who led a course of the Czech language for foreigners (CZ-N-ex-03-03.04.2017, p.1) and others.

Another group of teachers was observed that could be labelled as “experienced teachers in terms of modern teaching method”. They were observed exclusively within the internal seminars, as the highly interactive character of these seminars allowed this feature to emerge. They especially knew different methods from the pedagogical constructivism approach (please see below), or methods derived from the Quality or quantity methodology, focusing on measuring changes in students’ approaches. This method was promoted by the organisation in charge of the research work. (CZ-N-in-01-09.06.2016, p.4). This was also confirmed by the organiser of the internal seminars: “A number of participants are experienced in different interactive methods that they want to further develop” (CZ-If-in-01-23.1.2017).

Another minority group included teachers who come to GCE seminars, but do not fully share GCE values. There are those that challenge some of the important issues for GCE, such as global citizenship itself or respect for diversity, and an open atmosphere of the seminars allowed them to express their doubts. A teacher said: “I want to learn new things (about global citizenship), but I do not want to adopt all (GCE ideas),” (CZ-N-in-04-24.01.2017, p.2). Some others challenged the same core of GCE ideas. They often spoke about “us” and “them” and many prejudices could be found in their speech such as: “What is a norm here (in CR), is a sociopathy for them (immigrants),” (CZ-N-ex-03-03.04.2017); or “They (Roma children) cry all the time that it is a racism when I give them 5 (bad grade),” (CZ-li-in-02-24.01.2017). The last subgroup was rather exceptional though.

It was also observed that teachers also significantly differed in their belief in their own capability to change something in children’s lives in a positive way. This difference was especially highlighted in a debate concerning possibilities to change pre-school children’s ecological behaviour. A participant shared her worries: “The basis comes from families and we, as teachers, have only this “material” to work with, we cannot do anything about it” (CZ-N-ex-02-17.03.2017, p.3). Another one replied, in agreement with a trainer’s statement that “you can show children different ways (so that they have an alternative in future), although you have no possibility to influence this decision”, and added an example from her own life when she met a former pupil (CZ-N-ex-02-17.03.2017, p.3). A similar debate occurred around the ability of children to listen to each other (in Philosophy for Children method). A participant insisted that she could not imagine this would happen, while another participant replied: “it is a matter of practice... “. (CZ-N-in-03-17.01.2017, p.4).
It seems like this category is closely connected to general trust in all children’s capabilities and this would definitely deserve further research, as the observer could not enter the participants’ classrooms within the project to observe daily practice. However, judgement on children differs considerably. Considering children “already made material” is really different from considering “children open and sensitive with a sense for fair-play (CZ-N-in-01-09.06.2016, p.2)”. However, further research should be done in this field.

Finally, the questionnaires returned by 57 teachers (out of 111 participants) gave an interesting insight into participants’ opinions. Based on a number of appearances, these skills and abilities are seen as the most important by participants: a general overview, knowledge of facts, openness, empathy, the ability to catch students’ attention, the ability to motivate students, communication and creativity. In the case of an open question about where they got the most important skills and abilities, most participants answered “from practice”, followed by studies, continual professional development, media and family background.

Throughout the research, we have learnt something about what was happening before the seminar in terms of teachers’ inner processes such as motivation and expectations, and about external factors that enabled them or prevented them from going to CPD seminars. This aspect however would definitely deserve further research. We can state that the intrinsic motivation was the primary motivation, as repeatedly stated by teachers themselves when allowed to do so by the trainer. Some of the reasons mentioned were “a personal interest” (Cz-N-ex-01-30.11.2016, p.1), “It’s good to be out of school for a while, I’m overwhelmed” (CZ-N-in-02-13.10.2016, p.1-2) or “I teach children who perceive the world from the point of view of a city or a region. I would like to bring them to a perception of the world beyond the frontiers” (CZ-N-in-03-17.01.2017). In several cases they speak about an interest of pupils in the global issues that they want to respond to (Cz-N-ex-01-30.11.2016) or a need for new ideas or inspiration (CZ-N-ex-02-17.03.2017, p.1). The latter was a factor that the participants had expected to find, as seen from a number of appearances for the question raised in the questionnaires “To what extent has the course met your expectations?”: It was also confirmed by an organizer of GCE courses, when she stated that teachers are eager to learn something (an activity) which could be directly used in their lessons (CZ-If-in-03-22.3.2017, p. 3).

It was observed that one strong motivator was previous positive experience, either with a trainer (CZ-If-ex-01-30.11.2016, p.1) or the organization/institution or both, as confirmed by the fact that the observer met the participants she had previously met in another project (CZ-N-in-01-09.06.2016, p.1) or another seminar organized by the same organisation – NNO (CZ-N-in-04-24.01.2017, p.1). It was also observed that participants at the end of a seminar asked the trainer when another seminar would be organised (CZ-N-ex-02-17.03.2017, p.4).

Two external factors played an important role in teachers’ attendance in GCE courses/seminars. The first has to do with the funding of teachers’ CPD. The responsibility for budget lies upon the directors, it comprehends many other personal costs and it mirrors priorities and possibilities of individual directors who “decide whom
they send where”, as an organizer of GCE courses put it (CZ-If-ex-01-29.8.2016, p.1). From the point of view of GCE, it can be both a supporting and hindering factor, depending on whether a director consider GCE important. It is equally important to see what other obligations he or she needs to face with the same budget. Nonetheless, throughout the observation, no participants expressed themeselves on this issue. In the case of two observations from a long-term course, attendance for cooperating teachers had been already covered in the partnership agreement with schools/directors. In another case, an external seminar of 4 hours took place in the afternoon, which made it easier for teachers to attend, although this raised a challenge in terms of the aims of the seminars and the possibility to achieve them in such a short time. In all other seminars, nobody brought up this issue, suggesting that participants did not have any problem attending. However, there was no possibility to interview those that might not have attended.

Secondly, another external factor for attendance was the existing law and related obligations for schools. The seminar focused on explaining the existing legislation for pupils – foreigners in the Czech education system. This course was easily filled by participants and an experienced trainer explained why she thought there was such an interest: “They (the participants) do not know how to proceed ... on the basis of the law, ... they are not trained enough..., they need help (CZ-If-ex-03-3.4.2017).

Throughout the observation period, three planned seminars were cancelled, due to a lack of interest of teachers. While two of them should have taken place in December before Christmas 2016, which might have played a role in deciding whether to participate or not, the last one was planned for March 2017 and intended to tackle the topical issue of migration. The reasons for the lack of interest by teachers remained unclear.

Funding bodies mentioned in the interviews were the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the European Commission.

One of the main categories was that of contrasting cultures emerging from different actors in the field. In the Czech case, this includes different approaches to GCE in terms of teaching methods or the GCE concept in general. This will be the topic discussed in the next chapters. In a narrow sense, the main differences were observed within the category content and ethics/politics. They are both closely related.

The content of GCE courses was very diverse, as “Cross-cutting issues are not strictly defined and they therefore interfere into other tasks, so (under GDE CPD tasks) various courses are offered to teachers, such as foreigners in the Czech education system since 2014 or ethical education... (CZ-If-ex-01-29.8.2016, p.1).” While one type of seminars focused solely on GDE/GCE and its different issues or methods of effective GCE teaching, as understood by organizers, other seminars covered more specific issues that belong to the GCE field, though seen from other perspectives – legislative, historical or related to the upbringing of children. The most contrasting cultures were identified within the category of ethics/
politics and they do not concern individual cases, but individual trainers and their perspective. While all trainers declared during the lessons agreement with some of GCE basic principles, such as tolerance, respect, diversity, interdependence, in two out of seven cases, trainers expressed mistrust in multiculturalism or the principle of inclusion. In one case, the Samuel Huntington’s Clash of Civilisation paradigm was openly reported in the title of the seminar and the seminar’s advertisement (source D). In another case, the situation was even more extreme and included a lot of commonplaces about other cultures and openly expressed prejudices. “And Syrians wonder Do you need to work here? Also women?” (or “Older generation (of Ukrainians) were polite, they kiss hands, younger generation they pay everything (bribe).” (Source C). Besides, while humour was present in all types of seminars, in one seminar inappropriate jokes about other cultures were present. “One Muslim girl who was all covered did tests on the place of other students (laugh) That’s why I set a rule that they cannot be covered.” (Source C).

In contrast, another trainer explained his/her approach to GCE: “We all live in one planet, whatever I do, it influences somebody else, I feel like I need to perceive things in the context, also to perceive what we (all) have in common, there exist panhuman values, rather than differences…” (CZ-If-in-02-31.01.2017, p.1).

Or, another one, who made special reference to SDGs in his explanation of GCE outcomes… “GCE outcomes are concepts of sustainable development and human development..., While MDGs were mainly about poverty in less developed countries, SDGs are about a fact, that also we here have lot of problems that we have to solve ourselves such as climatic change, inclusion, human rights.” (CZ-If-in-01-23.1.2017, p.2)

A lot has already been described in the chapter on methods. Basically, there were two types of seminars. Firstly, there were lecture-type seminars, where little or bigger space was left for participants and where the trainer was at the centre of attention. These seminars were content-oriented.

Secondly, there were interactive seminars, where participants were very much engaged in different types of participatory methods, through which they discovered different views on different GCE issues. The interactive seminars were focused on either a specific GCE issue or a specific methodology. Three approaches were observed during the observation period – pedagogical constructivism (or Reading and Writing for Critical Thinking, as known in the Czech context), Philosophy for children based on employing different argumentation and discussion techniques and creation of so-called community of inquiry (John Dewey) and Quality or quantity methodology to measure attitudinal change.

A lot about GCE has been revealed already in the Aims and goals section. It has been shown that in both cases the organizers refer to the national curriculum and/or the National GDE strategy, though laying the emphasis on different aspects. While in one case, a cross-cutting character is stressed and GCE is understood as an umbrella for other cross-cutting issues (“GDE concerns lot of other cross-cutting issues such as environmental, gender, civilisation problems, etc.”, CZ-If-ex-01-29.8.2016), without deeper reference to values, in the second case a lot of attention is devoted to interconnectedness, multi-perspective
approaches, attitudes such as empathy, respect and tolerance, critical thinking. We all live in one planet, whatever I do, it influences somebody else, I feel like I need to perceive things in the context, also to perceive what we (all) have in common, there exist panhuman values, rather than differences.....”(CZ-if-in-02-31.01.2017, p.1) or “One of the basic things in PfC is that there exists no one right answer. It works with different perspectives, opinions and arguments that perfectly suits GDE. The basis of thinking about the world is that students learn to discuss, to argue, and also to listen to views of others. One important emphasis is on development of cooperative and caring thinking and we think that from the point of view of different approaches this is vital for GDE.” (CZ-if-in-02-31.01.2017, p.1)

Furthermore, it has been observed that main differences are due to different approaches used by individual trainers and not by institutions/organizations. In five out of seven seminars, GCE values such as interdependence, valuing of diversity, human rights and sustainable ways of living were implemented. Differences in GCE concept are reflected also in the selected methods. In case A, great attention is paid to different methods that are considered effective for GCE teaching. One of them is pedagogical constructivism, according to which we build the understanding of the surrounding world in our minds and there is no one general truth. Multi-perspectivity of different GCE issues and the emphasis on the development of critical, caring, creative and cooperative thinking are the basis of the Philosophy for children approach, based in John Dewey’s School. Finally, the so-called Quality or quantity methodology (How do we know it’s working) for measuring attitudinal changes has been promoted, suggesting the importance of the issue to the organizers. In case B, the selection of methods is left to participants and the trainer is given full confidence in interpreting the selected issue. Here, lecture-type seminars, filled with different levels of discussion and experience sharing between the trainer and participants were suitable for this conception.
This chapter of the report provides a description of teacher education for Global Citizenship Education (GCE) within Ireland. This chapter focuses on two teacher education programmes, hereafter named Programme A and Programme B. Programme A represents the internal case occurring within the Global Schools project. Programme B is an external case, chosen, in line with the research methodology, for its variance with Programme A. The chapter begins with a description of the programmes, identifies the participants involved, explores the aims and goals of programmes as well as the methods and activities utilised within each, before providing a description of how the programmes were evaluated and assessed. The second section of the chapter considers the different categories of actors within the programmes, including the teachers, teacher educators and funding bodies. This section also considers the agents who influence the development and implementation of the programmes. The final section of the chapter explores the key thematic areas derived from the analysis of data collected on both programmes.

In exploring the how, where, why and when of teacher education for Global Citizenship Education in the Irish context, this section of the research project was focused on two separate teacher education programmes developed for Irish primary teachers and focused on the broad area of Global Citizenship Education. The first of the programmes, hereafter Programme A, was a programme internal to the Global Schools Project, within which this research is based. The second programme, hereafter Programme B, was external to the Global Schools Project. This case was selected for its variance with Programme A in relation to the organisational structure, the funding sources and the type of lead organisations. Table 1 provides a general overview of both programmes and an introduction to some key differences inherent between.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Programme A</th>
<th>Programme B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>5 day summer school</td>
<td>5 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>Irish Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of hours</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3 x 5 hour sessions (for Facilitating Teachers) pa. 1 hour sessions (for Teachers) pa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of participants</td>
<td>18 primary teachers</td>
<td>15+ Facilitating Teachers pa. 150+ Teachers pa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Programme A took the form of a summer school for primary teachers. The programme took place over five consecutive days (Monday to Friday) in the first week of the Irish primary schools’ summer vacation. Advertised as a summer school event, Programme A involved a 30 hour course with 18 primary school teachers and took place within an Irish third level educational institution. The summer school had been developed through collaboration between a research centre within the university and an Irish non-governmental organisation (NGO) and was part of a wider teacher education programme funded by the European Union.

Programme B was developed and implemented by the Irish arm of an international NGO. The programme, funded by Irish Aid, the Irish Government’s programme for overseas aid and part of the Department of Foreign Affairs, had run for five years previously. Each year a team of approximately fifteen ‘facilitating teachers’ provided teacher education sessions to Irish primary teachers across Ireland. These sessions, usually an hour long, took place in a variety of locations including primary schools, education centres as well as the Dublin-based offices of the NGO. The ‘facilitating teachers’ were also engaged in a community of practice, run by the NGO, which entailed, over the course of each year, participation in three 5 hour-long ‘sharing practice’ sessions, each taking place in the Dublin offices of the NGO.

Both Programme A and Programme B were structured around specific aims stated by teacher educators, explicit within programme documentation and stated within the practice of programmes themselves. In summary, these aims focused on increasing participants’ knowledge of global issues, supporting participants to develop a critical lens to view global themes, and supporting participants to integrate GCE into classroom practice.

Both programmes were concerned with developing participating teachers’ knowledge of global issues including those which were perceived to be complex and sometimes misunderstood, such as climate change or migration. [The aims are] to improve teachers’ knowledge about issues. Even today, some of them were talking about Polar Bears and climate change, so to get them beyond that general knowledge of global issues and delving deeper into them. But then also introducing methodologies so they can bring these issues into the classroom and teach about them. (IE-If-02-18.07.2016)

For teacher educators involved in the development and facilitation of Programme A, the development of teachers’ knowledge in relation to issues such as climate change and migration was an important objective but there was also an objective to develop a particular perspective on these global issues. The aims were to introduce some teachers to GCE. To further engage those teachers who had some knowledge around the area. To explore issues around human rights, climate change and migration. To look at issues from a critical point of view and to explore the causes and effects of different events and the
interconnectedness and interdependence of different events as well, on different people. (IE-If-3-05.10.2016)

Longer term, they don’t necessarily have to take the resources and methodologies that we are doing with them, but that they will look at everything they teach through a global lens and they will at any stage make an effort to incorporate that justice perspective and maybe look at it through a global lens. (IE-If-02-18.07.2016)

Not only did the teacher educators involved in Programme A consider important aims of the programme to include increasing teachers’ knowledge of global issues, but also that teachers would develop a critical or justice perspective on these issues.

An important aim for both programmes was that participating teachers would be able to make connections between GCE and the primary curriculum and integrate the methodologies and approaches covered in the programmes into their own teaching practices. Within Programme A, this aim for integration was explained as follows:

The aims the week, well I suppose it was to support, I suppose teachers’ own learning in the area, particularly I suppose to do it in practice, to look at their planning, see how they could plan for it. To look at methods that you can use for teaching it and to grow their own learning around those subject areas. (IE-If-1-05.10.2016)

To look at ways it can be integrated in the curriculum. It’s not going to be a subject on its own any time soon, to support teachers with resources, ideas, activities, in order to try our best that GCE would be included in teaching. (IE-If-3-05.10.2016)

For Programme B, the aim of integration into pre-existing curricular areas was also stipulated.

Trying to get teachers in schools to see that it can be interlinked to curricular areas that are already there. English and SPHE are the main two that stand out. History, there is the strand of story that you could introduce HR heroes. It’s cross-curricular and it can be very easily linked. (xIE-If-05-29.03.2017).

Here, making explicit connections to the Irish Primary Curriculum (NCCA, 2002) offered an important means of supporting teachers to integrate GCE into their practice.

The intended audience of Programme B included both the participating primary teachers and the specialist ‘facilitating teachers’. Both groups were included within the general aims of the programme.

I suppose there are two aims. First of all there was to build the capacity in that community of practice of teacher educators where they would find solidarity or support, find a platform to like keep them motivated, fulfil their passion for social justice and human rights education. And then also there was the second aim which was to build the capacity of a wider network of teachers or just to have, I suppose, CPD in the area available to schools who might be interested or who are struggling in the area of whatever it might be. (xIE-If-06-03.04.2017)

It is apparent that providing a community of practice which offered a high level of professional development for the facilitating teachers was central to the objectives of the programme. Providing Irish primary teachers with the opportunity to engage with teacher education in the area of GCE was considered important, but also the opportunity for individual schools who were either
interested in GCE or perceived an existing deficit in their GCE practice to engage with the programme. As well as these broader aims, there was also evidence of the more specific objectives for primary teachers participating in Programme B. The lesson plan template provided to each of the facilitating teachers to support their planning of the teacher education sessions made specific reference to the expected learning outcomes:

1. The teacher will acquire new knowledge and skills that enable him/her to plan a classroom activity based on human rights-development education
2. The teacher will feel confident in teaching human rights education and/or global justice issues with their students
3. The teacher will be able to make connections to their lives and the lives of others and be enabled to challenge stereotypes (xIE-D-10-25.04.2017)

Although these generic learning outcomes were adapted by each of the facilitating teachers as they planned their teacher education sessions, they reveal a focus on developing confidence in the teaching of GCE, competence in planning GCE lessons but also a focus on some personal development (making connections) and some ensuing action (challenging stereotypes). For the facilitating teachers themselves, participation in the community of practice, through the ‘skillshare’ session was also intended to further knowledge of GCE practice, including relevant resources, but in particular to support the development of planning of GCE “classroom activity” (xIE-D-10-25.04.2017). The importance of the integration of GCE into teachers’ day to day practices was highlighted in another interview.

I think just to embed human rights education principles and also approaches in primary school teaching and embedding those practices in schools or cementing them in the tool kit of teachers. Very much focusing on the multiplier effect that that then has, the teacher has those skills and knows where to find resources then that they would continue to use them throughout their career influencing millions of children. (Laugh) hundreds, thousands of children. (xIE-If-04-29.03/2017)

An interview with one of the facilitating teachers offered an insight into how the aims of particular teacher education session might be adapted in light of schools requests for a focus on particular themes (xIE-If-05-29.03.2017). In the same interview, the facilitating teachers explained that the focus on supporting participating primary teachers to develop their planning of GCE was as a vehicle for the integration of GCE into everyday practice.

Many principles and methods, or methodologies, were evident within both teacher education programmes. Programme A referenced to the centrality of active learning within their programme.

A lot of [methodologies] would have been active learning obviously. Collaborative work would have been a big one. Problem solving. Talk and discussion. Skills development through the content we were using. Active learning would have been the main one. (IE-If-3-05.10.2016)

As well as supporting an understanding of utilising active and participatory methodologies, teacher educators in Programme A also identified the importance of the careful selection of appropriate methodologies in relation to certain global issues.
To give that power to the students, to debate and come to their own conclusions. You need to be a teacher who is very comfortable with that and I think that a teacher, teaching about an issue can sometimes be more damaging if they are teaching it an incorrect way. (IE-If-02-18.07.2016)
The teacher educators also considered the complexity of supporting an exploration of methodologies.
Even though we are introducing methodologies for the teachers to use themselves, we also have to think about the methodologies we are using to share these methodologies! (IE-If-02-18.07.2016)
One of the teacher educators explained the framework utilised within Programme A to communicate methodologies which support GCE, but also the important content.
Well modelling predominantly, modelling and reflection. Because I would feel when I participate I feel much more confident in using other people’s activities whilst I participated in them. So I think that’s a good way of doing teacher education is to model it. (IE-If-1-05.10.2016)
Within observations of Programme A, there was clear reference to this framework of modelling of methodologies (giving participating teachers the opportunity to experience methodologies) followed by small and whole group discussion (providing the opportunity for reflection). Likewise, Programme B made use of modelling as an approach to enable teachers to observe methodologies in practice.
Even though I introduced a lot of the activities, there wasn’t really the time to get the teachers to do them. When I go to 90 minute workshops, through Croke Park Hours, I actually physically get the teachers to sort the wants and needs cards. I’d pair them up, put them in groups, they’d feedback...They can talk about it, but they might not do it if they don’t see it being done. When they see it being done, they are more likely to bring it back to the classroom. Do you think they are more likely to..? Definitely! Definitely! I know that from going to workshops and the facilitator says you are going to so it you’d be “oh no!”, but actually when you do get up to do it, you do definitely remember it and you do bring it back to the classroom. When you do it, you do get more from it. In the longer workshop I would always tell them to get up and do it. And similarly, they appreciate it at the end, because even though they think “oh no!” they think “oh yeah, I’ll bring that back.” (xIE-If-05-29.03.2017)
Here there was a perception that in seeing the methodology taking place, teachers were more likely to use the practice back in their classrooms. However, it is important to note that the focus on methodologies was at times sacrificed to develop teachers’ own knowledge.
Definitely [drawing on NGO resources] and other resources as well, in particular on the migration issue because it’s one of those issues that is almost more of an, doing more at an adult level and increasing the teachers’ knowledge at an adult level and less of an emphasis on teaching methodologies. Migration is an issue which is so misunderstood and misrepresented in the media, so definitely I have drawn on a lot of [NGO] resources that aren’t suitable for children in the classroom, but it’s more for the teachers own knowledge. (IE-If-02-18.07.2016)
This explanation of the employment of activities and resources which were not considered suitable for children and were entirely focused on developing teacher knowledge highlights the varied aims of Programme A in supporting
the professional competency of teachers in delivery GCE, but also developing teachers’ own knowledge of global issues. This approach to methodologies was also observed in Programme A:

L finished the session by highlighting the possibilities in relation to the methodologies employed in this morning session: “you might not use these same methodologies but they could be adapted”. (IE-N-05-04.07.2016)

Programme B was explicit within its course advertising that participating teachers would have the opportunity to explore methodologies. ... our free continual professional development for primary school teachers. Our workshops introduce teachers to a range of human rights education (HRE) and development education (DE) methodologies and resources, which can be integrated across the curriculum and encourage the development of skills including literacy and working with others. (xIE-D-01-29.03.2017)

Indeed, the guidelines for the facilitating teachers highlighted the specific methodologies which were considered appropriate for inclusion within the teacher education sessions.

“Active Learning: hands on experience
Collaborative/Co-operative Learning: group work
Talk and Discussion: listening, questioning, brainstorming, debating, think, pair, share
Skills Through Content: observing, predicting, analysing, creating, describing, categorising, recording and communicating
Using Local Environment: use of the learners’ environment and lived experience
Problem Solving: applying logic and rationality to given situations”
(xIE-D-05-25.04.2017)

The facilitating teachers were provided with opportunities to experiment with and reflect on different active or participatory methodologies they could potentially employ within the teacher education session during the ‘skillshare’ sessions.

“The aim of each skillshare session is to give teachers at least one new idea for bringing human rights into the classroom, to model active or participatory methodologies and leave enough time for some discussion. This most likely will be done by going through a lesson plan in a session of 1 - 2 hours, but you may want to adjust this depending on the aims of your session”. (xIE-D-10-25.04.2017)

Within these ‘skillshare’ sessions, the teacher educators from the NGO also had the opportunity to explore some alternative methodologies with the facilitating teachers.

“One time I did a little bit about questioning with them like so I did some Socratic questioning with them which I thought was a little bit babyish for teachers, many of whom were like more experienced than I was. But actually it went down very well with them. So a big issue was them coming up with how they might challenge maybe overtly racist or underlying racist attitudes that would be coming from the children. So we just went through maybe sections of Socratic questioning where you’d be asking for evidence or asking for oppositional views. Or you could encourage discussion. And you know just simple strategies like that that worked quite well.” (xIE-If-06-03.03.2017)

This excerpt offers insight into some of the challenges of exploring methodologies and a consideration of particular case studies, for example considering how a
particular methodology may support dealing with a challenging scenario, such as racist attitudes, in the classroom.

At the level of the teacher education sessions, there was clear evidence that participatory active approaches were viewed as fundamental for Programme B. There was a perception that whilst participating primary teachers may have a familiarity with certain active and participatory methodologies, there was a value to modelling certain methodologies.

