JSSE

Journal of Social Science Education

2021, Vol. 20(2) 26-46

Edited by:
Mehmet Açıkalın, Olga Bombardelli , Gina Chianese

Article

# Visiting the forced visitors - Critical and decentered approach to Global Citizenship Education as an inclusive educational response to forced youth migration

**Eva Harðardóttir**
*University of Iceland*

**Ólafur Páll Jónsson**
*University of Iceland*

**Keywords:** global citizenship education, refugee youth, inclusive education, decentering

- Migrant and refugee youth face complex challenges pertaining to educational and social inclusion in Europe and international contexts.
- Global Citizenship Education (GCE) has gained increased prevalence as an educational response to globalizing processes such as forced migration and resulting cultural diversity.
- It is argued that a critical and decentered model of GCE can be applied as an inclusive educational response to refugee youth within national educational settings.
- Visual and participatory educational practices emphasizing the role of the teacher as a 'visitor' are presented and discussed.

**Purpose:** To explore the role and possibilities of Global Citizenship Education (GCE) in attending to neglected aspects of inclusive education when responding to forced youth migration in Europe.

**Approach:** We discuss different approaches to GCE within the literature, their implications for refugee students within national educational settings and give an example of how critical GCE can be practiced in education.

**Finding:** Drawing on theoretical work of John Dewey and Hannah Arendt, in conjunction with more recent theoretical work on global citizenship within education, we argue that a critical and decentered model of GCE is important to support processes of inclusion and citizenship for refugee youth within national educational settings.

**Implications:** We apply and discuss the suggested theoretical approach in relation to pedagogical practices developed as a part of an ongoing research project on irregular processes of inclusion and citizenship for migrant and refugee youth in Iceland, Norway, and the UK.



**Corresponding Author:**
Eva Harðardóttir, School of Education, University of Iceland, Skipholt 37, 105 Reykjavík, evahar@hi.is

**Suggested citation:**
Harðardóttir, E; Jónsson, Ó. P. (2021): *Visiting the forced visitors - Critical and decentered approach to Global Citizenship Education as an inclusive educational response to forced youth migration.*. Journal of Social Science Education 20 (2). https://doi.org/10.11576/jsse-3970

**Declaration of Conflicts of Interests:** none

# 1 INTRODUCTION

While the majority of refugees reside in host countries in the global south (Dryden-Peterson, 2016) young refugees are resettling in increasing numbers in northern European countries in the hope of seeking safety, building a future, and continuing their education. Formal education is considered key for all migrant children and youth to ensure their integration and inclusion into society (UNESCO, 2018). Despite most national education systems claiming to uphold inclusive educational policies, conflicting ideas and approaches impact inclusive school practices (Magnússon, 2019; Slee, 2011). This is especially true when it comes to inclusive responses to migration and refugee education (Ham, et al., 2020; MIPEX, 2020; UNHCR et al., 2019) where a major focus is generally placed on teaching specific skills, such as the majority language, as a vehicle for inclusion and participation. This often excludes equally important aspects of education, including civic, cultural, and social concerns (Crul et al., 2019; Harðardóttir et al., 2019; Herzog-Punzenberger et al., 2020). As a result, migration and education scholars have called for both policymakers and practitioners to make constructive links between globalizing processes such as forced migration and complex notions of citizenship when conceptualizing the basis of inclusive education policies (Arnot et al., 2016; Sant et al., 2018; Tarozzi & Torres, 2016).

In response to that call, we seek to understand the role and possibilities of the recent but increasingly notable framework of Global Citizenship Education (GCE) in attending to neglected aspects of inclusive education when responding to forced youth migration in Europe. This article is written within the context of a comparative research project focusing on Irregular Processes of Inclusion and Citizenship (I-PIC) as experienced by migrant and refugee youth in selected upper-secondary schools in Iceland, Norway, and the UK (I-PIC, 2020). We first draw attention to the status of migrant and refugee students within the context of the countries participating in the I-PIC project. We then explore the increased importance of global citizenship within education, discussing distinct yet interrelated approaches to GCE as presented in the literature. We conclude by outlining our own critical and decentered approach to GCE. Deepening our analysis, we draw on the conceptual thinking of John Dewey and Hannah Arendt when considering the implications of our proposed approach to GCE for refugee youth within national educational settings. Finally, we provide selected examples of educational practices developed from the perspective of GCE as both decentered and critical. Our paper contributes to the work of policymakers and practitioners and encourages a critical and decentered approach to GCE, emphasizing visual and participatory educational practices.

# 2 REFUGEE YOUTH AND EDUCATION WITHIN THE EUROPEAN CONTEXT

A recent joint policy briefing from UNHCR, UNICEF and IMO (2019) on the access and inclusion of education for refugee and migrant children and youth in Europe, highlights the complex challenges they face within national school settings. Even though figures regarding refugee students are hard to come by the report estimates that out of 83,272,636 school age (five-to nineteen-year-olds) children and adolescents in Europe, four percent are born outside of Europe. Refugee youth, arriving to Europe in the past few years, are considered a subset of this group. According to the report, children born outside of Europe make up between three to five percent of the school going population in northern Europe. This includes Iceland where it is estimated that three percent of the school age population is born outside of Europe. In comparison, the UK and Norway, who have a longer history of hosting refugees than Iceland, have estimated figures of four percent (UK) and six percent (Norway) of children and youth of school going age born outside of Europe.

Evidence suggests that migrant and refugee youth face multiple barriers when it comes to educational and social inclusion across European countries. Recent reports point to migrant students experiencing lower educational outcomes, higher drop-out rates, and lower sense of well-being within schools, compared to native born students (Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2019; OECD, 2015). Similarly, research findings within the context of Iceland indicate that migrant youth experience challenges in relation to academic retention and achievement (Blöndal, et al., 2011; Grunfelder et al., 2018), are less likely than native Icelandic youth to benefit from their own neighborhood and school contexts (Rúnarsdóttir & Vilhjálmsson, 2019) and find it difficult to engage with native born peers (Ottósdóttir & Loncar, 2018; Tran, 2015). In their comparative study on educational inclusion of Syrian refugees in five countries, including three European countries, Crul et al. (2019) point towards the many systemic barriers impacting refugees' educational pathways. Specifically, shortcomings around parallel school systems and segregated refugee classes. They also criticize the fact that in most countries educational inclusion rests fundamentally on refugee youth being able to speak the majority language – while at the same time the system fails to provide adequate language support to this group.

