

International Perspectives on Educating for Democracy in Early Childhood

Recognizing Young Children as Citizens

Edited by Stacy Lee DeZutter

First published 2023

ISBN: 978-1-032-13500-7 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-032-13501-4 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-003-22956-8 (ebk)

Chapter 20

Children as Citizens of a Global Society

Learning Together in Culturally and Linguistically
Diverse Classrooms

*Maryanne Theobald, Gillian Busch, Ilana Mushin,
Lyndal O’Gorman, Cathy Nielson, Shelley Radanovic,
Elizabeth Briant, Lisa Curtis, Erin Mirah, Louise Rana,
Tyler Moore, and Susan Danby*

(CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0)

DOI: 10.4324/9781003229568-23

The funder for this chapter is Queensland University of
Technology (QUT)



ROUTLEDGE

Routledge

Taylor & Francis Group

NEW YORK AND LONDON

Children as Citizens of a Global Society

Learning Together in Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Classrooms

*Maryanne Theobald, Gillian Busch, Ilana Mushin,
Lyndal O’Gorman, Cathy Nielson, Shelley Radanovic,
Elizabeth Briant, Lisa Curtis, Erin Mirah, Louise Rana,
Tyler Moore, and Susan Danby*

Introduction

With society becoming increasingly globalized, attention has turned to how young children might be interculturally responsive to develop global citizenry capabilities. The slogan “think global, act local” was adopted by large corporations for marketing and advocacy. To invoke the understanding “going global” one must first start at the local level. Learning together in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms means the local level begins with children’s everyday experiences. The aim of this chapter is to identify classroom practices that contribute to children’s global citizenry capabilities.

Global Citizenship and Education

There are different ways of understanding global citizenship, and how to foster children’s global citizenry in education. Effective global citizenship involves having a “sense of self” of one’s own experiences along with “understanding the social responsibilities of respect, belonging and collaboration” (Israel, Miller, & Reed, 2011, p. 309). Similarly, global citizenship is described as “awareness, caring, and embracing cultural diversity, while promoting social justice and sustainability, coupled with a responsibility to act” (Pierce, Reysen, & Katzarska-Miller, 2010, p. 167). It is everyday classroom interactions in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms that have the potential to build children’s capacity as global citizens.

Global citizenship education (GCED) is a key theme within the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2020) guidelines on *Education for sustainable goals*. This theme encourages young children to strive for acceptance, inclusion, and social justice. Global citizenship education, an umbrella term, includes the multi-faceted

aspects of “respect for diversity, empathy, altruism and outrage for social justice”, positioning young children as active agents (Ahmed & Mohammed, 2021, p. 3). The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC, 1989) set the groundwork for the critical role of educators to promote practices that foster inclusiveness and cultural competence. Critically, UNESCO (2014) emphasizes the processes of *how* children learn for the successful implementation of global citizenship education. Key principles of GCED include dialogue, critical thinking, holism, and values formation (UNESCO, 2014). These guidelines provide aspirations for classroom practice. Missing are observations of how these aspirational pedagogies are enacted in real-life classrooms.

Most countries that implement global citizenship education programs use a democratic approach. For example, global citizenship education in the United States focuses on the development of civic knowledge, which includes such matters as democratic voting, “obedience and patriotism” (Payne et al., 2020, p. 37). A “citizens in training” (Payne et al., 2020, p. 37) approach that asserts that children prepare for future roles as citizens, may not acknowledge classrooms as civic communities. These approaches may not identify the everyday practices that support children’s participation.

Global citizenship education includes multicultural education, intercultural education, and more recently, cultural responsiveness, and cultural literacy. There are nuances between these concepts, but in common is an emphasis on equity and social justice, incorporating identities and world views (Miller & Petriwskyj, 2013; Rapanta, Vrikki, & Evagorou, 2021). Multicultural education features the celebration of difference with the aim of the peaceful coexistence of diverse cultures, often in response to classroom “problems”. Intercultural education, on the other hand, goes further, seeking teachers to “recognize their own world views... to confront their potential biases and assumptions” (He, 2013, p. 56) for inclusive engagement with children of diverse cultures (Gundara & Portera, 2011). Cultural literacy is a “set of values and dispositions developed through dialogue and argumentation” (Rapanta et al., 2021, p. 475). Teachers who are culturally responsive develop a sense of belonging for change (Souto-Manning, 2009). Purposeful and cumulative dialogic programs are effective in promoting respect, empathy, and acceptance. As Garcia-Mila et al. (2021) demonstrate, children showed positive change toward civic matters (diversity, human rights, sustainable living, democracy, and social justice) after participating in targeted dialogic discussions stimulated by resources (books, short films). These programs show that when children *actively* engage critically with aspects of civics and intercultural awareness, more inclusive practices can result. Interactive approaches are key for explicit global citizenship education. There is a need for more studies to make these visible, revealing *how* such interactions transpire in situated practice.

Early childhood education in Australia is governed by a mandated curriculum. This policy recognizes intercultural understanding and respecting cultural diversity as central to effective global citizenship (Australian Curriculum and Assessment Reporting Authority (ACARA), 2016). Developing personal and social capability, appreciating diverse perspectives, contributing to civil society, and understanding relationships underpin the preparatory year, the first year of formal schooling (ACARA, 2016). The Australian Code of Ethics (Early Childhood Australia, 2019) recognizes valuing children's diverse family backgrounds is foundational to lifelong belonging and participation. While members of a global society, many young children's lived experience in classrooms is yet to fully realize the richness of these culturally and linguistically diverse settings. Daily opportunities to communicate with peers in respectful, empathetic, and accepting ways foster effective global citizens. In this study, we worked with teachers and children to identify these classroom practices.

Research About Global Citizenship

Most research on the child as a global citizen has been about older children. However, a few studies have highlighted how being a member of a global society and being a democratic citizen are experienced in early childhood classrooms. Phillips and Moroney's (2017) ethnographic study of three- to four-year-old children's activities in an Indigenous school in Australia identified that civic learning occurs as children interact. Activities might include:

- introducing self and others, naming places in the community, and having an interest in culture (identity)
- sharing food, helping others, and caring for the environment (collective responsibility)
- voicing concern (agency)
- considering other perspectives and offering solutions to disagreements (deliberation)
- working together and including others (participation).