I think there would be some methodologies [teachers] would be very familiar with but I think there are other ones that there was a real value to modelling it. So we would use photo methodologies quite a lot and that would be quite new to a lot of teachers. I think in that sense there’s a value, because when they would see how well they would work they would be more inclined to do them than themselves. (xIE-If-06-03.03.2017)

For this facilitating teacher, the choice of approach was also underpinned by a methodological decision:

One of the different things in teaching is to cater for all the different learners in the classroom. The audio learners, the visual learners and the kinaesthetic learners. There’s three different sets of learners in the classroom and it’s important that the methodologies appeal to all sets of learners. The least number of learners are those who are audio, yet teachers talk a lot. If you’re thinking of teachers, there’s very few people who would put their hand up and say I’m an audio learner. People need to see something, they’re a visual learner, or they need to do something, kinaesthetic learners. In doing a workshop I would try to incorporate, like I did for the egg-speriment, very visual, or moving on through the school, Human Right Boat or Going to a Desert Island. Maybe talking about freeze frame from the travel books, that would appeal to kinaesthetic learners. Getting up, walking around the room, sorting wants and needs, getting themselves into a drama. Learning the rights through doing rather than just sitting and trying to reel off the rights, maybe the way you would have done years ago. (xIE-If-05-29.03.2017)

Again, the idea of modelling certain methodologies to inspire future use from teachers was prevalent in the teacher education programme.

In developing any GCE programme, it’s important to think about the learners and think about methodologies that are active learning – that’s the word I would use. If children are involved in active learning as part of the GC programme there are things that they will always remember. If that active learning starts in your own community you can hopefully build on it to a global level by the time you are a little bit older. (xIE-If-05-29.03.2017)

Here active methodologies are not only perceived as memorable, but as foundational in relation to future action.

Within both programmes, the introductory activity within sessions appeared to be structured to provide a warm up to the session, or to act as an ice-breaker. L then introduces an ‘icebreaker activity’ – ‘Triangles’. L explains that, once the chairs are moved to the edge of the room, participants must find a space. Then each of them must silently choose two people. On L’s instruction, each individual will, as soon as possible, move around the room and form a right-angled triangle between themselves and the two people they have chosen.

L signals the beginning of the activity and participants move around the room,
trying to accomplish the task. Achieving the goal appears difficult, as the slight movements of one participant have a knock-on effect to others. L stops the activity, and begins a short discussion on strategy. A second round, with participants selecting two new participants begins (IE-N-02-04.07.2016)

This activity took part at the start of the day during the summer school and entailed lots of movement from participants. It appeared to be enjoyed by those taking part, and it offered a clear connection to the conceptual frameworks later explored, in this case the idea of interconnection. Icebreakers and other activities utilised in the programme sometimes originated from other teacher education programmes or from educational resources that the teacher educators had come across.

I got some of [the activities] from previous workshops I had done. [Another NGO] had used ‘the train game’. Some I would have found on different GCE websites of human rights websites. Some I had found on different problem-solving books or problem-solving pages. I would have taken them out and used them as an ice-breaker. (IE-If-03-05.10.2016)

Reflecting on their sessions, teacher educators in Programme A explained the range of different activities used throughout the sessions they facilitated during the summer school.

[My sessions] I would have use of a lot of pictures, videos, human rights documents, then concrete resources, paper, pens, charts. I think a lot mine were quite active. I would have used PowerPoint with different pictures and videos on them. A lot of it would have involved teachers using paper and pens to explore the different issues (IE-If-3-05.10.2016)

For this teacher educator, these activities often involved the collaborative creation of visual displays, sometimes lists, sometimes concept maps, sometimes illustrations. An example of one such activity was observed during the Summer School.

For the next activity, the group is split into four groups of four and the groups move to each corner of the room. They are tasked with the objective of drawing a ‘global citizen’. Each group has an A2 sheet of paper and some marker pens. The groups begin to draw a cartoon of a global citizen and annotate various global citizen characteristics of the cartoon. (IE-N-05-04.07.2016)

Other activities involved the use of moving images to stimulate discussion amongst the participants.

Teachers return to their seats and F plays a video from YouTube, entitled ‘Reverse Racism’ by Aamer Rahman. Lasting 3 minutes, the clip from Rahman’s comedy show plays on the importance of historical context when considering racism. A short discussion with the teachers on viewing the clip reveals that ‘Reverse Racism’ is a new concept for all the teachers. One teacher connects it to institutional issues. (IE-N-02-04.07.2016)

Other activities were utilised to draw out more specific and clearly stated opinions, and in doing so offered the opportunity for debate.

R begins the next activity which is named as a ‘Walking Debate’. After all the chairs are moved to the edges of the room, the teachers are instructed to move to the side of the room which best represents how strongly they agree (right of the board) or disagree (left of the board) with each statement that R reads out. (IE-N-02-04.07.2016)

This particular activity was also creatively adapted by one of the teacher educators
on Programme A, who provided participants with cards which prompted them to re-position themselves along the continuum of agree-disagree, for example, playing 'devil’s advocate' to the rest of the group, or repeatedly disagreeing with whatever the statement said, and then advocating their position.

I wanted to do a walking debate to get people talking about different ideas about the migration issue. But I was very conscious that people might not want to give their true opinion, if there were people in there who didn’t want migrants coming into the country but didn’t want to come across as racist so would not say it – people would be too polite. In designing the session I put a lot of thought into “how can ensure that those voices are being heard without people putting themselves in an awkward position?” (IE-N-05-04.07.2016)

Although Programme A is identified within this chapter as a stand-alone five-day summer school, it should be noted that the relationship between the organising NGO and the organising university was longstanding, and previous teacher education collaborations had yielded important learning for the teacher educators. During the observed pre-programme organising meeting, the three teacher educators had discussed this learning.

The meeting begins with a discussion between R and L in particular regarding what had worked well in the teacher education course which had run the year before. They discuss the positive feedback from teachers, which included the range of activities and one activity in particular – the scavenger hunt. (IE-N-01-28.06.2016)

In a later interview, one of the teacher educators explained how this evaluative reflection had informed the planning of the summer school.

A lot of [programme design] would have come from previous feedback, from work we would have done, different activities we would have done with teachers. I know that [NGO] have a long history of development education and outreach with teachers. I know R has done a lot of work and from a theoretical point of view, research which was done here within the college would have informed a lot of the activities, because some of the activities were based on resources that came from that research. Based on children’s abilities to engage with these issues. And from a practical point of view, from feedback from previous session and previous courses as well. We would have done what went well, and stopped what didn’t go so well...for me, because I’m new to the area, I would have done things that had worked well before. (IE-If-3-05.10.2016)

Within Programme B, the desire for facilitating teachers to evaluate their teacher education sessions at an early stage was made explicit within the information provided to facilitating teachers.

Can I run skillshare sessions with teachers in my own school?

Yes! Sharing your experience of using human rights education with your colleagues is a great idea. For new facilitators this year, it is recommended that your first session be carried out with your own school so that you can pilot the methodologies, the timings and the content. (xIE-D-10-25.04.2017)

In addition to this opportunity for evaluation, at the end of each teacher session, the facilitating teachers distributed evaluation sheets (xIE-N-15-31.03.2017). These completed evaluation sheets offered the NGO teacher educators the opportunity to review the outcomes of the teacher education sessions.
I have never seen the sessions that the teachers deliver being delivered. So I’m not, I can’t speak to the quality, I can in that I know this is a good program and I know that the feedback we get is great. But there isn’t any monitoring by the organisation of the workshops that are being delivered. So it’s a very trusting relationship in the facilitator teachers that they are delivering quality workshops. But the feedback, we get evaluation reports so that’s part of the criteria that there’s obviously sign-in sheets and then we have a standard evaluation form that all the participants teachers have to fill in and then the facilitator teachers then sends all that back to us. So I guess we can monitor the progress through that. (xIE-If-4-29.03.2017)

Previously in Programme B, teacher educators from the NGO had observed some of the teacher education sessions taking place. So I would have sat in on them there, so like I would never have, it was also a bit of quality control for me. Although I’d never say that officially. Just because with some teachers you wouldn’t know what they would be saying and it would be the case that maybe one or two of the workshops would be a bit too didactic, they wouldn’t be participative enough. So I would just chat to the teacher afterwards and suggest different ways or say the feedback was that they wanted, so instead of just going through the activities maybe I would say well maybe you might add in time to model one of them towards the end or something like that. But like the standard was really high and the quality was really high. It always used to come back in the feedback, so I was never too concerned about that. (xIE-If-06-03.04.2017)

Such evaluation appeared to ensure that the teacher education sessions maintained their focus on active and participatory methodologies. This general approach to evaluation was an important component of the conceptual framework which framed Programme B, as explained by the teacher educator who had designed the programme.

Certainly, in terms of the conceptual framework that we would have put together for you know where we were locating the program and the rationale for the program. Then we’d get feedback from participants as well in that. (xIE-If-06-03.04.2017)

Collecting the perspectives of participating teachers supported teacher educators to consider the degree to which the aims of programmes were achieved but could also reveal unexpected outcomes.

And it’s a complex area. So we can assume that like, I don’t know if we should be too ambitious but at the same time I think we therefore have to recognise small achievements. So whether that’s supporting teachers who are already motivated and have some knowledge in actually putting it into their practice. That’s a big achievement and that’s great if we can do that. Or whether it’s teachers who wouldn’t have had an interest to have an interest who might then do, integrate this or pick up that storybook and use that storybook or ask questions in a different perspective. Or question their own prejudice or reconsider a way in which they were planning on doing something. I would, I think our… there’s always going to be one or two amazing stories of teachers who are really inspired and who do brilliant stuff. (IE-If-1-05.10.2016)

Within Programme A, which as a summer school had a greater time to explore evaluation, other methods of evaluation, beyond collecting short questionnaires from teachers, were incorporated.
In pairs, teachers connect all of their learning to specific named curricular areas or themes – numeracy; literacy; IT; PE; SESE; SPHE; Religion; Gaeilge; Art; Music; Drama. Teachers then fed back their ideas on curricular integration of GCE to the rest of the group. The teachers moved into a circle of chairs. One by one, the teachers gave individual reflections: “I learned a lot, never mind for the children!”; Care for issues being important – passion transfers to the children; Integration important; “Professionally and personally mindful of these issues” Teacher J; “importance of learning outside the classroom; education as a vehicle to create change. (IE-N-14-08.07.2016)

Such an approach enabled a group evaluation, where participating teachers could listen to the perspectives and ideas of their peers.

The challenge of evaluating the longer-term impact of teacher education was a clear consideration for both programmes.

We haven’t gone out and evaluated it a year later. We get the feedback saying, “I think this is really great” but then we don’t know if they are putting it into practice and how much of it is actually having an impact...in terms of practice in the classroom, I’m not entirely sure. (IE-If-02-18.07.2016)

Considering that the integration of GCE into classroom practice is such a central aim for both programmes, a lack of opportunity to explore the implementation of learning from the teacher education programmes appears a considerable barrier to the teacher educators’ ideal imagined evaluation.

Ideally some kind of checking in, moving beyond a survey. If you could meet teachers, maybe month on month, hearing anecdotally from them. And surveys as well I guess. That’s the ongoing issue, that you are trying to report for funding for the courses we run whether it is been put into practice. It’s very superficial. (IE-If-02-18.07.2016)

However, there was scepticism that the timing of the summer school in Programme A was conducive to the implementation of learning into classroom practice.

This course is packed into five days and it’s at the start of the summer holidays, they may forget everything we say and September is months away. Will they use what we have been doing with them? A better timing would be one evening a week for two months in September October so they are applying what they are learning to their teaching. (IE-If-02-18.07.2016)

Programme B identified that if the opportunity to run more than one teacher education session with the same group of teachers, referred to as a “double-decker” (xIE-If-06-03.04.2017) arose, it would provide an important opportunity to consider how the learning from the initial teacher education session had been incorporated into the teachers’ practice.

Can I run more than one skillshare session with the same group of teachers?

Yes, you can run sessions with the same group of teachers, in fact it is encouraged! We are hoping this year to get some data on how teachers have built on their initial learning so it would be great if some follow-up sessions with skillshare groups were planned. However we do realise that it can be challenging to get one slot from a school, let alone two, so even if some of the participants came along to a second session it would provide a useful indication of how teachers are incorporating the content into their classroom teaching. (xIE-D-10-25.04.2017).

Despite the considerations of how evaluation could be useful in informing
transformation teacher education practice, there was also the consideration of the evaluations required by funders. So if Irish Aid were able to change maybe some of their funding structures which would be maybe to more long term funding, more strategic partnerships, more multiannual funding it would allow people to design programs that were a lot more coherent and a lot more meaningful. And then be able to track that change and the attitudinal change that might be coming with that... I think as well then if NGOs who run educational programs if they were a bit more respectful of education processes you know because a lot of them as well they’re finding themselves within these I suppose performance measurement frameworks you know a lot of it would be around clicks and how many likes a Facebook campaign was getting. Whereas with education those targets aren’t always able to be measurable within a given year. It’s more long term you’d be hoping to get. (xIE-IIf-06-03.04.2017)

For such programmes, the performance measurement frameworks were perceived to present a barrier to meaningful evaluation and in particular longer-term evaluation which could illuminate so of the longer-term impacts of teacher education.

Before embarking on a deeper exploration of the two programmes at the focus of the Irish section of this research project, it is important to consider the key individuals and organisations within the field of teacher education for global citizenship. Research into both Programme A and Programme B reveals a complex network of actors who, in different ways, influence the development and implementation of teacher education programmes focused on Global Citizenship Education. Table 2 provides a categorisation of these actors along with pertinent examples derived from either or both programmes.

3. Main Actors (Influential actors in the field of GCE teacher education)

3.1 Mapping the influential actors

Table 2 - Actors influencing GCE Teacher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children in Irish Primary Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For example, children in the classes of participating teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Irish Primary Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teachers participating in Programmes A and B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Educators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher educators involved in the development and facilitation of Programmes A and B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Educators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher educators involved in design and facilitation of Programmes but who are also practicing primary teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Irish Primary Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actors involved in the practices of Irish Primary Schools, for example school principals, school boards of management, other teachers (peers of teachers directly involved in Programmes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local Community

Actors within the local community of schools (and children) who influence how teacher education is developed and practised. For example, parents and family of children in Irish primary schools, individual activists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Governmental Actors</th>
<th>National Non-Governmental Actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irish governmental bodies or organisations whose policies and practices influence teacher education. For example, the Department of Education, the National Council for Curriculum and Assessment, the Department of Foreign Affairs, the Teaching Council, Universities</td>
<td>Irish non-governmental organisations whose policies and practices influence teacher education. For example, Teaching Unions, non-governmental organisations, civil society organisations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

International Organisations

International organisations whose policies can be seen to shape teacher education in Ireland. For example, the United Nations.

Whilst Table 2 offers a useful overview of the individuals and groups which this research suggests influence teacher education for global citizenship, however the degree of influence and manner by which this influence occurs is explored in greater depth later within this report. It is also important to identify that, as well as influencing the practice of teacher education for global citizenship, many of these actors are themselves hoped and perceived to be influenced by teacher education. This shall be returned to later within the report.

Within Table 2, highlighted in blue, are the actors directly involved in the practice of teacher education for global citizenship namely the teacher educators developing and delivering the programmes and the primary teachers participating in the programmes. There are currently 3,250 Irish primary schools served by the Department of Education and Skills in Ireland, of which 150 are Special Schools. These schools are served by 35,669 full time teaching staff (Department of Education and Skills, 2017). Both Programme A and Programme B were targeted specifically at Irish primary school teachers with Programme A engaging with 18 teachers over the course of the summer school, and Programme B engaging with over 1,500 Irish primary teachers over the 5-year duration of the programme. In relation to the delivery of the teacher education courses, Programme A involved 3 teacher educators – one university lecturer, one project officer from the same institution (also a qualified primary teacher) and one education officer from the partner NGO. Programme B involved 2 teacher educators working on behalf of the NGO, who were involved in the design of the programme and the facilitation of the ‘community of practice’, and a group of up to fifteen ‘facilitating teacher’ teacher educators responsible for the development and delivery of the teacher education sessions to primary teachers.
The United Nations (UN) appeared as a key international organisation in shaping the methodologies and content addressed within both programmes. Particularly in light of the strong rights-based approaches which were apparent in both Programmes A and B, the conventions adopted by the UN, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UN, 1949) and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UN, 1989) were clearly evident in the practice of teacher educators as exemplified in field notes from Programme A:

Teachers shared reflections on the activity with education mentioned numerous times. The right to privacy was perceived by one teacher as an often neglected right in schools. F suggested that a UDHR poster could be put up in the classroom. (IE-N-08-06.07.2016)

Within Programme B, there was also evidence of reference to more recent international agreements in the form of the Sustainable Development Goals both as key content (xIE-D-04-05.04.2017) and as an important overarching framework (xIE-D-02-29.03.2017). These larger frameworks appeared to offer teachers the opportunity to engage with GCE, as observed in Programme B:

The session begins by S explaining that bigger policy documents can be translated into child friendly language and also into illustrations. S mentions the Sustainable Development Goals and their 17 themes, as well as the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights. (xIE-N-15-31.03.2017)

Several government bodies also emerged as key actors in the field of Irish GCE. The Department of Education and Skills (DES) holds governmental responsibility for education and training in Ireland and the development of the continuum of teacher education (DES, 2016). Unsurprisingly, the DES was observed, alongside the Teaching Council, to shape the structure and the content of both teacher education programmes. Other references were made to the National Council for Curriculum and Assessment, the government body that advises the Minister for Education and Skills on curriculum and assessment which was heavily involved in the development of the Irish Primary Curriculum (1999). One of the key illustrations of the influence of the DES and the NCCA was the repeated reference in both programmes to the Primary National Curriculum. Such strong reference to curriculum-linked educational planning was evident in both Programme A and Programme B, particularly to the areas of Social Environmental and Scientific Education (SESE) and Social Personal and Health Education (SPHE), can be connected to the broader governmental policies as the NCCA explain:

While Ireland has a centrally devised curriculum, there is a strong emphasis on school and classroom planning. At school level, the particular character of the school makes a vital contribution to shaping the curriculum in classrooms. Adaptation of the curriculum to suit the individual school is achieved through the preparation and continuous updating of a school plan. The selection of text books and classroom resources to support the implementation of the curriculum is made by schools, rather than by the Department of Education and Skills or the National Council for Curriculum and Assessment. (NCCA, 2017)

The flexibility of the Irish Primary Curriculum was viewed by a TE on Programme B as a positive trait, allowing the introduction of emerging themes. “There is the ability within the Irish curriculum that if there is something happening currently on the news, such as the refugee crisis or Syria, there is the allowance within the curriculum that you could bring that in to geography under the strand..."
Myself and the Wider World. You could bring it in. There’s a lot of ownership that teachers have over the curriculum” (xIE-If-05-29.03.2017)

Whilst the national curriculum appeared to be a solid framework around which both programmes anchored their teacher education practice, other policy documents were also perceived to influence GCE practice in Irish primary schools. For example, within the teacher education sessions for Programme B, the National Strategy on Education for Sustainable Development (2014), developed by the DES, provided a justification for the use of “pedagogies [which] are transformative, participatory and emancipatory” (xIE-D-04-05.04.2017) and more specifically those which encourage the participation of children. The NCCA has also been involved in the production of guidelines for best practice in the form of the Intercultural Education in the Primary School: Guidelines for Schools (2005) which were recognised as important sources of information shaping the development of teacher education sessions for Programme B. However, it was also noted that, as vehicles for shaping actual classroom practice, the guidelines had limitations:

“If you think of the Intercultural Guidelines, published by the DES in 2005, while they have great recommendations in them, I would challenge anyone to say who’s read them. Probably very few teachers, because they are not compulsory. They are there to support the curriculum, to be weaved in to the curriculum. Whilst teachers might have the best intentions to do it, it’s not done because the curriculum is so heavy in what has to be covered, as long as something is add-on and not something that’s compulsory to do, there’s very few schools that might take it on board, unless it’s a flagship for your school” (xIE-If-05-29.03.2017)

Whilst the guidelines are perceived as a useful source of guidance for teachers, the criticisms here echo arguments within existing literature from the Irish context, which identifies the critical importance of approaches which move beyond simple add-ons and seek to reshape existing educational provision (Bryan, 2009). Reference to these guidelines, as well as other documentation, highlights in how, to varying degrees, both recommendatory and normative policy may shape teacher education.

Within both Programme A and Programme B, the influence of non-governmental organisations was very clear. NGOs had undertaken research on specific issues (such as human rights, climate change and migration) which informed teaching approaches in both programmes. NGOs were also involved in the development of targeted educational resources which were referenced and utilised in the teacher education sessions. Within Programme A, the ongoing collaboration between the partner NGO and the partner university centre (itself involved in the completion and dissemination of educational research, ongoing teacher education and the development of educational resources) had resulted in several GCE projects and these experiences were important sources of knowledge shaping the development of Programme A.

Teaching Unions in Ireland are recognised as having both a historical support for, and an ongoing commitment to, GCE practice within Irish primary schools (Amnesty International, 2004; Murphy & Ruane, 2004; INTO, 2017). Within this research, it was apparent that the teaching unions shaped how certain aspects of programmes were developed and experienced. In Programme B, resources
developed by Irish teaching unions were shared with teachers as examples of good practice. As follows, union policy was also seen to influence the content of teacher education in Programme A. In 2016, the Department of Education and Skills furthered their focus on school self-evaluation through the publication of the School Self-Evaluation Guidelines 2016-2020 (DES, 2016). Meeting this priority, self-evaluation was incorporated into the planning of Programme A. However, when the activities centred on self-evaluation were addressed within the course, in the form of a school-based human rights evaluation, teachers explained that teaching unions were opposed to engagement with self-evaluation (IE-N-04-04.07.2016). Indeed, the Irish National Teachers’ Organisation had issued a directive to members, stating that members should “cease cooperation with the school self-evaluation process” (INTO, 2016). Within Programme A, the reference to self-evaluation, albeit through a human rights lens, was perceived by teachers as problematic considering union policy, and may have represented a barrier to any further implementation of an activity such as school-based human rights evaluation by teachers.

At a more local level, the research suggests a few actors who influence how teacher education in relation to GCE is framed. Firstly, there are several actors within schools who are perceived to shape how teacher education takes place. Schools principals are recognised as having a role in either supporting, encouraging, demanding or denying primary teaching staff the opportunity to engage in certain forms of teacher education. There is also reference to the role played by each school’s board of management. In certain circumstances, the degree to which teacher education content can be implemented in the classroom may depend on these actors within schools, but also on the perceived attitudes of others within the locality, such as parents and other family members.

As identified in Table 1, both programmes were externally funded beyond the organising institutions. Although separate to the Department of Education and Skills, the Department for Foreign Affairs and specifically the arm known as Irish Aid has an important role in relation to the provision of Development Education/GCE in Ireland. Irish Aid’s approach to Development Education aims to “increase awareness and understanding of global development issues among the Irish public” (Irish Aid, 2017). As a key funder of Development Education, and the source of funding for Programme B, the focus on ‘development’ is important to recognise.

Another important supra-national actor within the field of GCE is the European Union (EU). Funded by the EU’s executive, the European Commission (EC), the Development education and awareness raising (DEAR) project “aims to inform EU citizens about development issues, mobilise greater public support for action against poverty, give citizens tools to engage critically with global development issues, to foster new ideas and change attitudes” (EC, 2017). It is through this DEAR funding that Programme A was funded.
Within the Irish case, the thematic analysis of data revealed many points of conflict within aspects of the teacher education programmes. These tensions appear in the spaces between some of the key actors, including organisations but also individuals operating within and alongside organisations. Within the Irish context, multiple themes can be connected to the issues of sustainability and it is unsurprising that multiple forms of education, or adjectival educations can be identified in the space of teacher education for GCE. For Programme B, the tension between the preferred conceptualisation of the funder (Development Education) and the preferred educational approach of the NGO (Human Rights Education) was apparent.

When you were reporting to [NGO] they would be querying the proportion of what they would perceive to be development education topics. And then when you would be reporting to Irish Aid they would be querying the perception, what they would perceive as being strictly human rights. So it didn’t matter what way we pitched it in terms of the intersection I think, I mean nothing was in my view what we were doing was both. But certainly [the NGO] were looking at it from a human rights perspective they felt the human rights wasn’t grounded enough. Irish Aid if they saw the word human rights you’d always get a note back going is this really development education? So I think neither of them fully got what we were doing in terms of the intersection but I suppose with all of those adjectives there’s a little bit of cross-over. (xIE-If-04-29.03.2017)

The teacher educator who had developed Programme B explained how she had negotiated the conflict between funder and lead organisation and had developed a positive resolution to this conflict, by including the tension between HRE and DE within the conceptual framework she had developed. This framework was shared with all participants and highlighted how human rights and development were central themes for the teacher education programme. This teacher educator also perceived that in focusing on human rights, the lead NGO was positioned in a unique position to add expertise to the development of teacher education in Ireland.