Although most European countries are positive towards supporting educational and social inclusion of refugee youth (UNHCR et al., 2019), their national education policies are still largely shaped by assimilative and normative notions of integration, where inclusion is viewed from the perspective and benefits of the host country as opposed to the migrant students themselves (ECRI, 2020; MIPEX, 2020; Tarozzi & Torres, 2016). Harðardóttir et al. (2019) provide evidence that teachers working with refugee youth in Icelandic schools found it difficult to move beyond an instrumental competency-based framework reflected in public policies when describing their work with refugee

students. In accordance with other studies such as Herzog-Punzenberger et al. (2020) and Crul et al. (2019) Icelandic teachers commonly drew on a deficit model of inclusion focusing heavily on students' ability or inability to speak the majority language rather than address other challenges to inclusion.

The Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX, 2020) describes education policies in Iceland as halfway unfavorable to migrants. Receiving 45 points out of 100 in total, it is suggested that the policy is "insufficient to overcome language and social obstacles to equal opportunities in education". Iceland thus trails far behind countries such as Sweden and Finland who score 93 and 88 respectively but is doing better than for instance France and Greece who get 36 points. The UK gained 40 points for its education policies which are described as being slightly unfavorable especially for non-EU citizens. Norway, on the other hand, scored 71 points with slightly favorable education policies, mostly due to strong mother tongue support and for culturally diverse teaching staff (MIPEX, 2020). However, Osler (2016) examining citizenship, inclusion and belonging in Europe, argues that both Norway and the UK deploy national values and assimilation of minorities despite the urgent need for education policies and practices to be based on wider notions of inclusion.

Research on the facets of multiculturalism and citizenship within the Icelandic education system indicates constrained and nationalistic understanding of multiculturalism and citizenship (Halldórsdóttir et al., 2016; Jóhannesson, 2007). In Iceland, concepts of the Icelandic citizen have been cultivated since the initial struggle for independence (Jónsson, 2018). Thus, despite national policy documentation and aspirations for a socially inclusive and equitable education system (Bjarnason et al., 2016; Dýrfjörð et al., 2013; Jónsson & Sigurðardóttir, 2012) inclusion continues to be a contested concept amongst policy makers and practitioners alike in Iceland (Magnúsdóttir, 2016; Wolff et al., 2021). Historical narratives of the other, along with colonial and racialized ideologies, have found their way into public discourse in Iceland, including literature and curriculum material (Loftsdóttir, 2010). Similarly, Fylkesnes (2018) concludes, in her study on whiteness as expressed through teacher education policies in Norway, that even though national education policies are explicitly narrated within Norwegian society as promoters of social justice, they inadvertently express forms of racialized exclusion and othering by honoring the Norwegian identity as the superordinate citizen.

Concerns about division and racism within education are important in this respect. According to Loftsdóttir (2020, p. 2) "racism is not only about hateful acts but also about institutionalized praxis" including how national education policy and practices respond to and work with forced youth migration in relation to inclusion and citizenship. Current educational frameworks, within and outside of Europe, are also heavily influenced by neo-liberal discourse and developments (Ball, 2015) emphasizing individual responsibility, global competitiveness, and standardization (Blossing, Imsen, & Moos, 2014; Reay, 2016). As a result, global, and national education policies focus increasingly

on the divide between native and migrant students, often depicting the latter as low-performers or lacking in ability compared to native students (OECD, 2010; Torslev & Borsch, 2017). In Iceland, as in other countries, a marketized model of education, focusing on global competitiveness, has resulted in heightened inequalities in choice, access, and achievement for migrant families and students (Auðardóttir & Kosunen, 2020; Magnúsdóttir et al., 2020).

# 3 GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION AND REFUGEE YOUTH

Global migration has not only changed the demographics of school settings across national education systems but has also brought the concept of citizenship to the forefront of education policy and practice (Adalbjarnadottir, 2007; Osler & Starkey, 2008; Tarozzi & Torres, 2016; Yemini, 2016). In 2012, the former UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, launched the Global Education First Initiative where fostering global citizenship was outlined as an equally important priority in education as providing access and ensuring quality. The initiative reflected a "shift in the role and purpose of education to that of forging more just, peaceful, tolerant and inclusive societies" (UNESCO, 2015, p. 5). The quest for a better world and the role of education in shaping that world is carefully laid out as a part of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) agenda which aims to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education for all by 2030, referring specifically to global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity as means to achieving that goal (UN, 2015).

The SDGs reflect a growing interest in Global Citizenship Education (GCE) generally understood as a value-based response to the many globalizing processes affecting people across the world (Bosio & Torres, 2019; Torres, 2017; UNESCO, 2015). There are distinct yet interrelated models of GCE being used to promote different conceptions of citizenship education in a global context. The various models and approaches to GCE reflect stakeholders' different understanding and often competing agendas (Pashby et al., 2020; Sant et al., 2018; Yemini, 2017). Below we will discuss some of the more prominent approaches of GCE in addition to more complex and nuanced typologies. Drawing on these we then outline our own model of GCE, which we believe may be both theoretically clarifying and also practical in supporting inclusive responses to migrant youth within educational settings.

The first approach to GCE, commonly addressed within global and national education policies and practices, focuses on human rights and equality, emphasizing unity based on universally acclaimed values such as empathy and tolerance. It aligns with different fields of knowledge including liberal multiculturalism and humanitarianism, highlighting individual's moral values and social responsibilities (Pashby et al., 2020; Yemini, 2017). This approach recognizes global issues such as poverty and forced migration as important aspects of GCE but often highlights lack of resources and skills or cites dissident culture as possible roots of these problems as opposed to critically

engaging with historical and social structures such as unequal power relations (Andreotti, 2006). At its best, it might spark students' interest in global issues and possible solutions while still running the risk of dissecting the student population according to backgrounds or abilities (Slee, 2011). Andreotti (2006) describes this as a divide between 'ordinary' individuals who form part of global solutions and other individuals who are a part of global problems. Today, when racism and otherness are no longer based on spatial or geographical distances but often produced and reproduced within local education (Loftsdóttir, 2020; Tarozzi & Torres, 2016, p. 25; UNHCR et al., 2019), it is important to critically consider all practices that could, even inadvertently, underpin such divisive notions between native and refugee students within national educational settings.