While Phillips and Moroney (2017) focused on children's actions, Zachrisen's (2016) study examined classroom communication. They found that dyadic exchanges between teachers and children can place children in competition with each other, counterproductive to developing respect, caring, and altruism. Group interactions that foster and discuss respect, empathy, and acceptance of difference, however, can contribute to building global citizens. Focusing on dialogue with hands-on-experiences, Salmon et al's (Salmon, Gangotena, & Melliou, 2018) study

of two teachers, one in the United States and one in Greece, found that reflecting on stories played a key part in helping children to develop as effective global citizens. Dialogue about themselves, their perspectives, and their identity fostered empathy, respect, and acceptance of other cultures. Making visible and challenging the ways children experience global citizenship makes possible more inclusive social policies that support families.

There are times in classrooms when children engage in disputes. These times may seem counter to global citizenship, and yet offer opportunities for negotiation toward democracy. Adults have a role in supporting children to realize differing perspectives and rights through tolerance and respect (Johansson et al., 2016). For example, Grindheim (2017) investigated play interactions among five-year-old children in Norwegian preschools to identify that, democratic goals are attained when children are involved in discussions about fair play, they are encouraged to be respectful, empathetic, and accepting. Rapanta et al. (2021) assert argumentation or an “outrage for social justice” (Ahmed & Mohammed, 2021, p. 3) as key aspects of effective global citizenship education. Early childhood classrooms are rich sites where ideas related to being a global citizen are actively negotiated and enacted.

The institutional context of early childhood classrooms may limit the democratic aspects of being a global citizen. For example, Theobald and Kultti’s (Theobald & Kultti, 2012) study of a teacher’s interactions with children in an Australian preschool identified that opportunities for children to employ democratic practices were restricted because of time limitations, a curriculum-driven focus, and power relations between teachers and children. These limitations existed despite the teacher’s commitment to children’s decision-making and participation.

Our study examines closely the talk and interactions in classrooms to identify practices for fostering effective global citizens. Making visible the practices of global citizens is underpinned by an understanding that culture is built on the local level, and from interactions with people, place, and time. The theoretical understanding of “culture in action” (Baker, 2000) that underpins the analytic approach used in this study is built on the premise that culture is not static, but rather cultural knowledge is co-constructed in situ (Francis & Hester, 2004). As participants interact and organize their relationships, they undertake “culture inside action, rather than action outside culture, already preconstituted” (Baker, 2000, p. 99). Using the lens of culture in action enables analysis to identify the ways in which culture is talked into being and how shared understanding is established. These practices are what teachers and children themselves employ to enable peers to participate, have their voices heard, and feel included and these are especially important in classrooms rich in high cultural and linguistic diversity.

The Study

This chapter reports on a study titled, *Empowering global learners: a teacher-as-researcher approach* (Chief investigators: Theobald, Danby, Busch, Mushin and O’Gorman; Human research ethics approval #1900000408). The project was funded by the Department of Education Queensland, Australia.

Australia is one of the most ethnically diverse countries in the world, with over 300 languages and 100 religions identified as significant to its families (Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS, 2022)). Australian classrooms are key sites for developing the intercultural capabilities of teachers. In our study, teachers partnered as co-researchers with university researchers to explore the topic of global learners using a participatory action research (PAR) process (Kapoor & Jordan, 2009). The study aimed to identify how global citizenry qualities of respect, empathy, and acceptance can be achieved in local classroom practices.

Setting

Four preparatory classrooms in two publicly funded co-educational schools within a large metropolitan city of South-East Queensland were invited to participate. All classrooms followed the Australian Curriculum (ACARA, 2016) that guides teachers’ intercultural understanding: valuing cultures, languages, and beliefs; and understanding that identities and culture are dynamic and created by mutual respect.

The schools were selected as they were rich in cultural and linguistic diversity, increasingly typical of Australian metropolitan schools. One was an inner-city school rich in cultural diversity welcoming children from Australia, Brazil, China, Germany, Korea, Thailand, Taiwan, Indonesia, Japan, Mongolia, and Italy, whereas the second, on the outer fringes of the city, celebrated children from Australian, Chinese, Korean, Indian, and Arabic cultural backgrounds.

Participants

Four teachers and approximately 100 children (aged 5–6 years) participated in the study across four preparatory (prep) classrooms in the two schools. Each teacher held a four-year undergraduate teaching degree and was registered by the state authorities to teach in Queensland schools.

Research Design

This co-designed project used a teacher-as-researcher approach. There were four phases to the study, following an overall cycle of participatory

action research (Kapoor & Jordan, 2009). The teachers engaged in workshops, igniting their curiosity in an iterative cycle of research, action, and reflection. Children were positioned as competent members of the research process and involved as informants, reflecting on their own classroom experiences.

Phase 1 involved the four teachers participating in a workshop to reflect and discuss what being a global citizen and being interculturally competent meant to them. The teachers reflected on how they might better support children from diverse cultural backgrounds and guide all children to be effective global citizens. As conversations evolved, questions became more structured: “how are we embedding our students’ cultures into our everyday practice? How do students themselves feel included, accepted, and respected in our classrooms?”

The teachers’ reflections identified that, while global citizen ideals underpin the curriculum, they welcomed the opportunity to research how these aspects are enacted and experienced by the children in classrooms. Working with the research team, the following research questions were developed:

- How do teacher-researchers reflect on and investigate their own classrooms in supporting intercultural practices?
- What elements of classroom pedagogy support participation, communication and respect, and the intercultural capabilities of all learners as “global” children?
- What are young children’s perspectives on participating, communicating, and belonging in classrooms rich in cultural and linguistic diversity?

The teachers learned data collection techniques to investigate these questions in their own classrooms during the Participatory Action Research (PAR) process.