I think certainly in the Irish context it feels like an almost overloaded market at the moment. Like particularly with development education and I think, I mean [the NGO] occupies a unique position ... But the development education sector is just, so many NGOs doing development education work. Teachers, I think or the sense I get from teachers is that a lot of them are almost overwhelmed by the amount of different training workshops that are on offer to them. Almost competing for their in-service hours. So I think that’s a huge challenge for the sector. Its figuring out or finding a way to provide teachers with be it development education or citizenship education without creating this kind of competitive market and overwhelming teachers with the amount of different programs on offer. (xIE-If-04-29.03.2017)

The tensions between the various conceptualisations of education was perceived to be further complicated by the position of the Department of Education and Skills, which in 2014, published its policy on Education for Sustainable Development 2014–2020 (DES, 2014) which positioned Education for Sustainable Development as the priority educational approach.

I think what stops them from being as successful as they could be is that [GCE] is not a curricular area, so a lot of focus from the Department or from schools will be on literacy and numeracy and things like that. GCE isn’t at the forefront and
doesn’t get as much funding, as much visibility as it could. As I said earlier on, it’s hard to set up systems where you have repeated engagement with teachers on issues like this. Oftentimes it’s one off, or is just a summer course for a week. It’s hard to set up a consistent programme. I think that’s a downfall. But I think that initially, as on offs, they are successful. We got good feedback, I think that teachers are really interested, and they enjoy them. Maybe they are not very sustainable given current priorities in education. (IE-If-03-05.10.2016)

For one of the teacher educators involved in Programme A, the tensions between conceptualisations of GCE extended to members of the public, or more specifically, her family.

No [not GCE], it would be Development Education…in [the NGO] it’s the Development Education Team, my role is [removed], if I’m explaining my role to friends or family I’d say GCE because they understand that better. I think there’s always confusion that I’m going into schools talking about the developing world, as opposed to the citizenship side of it. I would use the citizenship side when talking about my role, but I wouldn’t say I’m the GCE Officer. (IE-If-02-18.07.2017)

There was also a consideration of how other actors outside of the teacher education programmes perceived GCE and in particular its content.

People’s opinions and people’s views might be challenging I suppose, when the issues are quite sensitive, topical and contentious. I think that’s not just a challenge, it’s an opportunity as well to get people thinking in a different way and in a more critical way. Even that it’s not a subject on its own can be an opportunity as well as a challenge. If you are committed enough as a teacher, you can bring it in to all your teaching…Migration would be one [example of a difficult issue], there would be different opinions on that. Climate change – some people don’t see it as a big problem, as we would see it. Political issues. Religion. Even the intercultural things. You are trying to break down stereotypes I suppose, which can be quite deep set. For us, migration would be a big one at the moment, trying to get people to see it from a different point of view. (IE-If-3-05.10.2016)

Indeed, whether the public was supportive of such issues was an important consideration for participants.

Although the multiple adjectival educations may present a challenge to those trying to unpick GCE within an Irish context, there is also a recognition of the strength that the inclusion of multiple conceptual lenses may bring to GCE.

Because I’m based in a school and teaching, I based mine on practical lesson ideas, other teachers might have gone down a critical literacy route. Other people involved might have had a background in drama, they brought HR play scripts and mime. Other people from an ICT background developed things around ICT skills that would feed into a human rights perspective. In terms of the community of practice, you are learning from people from very different backgrounds to yourself and the way that they are approaching. (xIE-If-05-29.03.2017)

This strength in diversity also extended to Programme A, as one of the teacher educators explained that the specialism of her NGO complemented the strengths of the other teacher educators.

My area of focus from [the NGO] perspective is climate change education, but [other teacher educator] took that topic because of the new climate change programme [she had developed]. I found it brilliant that I was able to bring a different perspective, migration which we are doing tomorrow. It was a really nice opportunity to bring in another component of [NGOs] work. The [university]
doesn’t necessarily have access to the stories, the photographs of refugees that are migrating, and that’s something that [the NGO] could bring to the programme. We tried to each play to our strengths that we were able to bring to it. (IE-If-02-18.07.2017)

Here, the collaboration between a university centre steeped in GCE and an NGO specialising in development offers participating teachers a deeper engagement with global issues, such as migration.

This theme and the associated subcategories provide an insight into the reasons why teachers attend GCE teacher education programmes and why, in certain cases, they do not. The barriers to engagement with teacher education can be defined as time and financial resources.

A common barrier to the successful implementation of teacher education programmes were the time constraints faced by teachers – as described in documentation from Programme B, “schools are busy places” (xIE-D-10-25.04.2017). Unsurprisingly, these time constraints presented issues for teacher educators: “For finding access to teachers, the biggest issue is their time” (IE-If-02-18.07.2016). Having access to an extended period was perceived to be an important factor supporting the quality of teacher education.

I think in terms of challenges as well like you know again from what I hear teachers, from teachers themselves finding the time and the headspace to actually engage in, even though they may be incredibly interested in a topic and really want to but finding the space in their own practice to deeply engage in and participate in a training like that and then go back and work it into their lesson plan does take I think time and even though facilitator teachers pass on techniques and resources there’s still a level of work required of each participant teacher to actually put those practices to teams which if you are under pressure teacher time wise it’s a difficult task. (xIE-If-04-29.03.2017)

From both programmes, it is apparent that several windows for teacher education exist within the Irish context, as illustrated in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>E.g.</th>
<th>Opportunities/Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>Croke Park Hours</td>
<td>- Reach: Interested, committed and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Opportunity: For whole schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Challenge: Follow-up; time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentivised</td>
<td>Summer School (EPV)</td>
<td>- Reach: Interested and committed teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Opportunity: Deeper immersion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Challenge: Follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>After-school/Weekend</td>
<td>- Reach: Committed teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Opportunity: Specialist pitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Challenge: Follow up; time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 ‘Barriers to Participation in Teacher Education for GCE’

Table 3 - Windows for teacher education in Ireland
This table identifies the various windows for teacher education that occur within a teacher’s or schools calendar. These windows maybe compulsory for teaching staff, may be incentivised by the prospect of additional vacation days (EPVs) or be entirely voluntary. Each window may provide the opportunity to ‘reach’ particular teachers, may provide the opportunity for targeted formats and may also have inherent challenges. One window of opportunity for teacher educators are the Croke Park Hours.

One of the ways that has worked quite well is to get in within the Croke Park Hours, because Croke Park Hours are mandatory and staff have to stay behind. On a couple of occasions schools have booked me for Croke Park hours which has been really really handy, because you have all staff there and Croke Park Hours are often 90 minutes, so it’s slightly longer and teachers don’t mind being there. They have to be there so maybe they’re much more receptive. That’s not to say...you saw the group the other week – they are very receptive, but that’s voluntary time. I was very impressed that they got 14/15 member of staff to stay back, voluntarily, after school. It’s hard. I’m a staff member myself. I don’t know how quick I would be to stay after school. They’re busy places [schools].

(xIE-If-05-29.03.2017)

Although the Croke Park Hours, with the provision of whole-school time for planning and development work (DES, 2016) represented an important opportunity for teacher educators to gain access to teachers and schools, these opportunities were perceived to be fleeting. The only other opportunity I would have to get in and give teachers in-service teacher education would be their Croke Park Hours after school and a lot of the time, schools have them already planned for the year, from the beginning of the year. So it’s hard. (IE-If-03-05,.10.2016) Schools they are so constrained with I suppose the amount of stuff that’s being thrown at them (xIE-If-06-03.04.2017)

Within Programme B, facilitating teachers were instructed to act quickly to secure these Croke Park Hours: “slots fill up fast to it is suggested you contact schools in your area as soon as possible” (xIE-D-10-25.04.2017). There was also recognition that the competition for teachers’ time included other GCE teacher education providers.

As well as time, the financial resources available to lead organisations were perceived to limit whether certain teachers could attend the programmes.

I think resources are always going to be an issue and I think it’s the best way to get bang for your buck or you know reach the most amount of people that you possibly can. With a limited amount of sessions that you can deliver. Because otherwise if you are looking at direct student education then you are only reaching obviously the number of students that you and directly working with. (xIE-If-04-29.03.2017)

If [the course] is on during the year, do we have substitution cover to cover their days when they are doing the course? (IE-If-02-18.07.2016)

In certain cases, the lack of resources had led to teacher educators operating in a voluntary capacity.

Yeah I’ve stayed involved for that but that’s purely voluntary. Because I just felt that like the situation, like the lack of institutional support for the project was what made me leave. But because the teachers have shown such dedication
These financial restrictions also limited the geographical reach of programmes (xIE-If-06-03.04.2017). This issue was also raised within Programme A. Mostly in Dublin and Kildare, but I have been to Galway and Cork and to Roscommon and Laois. Roscommon and Laois were events that were done along with [the NGO]. The schools in Cork and Galway were part of this programme but one-off visits to the schools to give teacher education...It’s [based around Dublin] because we engaged with the Community National Schools network and most of them are based around Dublin. Once they expressed interest, it was easier to keep a cluster around Dublin I suppose (IE-If-03-05,10.2016)

A central plank of the teaching approaches addressed within Programme A and Programme B, as aims, methodologies and learning activities, has already been articulated in Sections 2.2-2.4. Although Programme A exhibited strong adherence to methodological approaches themselves grounded in theory, Programme B was explicit about the connections between theory and teacher education practice. In the external case there were several strong references to pedagogical and theoretical approaches which framed the work of course organisers and teacher educators. As has been previously identified, Programme B was structured around a formal conceptual framework and the following table suggests how the components of this framework can be best defined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical</th>
<th>Suggested Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Framework</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuum of Teacher Education</td>
<td>“formal and informal educational and developmental activities in which teachers engage, as life-long learners, during their teaching career.” (Teaching Council, 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community of Practice Peer Learning</td>
<td>“groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly.” (Wenger, 2011, p.1) “the acquisition of knowledge and skill through active helping and supporting among status equals or matched companions” (Topping, 2005, p. 631)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Methodologies Critical Reflection</td>
<td>“active learning involves students in doing things and thinking about the things they are doing” (Bonwell &amp; Eison, 1991, p. 2) Reflection which “to involve and lead to some fundamental change in perspective” (Cranton 1996, pp.79–80).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The teacher educator responsible for the development of the conceptual framework and the design of Programme B explained her decisions. I just wanted to start the process. Because I felt that you know especially when you are doing training it can be very lowest common denominator sometimes. So I was always fighting that actually we’ve a philosophy behind this, we have a values based approach, we know what we are doing in terms of how we are pitching it or what we want to do with the teachers. But I mean with the critical reflection we would have been drawing on I suppose problem posing methodology, ideas around maybe like the neutrality, the lack of neutrality I suppose in education as well. Community of practice obviously we were just taking the stuff, like it wasn’t anything, it wasn’t a particularly sophisticated model of community of practice. With the peer learning I think we were really looking more at policies, I suppose it was trying to fall in with the teaching council stuff there around how people learn and all that stuff. Here, not so much, we were drawing on development education theorists, like especially maybe Andreotti and Douglas Borne a little bit and maybe David Hicks. And human rights education. (xIE-If-05-29.03.2017)

Critical DE and HRE informed the overall project and justified the focus on active methodologies already discussed within this chapter. The focus on the Continuum of Teacher Education gave ground for an approach which provided learning opportunities for practicing teachers through the teacher education sessions, and provided learning for highly experienced through the Community of Practice and Critical Reflection. Peer learning framed the interaction between facilitating teachers and participant teachers during the teacher education sessions themselves.

I mean obviously the human rights based approach towards education generally and I think the peer-to-peer model is something that we deliberately considered and chosen as well. Certainly the feedback that I’ve gotten from the facilitator teachers is that peer-to-peer education model works really well. And the teachers, the participants teachers that they are delivering to really appreciate the insight that practicing teachers can provide as opposed to somebody more, you know like a human rights expert or someone like that. (xIE-If-04-29.03.2017)

It is also important to note that the facilitating teachers each had theoretical foundations for the teacher education sessions they had designed and delivered. S suggest that English, and in particular oral language, is an area of the curriculum amenable to HRE at J1 and S1, particularly through stories, poems and circle time. In 1st and 2nd class, want and needs could be compared to rights, and children can identify basic rights. In 3rd and 4th class, children can develop concepts of rights and explore the skills to negotiate conflict. In 5th and 6th class, S suggests that children can develop a critical understanding of rights. (xIE-N-15-31.03.2017)

After being observed delivering this session, the teacher educator explained her justification for the spiralled framework she had developed.

Over the years I’ve realised that focusing on themes with Junior classes such as empathy or identity are things they can relate to. And really, the theme of empathy forms the grounding for HRE. If you don’t have an empathetic side yourself, it’s very difficult to teach a HRE programme. We found those themes particularly useful at the junior end. Then it’s been a spiralled approach, we’ve gone from themes of empathy to identity, then in the first class introducing some of the basic rights from the UDHR or the UNCRC. And looking at them in further detail through 2nd, 3rd and 4th class. The spiralled approach would then
culminate in more critical and complex issues at national and global level by the
time that the children are at the senior end of the school. (xIE-If-05-29.03.2017)
The spiralled approach suggested by the facilitating teacher offers the opportunity
for teachers at each level of primary school to engage within GCE and allows
the planning of GCE integration throughout the entire primary school, from J1
through to Year 6.

The teacher education programmes addressed several different issues
within their practice. Issues connected to human rights were covered in both
programmes, although a focus for Programme B, as has been already discussed.
There was evidence of human rights being addressed alongside the theme of
‘responsibility’ within Programme B, and Children’s Rights were a feature of
both programmes. Several global issues were explored, including migration,
sustainability, development and climate change. Identity and empathy were
addressed as foundational themes in both programmes.

Issues more specific to the Irish context were addressed, in the forms of
homelessness and the rights of people from the Traveller Community. Certain
issues specific to the Irish educational context were present, including well-
being, literacy and numeracy. These themes have been the focus of increased
government policy in the last few years (DES, 2016). It is important to recognise
that for both programmes, engaging with unexpected or emergent issues was
considered an important approach within teacher education and a possibility
within Irish classrooms.

In delivering to teachers, [in a way that highlights] the ground work is already
there to support you. We are lucky in Ireland – our curriculum isn’t very prescribed.
It might be a heavy curriculum [in Ireland] but I did teach in the UK and it was a
very prescribed curriculum. Whilst teachers will say it’s heavy and there’s a lot
to get through, it isn’t prescribed. There is the ability within the Irish curriculum
that if there is something happening currently on the news, such as the refugee
crisis or Syria, there is the allowance within the curriculum that you could bring
that in to geography under the strand Myself and the Wider World. You could
bring it in. There’s a lot of ownership that teachers have over the curriculum.
(xIE-If-05-29.03.2017)
These issues included the British referendum on Europe.

The discussion moves on to the implications for classroom practice. BREXIT is
mentioned by one teacher, with another stating they are happy that “school is
over so that it’s not in the classroom now”. (IE-N-02-04.07.2016)
Other issues included the terror attack in the Batalan Theatre in Paris.
Teacher D described the challenges of dealing with the aftermath of the violence
at the Batalan theatre in Paris. The school Principal wanted to avoid discussing,
however teachers in the school did address it. Another teacher talked of inclusion
and diversity, and the possibility that schools could be a “safe space” to address
traumatic events. (IE-N-14-08.07.2016)

These illustrations highlight the need for responsiveness within both teacher
education addressing global issues, but also the adaptability expected of primary
classroom teachers addressing sensitive and complex issues at very short notice.
Although the conceptions of GCE central to Programme B have already been
explored within this chapter, it is important to note that the teacher educators involved in the programme had personal perspectives on the conceptualisation of GCE.

So my definition of global citizenship would encompass I think a lot of the types of education that I’ve worked in, in my career so they would have that human rights framework where you’d talk about rights and responsibilities. It would have the intercultural component in that antiracism and naming and challenging prejudice would be front and centre of all of the work that you do. And then also then I suppose the more traditional, what would be traditionally lumped under development education which would be looking at inequality in the world, looking at how the world is interdependent, how its rapidly changing like you know, the Irish Aid definition is certainly very standard. So I think my preferred term would be global citizenship. (xIE-If-06-03.4.2017)

This broad definition included human rights, intercultural education, antiracist education and critical forms of development education. For another teacher educator on Programme B, the conception of global citizenship appeared preferable to existing conceptions of DE.

So possibly a more appropriate umbrella term, but not just because it’s handier. But I think it says more, its much more accessible to people I think, people get turned off when they hear things about development education or the global south. Whereas when they understand that there’s a sort of, you know stuff involved in being a global citizen I think that makes a lot more sense, at an innate level. (xIE-If-06-03.4.2017)

Both programmes refer to certain characteristics of both teachers and students which can be considered as global competences. Indeed, certain characteristics are clearly defined within the aims of the programmes addressed in Section 2.1. A teacher educator from Programme A suggested that against the backdrop of increasing globalisation, it was increasingly important to provide young people with the competencies to develop critical understanding of the world they live in. I think then more broadly like that issues of social justice and global awareness again as the world becomes more globalised, commerce and general production there’s so much global influence in our everyday lives and kids are interacting with items and things that have come from all over the world from the moment they wake up. I think being able to have that awareness and realise where everything comes from and what people’s lives are like in different parts of the world that directly have to do with things that directly impact their lives is really important. (xIE-If-04-29.03.2016)

Documentation from Programme B defined the potential of HRE to “empower the next generation to develop the skills and attitudes that promote equality, dignity and respect in your community, society and worldwide.” (xIE-D-01-29.03.2017) and in addition a teacher educator from the programme suggested that “critical thinking is one of the skills you need for GC” (xIE-If-05-29.03.2017). This inclusion of critical thinking as an important global competence was also highlighted elsewhere.

I suppose the idea of multiple-perspectives and critical thinking, I would hope that a definition [of GCE] would have one or the other of those in it. I think that idea of not taking things at face value is important in GCE...I suppose I thought about it when I studied human rights, but I suppose before then I would have had
quite a one-dimensional view of development and development issues. I would have looked at them for what I saw rather than the different reasons behind them and aggravating factors, things that you don’t see. Only in the past 2 or 3 years I would have started thinking about them in that way. (IE-If-03-05.10.2016)

The inclusion of multi-perspectivity was also noted within this suggestion of global competence. Human rights were recognised as an important absence from Oxfam’s definition of Global Citizenship competences by the primary teachers participating in Programme A.

L begins with a recap of the previous day’s events and also encourages the teachers to write and wear a name badge. On the IWB there is a definition of Global Citizenship Education from Oxfam (2006). The definition of what makes a global citizen includes awareness of role as world citizen, respect and values, outrage at injustice and responsibility for action. L leads a group discussion on “what is missing?” from the definition. One teacher mentioned ‘human rights’ as one possible omission, however the teachers appeared to be quite quiet. (IE-N-05-04.07.2016)

Another critique of the Oxfam definition of global citizenship was provided by one of the teacher educators from Programme A.

I suppose when you are asked to define global citizenship education you slightly reel off the areas of knowledge skills and values or the Oxfam definition of global citizenship you fall back on those. I think important to me, in the courses we try and tie the definition of global citizenship education up more directly with the components we see as key to teaching. Which students might struggle with or might maybe take a bit more of a leap in faith to cling onto. So things like interconnectedness, and maybe in global citizenship education official definitions like the Oxfam definition there might be more of an emphasis on global solidarity or global interconnectedness. Whereas when we put it into a teacher education context we try to encourage interconnectedness in every sense. So that might be between subject areas, themes, people, present and historic and present and future. And I suppose it’s that more complex interconnected web of questioning which is definitely there in the official definition but maybe not highlighted as a key priority. Whereas things like what kind of questions you ask and how do you ask questions reflection... ... maybe they are the more constant themes of the skills side of global citizenship education but I think they do, there is a knowledge base there as well. I think they do span all three. (IE-If-01-05.10.2016)

This explanation highlights the importance of interconnectedness within the approach utilised by Programme B.
This chapter has provided an overview of two GCE-related teacher education developed for Irish primary teachers. From an introduction to the key participants within the design, development and implementation of both programmes, the chapter has considered the aims and goals of both programmes, the methodologies employed within the programmes and the activities developed to engage with the participating teachers. An analysis of the key actors in the field of Irish GCE-related teacher education provided a focus on governmental and non-governmental actors who influence teacher education practice in varied ways. The chapter finished with an exploration of the key thematic categories which emerged from the qualitative analysis of both programmes. Firstly, the contrasting cultures, as points of negative and positive conflict between organisations and individuals within the field of teacher education are identified and explored. Secondly, the barriers to participation in teacher education are discussed. Thirdly, the pedagogical and/or theoretical approaches influencing the practice of teacher education were considered. Finally, the varied conceptions of GCE have been considered and their influence on practice discussed.


Chapter 5: National case of Italy
Debora Antonucci, Carla Inguaggiato

This research report focuses on the description and analysis of three training courses on Global Citizenship Education for primary and secondary school teachers: two initial training courses and one advanced course for the trainers. The report is organized in four sections. The first focuses on the description of the training course focusing on participants, aims and goals, methods and activities and evaluation and assessment. The second describes the key actors in the implementation of these courses. The third explores the key themes which emerged from content analysis of data collected. The fourth summaries the main points emerged from the research.

All courses were co-financed by EU Commission funds; two of them by EuropeAid and one by another fund more related to education. We will refer to three courses as A, B and C. A and B are initial courses, C is a course for multiplier teachers. The biggest difference of course B is that it involves directly the application in class of the pedagogical approach taught during the course. Furthermore, in course B the beneficiary of the course are not only the teachers but also the students. The analysis is based on several typologies of data (field notes, interviews’ transcripts, key course documents, email exchanges and photos). The research has had the duration of two years. Table 1 illustrates the sources of data. The analysis is grounded in 118 hours of observation and more than 65,000 words of transcripts, 6 formal interviews and 13 informal interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>course A</th>
<th>course B</th>
<th>course C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>informal interviews</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formal interviews</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of training &amp; planning sessions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hours of observation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>words of transcripts</td>
<td>16,340</td>
<td>27,702</td>
<td>20,985</td>
<td>65,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>documents</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>document’ pages</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emails exchanged</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>photos</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>memos</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questionnaires</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,969</td>
<td>28,153</td>
<td>21,246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both initial training courses on GCE aim both at NGOs and teachers. In B the trainees are in total 28: 10 NGOs workers and 14 teachers coming from 3 schools involved in the project. In course A there are 29 teachers from 7 schools involved in the project.

In case B this implementation according to trainers should be done with the support of NGOs, should be limited to providing some resources. *The researchers have the know-how on didactics by competence. NGOs bring the contents on citizenship, sustainable development (...). NGOs should provide those contents, that compose a crucial part of the didactic model but they should not substitute the teachers in class.* (IT-Ex-If-02-23.06.2017)

In both case A and B the schools’ heads have been informed of course existence and involved in the course planning. In B head of schools have been present in the very first planning session before the start of the course, in which both contents and logistics and administrative (including pay for teachers participating) have been discussed. In A they have been informed with a letter by the local authority education department of the presence of this courses and some meeting have been organized in order to inform them of activities carried out during the courses and the overall goal of the project.

However, while in A the NGOs and teacher have only one joint meeting with NGOs in the B all training sessions see the presence of NGOs and teachers. “To NGOs it has been asked to participate for a very easy reason, as we ask to NGOs to mobilize contents, however if you do not know how to mobilize them, it is difficult that you could provide contents coherent to the model. You can only provide contents in general, therefore it is fundamental to give contents in the context of the model suggested” (IT-Ex-If-02-23.06.2017).

Another difference concerns the schools involved, while in B the three schools participate throughout the 3 years project, in A, different schools were involved every year of the project. The rational behind this choice is that they should reach the largest number of schools possible. “How can we involve schools? We can send a letter to all schools. The additional one will be involved in the third year.” (IT-Fn-022305106)

Furthermore the presence of an “advanced training” for teachers that will become trainers of trainers allow to continue working for the entire project with all schools involved since the beginning of the project.

The main promoting bodies of initial training courses on GCE are a local authority (namely the Department of international cooperation and international affairs), which works in cooperation with the local hub for NGOs coordination. In A it is the local hub for NGOs, which has a specific vocation to train development cooperation actors, which leads the process of course organization. The other actors involved are four teachers appointed by Local authority’s Education Department and a representative for the intercultural education in the province.

Course A is in the second edition of the training course of the local hub for NGOs while course B is in its first year of experimentation.

For what concerns trainers there is a difference as while in A there is a plurality of trainers being university professor and community psychologist, working on the territory in disadvantaged contexts teachers being in total four external and internal trainers.
In B instead the main trainer is a university professor and his team of research. This research team is composed by 1 university professor which is the main trainer, 2 research fellows that work as tutors for the course and participate in international meetings, and 1 university professor which has more of a backstage function having been very active in the planning moment but less present in the daily training activities. Instead NGOs, according to organizers, are mostly trainees as their role is to provide contents on the specific thematic areas agreed for the teachers but not to be trainers.

Both A and B courses were developed between November 2016 and June 2017.

Course B lasts 16 hours in class with frontal lessons plus a variable number of hours (being approximately around 12 hours) of joint planning between NGOs and teachers of the activities that teachers should develop in class with students and the characteristics and duration of the activities carried out directly by NGOs in class. This negotiation is always a very complex task where the main object of debate is the number of hours for NGOs activities where teachers try to reduce as much as possible the number of hours for this purpose (IT-Fn-02-24012017).