The second approach to global citizenship within education rests on neoliberal ideologies building on human capital theory where GCE is commonly arranged in relation to a set of skills or competences necessary to succeed in a global world (Pashby et al., 2020; Yemini, 2017). Neo-liberal ideologies shaping GCE often focus on curricula and educational activities from the perspective of global competitiveness and standardization. Such priorities reflect what Jónsson and Rodriquez (2019, p. 6) call "the market conception of democracy" in which schools strive to make people compete in a market of ideas. The role of the school is thus to prepare students for citizenship in a society they do not belong to but must adapt to. The neo-liberal approach also places rich emphasis on individual rights and responsibilities in terms of educational choices and achievement, paying little attention to structural inequalities to which most refugee youth are subjected in their everyday lives (UNHCR et al., 2019; WRC & UNHCR, 2016). Both above-mentioned approaches can be considered 'soft' versions of GCE (Andreotti, 2006) whereas neither one tackles the status quo nor considers it necessary to move beyond a pre-defined idea of citizenship and inclusion (Torres, 2017). While it is helpful to consider the most common approaches to GCE in terms of these two categories, reflecting a liberal/humanitarian approach on the one hand and neo-liberal/human capital approach on the other, more nuanced analysis is needed to understand the role and possibility of GCE in relation to educational responses to forced youth migration which is the aim of this article.

Oxley and Morris (2013) set out to distinguish the many different, and often overlapping, conceptions of global citizenship (GC) within education by developing a typology based on two general forms of GC: cosmopolitan and advocacy based. The two forms entail four distinct conceptions of global citizenship, a total of eight, each underpinning different details and interests. The authors maintain that the cosmopolitan form of global citizenship is generally associated with ideas of universality and human rights from the perspective of the individual, within which political, moral, economic, and cultural conceptions fall. The latter form, advocacy-based GC, comprises relativist and holistic ideas about global citizenship, including social, critical, environmental, and spiritual conceptions of GC. It is important to note that Oxley and Morris (2013) do not

see their typology as fixed or static but indeed recognize that many conceptions of GC exist or move between different categories in line with the wide range of interpretation and meaning associated with GC across different contexts.

We concur to this perspective and consider their analysis useful in understanding the often-ambiguous role of GCE within increasingly complex and diverse national educational settings. However, we find it less helpful to dissect the different theoretical underpinnings to global citizenship into the two forms of cosmopolitan (individual) and advocacy-based (anti-individual) approaches. Teaching and learning about global citizenship is less contrasted by cosmopolitan or advocacy-based forms than it is by the critical or non-critical approach used to address young peoples' citizenship and inclusion in relation to different dimensions (i.e. political, moral, economic, cultural, social, environmental, and spiritual). Moreover, GCE is impacted, perhaps more than any other educational concept, by relational factors such as time and space. This is especially true for refugee youth who traverse a myriad of formal and informal boundaries in their migration journeys, where different conceptions of global citizenship, shed very different lights on their individual and social circumstances.

Oxley and Morris (2013) define critical conception of citizenship as one of the advocacy-based categories of GC by referring to critical pedagogy authors such as Freire and Andreotti, who write from a post-colonial point of view, focusing on social inequalities and the emancipation role of education. However, we find the critical aspect of citizenship to be more useful as an analytical perspective than a distinct category. One could say that both Freire and Andreotti are indeed authors that address a range of different dimensions of GC in their work, concerning themselves with individual (i.e. moral and political) as well as social or holistic (i.e. social, spiritual) elements of citizenship, but always from a critical perspective. Hence, a critical conception of global citizenship within education, as we understand it, is much rather a matter of approach than a distinct theoretical category. The categories presented by Oxley and Morris (2013) are nevertheless important as they capture the wide range of elements of GC, policymakers and practitioners working with refugee youth should be able to address. Whether these different categories or dimensions are addressed critically or not, then becomes a key question. Pashby et al. (2020) reflect upon this question in their work while also discussing the complexities of critical approaches to GCE within policy and practice.

> First, critical can refer to any approach that raises the status quo as problematic, grouping together quite distinct approaches. Second, most critical approaches retain a strong interface with liberal orientations either explicitly or implicitly, including some with neoliberal-liberal interfaces (Pashby et al., 2020, p. 153).

Their analysis is a good reminder that any approach to GCE is likely to include elements of another approach or relate to more than one ideology. Pashby and colleagues aim to shift the focus from the various conceptions of GCE towards thinking

about how we approach these complexities and paradoxes. They suggest looking at GCE from different levels of interventions: methodological (the level of doing), epistemological (the level of thinking) and ontological (the level of being). At the methodological level of intervention, teaching and learning about GCE can aim for changes, progress, and solutions to global problems in an effort to make a better world, without necessarily thinking about what that means to different people at different scales. Intervening at the epistemological level is, on the other hand, a way to think more constructively about global issues by focusing on how different worldviews and ideas have been provided varying levels of power and legitimacy. "By applying such approach, the focus shifts from thinking only about the process of making a better world towards asking what such a world would look like from different perspectives" (Pashby et al., 2020, p. 158). The authors further point out that:

> Epistemological interventions, particularly critically-oriented responses, have been crucial in denaturalising both liberal and neoliberal approaches to global citizenship that reproduce universalising – and thus, structurally exclusionary and evolutionary – visions of the world (Pashby et al., 2020, p. 159).

The above quote highlights how important it is to approach the epistemological dimension of citizenship from a critical point of view to ensure that diverse and alternative perspectives are recognized and included as a part of the general discourse. Reading it in that way can make a difference for refugee youth, who have been historically disregarded within national and global policies and decision-making processes concerning them (Bastien & Hólmarsdóttir, 2015; WRC & UNHCR, 2016).

Andreotti (2015, p. 226) explains in her work that teaching and learning about GCE has to take place at the margins of political and existential levels, where we are able to "disarm and de-center ourselves". This means that we must be able to look at the many overlapping dimensions of citizenship that impact people's everyday lives while also considering and even questioning our own position, knowing and being. The act of decentering can also be described as *epistemic humility* where one is open to plural and unknown ways of interpreting the world and is thus able to interrupt the 'single story' of what represents valid worldview, knowledge, and experiences (Sant et al., 2018, p. 41). We understand the critical orientation of decentering as one of the most important aspects of GCE when considering its role for refugee youth within national educational settings. Especially as it relates to the act of *visiting* and constructing pedagogical spaces "where cultural diversity can be considered a meaningful key in re-interpreting contemporary society and school reform" (Torres, 2017, p. 77). We will discuss this connection later in the article building on the theoretical understanding of Dewey and Arendt.