Phase 2 involved video-ethnography, where university researchers spent five days in each classroom, video-recording classroom activities. Video recording focused on curriculum activities in which intercultural aspects might come into play, such as humanities, arts, and social science (HASS) and producing written text. Two cameras were used: a researcher-held camera that focussed on the children’s and whole group interactions, and a digital tablet placed on a rotating tripod robot, called a Swivl ©, programmed to follow the teacher.

In Phase 3, the teacher-researchers invited the children involved to view selected video recordings (Phase 2). The purpose of the conversations was to elicit video-stimulated accounts (VSA) (Theobald, 2012, 2017). This approach supported children to be self-aware of their actions with others, a key aspect of effective global citizenship. In this phase, the teachers reflected on the children’s responses.

In Phase 4, teacher-researchers came together with university researchers to view the video-recorded excerpts of classroom interactions (Phase 2), and the children's video-stimulated accounts (Phase 3). The teachers were introduced to elements of conversation analysis by describing what they noticed from the recordings, identifying patterns in actions, and reflecting on how their own practices might support children to be effective global citizens. The co-designed Empowering Global Learner framework (Theobald et al., 2022) was identified.

Research Ethics

The study was designed according to protocols outlined in the *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research 2007–Updated 2018* (The National Health and Medical Research Council, 2018) and included a consent protocol for adults and an assent protocol for children.

Data

A total of approximately 20 hours of video recordings of classroom interaction were collected from Phase 2. The noisy classroom setting made some recordings difficult to analyze.

Analytical and Theoretical Approach

The study employed the interactional analytical approach of conversation analysis (CA) a data-driven fine-grained analysis that interrogates sequences of interaction to identify the patterns, delivery, and uptake of talk and action (Sidnell, 2012). CA can highlight children and educators' linguistic and embodied skills used to access play activities and resources and get on with or manage peers. It is this use of empirical data to explicate how social action is accomplished *in situ* that ensures "transparency of analytic claims" (Perakyla, 1997, p. 208), thus contributing to the validity of any claims.

After viewing the video recordings in their entirety, the events were noted against time stamps, and topics related to the study's focus, intercultural competence, were identified. The team then worked with the teacher-researchers following a five-step analytical procedure proposed by Pomerantz and Fehr (2011).

The first step identified "bounded" excerpts, where there was an activity, topic, or participant shift. Each selected excerpt was transcribed according to Jefferson (2004) noting aspects of interactions such as gaze, overlaps, and pauses. Mondada's (Mondada, 2019) transcription method for multimodal interaction was also used, attending to embodied actions such as pointing. Pseudonyms were used in the transcripts. In the second step, the key actions of the members were described. The third step involved

considering how the members presented their talk and actions to others. The fourth step of analysis involved noting the way the members designed their turns and the timing, overlap, and how the members themselves displayed an understanding of the previous turn and responded. The fifth step identified the implications that the features of the talk, actions, and turn design had in terms of setting, roles, identities, and relationships. Analytical observations from these five steps distinguished the practices that promoted global citizenship qualities of respect, empathy, and acceptance.

An important part of the PAR process was to empower the children's voices in research, and so the video-stimulated accounts (VSA) from the children (Phase 3) are included at the end of the analysis of excerpts 3 and 4. Together these analyses and VSAs demonstrate ways being a global citizen are enacted *in situ*. These observations highlight how classroom cultures have the potential to produce effective global citizens.

Analyses

As part of the PAR process, the teacher-researchers and researchers selected excerpts to investigate how respect, empathy, and acceptance were observable in nuanced ways in everyday, local, and face-to-face classroom activities. We present two scenarios from our analysis. Scenario 1 investigates two excerpts from one learning activity triggered by a HASS activity from School A. Classroom practices within the HASS activity attended to *explicit* aspects of being a global citizen by asking the children to identify unique aspects of their culture. Scenario 2 presents analyses of two excerpts, each focusing on a different learning activity: HASS, and play. These excerpts were selected because they were *not* triggered by an *explicit* focus on culture or intercultural understanding as aspects of global citizenship in the preceding classroom practices.

Scenario 1: An Explicit Focus on Culture as an Aspect of Global Citizenship

In Scenario 1, analyses of two related excerpts from an interaction that took place in a HASS activity at School A are presented. The analyses were initiated during Phase 4 of the PAR process when the teachers and researchers closely examined the video recordings collected in Phase 2.

Preceding the interactions below, was an *explicit* focus on culture as the teacher announced in group time,

“today we are talking about ...C-U-L-T-U-R-E (*Teacher spells out the word*). Culture means the different celebrations you have, the different foods you have, the different music and dances you have if you come from another country.”

The children were asked to find their country of birth on a map and share something about their culture. This explicit focus on culture triggered an exchange of greetings in each other's languages. Excerpt 1 picks up when one child approaches the teacher and says, "Bonjour." A small group gather around the teacher, and they share ways of saying hello in different languages.

Transcription Key:

	MET - Metta
θ	SIM - Simon
	ELI - Eli
	JAS - Jason
	FIN - Finn
×	SUM - Summer
	ARI - Ari
	KAR - Karin
	KEI - Keiko
	MAR - Maria
+	Teacher Miss Colin

Excerpt 1: Sharing ways of saying hello

SIM: Bonjou:r,
 tea: ((sits straight, looks at SIMON, points towards SIMON/ELI))
 (0.5)
 TEA: +You: [just said to me he:llo in Fre:nch.
 SUM: [Buongio:rno.
 tea: +---points at SIMON----->
 (0.2)
 SUM: Buongio:rno.
 (0.3)
 TEA: +You:'re saying it in Ita:lian, (.) +you:
 were saying it in
 +-----points at SUMMER-----+---
 hand on METTA-->
 Indi- +(0.6) +let's see if we can +sa:y hello:,
 ->-----+ +both hands up-----+both hands
 into fists->
 (0.3) in our different la:ngua[ges.
 ELI: [(Ba:njour.)=
 SIM: +=B-
 tea: +points with both hands to ELI->
 (0.6)
 SIM: + Bo:njou:r. +
 tea: +points to SIMON+
 (0.4)