Course A is organized over two meetings of 4 hours each, and one eight hours, to which is added the revision of institute program and 4 hours added to reflect on the results of the work on the school program. A’s sessions have focused the following topics: a) GCE in current context a reflection on the challenges and opportunities of teachers, b) normative and theoretical framework to innovate didactics practice and exchange of good practices focusing on a schools with 100% foreign and where the main language is not Italian but several languages coexists, c) synergies to promote education for citizenship, d) Global Citizenship Education in the institute projects. Further than these four meeting there have been one additional optative meeting that was directly aimed at favouring writing of joint NGOs and school projects to be presented to the annual grant of the local authority. In this module we will offer a space for consultancy to plan an educational path for Global Citizenship Education. It will be organized in a participatory way and it will be chosen them and the instruments to be used, it will be organized the program and the system of evaluation. The module is inserted in the framework of the course devoted to associations that focus of GCE. (IT-Tn.D-28-17.03.2017)

For what concerns course B, it was composed by 3 sessions:

1. A first lesson on the main characteristics of the educational model proposed (IT-Ex-Fn-01-17112016)

2. A second meeting of monitoring to understand how activities in the school and the joint activities between NGOs and teachers have been developed so far. This meeting has also represented an overall assessment of the implementation of the pedagogical model suggested. Following the results of this assessment the trainers have given some specific guidelines to implement in the teaching practice (IT-Ex-Fn.05.09032017)

3. A third meeting where a new strategy of joint work between teachers and trainers has been suggested in order to guarantee a better implementation of the educational model proposed (IT-Ex-Fn.06.01062017)

Course C consisted of 6 meetings that took place from December 2015 to June 2016. Each session but one has been a full day with the following timetable:
9am-1pm, 2pm-7pm. (48 hours + 24 hours online). In course C the objective is to train teachers able to promote GCE as multipliers especially in their schools, but also in other schools. It was articulated in 5 main areas:

1. Methodology,
2. Motivation to use innovative practices,
3. Communication competences,
4. Analysis, selection and creation of GCE resources,
5. GCE and its implications on the revision of knowledge and contents.

In the advanced course, the trainers involved are: 1 trainer from the NGO supported by 2 members of the training team, 5 NGO educators who spoke about their workshops on GCE in the schools and 1 external trainer. At the end of the course the trainees were subjected to a test to assess their skills and some of them have started to collaborate in a group whose objective is training colleagues and making them test CGE resources in the classes.

In course C one of the key actors, is both trainer and course organizer and she plays the main role. She is responsible for the development education section of the NGO. She has a great experience first as a teacher and teachers’ trainer. She has always been promoting the ideals and the values of the NGO, whose mission is “the development of every man and all men”. She started in the 80s, when, as a teacher, she joined in a committee, coordinated by a university professor, whose objective was to decline a new concept of “development” considered as a process that is not always and not necessarily synonym of improvement and is irregular in time and space. The elaboration of this new concept has had implications on the culture and school vision, vision that is the core of the course.

She has organized the course and planned the activities with a retired teacher whose role in the training program has been to help in materials research and lesson planning, to be a supervisor of group work during laboratory activities. She has been the trainer in four out of six lessons. Other trainers held the other 2 lessons: a counsellor educator and 4 NGO educators. The counsellor educator works in schools’ projects aimed at overcoming the conflict within the groups and promoting intercultural education. The 4 NGO educators are 3 young girls and a boy who have proposed and experienced some workshops about GCE issues in several schools, one of them is a civil service volunteer. Another key actor is the director of the NGO. She has organized the course and she is on the forefront in the implementation of GCE at school. The trainers have been selected considering their curriculum, their previous experience in intercultural education, communication skills, research and study in conjunction with the University or with highly qualified research centres for the dissemination of GCE as well as their adherence to the NGO philosophy that considers culture as a decisive vehicle for achieving social equity as the heart of the new world citizenship.

As the observations, the questionnaires and interviews show, the course is attended by in-service teachers with experience in implementing intercultural education and GCE in class and that have already followed the NGO courses and support its mission.

The trainees are 21 in-service teachers; also 1 pre-service teacher has been admitted for her strong interest on GCE issues. They are all females; their average age is 50 (the youngest trainee is the pre-service teacher who is 25 and the oldest one is 59). The in-service teachers come from 12 schools of different
levels in Marche region: one of them works in a kindergarten, 4 teachers work in primary school, 7 are junior high school teachers (5 of them coming from the same school), 4 are high school teachers. Most of them are involved in the anthropological linguistic area at the different levels, 2 of them teach Maths and Science (one in a primary school and one in a junior high school), 2 are Religious Education teachers and only one is a teacher of children with special needs.

To summarize in a descriptive manner the main features of the course table 2 presents the overall characteristics of the courses and table 3 presents the overall characteristics of the trainees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IT course A</th>
<th>IT course B</th>
<th>IT course C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding body</strong></td>
<td>DEAR</td>
<td>Erasmus +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of hours</strong></td>
<td>16 hours of lessons + work on educational resources &amp; institute program + 4 hours added</td>
<td>8 hours lesson + 2 training in blended mode + 4 hours added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of trainees</strong></td>
<td>29 teachers</td>
<td>29 teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place</strong></td>
<td>Trento</td>
<td>Piedmont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Typology of organization promoting the training</strong></td>
<td>Local hub for NGOs</td>
<td>LAs – dep. Foreign affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of schools involved in the training</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizations/actors involved in training</strong></td>
<td>training officer + 4 teachers provided by Local Authority’s Education Department + LA dep. Foreign affairs</td>
<td>2 university professors + 2 research fellows + 7 NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of trainers involved</strong></td>
<td>3 external trainers + 3 internal</td>
<td>1 university prof + 3 research fellows as tutors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 From the NGO website
All courses have as core objective to train teachers on global citizenship education called “Educazione alla cittadinanza mondiale” in A and C course, and “Education à la Citoyenneté Mondiale” in course B. Analysing the objectives it emerges that the common elements are two in the courses A, B and C.

The first is to promote the acquisition of teachers’ competences to insert GCE into their teaching practice. (The school is strongly involved in this complexity: the school documents give indications for a new humanism and a new citizenship, asking for re-reading of the curricula to be open for a new global dimension, to allow that global themes will become shared knowledge to favour the comprehension and evaluation of cultural differences, the availability of non-violent resolution of conflicts, change of life style for the protection of the environment. IT-Tn.D-00-04.11.2016)

In course B, where a foreign University leads the project, it specifically aims at integrating education to sustainable development and international solidarity in the learning topics of initial and continuous training. (IT-Ex-D-03-17112016).

The second is to promote innovative teaching methods and pedagogy to allow the introduction of GCE in the teaching practice. Furthermore, there is an explicit reference to GCE as a way to improve education’s quality.


To improve the quality of educational offer by developing transversal competencies and grounding on education for sustainable development and international to propose innovative pedagogical practices (IT-Ex- D-03-17112016).

In courses A and B there is a third common objective that is to involve also other actors of the territory. The module starts from the awareness that global citizenship education cannot be the responsibility exclusively of the school but that needs of a network of multiple actors: associations and NGOs. In the module the different aspects of the educational alliances find specificity, instruments, role and tasks.

### Table 3 – Trainees’ profile

| Trainees that completed a questionnaire | 57 |
| trainees | 65 |
| schools involved | 23 |
| % male* | 17 |
| % Under 30* | 30 |
| % 31-45* | 13 |
| % Over 46* | 35 |
| % SSH teachers* | 52.4 |
| % STEMs teachers* | 9.5 |
| % all subject teachers* | 33.3 |
| %special needs’ teachers* | 4.3 |
| % missing | 2.2 |

1.2 Aims and goals
Our will is to have more impact, join more teachers, work together, and uniform methodologies, taking the things to improve and module on the basis of the various themes. (IT-Ex– 01-IF-22122016)

In A the necessity to make these actors work together and talk the same language is taken care of by organizing a specific session of training where the NGOs and teachers work together with the facilitation of a community psychologist. In B instead the four actors involved in the project: University – department of education, local authority, schools and NGOs and regional hub of NGOs are always all present to the training and define together the course characteristics. A relevant difference between A and B instead relates to the importance given to teachers’ ethics in the training practice. In A among the objectives of the course they refer to the necessity of a teacher ethos that makes them aware of their role in exercising at school solidarity and social and political participation. Which education for citizenship for a new humanism? Beyond the intercultural perspective to learn to think globally and act locally (IT-Tn-Fn-03-04112016)

In B this ethical dimension is not mentioned among the course objectives and this is very much connected to the main goal of the training course that, according to course organizers, is to develop testing instruments to assess the impact of teachers and NGOs educational activities on students’ competences more than to develop teaching module. (We do not test values that learners develop. we should train pupils to acquire the four competences and not teach them how to think. IT-Ex–01-IF-22122016). The four competences defined both for teachers and for students inserted in the framework of sustainable development and international solidarity are clearly identified (understanding of complexity, interculture, active citizenship and critical approach) and pupils will be tested before and after a lesson delivered by the teachers participating in the course. Teachers instead have to complete a self-assessment open-ended questionnaire before and after the training.

In course C ethical dimension is not mentioned among the course objective, but there are references to the fact that the teacher must be a witness. “What are the key objectives of the course? Cognitive, relational and behavioural skills, the educator of global citizenship must also be a witness” (IT-If-P–02-28.03.2017). This is a reflection of the importance of ethics in the GCE vision. C has the objective to train teachers’ trainers, that is a group of teachers able to promote GCE as multipliers especially in their schools, but also in other schools, in order to “support a reform that starts from the bottom, to expand the network of people who can train others.” (IT-If-P–02-28.03.2017)

The main declared goal of the course is “to promote the revision of the conceptual categories and paradigms to initiate a reform of thought and pedagogy in order to build a new global citizenship” (IT-N–01-28.12.2015). The revision of thought is considered fundamental because “only culture can shorten the times of the conflict generated by the epochal change in action and restore harmony” (IT-If-P–02-28.03.2017). At the same time, it is clear that there is a close relationship between the necessity of new categories to afford the evolving challenges of

8 The total number of trainees exclude trainees that are NGOs operators.
the global world and the pedagogical and didactic reform, in the awareness that each method corresponds to an idea of society and ethics.

This is confirmed by the objectives of the single sessions:

1. To deepen the revision of the conceptual categories and the ethnocentric thought paradigms as a basis for the construction of world citizenship.

2. To assume a transcultural vision of the teaching – learning process through the epistemological review of ethnocentric knowledge and the use of didactic models oriented towards constructivism and problem-posing. Plurality of teaching models. Comparative analysis of behaviourist and constructivist learning model. Problem-based learning and service learning. Experiential learning of Pfeiffer and Jones. Concept-based learning. The conceptual map as the assumption of responsibility for the non-ethnocentric definition of the cultural object;

3. To analyse the different types of maps, the process of conceptualization and the relationship between the cognitive structures of the learner and the action of teaching. The Conceptual Map and its functions in the teaching-learning process;

4. To deepen the practice of the Clinical Conversation and the implementation of concept based learning;

5. To deepen the practice of teaching mediators.

The focus is mainly on the revision of conceptual categories and paradigms of ethnocentric thinking, methodology, motivation to use innovative practices and communicative competences. Also from the answers to the question n 13 of the questionnaires (To what extent has this course met your expectations? What would you identify as the key themes/topics that have informed your learning?) the pedagogical setting is evident: 10 out of 18 teachers state that one of the most interesting topic has been the use of conceptual maps and 8 out of 18 consider the lesson on clinical conversation very interesting and useful. These are all fundamental elements of the constructivist model that represents the theoretical framework of the course. This setting is also in line with the expectations of the teachers interviewed informally that consider GCE also as a possibility to renew their own didactics.

In the post questionnaires, several teachers also stated that the focus on the relational aspect of the teaching- learning process is particularly important. The last training session was exactly on this issue. In this session, the focus has been on the group management (being aware of the dynamics inside a group to learn how to manage them, the role of the teacher in a group, the necessity to use different methods and media) and the methodology used have made the experience very incisive and effective for the trainees to the point that the teachers subsequently selected as trainers consider that experience the starting point of their being “a team”.

95
There is communality in the decision to consider competency-based approach as the basis of the course in both cases while there is difference between the A and B in terms of teaching methods. *Renew of the didactics, supporting an interactive and transdisciplinary methodology and a didactics by competence, that can integrate at cognitive and behavioural level* (IT-Tn.D-00-04.11.2016)

In A there is a strong preference towards a more participatory methodologies, that let the also the conceptualization of GCE emerge from trainees (such as connection with the necessity of change teachers’ practice, connections with interculture, which has strong practice and policy in the territory, learning difficulties and special needs of some students and let the imaginaries on the issue of teacher emerge).

*Questions: how is the world changing? How are teachers changing and how is the school changing? If we educate at citizenship which can be global, how can we do that?* (IT-Tn-Fn-03-04112016)

B instead adopted a specific pedagogical model and the objective of the research is to test whether this pedagogical approach can be a good theoretical framework for the introduction of GCE in teachers’ everyday practice and to test the impact of teaching on teachers and students using a pre-test and post-test. *This pedagogical approach interprets the learning process as composed by four elements: resources, structure of interpretation, structure of action and structures of auto-regulation* (IT-Fn-01-17112016)

This transition from learning based on contents to learning based on competences is a key element in both initial courses on GCE teachers training and the advanced course. (Before education is to fill in vases and now it is to light fires. IT-Tn-Fn-03-04112016)

To adopt methods starting from this pedagogical approach is considered a crucial element to allow for the integration of GCE into the several disciplines taught in school. *(Didactics by competence and not by ability and knowledge and therefore it is not a problem to tackle issues connected to climate change* IT.Ex.Fn.06.01062017) There are also some common pedagogical ideas, which are often cited, in both A and B such as Dewey and Piaget and experiential learning. (IT-Tn-Fn-04-02122016, IT.Ex.li.05.09032017)

In C the adopted methods reflect the theoretical framework of the course that refers to constructivism and posits learning as an active, constructive process. *“Thinking Schools of thought were: constructivist cognitivism (Bruner, Piaget, Damiano); the experiential cycle of Pfeiffer and Jones; The Problematic Approach with Resolving Reality Tasks (Service Learning Fiorin) Theory of Didactic Mediators (Damiano) and Classroom Interaction (Conversation, Discussion, Dialectal Processes, Cooperative Learning, Peer Education, Inverse Class, Perceptual Processes)”* (IT-If-P-02-28.03.2017)

As the focus on previous knowledge is very important in constructivism, every training session starts with a contract in order to make explicit the objectives of the meeting and promote self-assessment; it is a bridge between what teachers already know and what the trainers want them to learn.

The trainees are actively involved in activities that are interactive and trainee-centred, as it is described with detail in the paragraphs on activities. The tasks are authentic and related to real world. In one of the sessions for instance, the trainer delivers the trainees a Clinical Conversation on classroom
migrate already carried out in class and asks them to: analyse and comment answers, represent the mind map of students (what students know), the task of learning (what students do not know and need to learn) and the conceptual map (IT-N-03-28.05.2016).

The activities promoted during learning modules to schools’ teachers reflect the different teaching methods used. In B the teaching method is that of a frontal lesson with the use of slides and very few and specifically set moments for questions and answers. The NGOs are organized in small groups of two or three and each group work with one the three schools involved in the project to develop together activities that allow to focus on the four competences and thematic areas identified by the course. For each school, there is more than one teacher involved. It is important to point out that activities carried out by NGOs in classes involved in the project planned together with teachers are based on participatory methods such role-game, the use of techniques of citizen journalism, the discussion over films on GCE issues, the use of techniques which include the use of emotions to engage students in the learning process.

Course A teaching methods instead are characterized by plurality of methods such as “world café” (IT-Tn-Fn-05-13012017), critical thinking methods (IT-Tn-Fn-03-0112016) and other active learning methodologies such as the use of post-it, work in small groups (IT-Tn-Fn-04-02122016).

In course B after a midterm assessment of activities carried out by teachers and NGOs, the trainer indicated some rules to improve the teaching activities in the classes involved in the course:

*Work in order to make sure that students understand what they read. Use the lever of emotions to make them live the experiences that interest us. Work on the capacity of students to ask questions on their way of thinking. Try to do these activities at least 16-20 hours per school term. Work to make sure that students are cognitively active: they produce “thinking artifact.” Work on the four dimensions defined by the theoretical framework (critical approach, active citizenship, complexity and interculturality). Work to make sure that also besides the training course they behave as active and solidal citizens (recall periodically the principle of the path). Work to connect school subjects and the competences of the project (involve the entire team of class professors (IT-Ex-D-10-090317))

In course C the activities proposed encourage cooperative learning, promote trainees working together to enhance their learning experience: one of techniques implemented is “jigsaw” that is research-based and cooperative. *Example: Group work using the Jigsaw method: trainees compare different teaching methods (product model – Objectives-based learning, process model - Concept-based learning, Problem-based learning, Experiential Learning Cycle) and identify them: keywords, planning, priority attention, type of teaching, “virtue” of the teacher. The features of each template are shared and inserted into a summary table.*

The activities endorse interpersonal and group skills and group processing (reflecting on how the team is functioning and how it can function even better). During the last meeting, after an interactive game to introduce themselves, the trainer invites participants to imagine the same activity commented by other colleagues, and asks them to stand up if they think it would be welcome (only 2 people raise), a discussion about the importance of the game begins, but also about the risk that it can be considered unimportant by colleagues and criticized.
The group reflects on how it is possible to overcome the difficulties in the teachers’ team at school and how to react to the oppositions of some colleagues toward the implementation of different methods and issues linked to GCE. (IT-N-06-19.06.2016)

Interaction is promoted both in the small group and in the class work through the lab activities and the sharing of what emerged in the group (IT-N-03-28.05.2016). So the learners are actively involved in tasks that offer opportunities for self-assessment, correction and peer discussion. The teachers themselves are invited to reflect on the fact that the methodology followed will be active and they will be led to make direct experiences that will enable processes of reflection and metacognition (IT-N-06-19.06.2017).

One of the six sessions is about the GCE laboratories promoted by local NGO educators at school in the context of a national GCE project. The four educators propose to the trainees the laboratories they have implemented in the classes. Most of them are about migrations and have the goal to experiment empathy and decentralization; they also enhance the socio-emotional dimension of learning. The trainees are invited both to experiment and comment the activities, their effectiveness and positive and negative aspects, so the lesson becomes very interactive, but it has also the objective to promote an interactive way of teaching GCE using different kinds of mediators.

In B, this element is crucial as one key output of the project in which the training is to produce an instrument to test both teachers and students before and after educational activities focusing on GCE issues along with the creation of training modules for teachers and trainers (IT-D-03-17112016). For the local hub of NGOs as well as the local authority the main objective is to improve the competences of teachers and students but to create the instrument (IT-Ex-01-If-22122016). The objective of project is to operationalize the four students GCE competences and to evaluate if the training has an impact on students’ competences (IT.Ex.Ii.05.09032017)

The key question that university researchers ask for is: how do evaluate what we do? From an academic point of view for what concerns the work of teachers. (IT-Ex-01-If-22122016)

During all training sessions the trainer gave specific instructions to teachers on how to deliver the pre and post test, explaining the importance of delivering the test in the best condition and not helping students and guaranteeing the same conditions of the pre and post test (IT-Ex-Fn-01-17112016, IT.Fn.05.09032017). In A instead the training process is monitored with a questionnaire before and after the course and with a specific moment in the last session of the course, where a moment was devoted inquire to whether expectations over the course have been met and what changes they would like to make. One of trainers discusses the level of participation and request for clarification and the availability to implement in class what suggested and availability to change the way of teaching. (IT-Tn-If-02-12.12.2012)

In B instead there were no specific moments except for the very first lesson where the first question was to collect expectation but no other moments of exchange have been implemented in the course especially between the trainers and teachers. NGOs and teachers have more opportunities of meeting as doing
the joint programming of educational activities in class gives teachers and NGOs more opportunities to meet and discuss over the course. Course organizers have registered a difficulty of teachers and NGOs to adopt the pedagogical model suggested. It has therefore been decided for the following year to adopt a new methodology, which foresees the direct intervention in class of trainers and the definition already with the teachers of the discipline competence on which the training should focus. This methodology partly excludes NGOs in the training, as they will no longer develop joint programming activities with teachers (IT-Ex-07-010617)

Self-assessment and evaluation have been important components of C, promoted both through the training contract distributed at the beginning of each session and through the debate among the trainees and between the trainees and the trainers encouraged during the lessons and aimed at supporting metacognition. At the end of the course the trainees were given a questionnaire to evaluate their knowledge and competences. It was about the analysis of:

- some of the main sources that represent the theoretical and pedagogical framework of the course (GCE: Topics and Learning Objectives– Unesco 2015, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, The Global Education Guidelines, 2012, the “Transcultural Manifesto” by Armando Gnisci).
- What is problematic in a text extracted from a schoolbook.
- Conceptual maps, clinical conversations, teaching models and resources.

Eleven of the 22 participants have been selected as multipliers according to their experience in the implementation of GCE, their competences (“communication skills, organizational competence, experiential competence, cultural competences” IT-If-P-02–28.03.2017), “the willingness to decentralize, to question traditional training in order to review it with critical mind in light of the needs of new generations” (IT-If-P-02–28.03.2017)

For what concerns trainers in A there are several university professors, community psychologists and school teachers (3 external trainers + 2 internal), in the external the main trainer one university professor, supported by a research team, while NGOs are mostly trainees as their role is to provide contents on the specific thematic areas agreed for the teachers but not to be trainers. The activities that NGOs have been carried out from what we have understood from what we heard, it has been to manage all activities inside the schools. NGOs arrived, made an activity and teachers have done pre-test and post test (IT-Ex-If-02-23.06.2017)

These university trainers are 1 university professor, 2 research fellows that work as tutors for teachers, and 1 university professor which has more a backstage function having been very active in the planning moment but less present in the daily training activity. “When you think about structuring a training for teachers there is certainly a methodological part which can be done by normal academics, than there is a content part, to which teachers ask for support, as they are not able to do a certain type of research to talk about the issues we are dealing with” (IT-Ex- 01-If-22122016)

NGOs involved in course B, de facto have a double role as both trainers and
trainees.” *They want from us animation activities. We are the “clowns”: Several NGOs used to bring testimonies from Africa or Latin America but then we started to change and bring a more formative intervention and not only a witness from the south of the world*” (IT-Ex-Fn-02-24012017)

The role of the trainers in C is strongly influenced by one of the key actors who plays the main role, as she is both one of the course organizers and the trainer in 4 out of 6 classes. Besides the lead trainer being part of an NGO, her long experience as a high school teacher and activism on intercultural education⁹ is well respected by trainees differently from other NGO trainers. The root of the lead trainer activity lies on an intercultural education project that is a collaboration with a university professor expert on Intercultural Education at national and international level, they launched a project entitled “Beyond Ethnocentrism” aimed at the: 1. analysis of schoolbooks using intercultural criteria and logic; 2. review of disciplines from an intercultural point of view; 3. development and experimentation of new methodologies and a new intercultural curricular matrix in primary schools. Several teachers and university professors have been involved in the project and the process of research-action on these themes is still in progress, supported by the Ministry of Education in its document “The revision of curricula from an intercultural point of view to support school autonomy”, stating the need for an intercultural review of curricula. A network of schools hosted the Research Action and the NGO found support in the Region, but the educational institutions involved in the project have gradually increased involving a large part of the national territory (Piedmont, Lombardy, Veneto, Trentino Alto Adige, Emilia Romagna, Sardinia, Lazio, Abruzzo). During the years the NGO has organized national and international training seminars addressed to teachers on the themes of development, intercultural education, GCE and has been partner in European and national projects about these themes.

Thanks to this background the Ministry of Education has recognized this NGO as a teachers’ training institution. As for the educational field, it is identified with its leader that around her figure has built a network of schools working on GCE themes and involved in the national and international projects promoted by the NGO. As the observation shows, the other NGO trainers are not held in the same consideration by teachers. They are very young and they are not teachers. During the lesson led by 4 NGO educators, some of the trainees have had a critical attitude towards them, considered as unfit in terms of educational preparation and experience (IT-N-05- 11.06.2016).

The trainees’ age ranges from 29 to 65, with most between 40 and 55 years old. As gender is concerned, there is a prevalence of females both in A and B course being 23/24 in B and 24/29 in A. All the trainees of the advanced course are female.

NGOs, that in course B are mostly trainees, are instead much younger than the average age of teachers being approximately around 30 years old. This is true also for A where in the joint training session the age difference was visible between the two groups.

⑨ ???
Data shows that the trainees are mostly teachers that have been already involved in various activities connected to GCE, however the involvement of heads of schools, especially in course A has promoted the inclusion of other teachers that do not have a strong previous experience in GCE. It is possible to state however that it is a very much self selected sample mostly composed by what are referred as “sensitive” teachers. Especially in course B is important to stress as it has been mentioned both by course organizers in the interviews and the trainees in the questionnaire that some of the teachers have changed throughout the course and the attendance rate has been quite low as in the first meeting there were only two absent while in the last training less than half of the teachers were present to training. In course C the questionnaires, the informal interviews and the observation enlighten about the trainees’ profile. Most of them are experienced middle-aged teachers already involved in intercultural education programs and with a strong interest in GCE issues for their ethics and their personal and professional education. Some of them underline the strong innovative impact of GCE at different levels and consider it an opportunity to renew and redevelop their professional function: “The course for trainers of trainers has given me the opportunity to have new teaching prospects, spreading the vision of a new citizenship in a particularly innovative form” (IT-Ii-T-03-12.01.2017).

