

## Book Review

**Bourn, D. (ed.) (2020). *The Bloomsbury Handbook of Global Education and Learning*, London: Bloomsbury Academic, 488 pages, £117 (hardback), ISBN 978-1-3501-0873-8**

**La Salette Coelho**

*Polytechnic Institute of Viana do Castelo and University of Oporto*

**Sara Franch**

*Free University of Bolzano-Bozen*

Education has a key role in fostering global citizenship. A specific education tradition with an international and global outlook and an explicit non colonialist perspective emerged first in the United States of America (USA) in the late 1960s and then in the 1970s in the United Kingdom (UK) and in other European countries. However, in the 1980s, in both the UK and the USA, these global education movements came under political attack (Bourn, 2015). Global education, according to Pike (2015, p. 15) “was patently unprepared for the neo-liberal onslaught” because its key principles were “a poor fit with neo-liberal thinking” and “the movement itself had paid insufficient attention to the fundamentals of gaining credibility within either academic or political establishments”. On the one hand, being essentially a grassroots movement, global educators did not align themselves with establishment thinking because they considered it as the root cause of many contemporary global challenges; on the other, they did not invest in providing research-based evidence supporting the teaching and learning strategies they were promoting (Pike, 2015).

The situation now has changed and Global Education, as the contributions in this book illustrate, has a more secure footing in both international and national educational policies and also in academic research, both theoretical and empirical. This book brings a significant contribution to the field of GE as it combines chapters with conceptual perspectives that strengthen the theoretical foundations of GE, with others that provide evidence from empirical research.

As stated by its editor, Douglas Bourn, in the introduction, this book “aimed to bring together current issues and debates concerning global education”, “demonstrating how GE is being interpreted and implemented around the world” (Bourn, 2020, p. 1). Not being the first handbook devoted to this field, Bourn highlights its distinctiveness: i) the contribution to a “distinctive educational field of GE”; 2) the relevance that is given to early carrier researchers; 3) the inclusiveness of participation, bringing together visions from all over the world; 4) the “range of pedagogical approaches, voices and methodologies”, in terms of contents, formats, participants and combination of approaches (Bourn, 2020, p. 2).

**JSSE**

Journal of Social Science  
Education  
Vol. 19, No. 4 (2020)  
DOI 10.4119/jsse-3922  
pp.

Part 1 of the book, *Challenges for Today and Tomorrow*, introduces Global Education. Bourn in his chapter discusses the emergence and evolution of GE and highlights the growing role played by academics and researchers in strengthening GE as a distinctive educational field and as a pedagogy for global social justice. He stresses that GE is becoming a “distinctive pedagogical approach that in many ways is counter-hegemonic and that challenges the dominant orthodoxies and ideologies that have historically influenced educational theory and practice” (Bourn, 2020, p. 20). Wegimont, in his chapter, underlines the importance of strengthening the philosophical foundations of GE grounding it in a model based on eight philosophical dimensions: philosophical anthropology, ontology, ethics, sociology of social change, geo-political perspectives, curriculum studies and pedagogical principles. He calls for a research agenda that opens possibilities for deepening the theoretical reflection as a basis for “a more adequate, more reflective and ultimately more transformative model of critical GE” (Wegimont, 2020, p. 38). In her chapter Scheunpflug stresses the importance of developing “a strategy towards evidence” based on sound research as this is fundamental to ensure quality and impact of GE practices. Yet, she underlines also that evidence-based practice is not sufficient and what is required in GE is “a surplus of utopic thinking, hope and imagination” (Scheunpflug, 2020, p. 49). Ramalho explores the relevance of Freire’s work for GE, using in particular the ideas expressed by Freire in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. She emphasises the role of the educator as an ‘enabler’ and ‘facilitator’ as opposed to a ‘transmitter of knowledge’, as well as Freire’s ‘transformative pedagogy’ interpreted as a learner-centred and dialogical practice of freedom. Grounding GE in Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* is certainly valuable. We believe that Freire’s subsequent work can also strengthen the theoretical basis of GE by emphasising the required “utopic thinking” mentioned by Scheunpflug. Paulo Freire (1997) talks about a “pedagogy of hope”. He warns about the dangers involved in intellectual positions that accept the inexorability of what happens. Dreams and hope, for Freire, “are an intrinsic part of any educational practice with the power to unmask the dominant lies” (1997, p. 7). Freire links hope to struggle: without hope we cannot start the struggle, but “without the struggle, hope, as an ontological need, dissipates, loses its bearings, and turns into hopelessness” and despair (1997, p. 9). So, one of the “tasks of the progressive educator, through a serious, correct political analysis, is to unveil opportunities for hope, no matter what the obstacles may be” (Ibid.).