To summarize the above discussion, we present our own model of GCE, which highlights eight different and overlapping dimensions of citizenship. Seven of the eight dimensions are the same as outlined by Oxley and Morris (2013). As we consider

criticality a matter of approach, important to address the different dimensions of GC, rather than one more dimension, we position it on the left side of the model along with the notion of decentering. The eighth dimension in our model is epistemological in the spirit of Pashby et al. (2020). This dimension concerns questions of whose knowledge is valued and why. We find it important to place epistemology as a dimension rather than approach as it is often overlooked or neglected in the context of citizenship, especially in the case of refugee youth who are frequently placed in the position of those who lack civic and social knowledge instead of being able to contribute and create it.

**Figure 1: A model for critical and decentered GCE**

| | | SCALE | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CRITICAL AND DECENTERED APPROACH | **THEORETICAL DIMENSION** | Personal | Local | National | Global |
| | Political | | | | |
| | Moral | | | | |
| | Economic | | | | |
| | Cultural | | | | |
| | Social | | | | |
| | Environmental | | | | |
| | Spiritual | | | | |
| | Epistemological | | | | |

Apart from emphasizing a critical and decentered approach to the different and overlapping dimensions of global citizenship we also find it important for anyone addressing GCE within the context of national educational settings to address how all these dimensions impact the lives of young refugees differently at personal, local, national, and global scales. Understanding GCE from a relational perspective is important for refugee youth who often find themselves caught in an impasse between personal aspirations, global promises of human rights and excluding national or local realities (Dryden-Peterson, 2016). The different dimensions of the model (theoretical dimensions and scale) may also offer practical support in responding to controversial or polarized views within the classroom. The figure shows different theoretical dimensions from which such views might be responded to. This could be done for example, by responding to a politically provocative view, by drawing attention to other dimension such as epistemic, environmental, or spiritual. Likewise, one can approach it from the perspective of different scales, for example by asking what the implications of that view might be for ones personal life or local community. One might thus use the model as a didactic tool to critically engage with different and possibly opposing views in the classroom. In the following chapter we draw on the work of Dewey and Arendt to

explain the importance of applying a critical and decentered approach to CGE in order to support the inclusion and citizenship of refugee youth within national educational settings.

# 4 CRITICAL AND DECENTERED GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION FOR REFUGEE YOUTH

Forced global migration and its impact on young peoples' local realities clearly calls for a reconsideration of education policies and practices. In these unprecedented times, it is important not to lose sight of education as critical in responding to social challenges. We thus turn to Dewey who wrote passionately about the need to reconsider key concepts within education based on "a plan of operations proceeding from a level deeper and more inclusive than is represented by the practices and ideas of the contending parties" (Dewey, 1938, p. 2). A key dimension in Dewey's criticism of the conventional education system of his times was its lack of opportunities for young people to encounter different situations through modes of openness, reflection, and critical thinking.

> How many acquired special skills by means of automatic drill so that their power of judgement and capacity to act intelligently in new situations was limited? […] How many found what they did learn so foreign to the situations of life outside the school as to give them no power of control over the latter? (Dewey, 1938, p. 9).

These are important considerations today when analyzing what kind of approach to GCE offers refugee youth opportunities of educational openness and inclusion. Dewey was concerned with education supporting young people to act intelligently, by which he meant providing the possibility of reflecting on one's past and current situation enabling one to envision a meaningful future. Refugee youth, who find themselves repeatedly in new situations rarely experience being in a safe space where they are able to reflect on and share their thoughts with others and subsequently gain control over their lives (UNHCR et al., 2019); let alone construct a stable vision of a meaningful future. Nayeri (2019) describes these sentiments of time, space, and sharing one's thoughts in the lives of refugees in her semi-autobiographical book *The ungrateful refugee*: *What immigrants never tell you.*

> The waiting began to take its toll. It's a terrifying place […] The future brings anxiety because you don't belong and can't move forward. The past brings depression because you can't go home, your memories fade and everything you know is gone (Nayeri, 2019, pp. 207-208).

> […] stories are everything. Everyone has one having just slipped out from the grip of a nightmare. Everyone is a stranger, in need of introduction. It wasn't just a past time. Our stories were drumming with power (Nayeri, 2019, p. 6).

Unfortunately, school systems usually disregard the powerful stories of refugee students, demanding them to wait until they have acquired the "right" set of competencies enabling them to align to either national or global standards (Harðardóttir & Magnúsdóttir, 2018; Herzog-Punzenberger et al., 2020). The question we must ask is how national education settings can promote inclusive spaces in the spirit of Dewey (1939) where refugee youth are included as important knowledge creators.

Biesta (2006, 2010) describes such a space where young people are free to 'come into the presence' and 'create new beginnings'. Coming into presence, he explains, is not an individual act of showing off or forcing your point of view upon others. "It is about beginning in a world full of other beginners in such a way that the opportunities for others to begin are not obstructed" (Biesta, 2006, p. 49). Similarly, Sant et al. (2018) refer to the work of Ermine (2007) to describe the notion of an ethical space in which interaction between people is premised on plurality and cultural diversity. From an educational perspective, this is a space where both teachers and students acknowledge their own location and contribution and those of others, mindful of the fact that many different worldviews exist that contribute to knowledge. This is also outlined in Dewey's contextual and social thinking about democracy and education where democracy is a personal way of life, sustained only through "amicable cooperation [...] in which both parties learn by giving the other a chance to express itself, instead of having one party conquer by forceful suppression of the other" (Dewey, 1939 p.342). An educational space where refugee youth can come into the world and present their new beginnings is only possible if educational settings allow for diversity and difference; not only to exist but also in the belief that it truly adds value and worth to the way we understand and respond to the world (Jónsson, 2011).

Andreotti, Biesta, and Ahenakew (2015) present a conceptual model of global mindedness based on a complex notion of encounters – one that takes into consideration situated contextual factors above and beyond individual capacities. They build on Hanna Arendt's (1977) metaphors of *tourism, empathy* and *visiting* as three ways of engaging with diversity and difference. In short, *tourism* is understood as viewing others and different points of view from your own perspective. One encounters new places and people but always with a certain distance producing only a superficial impression or a fleeting memory. *Empathy* on the other hand is about seeing through the eyes of others. It is where one takes on the point of the other and sees things from their perspective – a kind of fusion of self and other (Andreotti et al., 2015). Empathy has been largely promoted as a key competence to facilitate social cohesion and cultural understanding. It has also been criticized for drawing on normative sameness (Dillabough, 2016) and reducing plurality (Biesta, 2010). While we consider it important to feel deeply for other people, empathy is an emotion that often overlooks the agency of the other and is therefore not likely to sustain empowering acts.