The main actors involved in the trainings’ organization and delivery are LAs, local hub for ONGs coordination (and training in one case), and single NGOs and Schools. In course B the University is an additional actor, which plays a crucial role. In B research team from the local university department of education is the only trainer while in A two out of four trainers are University professors coming from other universities).

The common point instead is the presence as lead institution of the international affairs office of a local authority; in A it is the province while in B it is the region; in both cases the most important administrative agency.

The way in which these actors interact and how their interaction influences the characteristics of the course is a relevant point. A first category of interaction is the one between NGOs and schools. This element is considered important in both A and B.

In A the necessity to make these actors work together and talk the same language is taken care of by organizing a specific session of training where the NGOs and teachers work together with the facilitation of a community psychologist. In B all training sessions include as trainee both NGOs and teachers. The LA officer declared that it is crucial to make NGOs and schools work together.

The relationship between Local Authority and the other actors in both cases represents a way to implement their political agenda. In A in the training planning team the local authority has identified some teachers and officials, which should take part of the group and during the training course it is also presented a grant to finance associations to develop GCE projects.

Another fundamental enabling agent are heads of schools: Trainer: In course A there has been a good participation. If there is the calendar of the training course activities then school head can lead the process. If there is an agreement with the head of school, then there are no issues of participation of teachers (IT-Fn-02-2305106).
As for C, during the years the NGO has been supported in its action by a network of actors that are local authorities, research institutes, university professors, head teachers and teachers and this fact has created the conditions for the promotion of a quality process of training, research and action. In particular, the opportunity to experience in the classroom the main items of a possible non-ethnocentric curriculum with materials produced by University Researchers represents the strength of the NGO activity. This has been possible as long as the research was funded. Recently the Ministry of Education has allocated many resources to GCE implementation with PON calls, but, according to the lead trainer, there is a moving back respect to the logic of the document “The Italian Way for the Intercultural School and the Integration of Foreign Students” (2007): that document endorsed the revision of school curricula from an intercultural perspective, whereas current PONs relegate GCE to afternoon activities and only for some students.

According to the vision of GCE that is behind this course, GCE is not a subject, not a set of issues, not a learning area, but a framing concept, a new perspective, a sort of lens through which it is possible to investigate and to afford the problems of the man and the entire world in a different way. “GCE is the true educational purpose of the school” (IT-If-P-02-28.03.2017). The organizers of the course claim that considering this perspective, the teachers’ training is a very important aspect of GCE implementation at school, but the change hoped for is much wider, it is therefore necessary to directly involve all the institutions responsible of the definition of the curricula and of teacher training programs, in – service and first of all pre- service teacher training, (the Ministry of Education, The Conference of Italian University Rectors, NGOs, head teachers, educators, representatives of UNESCO and UN).

An important common element between A, B and C is that they are developed in the framework of EU Commission funded projects, which have the duration of three years.

In Italy GCE training course are not a standardised practice and despite the UNESCO or by NGOs platform’s definitions we are very far from having a shared idea on what is GCE and what a training course on GCE should be. One of the communalities of the discourse in all course analysed is the importance of NGOs. “Teachers have methods and NGOs have themes” gatekeeper case A “The researchers have the know-how on teaching for competency-education approach while NGOs bring the contents on citizenship, sustainable development etc.” course B gatekeeper 3

The second common aspect is the focus on competency-based education approach. In all the courses there is a strong emphasis on this approach and it is said to be a way to make easier the introduction of GCE into teaching practice. In A and B trainings there is a specific section devoted to such topic.

In B the focus is even stronger as the university researchers, in charge of the planning and delivery of the training, do focus on this part and what concerns specifically GCE. There is no formal training but NGOs will co-plan with teachers the lesson on GCE related topics. Therefore in course B at the present time it is
not possible to analyse the discourse on GCE in the frontal lesson, if not for what concerns methodology, as the only element given is the identification of four key competences of education for sustainable development and international solidarity competencies.

In A the training planning has been very much influenced by other stakeholders involved. The funding bodies have in more than one module training sessions slightly but still significantly changed the organization of day and the use of time in order to fulfil their goals of visibility of their activities.

In B instead the training course characteristics are independent from other stakeholders but connected to the research objective/agenda of the group of researchers. However, the funding body is crucial in defining hierarchies among the stakeholders involved that also effect the choice of teaching methods and prevalence of one GCE issue over others.

In the NGOs local hub and for the local authority the idea of Unit of Learning did not pass (Ex.li.06.10032017).

Course organizer feels safer with the presence of the University inside the partnership (IT.li.06.10032017)

The main topic for the training of students is climate change. This is the result of negotiation between various topics suggested in a project mind. We have had also suggested the issue of migration but at the end the selected topic has been climate change and food (IT.Ex.li.03.29122016)

The different stakeholders have different visions of GCE integration between courses’ promoting organization and financing and often the course’s characteristics are also the result of the negotiation between several agendas. Local authorities do have among their objective to enhance territory visibility and emphasize the excellence of their agencies.

The most important category that emerges from the analysis of data is contrasting cultures. This importance is testified not only by number of occurrences (229 in total) but also because it represents the core identity or one of the main building blocks of the two courses. Both A and B have expressively identified in their presentation documents the presence of several actors as key features to enable the effective implementation of the GCE in education.

These actors comprise local authorities, including international affairs and development cooperation department and some offices related to the local department of education even if not directly the department of education itself, NGOs and teachers and for C only also University professors and secondary schools.

There are differences between teachers and NGOs representatives, both in terms of ideas and values on teaching practice, average age, organizational structures. The content analysis allowed to see on the one hand how many times several actors in course state that the presence of multiple actors is crucial to have effective GCE or simply referring to the presence of several actors involved in the implementation of GCE teacher education (C1), on the other it emerges how the different actors tend to differ in methods (C3) but also in contents (C4).

Only with a clear planning and careful we can do good research otherwise we risk entering a field that is that of development cooperation that is already difficult to manage already in terms of communication, different habits and different concept of
In terms of ideas and teaching practices there is tension between two different visions of GCE, one more connected to NGOs and to interculture tradition where there is a strong attention on ethics and on the importance of starting from learners and one strongly connected to the promotion of competency-based education where ethics are not considered so relevant, what matters is to be able to equip students with good competencies. While some trainers try to promote the idea that teaching GCE is not about ethics but it simply a competence of the modern teacher others strongly stress the importance of GCE as a way to promote norms and values and as part of teaching students to learn to live together.

In A in terms of pedagogical theories several approaches do co-exist namely Freire theory of education as transformation, Dewey, Milani but also theories related to competency-based education. The vision between teachers and course organizers differs over the use of time and the objective of teaching activities. The course organizers and trainers often propose elements which are considered new for some of the teachers and which change their everyday practice such as the fact that there are no longer fixed curricula but they still claim that they should finish the program. The reality is that they (teachers) did not become aware that there are no longer programs. Several teachers think that if we work in this way we lose a lot of time. We have to finish the program (teachers claim) Education by competence and ability and school of frontal lesson was more reassuring and did not have formative objectives.

The other aspect is considering activities on GCE as an additional element to their teaching and do focus in the negotiation process with NGOs of the teaching activities more on the issue of time rather than defining the clear educational objectives that these interventions should achieve. This element was clear in the observation of the joint meeting between NGOs and teachers, where after a short part devoted to the explanation of the plan of the activities that the NGOs would do in class and a debate of how to shorten the activities as there was not enough time for these activities according to NGOs. Most of the debate concerned how to reduce as much as possible the numbers of hours that teachers should devote to NGOs. Teachers say: “we could lose one hour.” Also in A in the very first planning session for the course there was a lot of debate on the definition of times and it has been by one of the course organizers: “Teachers have very much defined time”.

There is a strong effort in defining strategies to promote ways to effectively engage teachers in GCE teaching approach either by working on the single school program or by working on including GCE competence in the single disciplines. The crucial aspect to enter in class is planning contents: the programs do not exists. For the future we will work on specific subjects on how to insert GCE competences in the normal planning, that is the revolution.

C is a course strongly characterized by the setting of the main trainer, so only few contrasting cultures emerge and they are between the trainees and the NGO educators and between the trainees and their colleagues. During the session with NGO operators the attitude of trainees has been much more critical towards their proposals: activities, language used and methods have been questioned.
When one of the NGO operators points out that she prefers not to use the word GAME to refer to playful activities, especially in secondary schools, in order to avoid diminishing the value of the activities, 2 participants stress the importance and value of game in school.

As for the contrasts among colleagues, they emerged especially in the last session, whose focus has been on the group management, group of colleagues or group of students. Several teachers have showed the annoyance to be criticized by colleagues who don’t share the same philosophy, values, methods and themes to enhance at school. The trainer invites participants to play a ball game aimed at personal introduction, after that they imagine the same activity commented by other colleagues, and asks them to stand up if they think it would be welcome (2 people do raise), and to stand up if they think it wouldn’t be welcome (2 people do raise). A discussion about the importance of the game begins, but also about the risk that it can be considered unimportant by colleagues and criticized. The group reflects on how it is possible to overcome the difficulties in the teachers’ team at school and how to react to the oppositions of some colleagues toward the implementation of different methods and issues linked to GCE. The suggestion is to identify people and create a network with them. Some trainees suggest that it is more difficult in primary school because after years of great changes, it is closed to innovation. (IT-N-06-19.06.2016)

The second most important is the category GCE conception. In Italy GCE training course are not standardised practices and despite the UNESCO or by NGOs platform’s definitions we are very far from having a shared idea on what is GCE about and what a training course on GCE is supposed to be about.

This category is very important not only because it has a very high number of occurrences (359 in total) but also as it shows the presence of different visions in terms of GCE ultimate aim (F1) and the presence of communalities on issues that GCE encounters (F2). Furthermore “F3 – terminology” also allows eliciting the connection/overlap and divergence from the previous conceptions on which GCE is building upon such as development education, intercultural education and environmental education.

In addition “F4- GCE competences” especially for B allows having a description of GCE competences (Understand complexity, interculture, critical approach, active citizenship) while for the A “F5- GCE teacher profile” it is very important to see especially how course organizers describe the ideal GCE teacher. The main elements that emerge are the importance of using interdisciplinarity, work in team in C and openness to change, intercultural competence, self-reflection in A. One of the communalities of the discourse both in A and B is the importance of NGOs.

“Teachers have methods and NGOs have themes” A case gatekeeper
“The researchers have the know-how on teaching for competency-education approach while NGOs bring the contents parts on citizenship, sustainable development etc.” C case gatekeeper 3

The second common aspect is the focus on competency-based education approach. In both cases there is a strong emphasis on this didactical approach and it is said to be a way to make easier the introduction of GCE into teaching practice. In both trainings there is a specific section devoted to such topic. In B the
focus is even stronger as the university researchers, in charge of the planning and delivery of the training, do only focus on this part and what concern specifically GCE there is no formal training but NGOs will co-project with teachers the lesson on GCE related topics. Therefore in course B at the present time it is not possible to analyse the discourse on GCE as the only element given is the identification of key four education for sustainable development and international solidarity competences.

In A case the main recurring themes is GCE as a need to respond to change we are observing in schools and in the world, to the problem of foreign students (“now classes with a lot of foreigners”) and eventually also to the increase of students with certified special needs (one of the trainer refer to this phenomenon as the medicalization of students). Focusing on the learner rather on the teacher and focusing on competences of living together rather than on contents and programs can be a way to effectively teach also to difficult classes.

From the analysis of course C in GCE conception, the most important subcategories are vision, issues, GCE competences, GCE teacher profile. From the analysis of the data in these subcategories the vision of GCE that emerges is only partially related to GL issues and much more to the theoretical, pedagogical approach. The focus is more on the pedagogical reform and the change in the way of thinking that GCE should promote, than on GCE issues. “The basis for building a global citizenship are in the review of conceptual categories and ethnocentric thinking paradigms” (IT-N-01-28.12.2015). The idea is that only through this revision it is possible to empower learners to understand the logical relationships and connections in space and time dimensions, the interdependence and interconnection of complex subjects of study and to give them the instruments to acquire knowledge, understanding and critical thinking and to act responsibly and effectively for a more peaceful and sustainable world.

Themes are considered important because they support the content and they also orientate emotions, feelings, expressivity and behaviours (IT-N-02-24.03.2016), anyway “the change and revolution of thought will only pass through GL competences and not through the themes” (IT-N-08-09.02.2017). New mental habits are necessary, characterized by interdependence, interconnection, transcalarity, critical mind, imagination, creativity, and responsibility. So according to this view it is very important to promote a competence-based approach in order to empower students to afford the changed challenges of the global world and it is often underlined that there is a close relationship between the necessity of a reform of thought and the pedagogical and didactic reform, in the awareness that each method corresponds to an idea of society and ethics.

The analysis of informal interviews and questionnaires confirms that trainees conceive GCE as a tool through which they can renew their way of teaching and promote new millennium students’ competences. From this perspective the implementation of GCE at school has many effects on the teaching learning process: first of all it is considered “the true educational purpose of the school” (IT-If-P-02-28.03.2017) and it is not a subject or a set of issues, but a lens through which students can investigate the world and transform it.
Teaching methods is especially important in the three sub-categories: E4 teaching methods, E5 pedagogical approaches in both cases and E2 trainee assessment especially relevant for B where the creation of an instrument to test both teachers and pupils on GCE competences is the key outcome of the training course for some of its organizers.

The main point of attention is the impact on students as the goal of course organizers and trainers is that students will not only repeat beautiful concepts but they will be active and critical citizens (*We need to ensure that kids do not repeat concepts even beautiful on these topics but they are critical and active citizens*) [IT-Ex-If-02-23.06.2017].

It is interesting to create an instrument that can you use with a scientific validation. [IT-Ex-01-If-22122016].

The main point is the impact on students as the goal of course organizers and trainers is that students will not only repeat beautiful concepts but they will be active and critical citizens (*We need to ensure that kids do not repeat concepts even beautiful on these topics but they are critical and active citizens*) [IT-Ex-If-02-23.06.2017].

It is interesting to create an instrument that can you use with a scientific validation. [IT-Ex-01-If-22122016].

The main point of attention is the impact on students as the goal of course organizers and trainers is that students will not only repeat beautiful concepts but they will be active and critical citizens (*We need to ensure that kids do not repeat concepts even beautiful on these topics but they are critical and active citizens*) [IT-Ex-If-02-23.06.2017].

It is interesting to create an instrument that can you use with a scientific validation. [IT-Ex-01-If-22122016].

The training favours under several points of view acquisition of the complexity and critical thinking competence. [IT-Ex-04-Q-17.11.17]

However besides these declared goals the structure of course has very rigid definition of a specific pedagogical approach that leaves little space for dialogic moments between trainers and school teachers (except for international activities and an initial planning meeting) and a very strong focus on the explanation of the methods rather than direct guidance in class. *The trainer tries to make teachers feel at ease but he is very strict in the definition of moments when trainees can intervene.* [IT-Ex-Fn-01-17112016]

*The methodology proposed is interesting but it would have been more appropriate in a context which is complex respectively to a project so big as the one which is ongoing* [IT-Ex-Q-03-010617]

Actors of first level, which “simply” have not been able to apply the model [IT-Ex-02-23.06.2017].

Given the difficulties of implementing the model proposed, the future year of training will be very much concentrated on direct coaching of teachers’ activities in class.

The main goal instead of the A is very much related to teacher competence and ethos, which is not tested with quantitative methods but rather with participatory methods and several moments of exchange where also the previous experience of teachers is valued and constitutes the basis upon which the proposed methodologies and GCE teacher profile are built. *The purpose of the teacher training is to equip teachers with the confidence and competences to integrate GL in their didactic practice* [IT-Tn-D.00a-04.11.2016]

Course A called for “a new citizenship“ and it makes reference to concept of “new humanism“, during in the first session of the training the trainer makes explicit reference to school of Barbiana and to strong ethical and political value of teachers [IT-Tn-Fn-03-04112016].

There is a strong emphasis on the importance of using active methodologies such as game, practical activities, cooperative learning and group work as also testified by several responses of the questionnaires [IT-Tn-07-Q-04.11.17, IT-Tn-15-Q-04.11.17] and as indicated in the leaflet promoting the course goals. Through reading of the documents and the sample Units of Work teachers will exercise their reflexivity on their didactics practices, in order to identify appropriate methodologies to promote education for global citizenship as integrated in the school subjects. According to the course organizers the effort of the Unit of work
re-read the disciplinary competences in a global way crossing them with the European competences of permanent learning.

Education to train citizens of the world requires active, critical, cooperative, participatory methodologies: to cope this challenge teachers would be supported in the acquisition of new competences to orient and practice this approach (IT. TN.D-01-11.10.2016)

Also in case C teaching approaches are important not only for the great number of occurrences, but also because they offer a coherent and complete picture of what is the frame that includes all the aspects both practical and theoretical of the training program.

As for teaching approaches, the most important subcategories are aims and goals, classroom climate, teaching methods, activities, pedagogical theoretical approach.

The main general declared aims are:

- **Promoting a pedagogical reform linked to the reform of thought** (IT-N-05-11.06.2016).
- **Experimenting empathy and decentralization and enhancing the affective aspect of the activities proposed at school** (IT-N-05-11.06.2016)
- **Supporting a reform that starts from the bottom, to expand the network of people who can train others**“ (IT-If-P-02-28.03.2017)
- **Promoting the following competences in trainees: Cognitive, relational and behavioural skills, the educator of global citizenship must also be a witness** (IT-If-P-02-28.03.2017)

A great importance is given to teaching methods. As said before, the methods adopted reflect the theoretical framework of the course that refers to constructivism and posits learning as an active, constructive process. Furthermore, GCE is seen as an opportunity to improve the quality of the training offer at school and the use of innovative methods and techniques is one of the aspects indicated by teachers in the post questionnaire as strengths of the course. The methods adopted are active, pupil centred and encourage students/trainees to use active techniques experimenting real-world tasks, activating problem solving strategies, in order to create new knowledge and then to reflect on and talk about their knowledge acquisition process and the use of activities in class. Cooperative learning and metacognition are constantly encouraged, as well as peer discussion. In the post questionnaire some teachers have underlined that “working in groups and peer discussion have definitely been the strong points of the course” (IT-D-02-19.06.2016).

The classroom climate is important, too because it has brought out contrasting cultures between trainees and NGO trainers. It has always been very positive, relaxed and constructive, but during the meeting with the NGO educators, the trainees have been much more critical, and their attitude towards the trainers from the NGO is different compared to that towards the main trainer. What emerges from their attitude is that they think NGO educators have not a real experience in school activities and an adequate didactic preparation.

The activities used are a confirm that one of the goals is to promote a pedagogical reform inspired to constructivism, in fact many of them are a way to reflect on didactic models, tools such as clinical conversation and conceptual map. and their use in class considering GCE goals and perspective.

The activities proposed by the NGO educators have already been experimentated
in laboratories at school in the context of a national GCE project. They introduce GL issues like migration and are useful to enhance cognitive and emotional domains. Activities like “The magic boots ritual” help give security, containment, define particular time, create group. The game “The Fortress” lets students experiment empathy, decentralization and enriches the socio-emotional skills. In the last session the focus was on group management (be aware of the dynamics inside a group to learn how to manage them, the role of the teacher in a group, the necessity to use different methods and media). The methodology used by the trainer was very active, the participants were involved in different individual or group activities and energizers were always followed by a reflection about its effects on the participants and how/why to use them at school.

The choice of aims, methods and activities is an effect of the pedagogical/theoretical approach that is explicitly expressed in several field notes, interviews and documents. “Schools of thought were: constructivist cognitivism (Bruner - Piaget-Damiano); the experiential cycle of Pfeiffer and Jones; The Problematic Approach with Resolving Reality Tasks (Service Learning Fiorin) Theory of Didactic Mediators (Damiano) and Classroom Interaction (Conversation, Discussion, Dialectal Processes, Cooperative Learning, Peer Education, Inverse Class, Perceptual Processes)” (IT-If-P-02-28.03.2017)

Reference authors with their pedagogical documents are: E. Morin; E. Damiano; L. Anolli; T. Sundermeier; R. Mancini; R Salza, A. Gnisci (IT-If-P-02-28.03.2017 and IT-D-03-28.12.2015)

GCE policy along threat to GCE implementation are important in case A and B. They have put them together as they are considered related. Even though the number of occurrences is not so high it is among the most relevant as it has influence on several of the other themes/categories under analysis. GCE policies comprises, both normative but especially recommendatory documents, which on the one hand provide paths to facilitate or hamper integration into school system and on the other do constitute the basis of financial allocation of funds. In course A the revision of institute projects has been driven by provincial legislation in which is indicated that GCE is among the priorities of Trento school. Based on this element, trainees involved in the course, had among their activities the revision of their institute projects including GCE as a priority. The project of the institute is referred by course organizers as the “identity card of the institute” where the education purpose and school values are stated.

Both A and B reference the normative documents defining the school curricula and the recommendatory documents defining the importance of using the competence approach (INVALSI tests are structured according to competences IT-Ex-Fn-01-17112016) and the centrality of the approach suggested for teachers (I believe that are necessary the 8 citizenship key competences IT-Tn-02-Q-04.11.17; GCE present in funds for teachers’ training: 172 millions for the first time in Italian history. IT.Ex.II.06.10032017; putting together EU life long learning with GCE obviously under the hat of UN and transition from Millennium Objectives to Sustainable Development Goals, and if we think about SDGs 4 therefore we talk about improving education also for us IT-Ex-01-If-22122016).

An important difference between A and B in terms of recommendations refers to UNESCO documents: while in course A these documents are central references
for the definition of GCE B states that UNESCO is not an educational agency. This perceived distance of GCE from UNESCO is also registered in A as several of the trainers refer to these documents as new to them. Also in case C there are many references to national and international documents about GCE: “Global Citizenship Education: Topics and Learning Objectives”- UNESCO (2015), the “2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development”- UN (2015), “The Global Education Guidelines” - Council of Europe (2012), the “National Curriculum” (2012), “The Italian Way for the Intercultural School and the Integration of Foreign Students” (2007).

This chapter has provided a description of three training courses in GCE for teachers of primary and secondary schools. The research followed an ethnographic approach focusing on multi-site case study. The first part of the analysis focused on participants, aims and goals, methods and activities and evaluation and assessment. The second describes the key actors in the implementation of these courses. The third explored the key themes that have emerged from content analysis of data collected. The fourth summarized the main points emerged from the research.

The first course objectives that emerged is to promote the acquisition of teachers’ competences to insert GCE into their teaching practice. The second is to promote innovative teaching methods and pedagogy to allow the introduction of GCE in the teaching practice. Furthermore, there is an explicit reference to GCE as a way to improve education’s quality. The third is to involve also other actors of the territory.

There are different approaches to ethics but taking action is a common element. In all courses, there is strong focus on methods as a key element of GCE implementation in teachers’ practice. The most important theme that emerges from the analysis of data is contrasting cultures. This importance is testified not only by the number of occurrences (229 in total) but also because it represents the core identity or one of the main building blocks of the two courses. Both A and B have identified in their presentation documents the presence of several actors as a key feature to enable the effective implementation of the GCE in education.

The vision between teachers and course organizers differs over the use of time and the objective of teaching activities. The course organizers and trainers often propose elements which are considered new for some of the teachers and which change their everyday practice such as the fact that there are no longer fixed curricula but they still claim that they should finish the program. Furthermore, some teachers conceive GCE as an additional element to their teaching and do focus in the negotiation process with NGOs of the teaching activities more on the issue of time rather than defining the clear educational objectives that these interventions should achieve. The other element is the contrasts among teachers who do not share the same philosophy, values, methods and themes to enhance at school.

The second very important theme is teaching methods and there is a strong effort in defining strategies to promote ways to effectively engage teachers in GCE teaching approach either by working by on the single school program or by
working on including GCE competence in the single disciplines.
Lastly also GCE policy emerges as an important element as GCE policies comprises, both normative but especially recommendatory documents, which on the one hand provide paths to facilitate or hamper integration into school system and on the other do constitute the basis for which lies financial allocation of funds. All of the teacher education is founded by projects therefore courses characteristics are very much influenced by funding bodies’ agendas, with often very complex settings which risks making implementation difficult for teachers and also reinforcing the “more sensitive mechanism rather than expanding the number of teachers involved.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IT A&amp;B</th>
<th>IT C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,770</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>2,464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART II – Comparative analysis

The second section of the research report on GCE teaching practices presents a comparative analysis of the common key themes that emerged from the analysis across the four case studies.

The choice of these common key themes emerging from the analysis of the four case studies has not been driven by the number of occurrences of the themes but by the conceptual density of these themes and their importance in describing and interpreting the key elements of the case study analyzed. Each researcher, as ethnographer, indicated the 3 most relevant themes in their analysis for ethnographic intensity and conceptual density. Table 1 presents the key common themes that the five researchers identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>AT - internal</th>
<th>AT - external</th>
<th>IT- Ex Tn</th>
<th>IT -M</th>
<th>IT -M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C3, C4, C5</td>
<td>A3, A4</td>
<td>B1, B2</td>
<td>C1, C3, C4</td>
<td>E1, E3, E4, E5, E7</td>
<td>C4, C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1, E3, E4, E5, E6, E7</td>
<td>E1, E4, E3, E5</td>
<td>E1, E4, E5</td>
<td>F1, F2</td>
<td>F1, F2</td>
<td>A1, A2, A3, A4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1, F2, F4, F5</td>
<td>F1, F4</td>
<td>F1, F2, F4</td>
<td>G &amp; B</td>
<td></td>
<td>E5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2, D3, D4</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td>E4, E5, E2</td>
<td></td>
<td>B1, B2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The themes which were indicated as important across the 4 case studies, after the description of the course (D) were F (GCE conception), E (Teaching approaches) and C (Contrasting cultures). The reason why we did not take into consideration D description of the course is because it lacks the conceptual density which is required of the key themes.