Part 2 of the book explores some *theoretical perspectives* relevant for rethinking GE from a plurality of onto-epistemological angles. Stein talks about the risk that GE will “circularly reproduce a colonial politics of knowledge that re-centres the West and presumes the universality of colonial modernity’s onto-epistemological frames” (Stein, 2020, p. 63). She identifies three approaches to GE - learning about difference, learning from difference and being taught by difference - that provide very different diagnosis and responses to today’s global challenges. While clearly preferring the third approach, she concludes her chapter with a call to create spaces for students to critically and self-reflexively assess current GE approaches. Pieniazek takes up the challenge of de-centering Western onto-epistemological frames by bringing diverse forms of understanding the world into the GE discourse. In particular, she explores the Sub-Saharan African concept of *Ubuntu* and the possibilities it offers to ensure a “theoretically informed GE that upholds cognitive justice and epistemological pluralism in non-tokenistic ways” (Pieniazek, 2020, p. 86). Sharma contributes to the GE discourse by proposing a value-creating Global Citizenship Education grounded in the perspectives of Asian thinkers like Makiguchi, Ikeda and Gandhi. Her effort to bring Asian onto-epistemological frames into the GE discourse is very valuable. However, her pedagogical framework based on six dimensions brings together, in a rather confusing way, a variety of GE concepts (interdependence, common humanity, global outlook), topics (climate change, sustainable development, peace and non violence, human rights) and educational perspectives (reflective, dialogic and transformative learning, intercultural perspectives).

Part 3 brings together different analysis on *Impact of Policies and Programmes*. Lehtomaki and Rajala offer a review of GE research in Finland since 2007 organised around the five dimensions of GE defined by the Maastricht Declaration in 2002: *Development Education, Human Rights Education, Education for Sustainability, Education for Peace and Conflict Prevention and Intercultural Education*. The authors have added a new dimension specific to the Finnish case, *GE as a cross-cutting issue in education*, which illustrates the uniqueness of this country in the field. The following chapter focuses on the history of GE in Poland (origins, development and current state) and the distinctive factors characterising the neo-conservative trend in the present national context. To face it, Kuleta-Hulboj calls for a “joint task” involving various stakeholders (NGOs, academia, schools). Tarozzi, drawing from a comparative study on Global Citizenship Education in ten European countries, presents the main findings related to the role of NGOs in three areas: *theory* (regarding concepts), *practice* (innovative educational practices) and *policy* (key role in policy-making processes). He points out that NGOs are in the best position to “promote a collaborative agenda and close the gap between traditionally separate political actors” (Tarozzi, 2020, p. 146). In the fourth chapter of this part, Chou reflects on the status of GE in Taiwan’s curriculum, highlighting that it is a recent process encountering many challenges, in particular, the heritage of the Confucian tradition, which values an education based on knowledge performance standards; the teacher-centred didactic methods of teaching; and an overpacked curriculum. The last chapter focuses on a cooperation programme run by Sazani, a UK-based NGO working in Zanzibar. Its experience demonstrates that, as stated by MacCallum, Hoad and Proctor (2020, p. 169) “learner-centred guidance, group work and inquiry projects can result in better skills and competences”.