*Visiting* however, is where we see the possibility for empowerment. It is about having your own thoughts and feelings displaced, i.e. put in a context different from your own. Visiting is a metaphor used to reflect the act of placing your own perspective in a location, which not only is different from your customary location but is one where you don't feel at home. Engaging with diversity through visiting is thus not "to be or to feel like somebody else, nor of counting noses and joining a majority but of being and thinking in my own identity where actually I am not" (Arendt, 1977, p. 237). It is about decentering yourself, locating yourself in a story that may be very different from your own (Biesta, 2006).

Arendt's metaphors provide a useful context for educational reflection and responses to cultural diversity and difference; they also create an opportunity to transcend the static role of the outsider often forced upon refugee youth within national educational settings. If teachers can approach the different and intertwined dimensions of GCE from a critical and decentered approach, as presented in our model above, it opens the potential to create an educational space of new beginnings. A space where students are not only regarded as important knowledge-makers, able to develop and share their own perspectives, but also where teachers become visitors in their students' lives. By approaching CGE from a critical and decentered perspective, teachers shift their focus from the "right set" of knowledge and skills towards creating a range of "possibilities for action" (Andreotti et al., 2015, p. 253) at different scales (i.e. personal, local, national and global). The contextual and situated relationship between the personal and the social, the individual and the world, is also highlighted in Dewey's work:

> As an individual passes from one situation to another, his world, his environment, expands or contracts. He does not find himself living in another world but in a different part or aspect of one and the same world (Dewey, 1938, p. 18).

Here, Dewey and Arendt come together in focusing on how we ultimately share the same world but from many different perspectives and positions. Perhaps the most unique aspect of the act of visiting is that it creates a moment of dislocation. The visitor, whether he likes it or not, is momentarily out of his ordinary position and thus out of place which, according to Arendt (1977), is a fundamental condition for understanding how the world looks different to someone else. This positioning reflects the epistemological aspect of the visitor metaphor. Being dislocated enables us to develop representative thinking where one's opinion is determined by the position of the person being visited. For refugee and migrant youth who frequently experience being mis-represented or not represented at all within national education policies and practices these are not just theoretically important considerations but carry with them practical elements of freedom and hope.

> The ability to see the same thing from various standpoints, stays in the human world; it is simply the exchange of the standpoint given us by nature for that of

> someone else, with whom we share the same world, resulting in a true freedom of movement in our mental world, that parallels our freedom in the physical one (Arendt, 2005, p. 168).

A step in this direction would reflect what Arendt (2005) referred to as the 'promise of politics'. That is, ensuring educational policies and practices where diversity grows through the positions and perspectives of those who have been deemed other.

In the following chapter we attempt to bridge the gap between the academic discussion of critical approaches to GCE and practical implementation (Pashby et al., 2020; Yemini, 2017). We present selected examples of visual and participatory educational practices reflecting a critical and decentered approach to GCE. The practices presented are inspired by methods of photovoice (Latz, 2017; Wang & Burris, 1997) and developed in relation to a teachers guideline within the I-PIC project, which aims to support processes of inclusion and citizenship for refugee youth in upper secondary schools in Iceland, Norway, and the UK. While the guideline was designed specifically with migrant and refugee youth in mind to be used within formal educational settings, it can easily be adapted for non-formal educational settings, across academic fields and subjects, and to different age groups.

# 5 TEACHERS AS VISITORS

In the spirit of Sant et al. (2018) we recognize that GCE cannot be reduced to specific set of educational practices and that no manual can offer the right way of teaching global citizenship (Sant et al., 2018, p. 27). We understand the practices presented in the guideline as subject to continuous development and scrutinization where questions and considerations about power, participation, openness etc. are raised. The guideline is divided into five steps suggesting a set of activities inclusive of three components: 1) *Set-up*, 2) *activities* and 3) *reflections*. The set-up consists of teachers offering students motivations, explanations, or instructions in relation to the proposed activities. This includes asking questions about how we might think differently about key concepts and assumptions in relation to our historical, cultural, or socio-political understanding (Andreotti, 2014). To give an example, the first activity proposed in the guideline is about exploring images and spaces. The initial step taken by teachers would be to ask students to carefully look around the classroom or whatever space the group is in and consider questions such as:

- What can we read from this space? What is this space telling us?
- Is there anything that indicates the past or history of the space?
- Are there visible or invisible rules or restrictions (hierarchies) in the space?
- Where is the "best" and "worst" place to be within the space and why?

Looking critically at your immediate environment can be an important first step to engage with the world at large. The questions are meant to prepare students for a following activity, which is to take a picture of a public space where they 'belong'. The notion of belonging, as it is used in the guideline, relates to recognizing the experiences and connections of students in relation to their social settings. For students, who might be experiencing dislocation, there may still be places or spaces to which they connect. Recognition of this connection is important, as those are the spaces into which the teacher or other students can be invited to as visitors.

A second example of an activity where the relationship between the personal and the social is explored is an activity called *expedition*. After having set up with critical questions and considerations, teachers and students go for a walk along a route that has been pre-determined by the teachers. This can be any route at all but determining it before the activity takes place allows teachers to focus on a particular area, neighborhood, or other important places and spaces in the lives of students. During the walk, students are asked to take pictures of anything (except other people) that might evoke their feelings, positive and negative.

The activity requires teachers to listen carefully to students and make necessary pauses when either individuals or the group itself engages with the environment to take pictures. It explores how shared social settings affect the group and how certain spaces speak to us in different ways while also attending to the inter-personal relationship between teachers and students in the spirit of Dewey (1938). Harðarson (2018, p. 546) discusses how Dewey rejects the dualism between teachers and learners. In the same way, the guideline invites teachers to learn and learners to teach, encouraging teachers to continuously position themselves as visitors who have been invited to explore the experiences and perspectives shared by their students. The Deweyan (1938) vision of the teacher as a learner can be understood as a requirement to the decentering practice of visiting (Arendt, 1977) when applied within educational settings. Both Dewey and Arendt understand the importance of shifting agency and power, away from traditional authority and towards those that have been deemed powerless, for meaningful experiences and diversity to grow.

Building on methods of photovoice, the guideline suggests a range of different picture-taking activities focusing on different elements of photography and how photographs can be used to share personal perspectives or social positions. Using photographs in relation to educational activities calls for both ethical and legal considerations. These are discussed carefully in the guideline (see also Latz, 2017; Wang & Redwood-Jones, 2001). It is important to note that even though the guideline suggests activities that revolve around different kinds of photographic activities, the aim is not for students to take "beautiful" or aesthetically perfect photographs but rather, in the spirit of critical and decentered GCE, to capture and consider different points of view and new understanding regarding the things, places and spaces that appear in the pictures.