Moreover, from codebook analysis (Table 2) the same 3 main categories emerged as most relevant:

(C) contrasting cultures, Different perspectives, worldviews, beliefs among stakeholders’ culture also highlighting intergroup conflicts and tensions

(E) teaching approaches: The general principles, pedagogy and management strategies used for classroom instruction

(F) GCE conception, the different conceptualizations that actors contributing to the organization and implementation of the course have in mind.
More precisely, every theme and subtheme was described using a definition carefully discussed and approved across the research team, providing also examples for each one of them.

### Table 2 - Distribution of coding across themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes’ coding</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 below illustrates detail of the occurrences of sub-themes.

### Table 3 - Common meaningful themes. N. of occurrences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AT</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reason to attend</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong> A</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| B  | GCE Implementation in Schools | 38 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| B1 | Opportunities               | 46 | 1 | 42 | 65 | 154 |
| B2 | Threats                    | 22 | 5 | 23 | 100 | 150 |
| **Total** B | | 106 | 6 | 65 | 165 | 342 |

| C  | Contrasting cultures | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| C1 | Different actors in GCE training | 30 | 18 | 19 | 104 | 171 |
| C2 | Trainer profile        | 15 | 27 | 40 | 85 | 167 |
| C3 | In methods              | 16 | 19 | 8 | 52 | 95 |
| C4 | In contents             | 29 | 37 | 13 | 34 | 113 |
| C5 | In ethics/politics      | 8 | 54 | 9 | 8 | 79 |
| **Total** C | | 104 | 155 | 89 | 283 | 631 |

| D  | Course organization | 2 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 31 |
| D1 | Course evaluation    | 43 | 120 | 26 | 70 | 259 |
This second section of the research report is articulated in three chapters, one for each of the key common themes. The first chapter focuses on the GCE conception, the second on teaching approaches and the third on contrasting cultures. The chapters are in this specific order as the last chapter allows to elicit the differences among the different actors involved in the training implementation in GCE conception as well in teaching approaches.
Chapter 6: GCE conception

Carla Inguaggiato

GCE is a prominent issue in the educational policy agenda, but it is a contested notion which has very different conceptualizations ranging from neoliberal to radical approaches (Sohyun A., 2014). This chapter aims at analyzing GCE conception of GCE teacher education national case studies.

The use of the expression Global Citizenship Education has been widely promoted worldwide starting from September 2012 when the UN Global Education First Initiative (GEFI) has set fostering global citizenship among its three priorities. In 2015 the importance of implementing this approach into the government educational policy was reinforced as it is part of Sustainable Development Goal 4 “Quality education for all” and more specifically point 7: “By 2030 ensure all learners acquire knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including among others through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship, and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture’s contribution to sustainable development”.

Several authors (Tawil, 2013, Gaudelli, 2009, Andreotti 2006, Schultz, 2007) have codified GCE approaches into several categories. Gaudelli (2009) has a very detailed framing of the different visions of GCE: neoliberal, nationalist, Marxist, world justice/governance, and cosmopolitan.


Andreotti (2006) instead broke it down to a dichotomy between: individual-humanitarian and structural political approach. Table 1 illustrates the structural differences between the two approaches and stresses the risks of the individual-humanitarian approach falls into. The language used in the table is very much connected to post-colonial studies which inform this work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIVIDUAL-HUMANITARIAN</th>
<th>STRUCTURAL POLITICAL APPROACH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acts grounded on moral basis are easily withdrawn and end up reproducing unequal (paternalistic) power relations.</td>
<td>Justice is a better ground for thinking as it is political and prompts fairer and more equal relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being human raises issues of morality.</td>
<td>Being a citizen raises political issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument common humanity: interdependence and world-wide interconnectedness.</td>
<td>Argument unequal power relations: against the projection of Northern/Western values as global and universal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is defenseless in the face of and/or naturalizes the myth of Western supremacy-</td>
<td>Criticizes the myth of Western supremacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


10 Werner Wintersteiner, Heidi Grobbauer, Gertraud Diendorfer, Susanne Reitmair-Juárez, In cooperation with the Austrian Commission for UNESCO Klagenfurt, Salzburg, Vienna 2015, Global Citizenship Education Citizenship Education for Globalizing Societies, p. 11
The analysis of 9 courses of GCE teacher education in four different countries, offers a great opportunity to make an empirical analysis of GCE conception in practice. More specifically it can also allow, using an inductive approach which starts from data, trying to understand which of the former conceptualizations of GCE better describes the courses analyzed. This chapter focuses on the comparative analysis of the theme called “GCE conception” which emerged from the content analysis of four researchers as one of the key themes in GCE teacher education courses in the four countries. It is organized over 3 main sections: data description and data analysis, key results and conclusions.

GCE conception is composed by five sub-themes:

1. GCE Vision: The underlying assumptions that define GCE conception
2. GCE Issues: Reference to GCE issues
3. Terminology to refer to GCE: Terms used to refer to what one calls GCE
4. GCE competences: GCE competences of both teachers and students that are seen as important
5. GCE teacher profile: The ideal GCE teacher’s profile according to the different actors, that contribute to the organization and implementation of the course

Data analysis has followed the following steps. First, I analyzed the overall results of the coding in this category in order to have an overall idea of the dimension of data which are present in 5 subcategories. Second, I read carefully the national case studies in order to better understand in which context these quotes are inserted and the meaning and the importance that the authors attribute to them. These reports have been coded with Nvivo using the categories in order to identify the key passages which refer to GCE conception and its sub-categories. Third, I analyzed the most relevant quotes that the authors of the four case studies identified for this thematic area in order to understand whether there are recurring concepts which are common across the four case studies. These selected key codes, identified by the four researchers, have been translated into English and imported into Nvivo to do a word query to understand the key concepts which emerge, this element has then been confronted with the narrative case study in which the 5 researchers give an interpretation of their own thematic analysis.

Data mostly refers to the vision of courses’ organizers namely trainers and funding bodies as the core data are field notes of the courses’ sessions and trainers’ interviews, while the vision and voice trainee is limited to a small portion of the data collected (questionnaires and intervention during training of trainees).

Table 1 provides a descriptive statistic of the occurrences of the sub-categories. It shows the following distribution: “Terminology” is the less frequent sub-category while GCE vision and “GCE issues” and “GCE vision” are more frequent with similar number of occurrences followed by “GCE competences” and lastly “GCE teacher profile”. This description however is just a quantitative description of the distribution of quotes which does not reveal the core categories in terms
of sense. Table 1 describes the distribution of codes across the four case studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>IT-A&amp;B</th>
<th>IT-C</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F GCE conception</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 GCE vision</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 issues</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 terminology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4 GCE competences</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5 GCE teacher profile</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>347</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1,162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this purpose, I also made a closer analysis of the quotes that the researchers have considered key to describe their case study. Table 2 provides the distribution of the key quotes identified by researchers: the most important elements of GCE conception are GCE vision, GCE competences and GCE teacher profile.

The sub-category “GCE issue” is mostly contributed by the Austrian case study therefore it cannot be considered as an issue which is relevant across the four case studies. In none of the cases does “terminology” emerge as key theme, probably because it is not so central how GCE is referred when the issue concerned is not the definition of education policy but rather the implementation of GCE teacher education.

The key elements of GCE conception that emerge as common across the three cases are: interdisciplinarity, change of perspective in teaching and focus on GCE thematic areas.

**Interdisciplinarity:** it is connecting these approaches, in so far it thematises topics in a multi-perspective and interdisciplinary way (AT_D_in_02 p.5)

Already for some time we have felt like they (trainers) could conceive this issue (GDE) in a cross-cutting way. We are happy when we discover abilities of trainers to conceive the GDE courses like that (CZ-If-ex-01-29.8.2016 p.1)

Whereas when we put it into a teacher education context we try to encourage interconnectedness in every sense. So that might be between subject areas, themes,
people, present and historic and present and future (xIE-If- 06-03.04.2017). Asking for re-reading of the curricula to be open for a new global dimension, to allow that global themes will become shared knowledge to favor the comprehension (IT-Tn.D-00-04.11.2016).

The importance of putting together methods and themes is emphasized clearly in the case study reports of Ireland, Czech Republic and Austria. Thirdly it is an aim to get to know the didactics and methods to implement GCE in the classroom. Elements of open learning, social learning and also Montessori-pedagogy as well as orientation on dialogue and experience are central for this teacher training (AT-report-p.3).

The aims is to improve teachers´ knowledge about issues. Even today, some of them were talking about Polar Bears and climate change, so to get them beyond that general knowledge of global issues and delving deeper into them. But then also introducing methodologies so they can bring these issues into the classroom and teach about them. (IE-If-02-18.07.2016; IE case study, p. 5).

It is important to stress this point as GCE is not conceived only as issues but also significantly as a specific choice for a specific typologies of teaching methods. The change of perspective and therefore the adoption of new mental habits is therefore a key element in GCE teacher training. In the Czech Republic case study the importance of methods is considered as the key difference between the two case studies analysed.

Differences in GCE conception are also reflected in selected methods. In case A, attention is paid to different methods that are considered as effective for GCE teaching. One of them is pedagogical constructivism that claims that we built understanding of surrounding world in our mind and that there does not exist one general truth. Multi-perspectivity of different GCE issues and stress on development of critical, caring, creative and cooperative thinking is the basis of the Philosophy for children approach, based in John Dewey´s school (CZ case study, p.12).

This vision of GCE as an innovative pedagogical practice is also emphasised in the Italian case study while link of GCE to quality education is present in the Austrian report.

Taking a vision of teaching - transcultural learning through the epistemological review of ethnocentric knowledge and the use of didactic models geared towards constructivism and problem-posing (IT case study p. 6).

GCE in her school as ‘school-quality-theme’, an initiative of the ministry of education to develop and ensure more pedagogical quality and therefore make sure that children have the best conditions for learning (AT, case study p. 16)

The focus is not only on skills but also on attitudes and therefore on the transformative role of education in changing the society and world in which teachers are living in.

Through human rights education we can empower the next generation to develop the skills and attitudes that promote equality, dignity and respect in your community, society and worldwide (xIE-D-01-29.03.2017).

Teachers should understand that they do not transfer only facts, but also attitudes (CZ-If-in-02-31.01.2017 p.1).

Besides “GCE issues” does not emerge as key as core conceptual dimension, I decided to identify common across issues the four cases as GCE issues that are
also referred in the national case studies as one of the three key elements that compose GCE: thematic areas, methodology and their combination. Basically, three categories of GCE seminars were observed – thematic, methodological and their combination. (CZ, case study, p. 2).

The word frequency query of the most relevant quotes shows that the key words are GCE, global, human, justice, change, development, interculturality, interdependencies, peace, rights and sustainability. These issues emerge both from the word frequency query in NVivo of selected quotes but are also confirmed by the analysis of the four national case studies. For example, the orientation on the change of perspectives and to see GCE issues as interdependent and bringing together approaches of peace and democracy education, developmental education and human rights education. (AT case study p.3).

It is important to point that in some case studies “GCE issues” are also referred to as “GCE values”.

In five out of seven seminars, GCE values were promoted such as interdependence, valuing of diversity, human rights, sustainable ways of living, in two seminars different paradigms for viewing a specific GCE issues were implemented. (CZ case study p.12). Also, the issue of South and North emerges as common across the case studies. The GCE competences that emerge as most frequent across the four case studies are critical thinking, and self-reflection on GCE issues (Figure 1).

Secondly the aim is to build a reflective agency grounded on crucial GCE competencies like critical thinking, reflecting the own values, finding creative solutions, deal with complexity and ambiguity as well as to identify with issues like global justice, sustainability, human rights, democracy and intercultural learning (AT case study p.3). To acquire knowledge, understanding and critical thinking and to act responsibly and effectively for a more peaceful and sustainable world. (IT case study p.20)

The Irish case studie shows a strong focus on human rights as well as critical development education as two key pillars of the GCE teacher education. However only in one Italian case study there are specifically codified competences specifically stated by the course objectives: “development of critical spirit, complexity, interculturality and civil engagement” IT-Ex-D-05-29112016

The common characteristics of ideal GCE teacher profile should have been the following characteristics: critical thinking, self-reflection, creativity and responsibility (Figure 2). They will at any stage make an effort to incorporate that justice perspective and maybe look at it through a global lens (IE-If- 02-18.07.2016).

According to that (self) reflection and critical thinking on a global level was highly important for the teacher training. Beside that issues like to acquire knowledge, understanding and critical thinking and to act responsibly and effectively for a more peaceful and sustainable world and intercultural learning were central. (AT case study p.4)

First attitude of the teacher, which means to be open and reflective about the global interconnected world. Secondly the global teacher need a bunch of knowledge about globalization, migration, world economy, environment and development, human rights, peace and non-violence. Thirdly the didactic competence is highly important to implement the approaches and knowledge in the classroom, to build on the living environment of the children, to create a motivating and creative learning environment with participation and dialogue. (cf. curriculum, p.4-8) (AT case study p.4).
Figure 2 - World-cloud of GCE teacher profile
Referring back to initial debate on the different approaches to GCE it is possible to state that among different categorizations presented earlier the categorization of Schultz (2007) can explain the approaches adopted by the teacher education courses analyzed.

The three visions of GCE in Schultz’s conceptualization are:

a) Neoliberal approach: “The role of education, then, is to facilitate this participation through building relationships (e.g., exchange) based on cultural understanding as well as capacities such as language acquisition. This is understood as how to prepare global citizens able to negotiate this liberal global environment” (Schultz 2007, p.252);

b) Radical approach “global citizenship calls people to action against global institutions, particularly financial institutions that are the main architects of global economic liberalism.” (Schultz 2007, p.252)

c) Transformational approach calls for “reflects an understanding of the importance of creating democratic spaces for community and coalition-building across local, national, and regional boundaries. Through this process citizens are able to link action at the local and global level to build authentic challenges to those forces that perpetuate oppression, poverty, and marginalization”. (Schultz 2007, p.256).

“Transformational approach to GCE” can be considered a good framing for the courses analyzed. The key concepts that emerge from the analysis of GCE conception sub-themes are critical thinking and self-reflection that lead to action for a more just and sustainable world. This conception of GCE echoes one of the roots of GCE theoretical framework which is Freirean pedagogy (Scheunpflug & Asbrand, 2006).

“For a more equitable and just society, at the heart of development education’s objectives, people must be able to critically reflect on the world, challenge assumptions that create oppression and reconstruct understanding based on this collaborative inquiry” (Freire, 1970: 53).

The courses analyzed, except for few training sessions, do not cover in depth the issues raised in the “critical GCE approach” (Andreotti, 2006) summarized in table 1.

To summarize the main results of this comparative analysis, it is possible to state GCE is composed by five key elements.

First, interdisciplinarity as a key element of GCE integration into teachers’ practice.

Whereas when we put it into a teacher education context we try to encourage interconnectedness in every sense. So that might be between subject areas, themes, people, present and historic and present and future (xIE-Ilf- 06-03.04.2017).

Second, change perspective in teaching: where the importance of focusing not only on skills but also in the change of attitude of students.

Taking a vision of teaching - transcultural learning through the epistemological review of ethnocentric knowledge and the use of didactic models geared towards constructivism and problem-posing (IT-N-02-24.03.2016).

Third, the method is content: using methodologies which are learners’ centered and that are based on dialogue is a key element for introducing GCE into teachers’ practices.
First attitude of the teacher, which means to be open and reflective about the global interconnected world.
Secondly the global teacher need a bunch of knowledge about globalization, migration, world economy, environment and development, human rights, peace and non-violence. Thirdly the didactic competence is highly important to implement the approaches and knowledge in the classroom, to build on the living environment of the children, to create a motivating and creative learning environment with participation and dialogue. (cf. curriculum, p.4-8, AT case study p.4).

Fourth, important issues as GCE thematic areas: such as climate change, migration and development
Basicly, three categories of GCE seminars were observed – thematic, methodological and their combination. (CZ, case study, p. 2).
Fifth, the transformative role of education as key words for GCE teacher profile are critical thinking, creativity and responsibility.
“...we can empower the next generation to develop the skills and attitudes that promote equality, dignity and respect in your community, society and worldwide” (xIE-D-01-29.03.2017).

Freire P. (1970) The pedagogy of the oppressed
Gaudelli, W., & Heilman, E. (2009). Reconceptualizing geography as democratic global citizenship education. Teachers College Record, 111(11), 2647–2677
UN, (2012), Global education first initiative http://www.globaleducationfirst.org
Wintersteiner, Grobauer, Diendorfer, Reitmair-Juárez, in cooperation with the Austrian Commission for UNESCO, 2015, Global Citizenship Education Citizenship Education for Globalizing Societies, Klagenfurt, Salzburg, Vienna
The second core concept which stands out from the preliminary analysis as one of the key theme is:
Teaching approaches, defined as *The general principles, pedagogy and management strategies used for classroom instruction.*

This topic directly addresses one of the very initial research questions aiming "To highlight pedagogical ideas, educational approaches, theoretical patterns in which practices (1) are rooted (if any)".

From the very beginning we wanted to inquiry pedagogical ideas, theoretical and methodological perspectives which lay at the basis of the practice we observed in the nine case studies across four countries. We also wanted to investigate whether such practice was rooted in explicit and conscious theoretical and methodological ideas, values or beliefs; or, on the contrary, it was not supported by clear ideas and is just spontaneous and extemporary.

It can be argued that, although this question was at the origin of the initial exploration of multiple cases, during the data collection and first analysis, this topic became less relevant than others. The point is that, although there were a very high number of codes regarding this topic [n.1289], nevertheless theoretical, pedagogical and methodological references are not clear enough and the link between teaching approaches and teaching practice is not always well traceable. E4 (teaching method) and E5 (theoretical approach) are both considered by all the researchers one of the most relevant topic in each country.

Arguably, cases are functionally and structurally different from each other. But most of all the contexts in which they are located are so diverse that it is challenging and somewhat forced to find recurrences among them regarding theoretical and teaching approaches. For instance, sometimes very different and incompatible terms are used across multiple cases, some others the same terms are used to signify very different approaches. This is the case of “constructivism” as theoretical framework, mentioned in CR, Au and Italy but with different nuances or even theoretical features.

In principle, it can be argued that teacher education practice, like classroom practice with pupils, very rarely is influenced by an exclusive and mechanical adhesion to theories or methodological approaches. Nonetheless, according to Biesta et al. (2017), we maintain that beliefs have a huge impact on the key notion of “teachers’ agency”. This notion can be regarded as the teacher’s active contribution to shape their work and influence learning process, school setting, classroom atmosphere. However, beliefs are complex elements encompassing not only teaching methods. More broadly, teacher’s beliefs encompass ideas on pupils and their learning processes, on teaching and in the aims of education at large.

It should not be forgotten, however, that, especially in the internal courses examined (promoted within *Global Schools*), the main aim was twofold, and
so were the theoretical approaches accordingly: on the one hand, to promote the integration of the GCE into primary school and on the other hand, to equip teachers with the skills, knowledge, methods necessary to this end. Therefore, since integration of GCE in schools is one of the major goals of the project, not surprisingly courses were also aimed at empowering teacher agency and at engaging teachers for change:

“...ways it can be integrated in the curriculum. It’s not going to be a subject on its own any time soon, to support teachers with resources, ideas, activities, in order to try our best that GCE would be included in teaching”. (IE-If-3-05.10.2016).

There are five levels influencing teacher education practice, hierarchically structured among them (Figure 1). These levels have emerged inductively from the conceptual analysis conducted in each individual case study on all collected data.

1. **Values**: ethical, political as well as epistemological and ontological beliefs embedded in the theoretical perspective that teachers chose, almost always in an unconscious form. Values and theoretical perspective could be closely interrelated depending on the theoretical perspective embraced as well as on the personal GCE conception. At this level, one can find a major distinction between value-based or value-free orientation. If the theoretical perspective is value-based, as in the case of critical pedagogy or “new humanism”, then Values (1) and Theoretical framework (2) tend to overlap. On the contrary if it is value-free the theoretical perspective is ethically neutral and values can or cannot be explicitly expressed by teachers but they are not part of the teaching process. For example, in the Irish case, the value based approach is evident:

---

With “teacher” we refer here to the teacher-trainers, while participants and recipients of the educational actions are called “teacher-students”
“Because I felt that you know especially when you are doing training it can be very lowest common denominator sometimes. So I was always fighting that actually we’ve a philosophy behind this, we have a values based approach, we know what we are doing in terms of how we are pitching it or what we want to do with the teachers. (xIE-Ilf-05-29.03.2017)”

2. Theoretical and educational framework: This is closely related to the previous level, but more about educational field. It is the theoretical positioning of teachers. It is a theoretical stance informing the methods and providing them a context. It encompasses the pedagogical approach the ideas on education and its aims, learning theories that educators endorse.

Examples are constructivism or competence approach. As we noted earlier there is no unanimous understanding on constructivism while in CR it corresponds to a specific GCE conception which claims that we built understanding of surrounding world in our mind and that there is not one general truth, elsewhere it is understood as a broad theoretical framework different from a merely reproductive learning.

3. Teaching methods: They can be regarded as a strategy, plan of action, process lying behind the choice and use of particular activities. Often, but not always, such intentional methods inform or even guide classroom activities. We defined teaching methods as “a systematic and intentional way of arranging the teaching action according to some principles or pedagogy”. Example are critical thinking methods, reflective methods, philosophy for children etc.

However, not always teaching methods are explicitly based on precise philosophy. They can be just used in a technical way following precise goals or chosen because consistent with one’s ethical worldview. Sometimes the theoretical reference is clearer and more binding: “There was a strong adherence to methodological approaches themselves grounded in theory”.

4. Classroom activities are actual techniques or procedures used by the teachers to create the conditions for learning and to achieve an aim. We defined an “activity” as the work designed or deployed by the teacher to create the conditions for learning and to achieve an aim. Therefore they can belong to an established and recognized inventory or can be created ad hoc by the trainers. Very rarely they are detached from a coherent teaching method, and used only because they are just funny or effective.

These elements should not be regarded in a mere functional way. The complexity of the whole process should not be reduced to a simple unidirectional sequence. It must be reminded that the whole process happens within a peculiar political, institutional, organizational context. However, it is useful to highlight the main concepts involved in this process and to further elaborate them.

5. Teaching resources: These are concrete tools/devices/materials used to carry out the training activities. Their use much depends on the teaching approaches and course organization.

In the following section I will further elaborate these elements as they emerge from the data analysis.
Most of the participants echo the mainstreaming narrative which tends to divide school approaches in two opposite poles: a traditional school, based on contents and their transmission, ethically neutral and centred on learning (mostly cognitive); and an engaged school, grounded in values, aimed at educating pupils according to a set of ethical or even political principles. Similarly, teacher education can be divided into one content-based, where “content” is not only teaching subjects but also the technique to teach them. At the opposite lies a values-based teacher education model aiming at engaging teachers to embrace values or to activate them to promote school change and students’ emancipation. The research shows a more complex outlook where the dichotomy content-values is broader and it encompasses also the concept of competence. Therefore, the traditional polarized divide is transformed into a triangle whose vertices are: Content-based, values based and competence-based perspectives.

However, these dimensions are not always mutually exclusive. These views are indeed not exclusive, especially in the more elaborated courses, where content, competence and value dimensions are intertwined and consistently integrate in the same teaching process.

An exclusively or predominantly content-based approach is perhaps least frequent but still present at least in one case: “The main goal of the course is to transmit GCE and its fields of competences as well as GCE didactics and methods to be able to implement the dimensions of GCE in their own classroom practice” Content-based presupposes a transmissive pedagogy, what Freire called “banking education”. As we will see it prefers lecture-type teaching methods as in CR:
"The lecture-type seminars are based in transmissive pedagogy. The trainer is at the centre of attention, participants address him/her when they want to ask or add something. The trainer shared his/her knowledge and experience. The arrangement of chairs and tables in school-like rows is suitable for this type of seminar and it had been prepared before the lecture took place (CZ-N-ex-02-17.03.2017, p.1, CZ-N-ex-03-03.04.2017, p.1, CZ-If-ex-01-30.11.2016, p.1.)"

When the seminars are content-oriented, in two cases, the presentation was factual concerning history and legislation, in one case it presented the holistic approach towards nature, agriculture, environment and bringing up of children. In the lecture-type seminars, previously prepared electronic presentation, projected onto the wall of the room, played an important role.

In the value-based approach, the main goal is to change teachers’ attitude. Values, beliefs or an ethos are important to be developed throughout teacher education programs. Content is functional to promote commitment and engagement in teachers. To this end, more important are experiences and classroom atmosphere.

In Austria, for example, the main course aim 
“to build a reflective agency grounded on crucial GCE competencies like critical thinking, reflecting the own values, finding creative solutions, deal with complexity and ambiguity as well as to identify with issues like global justice, sustainability, human rights, democracy and intercultural learning.”

Course organizers believe that the priority for a GCE trained teacher is to develop an ethos that makes them aware of their role in exercising at school solidarity and social and political participation. Two different cases one internal (A) and one external (C) weigh differently the scope, function and relevance that ethos has within a teacher education program.