SUM: +Buongio:rna. +
 tea: +points to SUMMER+
 (0.5)
 MET: +(sa si ga:l.) +((sat sri akaal?))
 tea: +points to METTA+
 (0.3)
 TEA: You're [a:ll sa:ying,
 SUM: x[Sa: si ha[: , x
 KAR: [K[o:nnichiwa!
 TEA: [And if I say (.) =
 Sum: xpoints to METTAx
 TEA: = +h[ello: ,+and you sa:y,
 KAR: [Ko:nnichiwa.
 tea: +-waves--+points to KARIN->
 (0.5)
 KAR: Ko:nnichi+[wa:.
 TEA: [And you: say: ,
 tea: +points to MARIA->
 (1.3)
 MAR: (Ku:ku.)
 +(1.2)
 tea: +slightly shakes head, withdraws hand->
 SUM: xK[onnnichiwa:.x
 TEA: [() +how do you sa:y hello: , (0.5) in a =
 tea: +holds hand out towards KEIKO->
 Sum: x---waves----x
 TEA: = di:fferent la:nguage.
 (1.1)
 SIM: #0But I'm not from (French [oka:y?)0#
 KAR: [Ko:nnichiwa[:?
 TEA: [O:h (I) kno:w.
 Sim: 0---holds up one finger,-----0looks away->
 (0.3)
 TEA: Ko:[nnichiwa?
 SUM: [xKonni:chiwa:.x
 Sum: x---waves----x
 (0.4)
 KEI: [No: , u::m+ a:h,
 KAR?: [(Konnichiwa: ,)
 tea: ->-----+
 (0.6)
 SIM: I just ha:ve (0.3) have [bee:n to Fre:nch.
 SUM: x[Ni: cha:o ,x
 Sum: x---waves----x

Analysis of excerpt 1 highlights how the aspects of global citizenship including recognizing culture and developing respect, and empathizing with others, are enacted (ACARA, 2016). When Simon says “Bonjour” to the teacher, the teacher responds by sitting up to look at Simon and points. Her exclamation (line 4) and associated movements of holding out her hands are overly emphasized. These embodied actions work as an announcement that highlights that the child’s contribution is valuable. Simon’s peers respond excitedly, interjecting and saying hello using more languages.

Orienting to the teacher’s dramatic exclamation, another child picks up on the interactional sequence, proffering “Buongiorno” (line 6). The teacher makes explicit that the children are saying hello in different languages and identifies the national language used. Here, the classroom practice is to positively reinforce the talk as being on task and relevant to the curriculum lesson on culture.

The next turns identify how a joint goal helps unite the children. When the children start to talk at the same time, the teacher responds by pausing and signaling with her hands held up, refocusing the group’s attention on the teacher. She then offers a proposal to the small group saying, “let’s see if we can say hello, in our different languages” (line 9). The use of possessive noun “our” languages links the children’s own cultural identity with words for “hello.” The teacher has now established a joint goal, which serves to bring the group together (see Theobald, 2022). Metta and Karin join in saying hello in languages associated with India and Japan.

The next turns make evident a deeper level of the children’s understanding of how language and identity are linked. After a brief pause, Simon self-initiates a turn and makes a declaration, “But I’m not from French okay?” (line 36). Quite competently, Simon makes it clear in this statement that, while he knows the French word for hello, he is not French. Language may be a core cultural value (Lanza & Svendsen, 2007); however, using or speaking a language does not automatically attribute ownership of that culture or identity to that member (see Sharrock, 1974, for a discussion of ownership). After the interaction, Simon expands (line 36) by justifying his use of the French language, “I just have been to French” (line 46). Simon displays his understanding that language is one expression of culture, and that knowing how to speak a language does not mean that one necessarily identifies with that culture: Simon can speak French but not *be* French.

In excerpt 1, the children displayed competency by providing various ways of saying hello in different languages. Their excitement is evidenced by their smiles and upward pitch. The teacher’s response to the children’s initiation of saying hello in different languages was joyful, and she adopted a playful approach. This approach attracted nine children in total to join in the interaction with the teacher. Exploring greetings in different languages provided an opportunity to build a sense of identity and belonging. In this

way, the teacher is oriented to the children's displays of competence in intercultural aspects of citizenship within the classroom.

As the lesson continues, excerpt 2 follows excerpt 1. The teacher questions the children about why there are different ways of saying hello.

Transcription Key:

- MET - Metta
- SIM - Simon
- ELI - Eli
- JAS - Jason
- FIN - Finn
- × SUM - Summer
- ARI - Ari
- KAR - Karin
- KEI - Keiko
- MAR - Maria
- + TEA - Teacher Miss Colin

Excerpt 2: Talking about languages

- TEA: You +have a thi:nk+, we just=
tea: +taps head----+
- TEA: = sai:d the same thi:ng. We have the same
meaning but
[we use different wo:rds.=.hh
- SUM: [Buo:ngio:rn[o:.
- KAR: [Bo:n[jou:r.
- TEA: [Why- why do we have
different wo:rds
(.) for it.=
- SUM: =.hh because we kno:w [tho:se wo::rdsǃ
- KAR: [Ko:nba:nwa:!
(0.4)
- KAR: Ko:n[ba:nwa:.
- TEA: [Why do we have different wo:rds in
different pla:[ces.
- ELI: [([)
- SIM: [U:m,
(0.3)
- TEA: Why can't we all just say +hello:++
+-waves--+
- (0.5)
- SIM: Uh-
(0.2)
- TEA: +Why: do we say (susiga:l). (0.3) +or
buongio:rno. (0.2)+

+holds hand towards METTA-----+hand
towards SUMMER--+
+or bon[jou:r.+
SUM: x[Buongio:rno.x
tea: +hand to SIMON+
Sum: x---waves-----x
(0.4)
SUM: xBu[ongio:rno,x
TEA: [Ko:mnichiwa,+ why do we say different [wo:rd.s.
SUM: x[Buongio:r[no,x
tea: +-hand to KEIKO+
Sum: x-----waves---x x---waves-----x
MAR: Beca:use, be[cause we li:ve in different
(0.4) pla:ces.=
KEI: [He:llo,
TEA: =And different [places have =
ELI: [Miss (Co:lin),
TEA: = got d[iffere:nt,
SUM: [Buongio:r[no,
TEA: [La:nguages.

