Soft/Radical/Beyond Reform and GCE questions

Soft reform/ Methodological questions **Doing differently** (within the same global imaginary)	• How can we teach students the values that will support democracy, fairness and progress for all humanity? • How can we encourage students to take responsibility for people beyond their own nation's borders? • How can we create opportunities for students to act locally in ways that have an impact globally? • What kinds of activities can enable students to connect with and understand global issues so that they can be helpful in solving them (e.g. climate change, migration, economic globalization)? • How can learning about other cultures prepare people to work and collaborate more effectively and efficiently across cultural difference? • How can global learning be incorporated into curriculum, and assessed through formal evaluations to ensure that teachers are engaging global issues in the classroom in a more systematic way? • How do we evaluate the effectiveness and impact of GCE approaches?
Radical reform/ Epistemological questions **Knowing differently** (expanding the global imaginary)	• How can we imagine a responsibility *towards* others (both human and other-than-human beings), rather than a responsibility *for* others? • What kinds of analyses can enable students to understand how they are a part of global problems, and how they can work to mitigate or eradicate these problems at a structural level (e.g. the impact of consumption levels on climate change, the role of Western military interventions in prompting migration, the racialized and gendered international division of labor, etc)? • Whose definitions of citizenship tend to dominate in GCE discourses, and why? • How might we redefine and repurpose the concept of global citizenship to advocate for more inclusive forms of representation, and the redistribution of resources? • How can our ideas of global citizenship be informed not just by the national citizenship formations of Western nation-states, but also of other countries and other kinds of political communities (e.g. Indigenous nations)? • How can we learn to learn from different ways of knowing in order to imagine the world differently?
Beyond reform/ Ontological questions **Being differently** (enabling another global imaginary to emerge)	• How has the modern/colonial ontology restricted our horizons and what we consider to be possible, desirable, intelligible and imaginable? • What kinds of denials and entitlements keep us not only intellectually but also affectively invested in this ontology? • What can engender a stream of connections and a sense of care and commitment towards everything that overrides self-interest and insecurities and is not dependent on convictions, knowledge, identity or understanding? • What would it look and feel like if our responsibility to all living beings on the planet was not a willed choice, but rather something 'before will'? • What kinds of experiences can enable students to see and sense the ways in which they can be simultaneously part of global problems, and part of global solutions? • Is it even possible to imagine a definition of global citizenship not premised on conditional forms of inclusion, or shared values – and what might the inherent limitations of this mode of belonging teach us? • If citizenship (global or otherwise) is not a universalizable concept, then how might we nonetheless use it in strategic ways, while remaining conscious of its significant limitations, potential harms, and the partiality of any particular approach? • How can we open ourselves up to being taught by different ways of being in order to experience and sense the world differently, being aware of misinterpretations, idealizations and appropriations that are likely to happen in this process?

Global imaginary: social consensus for what is considered real, ideal, sensible, possible, normal, desirable and intelligible

HEADS UP	Whose idea of development/ education/the way forward?	Whose template for knowledge production?
Hegemonic practices (reinforcing and justifying the status quo)	What assumptions and imaginaries inform the ideal of development and education in this initiative?	Whose knowledge is perceived to have universal value? How come? How can this imbalance be addressed?
Ethnocentric projections (presenting one view as universal and superior)	What is being projected as ideal, normal, good, moral, natural or desirable? Where do these assumptions come from?	How is dissent addressed? How are dissenting groups framed and engaged with?
Ahistorical thinking (forgetting the role of historical legacies and complicities in shaping current problems)	How is history, and its ongoing effects on social/political/economic relations, addressed (or not) in the formulation of problems and solutions in this initiative?	How is the historical connection between dispensers and receivers of knowledge framed and addressed?
Depoliticized orientations (disregarding the impacts of power inequalities and delegitimizing dissent)	What analysis of power relations has been performed? Are power imbalances recognized, and if so, how are they either critiqued or rationalized? How are they addressed?	Do educators and students recognize themselves as culturally situated, ideologically motivated and potentially incapable of grasping important alternative views?
Self-serving motivations (invested in self-congratulatory heroism)	How are marginalized peoples represented? How are those students who intervene represented? How is the relationship between these groups two represented?	Is the violence of certain groups being deemed dispensers of education, rights and help acknowledged as part of the problem?
Un-complicated solutions (offering 'feel-good' quick fixes that do not address root causes of problems)	Has the urge to 'make a difference' weighted more in decisions than critical systemic thinking about origins and implications of 'solutions'?	Are simplistic analyses offered and answered in ways that do not invite people to engage with complexity or recognize complicity in systemic harm?
Paternalistic investments (seeking a 'thank you' from those who have been 'helped')	How are those at the receiving end of efforts to 'make a difference' expected to respond to the 'help' they receive?	Does this initiative promote the symmetry of less powerful groups and recognize these groups' legitimate right to disagree with the formulation of problems and solutions proposed?

The HeadsUp educational tool also highlights that trying to challenge all the problematic patterns identified at once is very difficult because they are tied to the "common sense" of how we think about the world and each other (through the single story): how we are taught to perceive wealth, poverty, progress, development, education, and change. Thus, if these patterns are challenged all at once, the resulting narrative/intervention can become largely unintelligible. In addition, interrupting these patterns also tends to create paradoxes where a solution to a problem creates another problem. The message here is that the transformation of our relationships is a long process where we need to learn to travel together differently in a foggy road – with the stamina for the long-haul rather than a desire for quick fixes. The questions below illustrate some of the paradoxes we face in educational practice. How can we address:

> *Hegemony without creating new hegemonies through our own forms of resistance? Ethnocentrism without falling into absolute relativism and forms of essentialism and anti-essentialism that reify elitism? Ahistoricism without fixing a single perspective of history to simply reverse hierarchies and without being caught in a self-sustaining narrative of vilification and victimisation? Depoliticization without high-jacking political agendas for self-serving ends and without engaging in self-empowering critical exercises of generalisation, homogenisation and dismissal of antagonistic positions? Self-congratulatory tendencies without crushing generosity and altruism? People's tendency to want simplistic solutions without producing paralysis and hopelessness? And, paternalism without closing opportunities for short-term redistribution?*