“A relevant difference between A and C instead relates to the importance given to teachers’ ethics in the training practice. In A among the objectives of the course they refer to the necessity of a teacher ethos that makes them aware of their role in exercising at school solidarity and social and political participation.” (IT)

Broadly speaking, the ethical dimension is more often enhanced by NGOs than school staff, and so creating the basis for a potential conflict between different pedagogical cultures as we will see below (see 2.3). There are several set of values, and different ways to promote them. Sometimes, values-based approach means to adhere to an extrinsically defined set of ethical values, to precise principles, normatively defined as in the following example:
“During in the first session of the training the trainer makes explicit reference to school of Barbiana and to strong ethical and political value of teachers (IT-Tn-Fn-03-04112016);

Other times this approach is emphasized as embracing commitment towards..."
school change, non-neutrality and critical perspective. Even if more data are required to support this claim, most of the times, student-teachers too believe that a change in their own attitude is important: “trainees mentioned several times that they see the change concerning their own attitude as highly important for the classroom, because if you as a teacher change your attitude you also deal differently with children’s question and you can raise more consciousness among other teacher colleagues. (Austria)"

In one case clearly emerges a deep divide between values and competence-based approach, conceived as two poles of an irreconcilable dichotomy, also elaborated in literature (Biesta, Priestley, & Robinson, 2017). In one Italian case there is a considerable tension between two different visions of GCE: “one more connected to NGOs and to interculture tradition where there is a strong attention on ethics and on the importance of starting from learners and one strongly connected to the promotion of competency-based education where ethics are not considered so relevant what matters is to be able to equip students with good competencies. While some trainers try to promote the idea that teaching GCE is not about ethics but it simply a competence of the modern teacher, others strongly stress the importance of GCE as a way to promote norms and values and as part of teaching students to learn to live together”.

Competence approach is the most coded item in this section (18 occurrences), but it is understood in very diverse ways. The term was used 86 times (more than elsewhere in Italy).

Figure 3 shows a word-tree explaining the ambiguous use of the term “competence” in some discursive contexts. Despite the vague use of the term, the methodological approach competence-based is better understood, since it refers to the mainstreaming European approach and worldwide.

On the one hand, it is understood as a teaching method approach integrating values dimension identifying competences or skills such as critical thinking, finding creative solutions, or dealing with complexity and ambiguity that allow teacher-students to build their agency. In this sense “the didactic competence is highly important to implement the approaches and knowledge in the classroom, to build on the living environment of the children, to create a motivating and creative learning environment with participation and dialogue” (Austria).

On the other hand, competences are understood in their instrumental meaning; they provide a structured system of knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary to live in a global context, and then it allows to objectively measure the efficiency of this task. Teacher trainers are required to compile a list of technical competences, or to adopt one compiled by experts, to identify the qualities necessary to live and work in a global context.

Here the above-mentioned tension between two different visions of GCE and different approaches to implement it become clear: teacher education is aiming at learning pre-set list of competences that teacher-students in turn should be able to transmit to students in different settings. Here there is little or no space for values, and even less for promoting change and teacher agency. The following
claim from a university teacher educator is emblematical: “We do not test values that learners develop. We should train pupils to acquire the four competences and not teach them how to think”. IT-Ex-01-If-22122016).

This excerpt shows that different trainer groups embrace and endorse different approaches, based on what we call contrasting cultures:

“The researchers have the know-how on didactics by competence. NGOs bring the contents on citizenship, sustainable development etc. NGOs should provide those contents, that compose a crucial part of the didactic model but they should not substitute the teachers in class”. IT-Ex-If-02-23.06.2017.

Beyond these three major models there are other non-systematic or theoretical references, disseminated in several parts of the data. In both the external and internal cases, there were several strong references to pedagogical and theoretical approaches which framed the work of course organisers and teacher educators. “New humanism” (IT), theory-practice transfer (AT) or transformative learning (IE), are theoretical stances somehow mentioned.

Several actors refer also to a number of authors including Montessori, Freire theory of education as transformation, but the most widely cited author is Dewey, quoted transversally in various contexts in relation to experience learning, to community of inquiry or as theoretical reference of philosophy for
Following a clear distinction made in CR to categorize the types of teaching methods analyzed in that country, we can represent also teaching methods with an ideal triangle which to some extent corresponds to theoretical frameworks.

As we have seen, diverse typologies of trainers not only enhance different approaches, but also play different roles in a complex educational process. A trainer well summarized this point by claiming: “Teachers have methods and NGOs have themes”.

In his perspective, the teachers have the know-how on teaching methods, curriculum and even competence approach, while NGOs bring the contents on global citizenship, sustainable development etc. “NGOs should provide those contents, that compose a crucial part of the didactic model but they should not substitute the teachers in class”. IT-Ex-If-02-23.06.2017
NGO not only are responsible for “contents”, but they also bring into teacher education a number of active teaching strategies, that seem to be successful and innovative. However, some teachers, sometimes reluctant to engage in games, are requested to overcome their resistance in using their bodies in activities not strictly scholastic, which can be considered unimportant by colleagues and criticized.

“They want from us animation activities. We are the “clowns”. (IT-Ex-Fn-02-24012017). In other cases these activities did not interfere into participants’ comfort zone, everybody was let free to express as much as he/she wanted (CR).

The risk pointed out by some teachers is in some contexts real: to associate activities related to the GCE to approaches that can be considered innovative but also not typically academic and therefore disregarded as extracurricular. Thanks to the diverse actors involved (school teachers, NGOs trainers, university experts) and their different educational backgrounds, the nine observed settings foster a broad and highly diverse set of different teaching methods.

Although sometimes the activities are proposed as effective and fun, they often reflect the methods used and didactic approaches, and this is especially true for internal courses. Some examples of this and their corresponding teaching methods are summarized in table 1. Less direct is the correspondence with three theoretical frameworks above mentioned.
Evidences shows that we should overturn the mainstream view, according to which certain activities clearly illustrate a certain type of theoretical framework. For instance, if a frontal lecture is proposed then the theoretical framework is content-based, or if one suggests a role-play, then the approach is value-based. On the contrary, each activity changes its educational intent according to the theoretical and methodological premises in which it is embedded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHING METHODS</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES (EXAMPLES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lecture based</td>
<td>quiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seminar</td>
<td>power point presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lecture</td>
<td>poster presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active learning</td>
<td>movement, icebreaking activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiential learning</td>
<td>excursion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>philosophy for children</td>
<td>discussion and dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer learning</td>
<td>world café, role play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperative learning</td>
<td>jigsaw, work in different group settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical thinking methods</td>
<td>discussion and dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reflective methods</td>
<td>reflective walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culture diversity in methods</td>
<td>multilingual work-groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The activity ‘my world map’ was important to reflect on the global track they left behind. It was about: where have I lived or been for vacation, where do friends or family members live. Other activities like the ‘world-game’, the ‘apple-method’ or ‘meal-conversations’ were activities which focused on central GCE issues like globalisation, world-population, distribution of agricultural land or change perspectives (AT).

The activities then utilize a series of materials and resources such as world-maps, quotes, books, movies, pictures, video, as well as concrete tools such as paper, pens, charts, post-it. The resource level can, to some extent, be considered the fifth level of the pyramid depicted in figure 1.

Learning is not the only outcome of the teaching process through ad hoc activities. Another important outcome is the creation of a positive classroom atmosphere, which provides a learning environment suitable for developing social, emotional, relational dimension which, mostly in the value-based approaches are considered a major goal of the whole educational process.

Teaching methods also aim at creating a particular climate in the group a social and environmental atmosphere encompassing emotional aspects of the classroom which represents a desired outcome as such of the project. “classroom atmosphere and the respect, trust and empathy which emerged in the group through the months were seen as tremendous important for the learning process as well as for the wellbeing of the group” (AU, D1).
Teacher education is important not only to equip teachers with knowledge, skills and abilities required to educate pupils to GCE but also for GCE implementation in primary school. GCE implementation cannot be reduced to a top-down political process to impose prescriptive, well-structured curricula, but it is necessary to foster teacher agency as well. As demonstrated in the recent school reform in Finland (Pyhältö, Pietarinen, & Soini, 2012), teacher professional agency plays crucial role in large-scale school reform. On the contrary, there seems to be a growing trend to technicalization of teachers’ work and to prioritize evidence-based approach, prescriptive curricula or rigid didactics and to build teachers professionalism around them. Although teachers’ professionalism is fundamental and to design well-structured educational programs for them is essential to avoid both spontaneity and improvisation, and ideological or techno-scientific dogmatism, nevertheless forming teachers to GCE has to do mostly with the teachers’ agency and with the work to empower them. To empower teachers’ agency, values play a crucial role. Therefore a value-based approach is pivotal to engage teachers to promote school change in their context. Since NGOs and civil society are the actors who typically provide a value-based theoretical framework and assign to values a central role, their contribution is highly valuable in the teacher education processes. But in order to make this contribution effective, any effort should be done to overcome contrasts and conflicts among several actors and their diverse pedagogical cultures.


Chapter 8: Contrasting cultures

Ben Mallon

This chapter explores the next key theme of this report, ‘Contrasting Cultures’, in greater depth. Through a process of collaborative analysis of data from Italy, Austria, Czech Republic and Ireland, this theme came to be defined as the conflicts or tensions arising from different perspectives, worldviews and beliefs held within the cultures of stakeholders in the field of GCE teacher education programmes.

As part of an agreed analysis agenda taking place throughout the research process, each researcher created several analytical memos, which provided important information on the state of the art in each country. These memos also provided an outlet for sharing potential themes as they emerged from the initial analysis of the data in each case. The theme of ‘Contrasting Cultures’ can be traced back to the early stages of the project, as exemplified within the following section from an analytical memo within the Irish case:

Aside from GCE, “Education for Sustainable Development” and “Development Education” are also commonly used in Ireland, so may provide a potential avenue if additional cases are required at a further date. I think remaining open to the range of different “adjectival educations” which share the features of GCE (Development Education etc.) may support researchers in finding elusive external cases. (IE–M–2–07.06.2016)

This excerpt identifies the various “adjectival educations” which are positioned alongside and sometimes used interchangeably with ‘Global Citizenship Education’ (Bryan & Bracken, 2011; Davies, 2006; Bourn, 2014). However, as later analysis revealed, these forms of education represent points of tension between the contrasting cultures of actors within the space of in-service teacher education within the European context. The further emergence of this theme can be seen in an interview conducted the following year which emphasised how tensions between adjectival educations may appear.

“When you were reporting to [NGO] they would be querying the proportion of what they would perceive to be development education topics. And then when you would be reporting to [Funder] they would be querying the perception, what they would perceive as being strictly human rights. So it didn’t matter what way we pitched it in terms of the intersection I think, I mean nothing was in my view what we were doing was both. But certainly [NGO] were looking at it from a human rights perspective they felt the human rights wasn’t grounded enough. [Funder] if they saw the word human rights you’d always get a note back going ‘is this really development education?’” (xIE-If- 06-03.04.2017)
Within this example, the educational preference of the funder (Development Education) and the educational preference of the organising NGO (Human Rights Education) must be negotiated by the teacher educator involved in the development of the programme.

Ongoing analysis within each country, complemented with collaborative cross-case analysis, enabled the refinement of this theme and the identification of associated subthemes. These themes and associated sub-themes are named and defined in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme type</th>
<th>Theme name</th>
<th>Theme definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main theme</td>
<td>contrasting cultures</td>
<td>Different perspectives, worldviews, beliefs among stakeholders’ culture also highlighting intergroup conflicts and tensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub theme</td>
<td>Different actors in GCE training</td>
<td>List of key educational stakeholders explicitly mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub theme</td>
<td>Trainer profile</td>
<td>Knowledge, skills and experience that a GCE trainer is expected to have according to a specific actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub theme</td>
<td>In methods</td>
<td>Differences among actors in teaching and learning methodologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub theme</td>
<td>In contents</td>
<td>Differences among actors in GCE definitions and related issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub theme</td>
<td>In ethics/politics</td>
<td>Differences among actors in values, beliefs, ideologies and political commitment in teaching GCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remainder of this chapter considers the contrasting cultures within teacher education for global citizenship across the European countries involved within this research project. This commentary is drawn from the in-country analysis and the national reports developed within each case.

As already identified within the four national reports, there is a range of different actors involved in the process of teacher education for global citizenship education. In Austria, Italy, Czech Republic and Ireland, there are clear similarities between the types of actors involved and the roles these individuals and organisations
play in the field of teacher education. An overview of the common actors can be seen in Table 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor(s)</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding Body</td>
<td>Provision of funding to programme organisers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government/Local Authority Body</td>
<td>Development of statutory requirements which shape provision of teacher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Expertise in development and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers/Trainees</td>
<td>Participation in programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educators/Trainers</td>
<td>Design and facilitation of programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In each country, funding bodies were identified as important actors involved in the process of teacher education. Apart from the internal cases, which shared the same funding body, the external cases derived funding from a variety of sources.

Governmental and local authority bodies were also identified as key actors across each of the European contexts. Interestingly, governmental involvement within the field was not confined to educational bodies. In the Irish context, both the Department of Education and Skills and the Department of Foreign Affairs, the latter through its arm Irish Aid, were identified as important actors shaping how GCE teacher education was developed and experienced. A similar situation could be seen in the Austrian context where both the Austrian Development Agency served as a partner on one programme and the Ministry of Education funded another of the programmes.

Non-governmental Organisations clearly played an important role in the development and delivery of programmes and served as both a source of knowledge in relation to the themes addressed within programmes, but also, at times, a source of expertise in relation to the educational processes underpinning approaches.

Teacher educators played important roles in the design and facilitation of programmes, hailing from NGOs but also from Universities. Other key actors within each programme were of course the teachers participating within the programmes and, by association, the schools where the teachers were employed.

Across each of the European contexts, teacher education provided a space where the contrasting cultures of varied organisations would meet, and indeed such interactions produced a challenge to those tasked with negotiating these relationships.

“It’s most challenging when NGOs and an official education authority work together” (AT-If-in-02-2017)

The types of subject content, or issues, addressed within teacher education programmes appeared to depend on the specialty of the teacher educators.
and their associated organisations, whether that be universities or NGOs. For example, within the Austrian context, issues such as racism, discrimination and migration were prioritised within one programme, driven by a sense of collective responsibility considering a colonial past (AT-N-in-06-2017). Within the Czech case, climate change, inclusion and human rights were identified as specialisms. Within the Irish context, an NGO partner’s specialism in migration offered important input into aspects of the internal teacher education programme. Within the Italian context, a specialist focus on migration and food was apparent (IT-Ex-Li-03-03.12.2016) but also a perception that NGOs had originally been used “to bring testimonies from Africa or Latin America but then [they] started to change and bring a more formative intervention and not only a witness from the south of the world” (IT-Ex-Fn-02-24.12.2017).

Whilst this subject knowledge on development issues was clearly important across each context, there was evidence of perceptions that educational expertise was also essential in the development of teacher education programmes. However, such expertise was not always recognised in other actors.

“What emerges from their attitude is that they think NGO educators have not a real experience in school activities and an adequate didactic preparation” (IT-N-05-11.06.2016).

A reason for scepticism may be identified in the external Italian case, as an interview revealed a perception that, although they may bring important knowledge to education, NGOs “should not substitute teachers in class” (IT-Ex-If-02-23.06.2017). This tension between those who have “real experience” in the primary classroom and those who do not was also emphasised in the Irish case study. Indeed, the external Irish case advertised its teacher education programmes as facilitated “for teachers, by teachers”, drawing attention to the classroom-based experience of the teacher educators facilitating the course. However, also within the external case, there was recognition that the primary role of the NGO was often not education, and there was a risk of “education programs who are not run by people who have education values or pedagogical strengths” (xIE-If-06-03.04.2017). The perceived importance of values shall be returned to shortly.

The development of a strong theoretical framework behind educational approaches was perceived as a highly important component of effective teacher education (xIE-If-06-03.04.2017). Within the Italian context, a similar observation on the preservation of theoretical foundation was made:

“the NGO operators point out that she prefers not to use the word game to refer to playful activities, especially in secondary schools, in order to avoid diminishing the value of the activities, 2 participants oppose the importance and value of the game in school” (IT-N-05-11.06.2016)

Such examples highlight an expectation that certain courses require not only subject knowledge in relation to the topics addressed within the programmes, but also educational experience which has been derived from actual classroom practice. These examples also suggest a perception from some actors as to the importance of bridging the gap between subject knowledge (for example, understanding of migration) and classroom practice (for example, teaching about migration in the primary classroom).
Although the role of NGOs in shaping teacher education was clear across each of the European contexts, there was also some evidence of some scepticism towards forms of NGO involvement in teacher education. For example, within the Czech context, a negative perception of some of the motivations for NGO involvement in teacher education was identified.

"Trainer: Can NGOs organize the extra classes? 
Participant: I feel like they often want to get money." (CZ-xN-03-03.04.2017)

Other negative perceptions of NGOs were apparent in the external Italian case, as one participant argued that “NGOs are presumptuous; they think they know everything” (IT-Ex-Li-05-09.03.2017). In the Irish context, one research participant expressed some concern about the number of NGOs involved in the provision of teacher education now.

I think certainly in the Irish context it feels like an almost overloaded market at the moment. Like particularly with development education and I think, I mean [NGO] occupies a unique position in human rights education. But the development education sector is just, so many NGOs doing development education work. Teachers I think or the sense I get from teachers is that a lot of them are almost overwhelmed by the amount of different training workshops that are on offer to them. (xIE-If- 04-29.03.2017)

Despite these difficulties, there was recognition of the important specialisms that different NGOs could bring to teacher education.

“Although imperative appeared the needs for recognition of the work done by NGOs” (AT-If-in-01-2016).

The important yet varied contribution of NGOs was apparent within each of the European contexts and in collaboration with other actors, there was evidence of NGOs work strengthening teacher education practice.

As many of the programmes explored within this research focused on the development of teachers’ classroom practice, there was a common emphasis on supporting teachers participating in programmes to take their learning into their classrooms. A common point of contrast appeared that despite the attitudes of teacher educators and participating teachers, schools might not share a belief in the value of global citizenship education. There was a perception of the challenge of incorporating GCE within certain schools and the need for teachers to consider how they might:

“react to the opposition of some colleagues toward the implementation of different methods and issues linked to GCE...some trainees suggest that it is more difficult in primary schools because after years of great changes, it is closed to integration” (IT-N-06-19.06.2016)

Here, the contrasting attitudes towards GCE methodologies are perceived to be an important potential barrier to the implementation of GCE in schools. Elsewhere, the successful implementation of GCE within schools was perceived to be limited by broader issues within the education system.

I think what stops them from being as successful as they could be is that [GCE] is not a curricular area, so a lot of focus from the Department or from schools will be on literacy and numeracy and things like that. GCE isn’t at the forefront and doesn’t get as much funding, as much visibility as it could. (IE-If-
In this interview from the internal Irish case, the value placed on literacy and numeracy from the Department of Education, potentially to the detriment of global citizenship education, was perceived to represent a barrier to the implementation of GCE in schools. In a similar example, in an interview from the external Czech case, GCE issues are perceived to be in many different teacher education programmes, such as “ethical education” (Cz-if-ex-01-29.08.2016) yet run the risk of being unspecified and therefore underexplored.

A range of contrasting methodological approaches to GCE was observed across each of the different European contexts. Certainly, a contrast between top-down models of teacher education and participatory, learner-centred approaches was recognised in each case. Within the Austrian context, this contrast was apparent in the comparison between the practice of scholars and the practice of educators from NGOs, the latter preferring interactive participatory approaches.

Within the Italian context, an important tension emerged between those teacher education approaches which employed tightly structured pedagogical models and those, often utilised by NGOs, which developed the learning process through co-construction with teachers and children, often with a strong emphasis on self-reflection. Considering these contrasting methods within the Italian case at a deeper level suggests that when those top down approaches to teacher education which prioritise global competence are contrasted with learner centred approaches, they lack a focus on issues of ethics and values. Whilst the both the internal and external case within the Irish context revealed clear engagement with the values of critical global citizenship, there was a notable gap between specific educational approaches which fostered participating teachers to engage with values at a personal level, and those approaches, most apparent where time was constrained, where a reflection on issues of ethics and values was absent.

Consideration of values offer important points of contrast, but also conflict in certain cases. In describing the perceived success of the community of practice in the external Irish case, the teacher educator revealed how a conflict between the ethos of the primary school and a proposed activity of a teacher educator, themselves a teacher within the school had developed:

“We had one or two teachers who were so delighted to find the group because they were coming from schools where parish priests had been giving out when they go to organise a yoga session for children. So one teacher came in very upset because she had organised a yoga session for children when they were very stressed and the priest said it was promoting Buddhism and that they weren’t allowed to have that in a catholic school.” (xIE-If- 06-03.04.2017)

Here the values of the classroom teacher and the values of the school board of management, and thus attitudes to global citizenship education, appear in stark contrast. Such a narrative also highlights the barriers to the implementation of certain forms of global citizenship education which teachers may face. Whilst the nature of the values children experience at school may be hugely varied, the strong importance of schools as places where values are transmitted was identified within the Czech research.
“Attitudes and values are not such a safe issue, but if we think about it, the school is one of the places where we learn them.” (CZ-N-01-09.06.2016)

The conceptualisation of values as an insecure yet important phenomenon within schools and within teacher education appeared to be reinforced throughout the different contexts. However, it is important to note that within certain programmes, the contrast between approaches to global citizenship education was marked. Perceptions of, and attitudes towards, broader cultural differences appeared to play a role in how GCE was approached within one of the external Czech cases.

“Arabs spit on the ground, Asians cooperate. They show esteem to the teacher, even if they make a mistake. They do not look into the eyes of socially more important people. If they do not know, they smile. We have Kazachs in [this city], they have problems with drawing faces” (CZ-xN-03-[removed]-2017)

The broad generalisations espoused within this example stand in stark contrast to the approaches to GCE evident within other cases observed within the Czech Republic and elsewhere in other European contexts, but highlights the potential variance in understandings of GCE that may occur. Certainly, this excerpt reveals the nature of the more explicit conflict that can exist within teacher education. Elsewhere, participants questioned the extent to which aspects of GCE could be considered universal.

“Contrary to those who argue that the educational competencies of world citizenship are the European key competencies.” (IT-If-02-28.03.2017)

Here, the question of whether the competencies of GCE are mirrored in European competencies is considered within a formal interview from the Italian internal case. The contrast between actors within the field of teacher education may also revolve around the extent to which conceptualisations of GCE are considered universal.

It is evident that teacher education programmes in this project provided an important space for multiple actors to contribute their specialisms towards supporting teachers in their engagement with GCE. Collaboration between these stakeholders was an important consideration.

“Strengthening the networking between college of education, university and NGOs would be important” (AT-If-in-01-2016)

Finding a balance within such collaborations is recognised as a challenge and viewing teacher education in other national contexts provided an opportunity for practitioners to consider how such balance could be achieved.

“I got the impression that in other countries the impartation of knowledge operates often overall (top heavy) and the methodological part as well as group-dynamic processes go by the board” (AT-If-in-02-2017)

Again, from the Austrian case, there appeared a clear desire to include a range of perspectives within elements of teacher education.

“...appreciation of different, diverse opinions and approaches is central in the concept of the teacher training” (AT-D-in02)

In this case, the contrasting approaches and diverse perspectives promoted by the different actors were perceived to represent a valuable opportunity for
teacher education. It was evident elsewhere that finding this balance between the contrasting cultures presented both a challenge and an opportunity for teacher education programmes. Within the Irish external case, the contrasting educational approaches offered by the funder (Development Education) and the organising NGO (Human Rights Education) were both included within an explicit conceptual framework which underpinned the teacher education programme and sought to maximise the potential of critical Development Education and human rights frameworks as a foundation for GCE teacher education. Documentation from the internal Italian case also expresses a positive perception of the potential of collaboration between the different actors within teacher education.

“The module starts with awareness that global citizenship education cannot be the exclusive responsibility of the school but needs a network of multiple actors: associations of NGOs.” (IT-Tn-D-01-11.10.2016)

Within such an example, the responsibility for successful GCE teacher education is posited as a collective endeavour between the formal education system and NGOs. From the same teacher education programme, documentation highlights how such a shared obligation might be achieved, by “opening spaces for teachers and NGO practitioners to be trained together so that they can share perspectives and methodologies” (IT-Tn-D-00a-04.11.2016). The sharing of contrasting approaches was also considered an important potential within the Irish context:

“Because I’m based in a school and teaching, I based mine on practical lesson ideas, other teachers might have gone down a critical literacy route. Other people involved might have had a background in drama, they brought HR play scripts and mime. Other people from an ICT background developed things around ICT skills that would feed into a human rights perspective. In terms of the community of practice, you are learning from people from very different backgrounds to yourself and the way that they are approaching. Some of things they do are in actual subjects in schools so you can take that into your own workshop if you want, and develop it that way. You are learning all the time from people from different backgrounds” (xIE-If- 05-29.03.2017)

Such an emphasis on collaboration was also clear within the internal Czech case, with reference to the “emphasis on development of cooperative and caring thinking...vital for GCE” (Cz-If-in-01-23.01.2017). One final excerpt from the Italian case highlights the potential difficulties that may be faced conducting teacher education within the spaces between contrasting cultures, but also alludes to the potential benefits to be gained from well-planned programmes.