Analyses of excerpt 2 by the teacher-researchers and researchers (Phase 4) identified how engaging children in conversations about differences can guide children to develop respect and understanding of culture. The exchange of greetings continues when the teacher prompts the children to further consider why there are different languages. This question orients the children to think more deeply about the reasons for sharing languages.

The pedagogical component is flagged as the teacher prefaces her next turn by saying, “You have a thi:nk+, we just=” (line 48) with an accompanying gesture of tapping her head. This preface signals to the children that they need to be actively involved in what is to come. The teacher and children use the collective pronoun, “we,” to indicate togetherness and inclusion. While the teacher’s question may be about differences, using a collective pronoun emphasizes *unity*. In so doing, the teacher brings into play matters to do with global citizenship elements of respect and understanding the perspectives and culture of others of the associated curriculum (ACARA, 2016), and highlights acceptance and unity as an expectation of classroom practice.

Analyses of the next turns show how identifying and discussing matters of difference is a critical part of developing an intercultural understanding for effective global citizenship. Responding to the teacher’s question, “why do we have different words,” Maria answers, “because we live in different places” (line 75). In answering in this way, Maria may be picking up from the teacher’s earlier question, “Why do we have different words in different places” (line 59), which presupposes those different places have

different languages. The child's response, "live in different places," competently displays this understanding. By using the inclusive pronoun "we," the child positions herself and her peers as people who may live in different places and thus speak different languages. The inclusive "we" thus displays membership of and orientation to global citizenry capabilities.

The interaction reveals some understandings that the children have about culture and global citizenship. When children are involved in discussion about language, and share perspectives about culture, a deeper learning experience can result, one where children can competently contribute to their understanding of the relationship between language and cultural identity. The persistence of the children to have a say and make their voices heard in this interaction is further evidence of the significance of this language exchange.

Scenario 2: Learning Aspects of Global Citizenship without an Explicit Focus on Culture

In Scenario 2, as part of the PAR process, teacher-researchers and university researchers interrogate the interactions that occur in classroom activities that were not preceded by a specific focus on culture or intercultural understandings as aspects of global citizenship, rather emerged within curriculum, HASS, and play activities. The analysis identifies what respect, empathy and acceptance, all aspects of being a global citizen, look like in the lived experience of children's lives in early childhood classrooms.

HASS Activity

Excerpt 3, below, is from an interaction in a HASS activity that focuses on looking after the local environment. The children are working in a small groups using a cooperative learning strategy called *Sage and Scribe*, (Kagan, 2013), an approach adopted by the school. This strategy entails collaborative group work in which children take on specific roles. One child is given the role of the "scribe" who writes down the ideas of the other children, while the other children are given the role of "sage." In this role, the children offer the scribe ideas about the topic for discussion. The children are seated at a table with a sheet of paper in front of Jessika. The teacher now comes to the group to see what they have written on the paper.

Transcription Key:

- SUS - Susan
- JES - Jessika
- Δ HEL - Helene
- AND - Andrew
- + TEA - Teacher

Excerpt 3: Making sure everyone's voice is heard

- TEA: + (Let's-) + e:veryone's idea:s can +be
written do:wn.
+looks at page+moves hand circle motion+
So who:, (0.2) has He- has Hele:ne sha:red
so:meth[ing ye::t?
- AND: Δ[No:, she: Δ she's stu:ck.
hel: Δshakes headΔ
(0.2)
- TEA: So + wha:t can we do to help + Hele::ne.
+both hands up, palms open+
(0.2)
- AND: Ah we don't know a:ny idea:s.
(0.3)
- TEA: So are you stu:ck? a little bit stu:ck?
(0.2)
- SUS: Yea[::h;
TEA: [Ja:mie've you: got any idea::[s? ((off
camera view))
- SUS: [We ju:st did some
i[dea:s.
TEA: +[.hh So le:t's have a loo:k at what we've go:t.
tea: +leans forward slightly, pointing toward
paper->>

As the interaction unfolds, the children employ agency by flagging to the teacher that Helene has not had a turn, ensuring all voices are heard. The interaction focuses on how children interact and very capably show empathy toward others, an element of intercultural understanding identified in the associated curriculum of the school (ACARA, 2016). This element is evidenced when children can participate and have a say by expressing their opinions. Principles of inclusion are evidenced when children are encouraged to listen to the opinions of others (ACARA, 2016).

By including the group in problem-solving, this classroom practice incorporates aspects of global citizenship. A collaborative classroom culture is fostered as the teacher asks the other children in the group, "So wha:t can we do to help Hele:ne" (line 97). The teacher brings to the fore matters to do with helping. Her continued use of the collective pronoun, "we" reinforce that they are to work together and, further, reinforces the culture of the classroom as an orientation toward the civic action of helping.

Andrew competently displays his stance toward the task as one of collective responsibility by also using the pronoun "we" in his reply saying, "we don't have any ideas" (line 99). As the teacher provides a strategy for how to work together to progress the activity, "let's look at what we've got"

(line 107), she uses inclusive pronouns (we/us) that characterize ‘working together’ as an expected classroom practice. The teacher’s turn suggests that she is also part of the we, building a culture of a class community.

Reflections from Video-Stimulated Accounts

After this interaction took place and as part of the PAR process, the teacher shared the video recording of excerpt 3 with the children involved to elicit a video-stimulated account (VSA) (phase 3). In the VSA, Andrew suggested that everyone should get a turn, so that “no one feels left out.” When asked by the teacher how they felt about everyone’s ideas being written down, the children in the group suggested that they would “feel sad” if they didn’t get their ideas written down. Andrew also commented that it was important to hear the ideas of everyone because “they may have another ideas that you can use.” The children here highlighted aspects of being an effective citizen including inclusion and respect.