Photographs are considered an important alternative narrative for refugee and migrant youth to express their experiences and perspectives. Traditional learning activities rely heavily on students' ability to read and write the majority language, which is a major barrier, hindering young people with refugee background in responding to the educational opportunities they are provided with. Biesta (2006) claims that we cannot "approach language as a set of skills that students simply must acquire, but that we see it as a human practice in which students can participate and through which they can find new ways of expressing themselves" (Biesta, 2006, p. 139). Pictures become an alternative or additional medium of expression used to capture students' diverse experiences and perspectives. More importantly, they also become a tool with which the students can position themselves as knowledge creators, who are able to offer others the opportunity to visit their perspectives.

Allowing students to capture many images of what they consider to be important to their everyday lives as opposed to taking only one picture, aims at catching the range of situations young people pass through and the different worldly aspects they reflect in the spirit of Dewey (1938). Teachers play an important facilitation role, which is why the guideline encourages and supports them with critical and decentering questions and considerations. These include considerations about how to create meaningful links between personal and local everyday experiences of students and national and global issues where normative assumptions about global citizenship and inclusion are interrogated (see also Torres, 2017; Sant et al., 2018).

After each picture-taking activity, teachers and students collectively engage in an exercise of reflection where they study each other's pictures by using a list of analytical questions inspired by the photography-based research work of Latz (2017) and McIntyre (2003):

1. When was the photo taken?
2. Where was the photo taken?
3. What can you see in the photo?
4. Is there something in this photo that only you realize or understand?
5. Who or what belongs to this space or place?
6. Is there anything missing from this photo?
7. What is the most important thing about this photo?
8. What were you thinking when you took the photo?

The aim of proposing reflective questions after each picture-taking activity, over an extended period of time, is to create not just one but several opportunities for students to engage with a range of diverse experiences and perspectives. These opportunities consequently support their 'possibilities for action' (Andreotti et al., 2015) based on diverse knowledge, understanding and perspectives. Teachers are also continuously

encouraged to approach teaching and learning from a critical and decentered point of view because:

> …we have to engage with our own and other perspectives to learn and transform our views/identities/relationship… without telling learners what they should think or do by creating spaces where they are safe to analyze and experiment with other forms of seeing/thinking being/relating to one another (Andreotti, 2006, p. 48).

In relation to the GCE model we presented in Figure 1, this means that whatever dimensions or scales teachers are focusing on, the determinants for a productive action must be compatible with the work being critical and decentered. Such educational context provides teachers the possibility of being invited – as visitors – to explore the different standpoints their students have developed within a shared world (Arendt, 2005). By doing so, refugee students' experiences are allowed to grow in the Deweyan (1938) sense through the plurality of worldviews that people visit and revisit to form a learning community.

## 6 CONCLUSION

The increasing number of young people who have been forced to leave their countries of origin and who are now seeking safety in European countries, hoping to continue their education, is a matter of urgency as regards to the need to reconsider education policies and practices within national educational settings. The changing demographic landscape in many countries, including those that are regarded as egalitarian countries such as Iceland, Norway, and the UK, is nevertheless one of increased division and divide. Educational responses to refugees and migrant students in general have been designed based on normative multicultural policies focusing heavily on students learning the majority language as a means to assimilate and adapt to national or global standards. Global Citizenship Education has gained increased traction in policies and practices, reflected for example in the way in which education is presented in the UN Sustainable Development Goals.

In this article we have highlighted how different GCE approaches have varying implications for refugee youth. We have proposed a critical and decentered approach to GCE to support inclusive educational response to refugee youth within national educational settings. Drawing on the work of Arendt and Dewey, we have provided a deeper analysis of the pedagogical and political role of education for refugee youth, through the metaphor of teachers becoming visitors in their students' lives. Attempting to bridge between abstract critical theoretical discussions and actual implementation, we have presented selected educational practices from a teacher guideline developed within a comparative research project concerning refugee youth, inclusive education and citizenship in Iceland, Norway, and the UK. The presented practices are intended for policy makers and practitioners. They provide suggestions on how to create educational

settings where refugee youth play an important part in generating and sharing diverse world views and perspectives through their visual and narrative accounts.

The stories of the forced visitors are of critical importance to the process of educational inclusion and citizenship within national educational settings in Europe. It is equally important that the story of public education in affluent countries becomes one where those often-silenced stories are heard, and where the locals, be it teachers or students, become the visitors in the life of the other through critical and decentering pedagogies.

## REFERENCES


Adalbjarnadottir, S. (2007). *Virðing og umhyggja: Ákall 21. aldar* [Respect and care: The call of the 21st century]. Reykjavík: Heimskringla.

Andreotti, V. (2006). Soft versus critical global citizenship education. *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review 3*(Autumn), 40-51.

Andreotti, V. (2014). Critical literacy: Theories and practices in development education. *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review* (19), 12-33.

Andreotti, V. (2015). Global citizenship education otherwise: Pedagogical and theoretical insights. In A. Abdi, L. Shultz & T. Pillay (Eds.), *Decolonizing global citizenship education* (pp. 221-230). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Andreotti, V., Biesta, G. J. J., & Ahenakew, C. (2015). Between the nation and the globe: Education for global mindedness in Finland. *Globalisation Societies and Education, 13*(2), 246-259.

Arendt, H. (1977). *Between past and future.* New York: Penguin Books.

Arendt, H. (2005). *The promise of politics*. New York: Schocken Books.

Arnot, M., Schneider, C., & Weply, O. (2016). *Education, mobilities and migration: People, ideas and resources.* New York: Routledge.

Auðardóttir, A. M. & Kosunen, S. (2020). Choosing private compulsory schools: A means for class distinction or responsible parenting? *Research in Comparative and International Education, 15*(2), 97-115.

Ball, S. (2015). What is policy? 21 years later: Reflections on the possibilities of policy research. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 36*(3), 306-313.

Bastien, S., & Hólmarsdóttir, H. (2015). *Youth 'at the margins': Critical perspectives and experiences of engaging youth in research worldwide.* Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Biesta, G. J. J. (2006). *Beoynd learning: Democratic education for a human future*. London: Boulder.

Biesta, G. J. J. (2010). How to exist politically and learn from it: Hannah Arendt and the problem of democratic education. *Teachers Collge Record, 112*(2), 556-575.

Bjarnason, D. S., Gunnþórsdóttir, H., & Jónsson, Ó. P. (Eds.). (2016). *Skóli margbreytileikans: Menntun og manngildi í kjölfar Salamanca* [School of Diversity following Salamanca]. Reykjavík: Iceland University Press.