Part 4 focuses on *Global Perspectives in Higher Education*. Manjeya presents an analysis of the South African Higher Education (HE) system, focused on five themes: values, transactions, actors, procedures and mechanisms. Having a definition of GE centred on the “international standards in education” (2020, p. 176), the main conclusion is that the South African HE system has evolved a lot in the last twenty years, in the pursuit of social justice and equity. Bosio, in a comparative study of courses at HE in United States, United Kingdom and Japan, identifies three main dimensions present in the GCE curriculum in HE: *critical cognizance* (a positive appreciation of diversity, engaging with new perspectives and ideologies), *ecotistical/ecocritical view* (changing the ego- to eco-, humans as part of a wider environment) and *inclusive self/identity* (the multiple elements of identity, the sense of belonging to the global humanity). The author then proposes a framework of a “yet-to-come ethical GCE curriculum” (2020, p. 201), which crosses these three dimensions, with three GCE curricular theories: *critical/post-colonial, transformative, value-creating*. Moraes and Freire suggest that the concept of *Planetary Citizenship* is particularly relevant to the context of Brazilian universities. They reflect on how the postmodernist and postcolonial theories influence the curriculum, question the traditional role of university regarding its identity, place and function and give examples of how planetary citizenship could be articulated in HE. In the following chapter, Posti-Ahokas, Moate and Lehtomaki propose a reflection on the concept of *global responsibility*, based on a HE experience with future educational professionals in Finland. Hartmeyer, using the concept of *glocalization*, presents the experience of a research seminar in HE in Austria. Students were invited to analyse and research the city of Vienna “through a specific focus on the global in the local” (2020, p. 245). The author stresses the idea of universities being places for learning and not just places for training for a profession. From Spain, Nos Aldá brings a case study focusing on how to engage future professionals in the field of communication as global critical citizens. The last chapter of this fourth part, written by Bamber, presents two case studies of “GCE at home” experiences, that is to say, without international experiences. We found of particular interest the distinction made by the author between *internationalization* and *internationalism* (2020, p. 264) referring the first to the global market and the sense of competition and the second to the sense of belonging and connection to the wide world from a solidarity standpoint. The chapter ends with a call for more conceptual clarification.

Part 5 of the book, *Global Education and Learning within Schools*, delves into how GE is perceived and practiced in schools. It includes chapters that analyse how GE is embedded in schools, curricula and teachers' perspectives and practices in a variety of geographical contexts (Spain, England, Finland, Sweden, Ghana, Nigeria). It also shows the multiples ways in which GE is supported and implemented within schools. The chapters show the complexities of embedding GE in the curriculum and in schools practice, and particularly the challenges related to ensuring critical and transformative GE perspectives and approaches. Some of the chapters are particularly illuminating and, while grounded in the experience of particular teachers or contexts, offer valuable insights to both scholars and practitioners. In their chapter, Pashby and Sund look at the possibilities and complexities of teaching global issues through critical and post-colonial lenses like Andreotti's HEADSUP tool (Andreotti, 2012). They underline that to varying extends the teachers they met were comfortable challenging charity-based initiatives and soft approaches to GE, and some of them were able to articulate an anti-oppressive position that challenges Eurocentric oppressive structures of knowledge and power (Stein, 2015). Questions remain in the authors as to how can teachers be supported to move from this anti-oppressive stance that fails to recognise one's complicity in the systems being critiqued, to the incommensurable position (Stein, 2015) where possibilities for engaging differently with existing world orders are imagined and enacted. In her chapter Hunt identifies a number of characteristics of 'a global learning school'. These are not a fixed and prescriptive list but rather a range of attributes and approaches that facilitate the systematic embedment of GE in school. Thus they could act as a guide to those schools willing to embark on a journey aimed at enhancing their own GE work. Lastly, Bentall offers in her chapter useful insights about the important role of continuing professional development (CPD) provided by external organisations and the characteristics of effective CPD for global learning. She underlines that the effectiveness of one-off CPD events is very limited because schools require ongoing support and a collaborative approach within and/or between schools.