Play Activity

Disputes are opportunities to identify and push back on social injustices (see Johansson et al., 2016; Rapanta et al., 2021). Excerpt 4 focuses on an interaction that occurred during a free-play learning activity. The investigation area has been set up as a pretend year one classroom. During the play, a dispute arises about taking turns.

Transcription Key:

- KYL - Kylie
- AHM - Ahmad
- CAI - Caitlyn
- CAM - Cam
- AME - Amelia
- GUN - Guneet
- + TEA - Teacher Missus Beam

Excerpt 4: Modelling how a dispute can be resolved

- TEA: What’s ha:ppening, o[ver he:re,+
->>-walking towards table-----+
- Ahm: ->>-writing on whiteboard--->
- AHM?: [Look Mi:ssus (0.2) Mi:ssus,
(0.2)
- CAI: (Ahmad’s writing there)
- AHM?: [(Bea:m,) (0.7)
- CAI: Writing on the b[oa:rd.

TEA: [So why: can't he: write on the board.
 +(0.4)
 tea: +sits at the table->
 CAI: Because he's+ one of the students.
 tea: ->-----+
 TEA: Oh, so::, (0.3) are +you: a student?
 +touches AHM on shoulder->
 (0.4)
 AHM: No:,
 (0.8)
 TEA: So: who::'s the tea:che:rs,
 (0.4)
 CAM: Cai:tly[:n,
 CAI: [And Ca:m.
 (0.2)
 TEA: +Cause I know before it was +C::am an +
 Kyli:e:,+ so
 +lifts hand-----+points-----+
 points--+
 Kyli:e's now a student, (0.6) so::, (0.5) I
 thi:nk
 a:ctually A:hammad had been wait:ing for his
 tu:rn cause
 remember there was three: teache:rs,an I sai-
 o:h Ca:m and
 Kyl:ie were ha:ving their tu::rn, so A:hammad
 was then
 wait:ing, so I think it's fai:r if we let A:hammad
 ha:ve a tu:rnç
 (1.2)
 TEA: Yea:h.
 (0.2)
 TEA: And so::, (0.3) what are we go:ing +to do
 he:re+, so Ca:m
 +-----+
 gestures towards Cam and Caitlyn
 and Cai:tlyn, how can we work ou:t, (0.9)
 u:m, (0.8) who::
 e:lse should be the tea:cher.
 (1.2)
 CAI: (Maybe) A:hammad.
 (0.4)
 TEA: >Okay,< +so A:hammad, an wha:t abou:t you
 t+wo:,

- +points to AHM, points to CAM, CAI--+
(0.3)
- TEA: Who:'s go:ing to be the tea:cher, maybe you
two: can
ta:lk about tha:t? (0.6) and deci:de:
(1.5)
- CH3: Ma:ybe he can be- (um the principal) (0.5)
Mi:ster Bry:ce?
(0.4)
- TEA: O:r ih maybe you: can talk to hi:m about tha:t:
(0.2)
- TEA: You +c[ou:ld,
CAM?: [Wai-
(0.2)
- TEA: [deci:de to[ge:ther:
CAM?: [wai:t [he ca:n?
tea: >-----+
(0.3)
- CAM?: He can be: Mist- Bry:ce.

Excerpt 4 highlights that breaches of classroom order can provide opportunities for children to practice respect, empathy, and acceptance. In this excerpt, classroom practices orient toward managing the dispute in an inclusive way, using conciliatory language that empowers the children to talk to each other to find a solution and ensure fair play.

The interaction is triggered by Ahmad, who approaches the teacher saying that he wants a turn. The teacher follows him back over to where the play activity is happening. Her question of “what’s happening over here?” (line149) is general, addressing everyone in the area. There is an open ended-ness to this question. The question does not seek to make assumptions or accusations about the interaction taking place, but rather positions the children to be reporters of their own activities. In a similar way to the teacher’s actions observed by Theobald and Danby (2012), the teacher here acts as an arbitrator by offering opportunities for each child to present their version of events. The teacher’s talk here orients the children to intercultural aspects of the associated curriculum to listen to the perspectives of others (ACARA, 2016).

Caitlyn’s reply displays an orientation to Ahmad’s “telling” as they immediately report that Ahmad is playing in “there,” meaning writing on the board. The teacher asks a follow-up question to specify as to what they see is the “problem” with Ahmad’s actions. Caitlyn identifies that his “role” in the role play of the year one classroom is as a “student,” who does not have “rights” to write on the board as someone in the role of the “teacher” might.

The teacher responds by using mitigating language that positions the children as part of the process to find out what is fair. She provides evidence of who has had a turn and proposes that as he has been waiting for a turn, it would be “fair” that Ahmad has a turn (to be the ‘teacher’) (line 123). Her use of the term “fair” brings to the fore matters of social justice and her turn here models language that the children can use to present their case.

The teacher next provides strategies for negotiation. She suggests that the children “can talk about that” (line 136). She presents an opportunity for the children to negotiate a solution saying, “And so:, (0.3) what are we going to do here” and “who: else should be the teacher.” (line 128). By incorporating the term, “should,” the teacher indicates an orientation toward a “correct” action, one that facilitates participation and advocates for social justice. Caitlyn picks up on the teacher’s orientation to participation and suggests that Ahmad could be a possible candidate (line 139). Rather than directing, the teacher presents possible next actions using a strategy of talking to “decide together” (line 146) making explicit a preference for a collaborative approach as the expected behavior. Analyses show the classroom practices of dialogue and argumentation within incidental interactions to demonstrate the concepts involved in being an effective global citizen.

Reflections from Video-Stimulated Accounts

Following the PAR process and to privilege children’s voices, the teacher shared the video-recording of excerpt 4 with the children involved in a video-stimulated account (phase 3). After the children viewed the interaction, one girl commented, “it’s nice to get people to play and we all join in, and no one gets left out.” As the conversation went on, the other children agreed saying ensuring everyone is included made them feel “like they belonged to the group” and stating, “yeah and then it was kinda fun.” The language used by the children to describe their experiences “no one gets left out” attends to notions of citizenship including acceptance, inclusion, and fairness. These accounts confirm that the classroom practice of facilitating communication when a dispute had arisen, helped the children to reach an agreement, and ultimately supported the participation of all members.