Blossing, U., Imsen, G., & Moos, L. (Eds.). (2014). *The Nordic education model: 'A school for all' encounters neo-liberal policy*. London: Springer.

Blöndal, S., Jónasson, J. T., & Tannhauser, A. C. (2011). Dropout in a small society: Is the Icelandic case somehow different? In S. Lamb, E. Markussen, R. Teese, N. Sandberg, &

J. Polesel (Eds.), *School dropout and completion: International comparative studies in theory and policy* (pp. 233-252). London: Springer.

Bosio, E., & Torres, C. A. (2019). Global citizenship education: An educational theory of the common good? A conversation with Carlos Alberto Torres. *Policy Futures in Education, 17*(6), 745-760.

Commission/EACEA/Eurydice. (2019). *Integrating students from migrant backgrounds into schools in Europe: National policies and measures. Eurydice Report*. Luxembourg: European Commission.

Crul, M., Franz, L., Özge, B., Nihad, B., Elif, K., Ifigenia, K., . . . Shuayb, M. (2019). How the different policies and school systems affect the inclusion of Syrian refugee children in Sweden, Germany, Greece, Lebanon and Turkey. *Comparative Migration Studies, 7*(10), 1-20.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Kappa Delta Pi.

Dewey, J. (1939). Creative democracy - The task before us. In L. A. Hickman & T. M. Alexander (Eds.), *The essential Dewey*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Dillabough, J. (2016). Gender, social justice and citizenship in education: Engaging space, the narrative imagination and relationality. In A. Peterson, R. Hattam, M. Zembylas, & A. James (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of education for citizenship and social justice* (pp. 49-71). London: Palgrave.

Dryden-Peterson, S. (2016). Refugee education: Crossroads of globalization. *Educational Researcher, 45*(9), 473-482.

Dýrfjörð, K., Kristinsson, Þ., & Magnúsdóttir, B. R. (2013). *Jafnrétti.* [Equality]. Reykjavík: The Icelandic Directorate of Education.

ECRI. (2020). *Annual report on ECRI's activities: Covering the period from 1 January to 31 December 2019*. Strasbourg: European Comission Against Racism and Intelorance.

Ermine, W. (2007). The ethical space of engagement. *Indigenous Law Journal, 6*(1), 193-203.

Fylkesnes, S. (2018). Whiteness in teacher education research discourses: A review of the use and meaning making of the term cultural diversity. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 71*, 24-33.

Grunfelder, J., Rispling, L., & Norlén, G. (2018). *State of the Nordic region.* Copenhagen: Nordic Council of Ministers.

Halldórsdóttir, B. E., Magnúsdóttir, B. R., & Jónsson, Ó. P. (2016). Education for democracy, citizenship and social justice: The case of Iceland. In A. Peterson, R. Hattam, M. Zembylas, & J. Arthur (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of education for citizenship and social justice* (pp. 435-463). London: Palgrave.

Ham, S., Song, H., & Yang, K. (2020). Towards a balanced multiculturalism? Immigrant integration policies and immigrant children's educational performance. *Social Policy and Administration 54*(5), 630-645.

Harðardóttir, E. & Magnúsdóttir, B.R. (2018). Að þreifa sig áfram í myrkrinu: Ríkjandi stefnur og straumar um ungt flóttafólk í íslensku grunn- og framhaldsskólakerfi [Moving in the dark: Policy discourse on young refugees within the Icelandic compulsory and upper-secondary school system]. *Icelandic Review of Politics and Administration, 14*(3), 183-204.

Harðardóttir, E., Magnúsdóttir, B. R., Dillabough, J. (2019). Understanding the politics of inclusion, the 'refugee' and the nation: Analysis of public policies and teacher narratives in Iceland. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1707306

Harðarson, A. (2018). The teacher is a learner: Dewey on aims in education. *Educational Philosphy and Theory, 50*(5), 538-547.

Herzog-Punzenberger, B., Altrichter, H., Brown, M., Burns, D., Nortvedt, G. A., Skedsmo, G., . . . O'hara, J. (2020). Teachers responding to cultural diversity: case studies on assessment practices, challenges and experiences in secondary schools in Austria, Ireland, Norway and Turkey. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 32*, 395-424.

I-PIC. (2020). *About I-PIC.* Retrieved from https://evahardar.wixsite.com/ipicproject/blank-page

Jóhannesson, I. Á. (2007). Fjölmenning og sjálfbær þróun: Lykilatriði skólastarfs eða óþægilegir aðskotahlutir [Multicultaralism and sustainable development: Key aspects of school practices or uncomfortable objects]. *Netla, Online Journal on Pedagogy and Education.* https://netla.hi.is/greinar/2007/018/index.htm

Jónsson, Ó. P. (2011). *Lýðræði, réttlæti og menntun*. [Democracy, justice, and education]. Reykjavík: Iceland University Press.

Jónsson, Ó. P. (2018). Lýðræði og borgaravitund: Hugsjón, stefna og tómarúm [Democracy and citizenship: Ideal, direction and vacuum]. In V. Árnason & H. A. Henryson (Eds.), *What defines Icelandic democracy* (pp. 213-238). Reykjavík: Iceland University Press.

Jónsson, Ó. P., & Rodriguez, A. G. (2021). Educating democracy: Competences for a democratic culture. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice, 16*(1), 62-77. https://doi.org/10.1177/1746197919886873

Jónsson, Ó. P., & Sigurðardóttir, Þ. B. (2012). *Lýðræði og mannréttindi* [Democracy and Human Rights]. Reykjavík: The Icelandic Directorate of Education.

Latz, A. O. (2017). *Photovoice research in education and beyond: A practical guide from theory to exhibition*. London: Routledge.

Loftsdóttir, K. (2010). Encountering others in the Icelandic schoolbooks: Images of imperialism and racial diversity in the 19th century. Opening the mind or drawing boundaries? In Þ. Helgason & S. Lässig (Eds.), *History texts in Nordic schools* (pp. 81-105). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht UniPress.

Loftsdóttir, K. (2020). An alternative world: a perspective from the North on racism and migration. *Race & Clas*s. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306396820948320

Magnúsdóttir, B. R. (2016). Skóli án aðgreiningar: Átakapólar, ráðandi straumar og stefnur innan rannsóknarsviðsins [Inclusive school: Conflicting poles in policies and trends within the research field]. In D. S. Bjarnason, Ó. P. Jónsson, & H. Gunnþórsdóttir (Eds.), *Skóli margbreytileikans í kjölfar Salamanca* (pp. 67-94). Reykjavík: Iceland University Press.