Only with a clear planning we can do good research otherwise we risk entering in a field that is that of development cooperation that is already difficult to manage already in terms of communication, different habits and different concepts of research (IT-Ex- If-02- 23.06.2017).

This chapter has illuminated how the theme of “Contrasting Cultures” was derived from the analysis of data across each of the European cases involved in the Global Schools project. The chapter identifies the key actors common to each of the country cases but also reveals how, as described by a participant in the research associated within the Austrian external case, “the logic and needs of organisations are totally different” (AT-If-in-02-2017).
These differences emerge as tensions in relation to content, methods and broader philosophical matters. The chapter explores the tensions between NGOs and the formal education systems of partner countries before considering some conflicts apparent in relation to broader aspects of culture. The chapter reveals how contrast is apparent in how the ‘value of’ global citizenship is perceived by different stakeholders, and how this may limit the opportunity for developing global citizenship education in the classroom. The chapter also identifies the contrasting levels of ethical engagement, or ‘values in’ global citizenship education. Finally, the chapter considers how, despite the challenges faced by those developing teacher education in the spaces where contrasting and sometimes conflicting cultures meet, collaborative and cooperative approaches offer the opportunity for the development of meaningful GCE teacher education.


Chapter 9: Conclusion

M. Tarozzi, C. Inguaggiato

In this report, we provided the results of the second and third year of the research, conducted in the framework of DEAR co-funded project Global Schools. In this part, we focused on teachers’ education practice in Austria, Czech Republic, Ireland and Italy. The methodology adopted is a multiple-site case study design, based on ethnography as overall methodological approach. The research theoretical framework was a qualitative one, seeking for a description of practices and meaning making to behavioural patterns.

After having briefly reviewed the literature on GCE teacher education and a description of the methodology used, the first part of the report presented the four national case studies which offer a careful description of both internal and external cases. Such evidence-based reports are grounded in data analysis of field notes, course documents and interviews collected within the framework of the ethnographic participant observation. A second part consists of a comparative analysis of the three major common themes that emerged from the analysis in the four national cases: GCE conception, teaching approaches and contrasting cultures. This last part summarizes the key elements taken from the analysis. As we stated in the introduction, research does not measure efficacy and impact of the proposed training course. Thus, it does not allow to evaluate effectiveness and impact of the courses. However, in depth analysis provides exploration on ideas, visions and course design which could be somehow useful to practitioners and course organizers.

This material can be also useful for policy makers, because it provides evidence useful for promoting background conditions for systematic, long-term teacher education programs which can also support GCE policy formulation and agenda setting.

This qualitative inquiry confirms what emerged as a possible outcome from the comparative policy analysis carried out in the first part of the research. Teacher education is important not only to equip teachers with knowledge, skills and abilities required to educate pupils to GCE but also for GCE implementation in primary school. Therefore, (value-based) teacher education can be regarded as a somehow political action to school reform.

We should also notices that all the GCE teacher education programs under inquiry here are funded by EU agencies either EuropeAid or Erasmus Plus while the national or regional educational agencies seems at present to have a minor role in financially supporting the implementation of such courses. Furthermore, the duration of these teacher education programs is very short, it takes maximum three years and therefore does not allow for the depth of action which is needed to enhance a change of perspective in teaching nor they can enlarge the basis of teachers which have a sound understanding of GCE theoretical and practical approach to teaching. To limit the risk of having a “richer gets richer” mechanism (Merton, 1968 Barabási et al 1999) which means only involving already GCE
engaged teachers, it would be necessary to have long term funding policy of the duration of at least ten years to allow for deep, coherent and well rooted in the territory teacher education programs.

Since GCE implementation cannot be reduced to a top-down political process to impose prescriptive, well-structured curricula, or a set of competences to be directly implemented into teaching practices, teacher education is necessary to foster teacher agency as well. Teacher agency is a crucial element for educational change and reform, and it recalls the teachers’ active contribution to shape their work and actively influence learning process, school setting, classroom atmosphere. In doing so, teacher education is critical to empower teacher as agents of change creating paths for GCE implementation into primary school.

Many authors outlined that teacher agency is a very important concept in educational policy implementation (Biesta et al. 2014).

Biesta (2014 et al.), in his ethnographic study on the Curriculum for Excellence in Scotland, has investigated the role of beliefs on teachers’ action, namely beliefs about children, and young people; beliefs about teaching; and beliefs about educational purpose. The research focused how the introduction of the new curriculum effects put teachers’ agency into place, and on the factors, that promote or inhibit such agency. The analysis suggests that: “teacher education may have become geared towards the instrumental side of the spectrum – that is, getting the job done – and has been steered away from a more intellectual engagement with teaching, school and society” (Biesta et al., 2014 p.638).

While we do not have enough data to investigate the impact of implementation of GCE in primary schools, our analysis demonstrated the powerful role of teachers as agents of change and the role of a value-based approach in enhancing this attitude in teachers. However, we have explored some of the key elements which have been highlighted in model (Biesta et al, 2014, p.627) on the achievement of agency, namely how beliefs influence teachers’ teaching practices focusing on resources and physical environment.

In large-scale national school reforms, teacher agency plays a key role for policy implementation as demonstrated in the recent school reform in Finland (Pyhältö, Pietarinen, & Soini, 2012). However, unfortunately, everywhere in Europe there is a mainstreaming trend to technicalization of teachers’ work, reducing the autonomy of teachers and teachers’ and limiting teachers’ choices on teaching approaches and themes to impose prescriptive curricula or rigid didactics, and oppressive regimes of testing and inspection (Biesta, 2010), to build teachers professionalism around them and to distance the political dimension of teaching and its key transformative role.

Moreover, according to Korthagen (2004), who also emphasized the importance of beliefs and its impact on teacher, research shows that values and beliefs have a huge impact to empower teachers’ agency. His onion diagram is an effective tool to illustrate layers that compose teachers’ professional subjectivity (identities, beliefs, competences, behaviour and environment) which are simultaneously involved when GCE is practiced in
teacher education, but also in classroom activities. Korthagen claims that working on the inner layer, values and beliefs has a great impact in teacher education. In this vein, we maintain that a value-based approach is pivotal to engage teachers to promote school change in their context through their teachers’ agency.

The research also shows that values-based approach in teacher education is mostly promoted by NGOs, which, unlike traditional school, typically introduce value-based approaches and coherent teaching methods. This is also due to teachers’ fear of any politicization of GCE as some previous research demonstrated (Rapoport, 2010).

However, this research also revealed potential and actual tensions between NGOs and the Formal Education Systems and described the presence of contrasting cultures between the various actors involved in the implementation of GCE education. There are different approaches to GCE, to teaching approaches and values and beliefs between teachers and NGOs, NGOs and funding bodies and among teachers. While the interaction between NGOs and Formal Education System is a great opportunity to enhance GCE school practice, it often creates frictions because of the methods proposed and the beliefs about educational purposes.

Different visions among GCE conception on the one hand could enrich teacher education practice, but on the other if not part of a coherent educational program which organize coherently the different visions of GCE could risk to create confusion in teachers and diminishing the effect on teachers’ agency.
NGOs tend to adopt a values-based approach and focus on the affective and ethical dimensions. These elements represent both an opportunity and a threat: an opportunity as working on teachers’ values empowers teachers’ agency, but also a risk, as if the affective and ethical dimensions is overemphasized, then less attention is paid to knowledge and competences.

In sum, teacher agency is crucial for promoting real school change and make school reform successful. Besides, values and beliefs are highly valuable to improve teacher agency. Since NGOs typically introduce values based approaches, their contribution in teacher education is imperative. However, there is a risk of contrasting cultures and conflicts, therefore in order to make this contribution effective, any effort should be done to overcome contrasts and conflicts among several actors and their diverse pedagogical cultures. In particular, the coordination between NGOs and school staff should be high and based on long term planning.
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1. Questionnaire analyses

D. Antonucci, S. Altemberger, M. Novotná

This part provides a descriptive statistics of the characteristics of the trainees that can be found in the first section of the questionnaire (age, gender, teaching subject, school order, country, town). They refer to the analysis of the questionnaires completed by trainees and not to all the participants. The table below offers an overall picture of the data collected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>IT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>questionnaires</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trainees</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% male*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Under 30*</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 31-45*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Over 46*</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% SSH teachers*</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% STEMs teachers*</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% all subject teachers*</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% special needs’ teachers*</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data collected have been organized according to six different age groups (25 years or younger, 26-30, 31-35, 36-40, 46 or older). From their comparative analysis, it is evident that there is a deep difference in the age of trainees between Italy and the other countries. Graphic 1 provides a categorization of the data.
In Italy 35 out of the 43 teachers are older than 46 years, only 3 out of 23 in Ireland, 5 out of 18 in Austria and 12 out of 54 in Czech Republic. Apart from Italy where the average age is 50.6, in all the other 3 countries there is a quite homogeneous distribution of the teachers in the age groups, and the average is 39 in CR and 40, in Austria. Most of the Irish teachers are 31-35 years old.

In Italy, Austria and Czech Republic there is a clear similarity about the ratio of female to male in the courses: female teachers represent more than 80% of the trainees. The data about the Irish case are not available.

The educational systems are different in the 4 countries and the assignment of the subjects to the teachers follows different rules. In Ireland the primary teachers teach all the subjects, whereas in Italy the headmaster assigns disciplinary areas, “taking care to guarantee the conditions for educational continuity, as well as the best use of professional skills and experience, ensuring, where possible, an appropriate rotation over time” (art. 396 Legislative Decree no. 297/1994).

These variances and the fact that disciplinary areas are not the same in different schools and in different countries have required an interpretation of the data. In order to analyse and compare them, the subjects were organized in the following areas:

- Social Sciences and Humanities (Ssh)
- Science, Technology, Mathematics, Physics, etc. (Stems)

As it is evident from the overall table, there are similarities about the subjects taught by the trainees of the 4 countries, most of them teach Humanities, in particular mother and/or foreign languages, history and geography. In the Irish, Italian and Austrian case there are some teachers responsible of learning support to the class and/or to children with special needs.

Overlooking the four cases it is possible to see overlaps and distinctions. In the Irish case all the trainees are primary school or kindergarten teachers. The other cases are different because in the Italian, Austrian and Czech cases some trainees are lower secondary teachers, but in different ratio.

In Italy 52% of the trainees teach in secondary school (11-14 junior high school/14-19 high school), 41% in primary school (6-10) and also a pre-service teacher has attended the course. In Austria the distribution in the 3 different levels is more homogeneous and it is important to notice the high number of pre-service teachers attending the course compared to the other cases (33% pre-service primary, 22% in service primary, 33% secondary education). In Czech Republic 67% of the trainees teach in primary school, 24 in kindergarten and only 4% in secondary education. In Ireland and Czech Republic no pre-service teacher has attended the course. An overview of the ratio can be seen in the tables 2 and 3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School level</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>CZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior infants/senior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infants</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>primary pre service</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>primary in service</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
In the Irish case all the trainees’ school are in urban areas, in Italy they are equally distributed between urban and rural areas. In Austria the schools in the urban area are almost twice as many as those in the school in the rural area, but in 5 questionnaires there are no details about the school location. As for the Czech case the data are not available.

This part analyses answers in questionnaires concerning competences which are seen as necessary for GCE teachers and by GCE teachers. The current ongoing discussion on significance of competences for pedagogical practice will not be solved here. Nonetheless “the paradigm shift in pedagogy from an orientation towards content to an orientation towards competences” (Wintersteiner et al. 2015: 11) is currently present, especially in GCE contexts competences are seen as central. In the paper of the Austrian UNESCO-commission Wintersteiner et al. defined GCE competencies as follows:

“Competences: global citizens have competences that allow them to question and reflect their own (local or national) situation critically, systematically and creatively, and to take different perspectives to understand topics form diverse angles, levels and positions; they have social competences like empathy, the ability to solve conflict, communication skills, the ability to engage in social interaction with people from different contexts (origin, culture, religion, etc.) and the ability to collaborate in cooperative and responsible ways with others in order to find joint global solutions to global challenges.” (ibid. S.11).

So following the question which competences belong to a ‘global citizen’ and therefore to a ‘global teacher’ was also a central question within the
questionnaires. Through questionnaires trainees of each teacher training programme in Austria, Ireland, Czech Republic and Italy formulated necessary competences as well as competences they declare to have. They gave answers to the question “What skills, competences do you believe are necessary to teach Global Education?”. This chapter is a description of the emerged competences based on the collection of questionnaires of each country. The following table shows the whole amount of questionnaires analysed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Questionnaires – Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The competences mentioned by trainees within the questionnaires were listed and counted in specific files by the researchers. To provide an overall picture of national overlaps and distinctions the most relevant competences (amount of 3) were selected. In the following table the overlaps of competences in at least two countries are highlighted in green and competences with overlaps in all countries are highlighted in blue. Although some of the trainees declared in the beginning of the programme that they already have some of the competences, it was to observe that many of the competences were reinforced within the programmes. And therefore, it was possible to define seven key competences for GCE teachers. The two most relevant competences which emerged from the analysis seem to be empathy and open-minded which was mentioned in all cases very often.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competences</th>
<th>Austria (8)</th>
<th>Italy (8)</th>
<th>Czech Republic (9)</th>
<th>Ireland (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Cultural) awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Cultural) awareness</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical – thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical – thinking</td>
<td>General overview</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open – minded</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open – minded</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No stereotyping</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good listener</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Open-minded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>Didactic competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To argue</td>
<td></td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Open – minded</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didactic competence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Didactic competence</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decentralisation</td>
<td>Life-long-learning</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Patience</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 - Frequency of questionnaires

Table 6 - Competences in national comparison
For Austria, as mentioned in the national report, programme A had a strong focus on reflection of the self and the world and in order to that it correlates with the description of a global citizen in the paper “Global Citizenship Education. Citizenship Education for Globalizing Societies” published in Austria in cooperation with the Austrian UNESCO Commission.

Therefore, “global citizens, however, are also self-reflective and have an enhanced awareness of connections between their own actions, social structures and economic processes, such as forms of inequality and injustice on different levels, and can identify possible opportunities for action (my local actions or my choosing not to act have global consequences).” (ibid.: 11)

In Italy to be a good listener can be seen as a competence related to patience, cooperation and orientation along the individual life situation of the pupils. Therefore, a good listener has the competence “to collaborate in cooperative and responsible ways with others in order to find joint global solutions to global challenges.” (ibid.: 11) For the Irish case it seems to be crucial to have competences concerning GCE resources and materials. Resources can be classified under the broader term methodological competence which “comprises understanding and critically questioning texts, statistics, arguments, and more (deconstruction), as well as independently using media, research options or presentation techniques.” (ibid.: 35) Lifelong learning related to the Czech case points out that GCE teachers have to react to the ongoing processes in the global society. GCE is process oriented and that’s why the focus on ongoing processes of learning and teaching can be seen as important for GCE teachers. Therefore “the development of global citizenship is a process that is historically possible and actually in progress today, even if we do not yet know whether it will succeed.” (ibid.: 13) Finally, the listed competences (overlaps and national distinctions) of trainees can be seen as highly beneficial for planning and realisation of future teacher training programmes.

Participants of all courses responded also to the question „What are in your opinion the most important issues related to GCE for teaching in primary education?“ This analysis is based on this section of questionnaires that frame the overall perception of GCE and its individual components, as understood by participants.

The data were processed in the following way. Regardless of the number of questionnaires, in each country ten issues mentioned most frequently were taken into account. When there were more issues that ranked the same frequency as the last one, they was also considered. To show their weight in the final word cloud, each category has been assigned points – the highest frequency 10 points, the second highest 9 points etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue/No of points</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>IE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>environment/climate change</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human rights</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social and economic justice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peace/war</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diversity/differences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

3. Main issues and topics
In the Czech Republic the issues of environment, diversity and human rights ranked on the first three positions, followed with a bigger interval, by other issues such as equality, relations, consumption, sustainable development, social and economic justice, poverty and wealth, and multiculturalism, tradition and habits, peace, food security and stereotypes.

In Austria, social justice, globalisation, human rights and peace were in the first three places, with the two latter being on the same position. They were closely followed by the issues of sustainability, democracy, interconnectedness and diversity, with a bigger interval, by climate change and refugee-politics.

In Italy, teachers mentioned as the most important GCE issues environment (1), human rights and peace (2), interconnectedness and differences, together in third place. They were followed by democracy and social and economic justice, and with a bigger interval by respect, migration, climate change, sustainability and development.

In Ireland, human rights, climate change and migration ranked the highest, followed with a bigger interval by the issues of homelessness, social and economic justice, education, war, identity, rights and responsibilities and globalisation.

Altogether, four issues were considered important by participants from all countries – human rights, environment/climate change, social and economic justice and peace-war. Diversity/differences ranked high in three countries (CZ, AT, IT), as well as migration/refugee-politics (AT, IT, IR). Some other issues were considered important by two countries: globalisation (AT, IR), sustainability (CZ, AT), democracy (AT, IT) and interconnectedness (AT, IT). There were also issues which were specific in the highest ranking for each country, such as for example homelessness for Ireland, traditions for Czech Republic or development for Italy.
Within the questionnaire there was also a question for the most relevant topic in the training that a participant sees relevant in regards to his/her development as an educator who teaches GCE. Individual researchers highlighted those with the highest frequency. The answers here reflect the high diversity of issues treated in GCE trainings in all countries, as showed in the following word cloud. The word cloud in this case does not represent the frequency as only two issues (extension of perspectives and differences were mentioned in two countries, all other were mentioned only once).

### 3. Codebook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reasons to attend</td>
<td>Factors influencing the attendance and participation of teachers in teacher education programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td>Factors that either limit or prevent the attendance of teachers at teacher education programmes</td>
<td>“We understand that schools are very busy places and it can be challenging” (IE-D-10-25.04.2017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>Teacher’s intrinsic motivation for engaging with teacher education programmes (decision to attend the course the teacher enjoy the activity itself or the inspiration for acting on intrinsic motivation can be found in the action itself)</td>
<td>“The teacher will feel confident teaching human rights education” (IE-D-05-25.04.2017)</td>
<td>This might include things like own learning or personal development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>Teacher’s extrinsic motivation for engaging with teacher education programmes (decision to attend the course is taken done for the sake of some external outcome)</td>
<td>“provided with a certificate on completion confirming attendance and completion of the course” (IE-D-06-27.04.2016)</td>
<td>This will include things to support outcomes beyond the self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Teacher’s expectations for the teacher education programme</td>
<td>Post-Questionnaire - Question A1 - ‘To what extent has this course met your expectations?’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>GCE Implementation in Schools</td>
<td>Issues that are perceived to influence GCE practice in classrooms or schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>This does not include factors which influence teacher education. It is focused in GCE practice in schools and classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>Issues that are perceived to represent a positive opportunity for GCE practice within classrooms or schools</td>
<td>“The teacher education programme...for teaching citizenship across the curriculum” (IE-D-01-08.06.2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Threats</td>
<td>Issues that are perceived to represent a threat to the GCE practice in classrooms or schools</td>
<td>“The CEC directs all members to cease cooperation with school self evaluation” (IE-D-06.07.2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Contrasting cultures</td>
<td>Different perspectives, worldviews, beliefs among stakeholders’ culture also highlighting intergroup conflicts and tensions</td>
<td>NGOs are presumptuous and they always think they know everything</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Different actors in GCE training</td>
<td>List of key educational stakeholders explicitly mentioned as institutions (e.g. University), function (e.g. Principals) or proper name (e.g. Trocaire)</td>
<td>The group splits into three different subgroups (Teachers/NGO/university)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Trainer profile</td>
<td>Knowledge, skills and experience that a GCE trainer is expected to have according to a specific actor</td>
<td>(teachers) think ONG representatives don’t have a real experience in school activities nor an adequate didactic preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>In methods</td>
<td>Differences among actors in teaching and learning methodologies</td>
<td>in the photo of a training session all teachers are working in small groups and also other trainers take part in the groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>In contents</td>
<td>Differences among actors in GCE definitions and related issues</td>
<td>We (course organizers) believe differently from Prof. C. who has instead a value approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>In ethics/politics</td>
<td>Differences among actors in values, beliefs, ideologies and political commitment in teaching GCE</td>
<td>“Globales Lernen ... als... Grundprinzip.” Global learning as basic principle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Course organization</td>
<td>Description of the characteristics or general information on the training course</td>
<td>“nuovo percorso di 3 mesi piu’ focalizzato sulle competenze” new, 3-month course more focused on competences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Course evaluation</td>
<td>Methods or tools that educators use to assess and evaluate that document both formative and summative outcomes (including the assessment of trainees’ expectations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Information on the course</td>
<td>Description of features of the course (such as requirements to access the certificate, maximum number of participants) or general information on the course</td>
<td>“Präsentation eigener Praxisprojekte” “It takes 6 hours”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Trainee profile</td>
<td>Description of the expected and observed characteristics or general information on the trainees</td>
<td>During the break I speak to T (m, 60+) and he tells me about some of the environmental projects he has been involved in at school which includes tree planting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Concrete tools/devices/materials used to carry out the training</td>
<td>“ognuno ha una carta: modo per presentarsi” everyone has self-introduction sheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>The process of making a plan to achieve aims and goals through proper and coherent methods (including syllabus and organization in topics).</td>
<td>“In the meeting they planned the content of the course”; “Developing whole school approaches?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Teaching approaches</td>
<td>The general principles, pedagogy and management strategies used for classroom instruction</td>
<td>didattica per competenze e non per conoscenze e abilita’, quindi non e’ un problema trattare le tematiche di cambiamento climatico.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Aims and goals</td>
<td>The results the trainers intend to achieve with their teaching action</td>
<td>Responsabilità ed ethos dell’insegnante ideale (competenze degli insegnanti di oggi). definizione dell’insegnante ideale: quali sono le competenze del docente contemporaneo.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Trainee assessment</td>
<td>The results the trainers intend to achieve with their teaching action</td>
<td>Questionario di valutazione e prosecuzione di incontri con i formatori</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Classroom climate</td>
<td>Social and environmental atmosphere encompassing emotional aspects of the classroom</td>
<td>Laugh of participants, Spontaneous clapping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>E4</td>
<td>Teaching methods</td>
<td>A systematic and intentional way of arranging the teaching action according to some principles or pedagogy</td>
<td>Role play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>E5</td>
<td>Pedagogical/theoretical approaches</td>
<td>The reference to a pedagogical approach or theory adopted</td>
<td>C’è al centro il bambino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>E6</td>
<td>Classroom setting</td>
<td>How the spatial structure of the classroom was organized</td>
<td>The trainees are set in a round table but the setting is fixed and does not change during the training session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>E7</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>The work designed or deployed by the teacher to create the conditions for learning and to achieve an aim</td>
<td>The traveller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GCE Conception</td>
<td>How is GCE conceived? What the different actors that contribute to the organization and implementation of the course had in mind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>The underlying assumptions that define GCE conception</td>
<td>Importance of change, importance of interdisciplinarity, inclusive and multidimensional citizenship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Reference to GCE issues</td>
<td>Migration, ecology, human rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Terminology</td>
<td>Terms used to refer to what one calls GCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>GCE competences</td>
<td>GCE competences of both teachers and students that are seen as important</td>
<td>Creativity, Critical Thinking, Empathy, Responsibility, Foreign language knowledge, Knowledge of other cultures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>F5</td>
<td>GCE teacher profile</td>
<td>The ideal GCE teacher’s profile according to the different actors that contribute to the organization and implementation of the course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>GCE policy</td>
<td>Political process that has an impact on the integration of GCE in formal primary education system</td>
<td>GCE ist demnach eine ‘Querschnittsaufgabe für alle Bildungsprozesse’ / GCE is therefor a cross-section purpose for all educational processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Normative documents</td>
<td>A coherent set of decisions or binding recommendations with a common middle or long-term objective(s) relevant to the integration of GCE in school education</td>
<td>Mit dem vorliegenden Lehrgangscurriculum legt die PHT in Kooperation mit Südwind einen Grundstein für eine stärkere Verankerung von GCE an Schulen. / With the current curricula the college of education and Südwind laid a cornerstone for the implementation of GCE in schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Documents providing a coherent set of non-binding recommendations or guidelines relevant to the integration of GCE in school education</td>
<td>In einem vom BMBF in Auftrag gegebenen Strategiepapier ...werden Fortbildungen zu GCE ausdrücklich empfohlen / In the strategy paper of the Ministry of Education GCE teacher trainings are explicitly recommended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>GCE values</td>
<td>Local contextual codes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>GCE values that are followed and focused on documents used in teacher training as well as in practice of trainers. GCE values stated by trainees</td>
<td>Aspects that emerge as very relevant for the specific (national or regional) context analysed but across the 4 countries (IT, AT, CR, IE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Ethical GCE values – mainly focusing on the subject and the community</td>
<td>Reflecting own values and attitudes and developing respect and tolerance in dealing with value pluralism and diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>Political GCE values – mainly focusing on the structures and political issues</td>
<td>To react with empathy to the situation of people with different backgrounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mit dem Leitbild globaler Gerechtigkeit und nachhaltiger Entwicklung, Menschenrechten und Grundwerten der Demokratie identifizieren zu können. To be able to identify with the policy of global justice and sustainability, human rights and core values of democracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>