Discussion

This chapter identified classroom practices that helped to foster teachers’ and children’s engagement in civic interactions daily, as they are immersed in a highly diverse peer group. A focus on actual classroom interaction to explore teachers’ and children’s practices to global citizenship explored

two different scenarios: (1) a scenario where the lesson explicitly focused on curriculum content of culture and citizenship, and (2) a scenario where teachers and children drew upon their understandings of the curriculum related to culture and citizenship and teachers introduced the concepts serendipitously as they became relevant.

The findings identify that, in both scenarios, children were introduced to aspects of global citizenship but classroom practices empowering children to negotiate were crucial. Using culture-in-action perspective, analyses explicated how concepts associated with global citizenship, including respect, empathy, and acceptance, were accomplished. The talk and organization of collaborative learning activities were critical for the children to learn about, and experience aspects associated with citizenship. These concepts were drawn upon by teachers and children when learning together in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms.

The PAR process involved both teachers and children in video-stimulated accounts to reflect on classroom interactions and consider how these might affect certain members of the class. As a result, the teachers gained insight of children's classroom experiences, and the children deepened their understandings and awareness of being effective global citizens.

A Framework for Empowering Global Learners

As part of the PAR process, further reflection during Phase 4 resulted in a co-designed three-part framework that attended to how classroom practices might empower all learners as effective global citizens. The Framework for Empowering Global Learners focuses on what we might "do, say and feel" as examples of key practices through the three-parts of 1) participation, 2) communication, and 3) belonging. The framework is underpinned by the thesis that citizens for a global society are fostered when young children are respected, included, and accepted. This framework of practice makes visible the classroom practices that guide children in classrooms to be change agents who respect, have empathy for and accept all people. The key parts of the framework are further unpacked below.

Part 1: Participation

Being an effective global citizen involves active and full participation in classrooms. Participation is encouraging children's agency to have a role in an activity, have their voice heard, and feel included (Theobald et al., 2011). Participation was achieved through organized classroom practices of collaborative small group work and discussions, gathering the perspectives of children, and dispute negotiation. The teachers and children used collective pronouns (we, our) and this authenticated children to work together in groups, to employ their agency, and ensure all had input.

Part 2: Communication

Global citizenship and intercultural understanding are promoted with classroom practices that support communication among children. Communication recognizes the social aspects of learning, and that talk is central to social action (Baker, 2000). Promoting children to have their voices heard and providing opportunities for children to talk to each other emerged as effective practices. Excerpt 4 highlighted the importance of communication. The teacher's conciliatory talk, "maybe you can talk about that," "decide together," facilitated turn-taking and orientation to social justice, an important aspect of citizenship.

Part 3: Belonging

Global citizenship and intercultural understanding are promoted with classroom practices that support belonging. Culturally responsive practices are useful as they inspire *action* (Souto-Manning, 2009, p. 50); "Belonging is central to being and becoming in that it shapes who children are and who they can become" (Department of Education, Employment, & Workplace Relations, 2009, p. 7). Analysis identified classroom practices such as the exchange of languages, sharing about self, dispute resolution, and small group activities where children were empowered to include others. These practices led to obligations toward a sense of belonging where respect and acceptance of others were fostered.

The framework is a set of classroom practices, designed to make visible the classroom practices, and presented in clear language, with the view that teachers *and* children engage with the practices related to being an effective global citizens. Significantly, few studies have examined the concepts of effective global citizenry as *situated* practice. Using culture-in-action approach, the findings demonstrate that co-constructed classrooms can produce interculturally *responsive* global citizens. This small co-designed study provides a snapshot of the possibilities of using PAR with teachers and children. Follow-up studies will focus on the children's engagement with the framework.

Conclusion

The PAR processes of this co-designed study identified the nuanced and challenging work that teachers *and* children do, both serendipitously and rigorously, to engage in effective global citizenry in classrooms. When classroom practices facilitate participation, communication, and build a sense of belonging, children can be verified global citizens and change agents as they endorse and enact the social responsibilities of respect, empathy, and acceptance.

Acknowledgments

Research funded by the Queensland Government Education Horizon grant scheme and led by researchers at Queensland University of Technology, Central Queensland University, and the University of Queensland. We would like to thank the children and teachers involved in the study. We are very grateful for their time and commitment to this project.

References

- Ahmed, E. I., & Mohammed, A. (2021). Evaluating the impact of global citizenship education programmes: A synthesis of the research. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17461979211000039>
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). (2022). Cultural diversity in Australia. <https://www.abs.gov.au/articles/religious-affiliation-australia>
- Australian Curriculum and Assessment Reporting Authority (ACARA). (2016). *The Australian curriculum: Foundational years*. Commonwealth of Australia.
- Baker, C. D. (2000). Locating culture in action: Membership categorisation in texts and talk. In A. Lee & C. Poynton (Eds.), *Culture and text: Discourse and methodology in social research and cultural studies* (pp. 99–113). Allen & Unwin.
- Department of Education, Employment & Workplace Relations (DEEWR). (2009). *Belonging, being & becoming: The early years learning framework for Australia*. Australian Government.
- Department of Education, Training & Employment (DETE). (2014). *Global child: Creating successful global citizens*. State Department of Education.
- Early Childhood Australia. (2019). *ECA code of ethics—core principles*. <http://www.earlychildhoodaustralia.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/ECA-COE-Brochure-web-2019.pdf>
- Francis, D., & Hester, S. (2004). *An invitation to ethnomethodology: Language, society, and social interaction*. Sage. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781849208567>
- Garcia-Mila, M., Miralda-Banda, A., Luna, J., Remesal, A., Castells, N., & Gilabert, S. (2021). Change in classroom dialogicity to promote cultural literacy across educational levels. *Sustainability*, 13(11), 6410. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su1311641>
- Grindheim, L. T. (2017). Children as playing citizens. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, 25(4), 624–636. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1350293X.2017.1331076>
- Gundara, J., & Portera, A. (2011). Theoretical reflections on intercultural education. *Intercultural Education*, 19(6), 463–468.
- Hancock, R. E. (2017). Global citizenship education: Emancipatory practice in a New York preschool. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 31(4), 571–580. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02568543.2017.1346731>
- He, Y. (2013). Developing teachers' cultural competence: Application of appreciative inquiry in ESL teacher education. *Teacher Development*, 17(1), 55–71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2012.753944>
- Israel, R., Miller, V., & Reed, S. (2011). Global citizenship education. In E. L. Brown & P. E. Gibbons (Eds.), *Ethnicity and race: Creating educational opportunities around the globe* (pp. 309–321). Information Age Publishing.

- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. *Pragmatics and Beyond New Series*, 125, 13–34. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.125.02jef>
- Johansson, E., Emilson, A., Röthle, M., Puroila, A. M., Broström, S., & Einarsdóttir, J. (2016). Individual and collective rights expressed in educator and child interactions in Nordic preschools. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 48(2), 209–224. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13158-016-0164-2>
- Kagan, S. (2013). *Cooperative learning structures*. Kagan Publishing. www.KaganOnline.com https://www.kaganonline.com/free_articles/dr_spencer_kagan/426/Cooperative-Learning-Structures
- Kapoor, D., & Jordan, S. (2009). *Education, participatory action research, and social change International perspectives*. Palgrave Macmillan Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230100640>
- Lanza, E., & Svendsen, B. A. (2007). Tell me who your friends are and I might be able to tell you what language(s) you speak: Social network analysis, multilingualism, and identity. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 11(3), 275–300. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069070110030201>
- Miller, M., & Petriwskyj, A. (2013). New directions in intercultural early education in Australia. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 45(2), 251–266. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13158-013-0091-4>
- Mondada, L. (2019). *Conventions for multimodal transcription*. Mondada. https://iling.spb.ru/departements/anthropologic/materials/mondada_transcription.pdf
- National Health and Medical Research Council (Australia). (2007–updated 2018). *National statement on ethical conduct in human research*. Commonwealth of Australia: Canberra.
- Payne, K. A., Adair, J. K., Colegrove, K. S. S., Lee, S., Falkner, A., McManus, M., & Sachdeva, S. (2020). Reconceptualizing civic education for young children: Recognizing embodied civic action. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 15(1), 35–46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1746197919878359>
- Perakyla, A. (1997). Reliability and validity in research based on tapes and transcripts. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (pp. 201–220). Sage.
- Phillips, L. G., & Moroney, K. (2017). Civic action and learning with a community of Aboriginal Australian young children. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 42(4), 87–96. <https://doi.org/10.23965/AJEC.42.4.10>
- Pierce, L., Reysen, S., & Katzarska-Miller, I. (2010). The search for a definition of global citizenship. In S. Reysen (Chair), *Global citizenship: Americans within the world. Symposium conducted at the 54th Annual Meeting of the American Studies Texas Association of Texas*, Commerce, TX. Texas A&M University – Commerce.
- Pomerantz, A., & Fehr, B. J. (2011). Conversation analysis: An approach to the analysis of social interaction. *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, 2, 165–190.
- Rapanta, C., Vrikki, M., & Evagorou, M. (2021). Preparing culturally literate citizens through dialogue and argumentation: Rethinking citizenship education. *The Curriculum Journal*, 32(3), 475–494.
- Salmon, A. K., Gangotena, M. V., & Melliou, K. (2018). Becoming globally competent citizens: A learning journey of two classroom in an interconnected

- world. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 46. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-017-0860-z>
- Sharrock, W. W. (1974). On owning knowledge. In R. Turner (Ed.), *Ethnomethodology: Selected readings* (pp. 45–53). Penguin Education.
- Sidnell, J. (2012). Basic conversation analytic methods. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 77–99). Wiley.
- Souto-Manning, M. (2009). Negotiating culturally responsive pedagogy through multicultural children’s literature: Toward critical democratic literacy practices in a first grade classroom. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 9(1), 50–74. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468798408101105>
- Theobald, M. (2012). Video-stimulated accounts: Young children accounting for interactional matters in front of peers. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 10(1), 32–50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476718X11402445>
- Theobald, M. (2017). Children as research participants in educational research using video-stimulated accounts. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 86, 131–143. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2017.07.008>
- Theobald, M. (2022). Friendships. In A. Church & A. Bateman (Eds.), *Talking with children: A handbook of interaction in early childhood education* (pp. 368–387). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108979764.019>
- Theobald, M., & Danby, S. (2012). “A problem of versions”: Laying down the law in the school playground. In S. Danby & M. Theobald (Eds.), *Disputes in everyday life: Social and moral orders of children and young people* (pp. 221–241). Emerald. [https://doi.org/10.1108/S1537-4661\(2012\)0000015013](https://doi.org/10.1108/S1537-4661(2012)0000015013)
- Theobald, M., & Kultti, A. (2012). Investigating child participation in the everyday talk of a teacher and children in a preparatory year. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 13(3), 210–225. <https://doi.org/10.2304/ciec.2012.13.3.210>
- Theobald, M., Nielson, C., Busch, G., O’Gorman, L., Mushin, I., Radanovic, S., Briant, E., & Danby, S. (2022). Empowering Global Learners: eLearning module. [Digital or visual products].
- United Nations. (1989). *Convention on the rights of the child*. Geneva, Switzerland: Office of High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). Retrieved from <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CRC.aspx>
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2014). *Global citizenship education: Preparing learners for the challenges of the 21st century*. Retrieved from <https://tinyurl.com/yxoye2eh>
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2020). *Education for sustainable goals*. Retrieved from <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000374802>
- Zachrisen, B. (2016). The contribution of different patterns of teachers’ interactions to young children’s experiences of democratic values during play. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 48(2), 179–192. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13158-016-0166-0>