Magnúsdóttir, B. R., Auðardóttir, A. M. & Stefánsson, K. (2020). The distribution of economic and educational capital between school catchment areas in Reykjavík capital region 1997-2016. *Icelandic Review of Politics and Administration, 16*(2), 285-308.

Magnússon, G. (2019). An amalgam of ideals – Images of inclusion in the Salamanca Statement. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 23*(7-8), 677-690.

McIntyre, A. (2003). Through the eyes of women: Photovoice and participatory research as tools to reimagining place. *Gender, Place and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography, 10*, 47-66.

MIPEX. (2020). Migrant Integration Policy Index. http://www.mipex.eu

Nayeri, D. (2019). *The ungrateful refugee: What immigrants never tell you.* Edinburgh: Canongate Books.

OECD. (2010). *Reviews of migrant education closing the gap for immigrant students: Policies, practice and performance.* Paris: OECD Publishing.

OECD. (2015). *Immigrant students at school: Easing the journey towards integration.* Paris: OECD Publishing.

Osler, A. (2016). Citizenship education, inclusion and belonging in Europe: Rhetoric and reality in England and Norway. In J. Banks (Ed.), *Global migration, structural inclusion, and citizenship education across nations.* Washington DC: American Educational Research Association.

Osler, A., & Starkey, M. (2008). Education for cosmopolitan citizenship. In V. Georgi (Ed.), *The making of citizens in Europe: New perspectives on citizenship education* (pp. 204-212). Berlin: German Federal Agency for Civic Education.

Ottósdóttir, G., & Loncar, M. (2018). Ungt fólk að taka skrefin inn í fullorðinsárin [Young people
taking steps into their adult years]. *Journal of Social Workers 12*(1). https://www.timaritfelagsradgjafa.is/article/view/2726

Oxley, L. & Morris, P. (2013). Global Citizenship: A typology for distinguishing its multiple conceptions. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 61*(3), 301-325.

Pashby, K., Costa, M., Stein, S., & Andreotti, V. (2020). A meta-review of typologies of global citizenship education. *Comparative Education, 56*(2), 144-164.

Reay, D. (2016). How possible is socially just education under neo-liberal capitalism? Struggling against the tide? *Forum, 58*(3), 325-330.

Rúnarsdóttir, E. M., & Vilhjálmsson, R. (2019). Ethnicity and adolesceent well-being in the context of families, friends and neighborhoods. *Journal of Youth Studies*. https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2019.1578873

Sant, E., Davies, I., Pashby, K. & Shultz, L. (2018). *Global citizenship education. A critical introduction to key concepts and debates.* London: Bloomsbury.

Slee, R. (2011). *The irregular school: Exclusion, schooling and inclusive education.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Tarozzi, M., & Torres, C. A. (2016). *Global citizenship education and the crisis of multiculturalism* London: Bloomsbury.

Torres, C. A. (2017). *Theoretical and empirical foundations of critical global citizenship education*. London and New York: Routledge.

Torslev, M. & Borsch, A. S. (2017). *Refugee and immigrant children's right to education: A comparative analysis of education policies targeting immigrant children in the Nordic countries.* Copenhagen: CAGE.

Tran, A. (2015). *Untapped resources or deficient 'foreigners': Students of Vietnamese background in Icelandic upper secondary schools*. Doctoral Thesis. University of Iceland. Reykjavík.

UN. (2015). *Sustainable Development Goals.* https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal4

UNESCO. (2015). *Global citizenship education: topics and learning objectives*. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO. (2018). *Global education monitoring youth report 2019: Migration, displacement and education – building bridges, not walls.* Paris: UNESCO.

UNHCR, UNICEF, & IMO. (2019). *Access to education for refugee and migrant children in Europe*. https://www.unhcr.org/news/press/2019/9/5d774dbb4/unhcr-unicef-iom-urge-european-states-boost-education-refugee-migrant-children.html

Wang, C., & Burris, M. (1997). Photovoice: Concept, methodology, and use for participatory needs assessment. *Health Education & Behavior, 24*(3), 369-387.

Wang, C. & Redwood-Jones, Y. A. (2001). Photovoice ethics: Perspectives from Flint photovoice. *Health, Education & Behavior, 28*(5), 560-572.

Wolff, C. E., Huilla, H., Tzaninis, Y., Magnúsdóttir, B. R., Lappalainen, S., Paulle, B., Seppänen,

Kosunen, S. (2021). Inclusive education in the diversifying environments of Finland, Iceland and the Netherlands: A multilingual systemic review. *Comparative and International Education, 16*(1), 3-21.

WRC, & UNHCR. (2016). *We believe in youth.* https://www.unhcr.org/ke/wpcontent/uploads/sites/2/2016/09/We-Believe-in-Youth-Global-Refugee-Youth-Consultations-Final-Report.pdf

Yemini, M. (2016). *Internationalization and global citizenship: Policy and practice in education*. Cham: Palgrave macmillan.

Yemini, M. (2017). Global citizenship education redefined – A systematic review of empirical studies on global citizenship education. *International Journal of Educational Research, 82*(1), 170-183.

## AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

**Eva Harðardóttir**, is a PhD candidate and an Adjunct Lecturer in the Department of Education and Diversity, at the School of Education, University of Iceland. Her research interests include critical global citizenship, educational inclusion of young migrants and refugees. She is an experienced upper-secondary teacher focusing on democracy, citizenship, and cultural literacy. She also has substantial international policy and implementation experience while working for the UN in Malawi.

**Ólafur Páll Jónsson** PhD, is a Professor of philosophy in the Department of Education and Diversity at the School of Education, University of Iceland. His main research interests revolve around democracy, inclusion, sustainability, and moral development in and through education. He is a member of the Education Policy Advisors Network for the Council of Europe and has recently directed a Nordic project on the implementation of sustainability education in the Nordic countries (https://pub.norden.org/temanord2021-511/).

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research is partly funded by the Icelandic Centre for Research, grant no. 206915-051 and by the Icelandic Teacher's Union Research Fund. We are grateful to the many people who have contributed to our work, in particular to Berglind Rós Magnúsdóttir, Jo-Anne Dillabough and Halla Hólmarsdóttir, who form part of the I-PIC project, Tinna Ottesen who is a coauthor with Eva Harðardóttir of the teaching guide, and to the two anonymous referees for this journal whose critical reviews helped us improve the paper.