The last part of this handbook, devoted to *Learning and Experiences and Being Global Citizens*, opens with a reflection proposed by Sutherland, Susa and Andreotti, about the challenges of designing a North-South service-learning programme that makes the most of its "potential to be disruptive, generative and transformative" (2020, p. 385), in order to "provoke a shift in how participants relate to themselves, to others and to knowledge" (2020, p. 386). With the critical and radical approach that characterises these authors, a case study is analysed, and its tensions and complexities are explored. Two more chapters address the potential of international experiences to develop global citizenship values. Liddy presents a case study on a short-term volunteering experience of Irish teachers providing courses to other teachers in India, examining how this experience had an impact on their practice at home, a learning that the author calls "apprenticeship of reflexivity" (Liddy, 2016). Blum offers a reflection on what one group of undergraduate students consider to be the learning arising from their experience of studying abroad and how this learning related to global issues and global citizenship. One common feature is the required support that participants in these programmes need in order to make sense of their learning. Much is needed in order to help them integrate their perspectives of the world with those of others, overcoming simplistic and paternalistic views. One chapter is devoted to informal learning with Le Bourdon inviting the readers to reflect on what makes informal spaces so "impactful" (2020, p. 403) in terms of GCE, understood as a lifelong learning process. Based on a case study, the author concludes that those spaces are fundamental once they promote affective learning moments of sharing, creating strong bonds and a sense of belonging. The last chapter brings a vision from the South, with Allen examining the views of young people from Tobago who have positive perceptions of global citizenship even if they do not feel included in it. Another challenge for the field.

Lastly, the handbook ends with a conclusion chapter by the editor, Douglas Bourn, who highlights the most salient elements of the Handbook: the consideration of GE as a distinctive

educational field; the diversity of countries covered by the chapters; the main themes that encompass all the contributions – i) the influence of critical pedagogy and post-colonial and post-structural thinking, ii) the construction of knowledge and its relation with power, iii) interdisciplinarity, iv) relation between learning and real-world experiences, and v) GE as challenging the dominant status quo in order to build a more equitable world; the need for stronger and independent research –; the need of more research; and the richness of the diversity present in the book.

These 488 pages demonstrates how GE is a flourishing field, with a wide range of perspectives and approaches. As Bourn stated in the introduction, the diversity of terms, concepts, meanings, approaches “is deliberate because this handbook does not aim to present some uniform approach to GE but to reflect the differing ways in which terms and concepts are interpreted” (Bourn, 2020, p. 3). However, this plurality of voices can bring some challenges: i) conceptual confusion, as expressed, for instance, by Bosio, who calls GCE a “multivocal symbol” (2020, p. 188); ii) contradictions and incoherencies between different interpretations, like those articulated by Bamber (2020, p. 264) with its distinction between *internationalization* and *internationalism* and the warning that some approaches focus more on cultivating “global workers rather than global citizens” (2020, p. 262). Such approaches, according to us, twist the meaning of GE to a point that we believe distort its vision, purpose, meaning and distinctiveness; iii) the superficial quotation of established GE scholars in a way that twists their words creating incoherence between the theoretical work of these scholars and the perspectives put forward by some authors; iv) the weakening of the educational distinctiveness of the field because of this very open space for interpretation. As Scheunpflug stresses in her chapter, research and a strong body of evidence (2020, p. 48) is needed. This is necessary and, as foreseen and wished by Bourn in the conclusion, “this Handbook will lead to a range of publications on GE that move the debates forward even more, that encourage differing voices and outline the outcomes of empirical research from all regions of the world” (Bourn, 2020, p. 453).

## REFERENCES

- Andreotti, V. (2012). Editor's preface: HEADSUP. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices*, 6(1), 1-3.
- Bourn, D. (2015). *The Theory and Practice of Development Education. A Pedagogy for Global Social Justice*. Oxon, New York: Routledge.
- Freire, P. (1997). *Pedagogy of Hope. Reliving Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Pike, G. (2015). Re-imagining global education in the neoliberal age: Challenges and opportunities. In R. Reynolds, et al. (Eds.), *Contesting and constructing international perspectives in global education* (pp. 11-25). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Stein, S. (2015). Mapping global citizenship. *Journal of College and Character*, 16(4), 242-52.