

Foreign Language Teaching for Global Citizenship

Ian Hosack

It is my great pleasure to be able to contribute to this special publication in honour of our dear colleague Gordon Ratzlaff, whose warm, humanizing influence at Ritsumeikan will be very sorely missed after he retires at the end of this year. Gordon was a member of the first committee I served on at Ritsumeikan, so I still associate him with my arrival at the university and once again thank him for his kindness in guiding me while I was finding my feet (and many times since). In inviting me to write this paper, Gordon has given me an excellent opportunity to reflect upon some of the themes that have informed my teaching and research, and for that too, he has my thanks.

Like me, Gordon will have witnessed many changes in the way English is taught at Ritsumeikan. When I joined the university in April 1996, it was first and foremost as a teacher of language skills, and I spent most of my time helping students improve either their conversational English or their ability write in an academic style. Within a few years, however, following a major overhaul of the curriculum, traditional English language skills teaching had largely disappeared from the Kinugasa campus to be replaced by a new commitment to Content-Based Instruction (CBI). Teachers were now told to avoid giving explicit attention to language skills, to concentrate their efforts on teaching interesting *content* and – not forgetting Krashen’s (1982) input hypothesis – making it comprehensible for the learners.

In my own case, the shift to CBI has had significant effects, not just on the kind of material I prepare for my classes, but also on how I’ve come to view my role as a teacher. Drawing on my background as a student of politics, much of my teaching now focuses on current topics connected with democracy and human rights. Teaching this kind of content-based course – looking for English readings that are accessible without “dumbing down” important ideas, planning activities that engage students with the issues while simultaneously keeping an eye on the vocabulary they need to comprehend the material – has been both stimulating and challenging. It has also made me more conscious of how a foreign language teacher’s role can extend beyond language skills development to embrace wider educational objectives, in particular those associated with “global

education” or what is often referred to as “education for global citizenship”. In this paper I’d like to explore some of the principal ways in which language teachers can contribute to global citizenship education. I focus on three main areas: tackling *global issues*, teaching *intercultural competence*, and *education for dialogue*. I begin though, with a brief sketch of what is meant by “education for global citizenship”.

Citizenship education

There has been a growing interest in citizenship education in recent years, with countries across the world introducing new educational programmes aimed at helping young people develop the values, knowledge and skills that will enable them to participate in social and political life as responsible citizens. Since 2002, citizenship has been included as a statutory subject within the national curriculum for England, and there have been citizenship education initiatives across Europe, and in the US and Australia. The steady growth in citizenship education research is reflected in the increasing number of participants in major international studies. In 1975 just 9 countries took part in the Civic Education Study run by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) (Arthur, Davies, & Hahn, 2008). For its more recent study, launched in 2009, the number of participating countries swelled to around 40 and included not only Western states, but also countries from Latin America (e.g. Mexico, Chile, Paraguay) and Asia (e.g. Indonesia, Korea and Thailand) (IEA, 2009). In Japan, too, innovations in citizenship teaching, notably by schools in Shinagawa and Ochanomizu in Tokyo, have attracted considerable scholarly interest and stimulated debate about citizenship education in Japan (Ikeno, in press).

Of course, the nurturing of good citizens has been a fundamental goal of education since antiquity. Throughout history communities have considered it necessary to socialize the task of raising children so that they share fundamental values and are bound to the rest of the community by feelings of duty, cultural identity, shared destiny, and national pride. Much of the current debate concerning the nature of citizenship continues to address questions that have exercised humanity for centuries: what is the nature of a good human life? What are the personal qualities required in a good citizen, and how can education contribute to nurturing those qualities?

In important ways, however, the current discourse on citizenship education is being conducted in new territory. The old questions about the duties and rights of citizens still stand, but they are being posed in a new and historically unprecedented context. The steady globalization of human affairs is having profound effects on the way in which we conceive notions of identity and belonging, the way people imagine their futures, and the way we conduct politics. For most of history citizenship has concerned the duties and rights of people living within bounded communities, principally states, and its main function has been to define the boundaries between

“us” and “them”, to establish who is allowed in and under what terms. More recent history has had the effect of blurring many of the criteria for making those us/them distinctions. Traditional, state-centred notions of citizenship now have to contend with large-scale migration and rapidly shifting demographics that are producing increasingly diverse populations. In response to these changes, citizenship is being theorized in new ways – for example, as multicultural citizenship (Kymlicka, 1995) or cosmopolitan citizenship (Archibugi, 1998; Held, 1995) – and citizenship education now deals increasingly with issues of identity and cultural diversity as well as with the political rights and responsibilities that are its traditional focus.

Education for citizenship thus covers a potentially vast terrain. According to Audigier,

Since the citizen is an informed and responsible person, capable of taking part in public debate and making choices, nothing of what is human should be unfamiliar to him [*sic*], nothing of what is experienced in society should be foreign to democratic citizenship (cited in Arthur, Davies, Wrenn, Haydn, & Kerr, 2001, p. 30).

But as Arthur and his collaborators point out, such a broad conception of citizenship offers insufficient guidance for those charged with teaching it, and one of the tasks of citizenship educators is to hone in on a definable set of skills that can form the basis of a coherent curriculum. Recent attempts to do this analyse citizenship in terms of three dimensions: 1) *status* 2) *feeling* or *identity*, and 3) *practice* or *participation* (Davies et al., 2003; Osler, 2005). While theories of citizenship span all three of these dimensions, citizenship *education* tends to concern itself with dimensions 2) and 3) – that is, with helping students develop a sense that they belong to the community and share its core values, and providing them with the knowledge and skills needed to be active participants in politics and civil society.

Global citizenship

Is there such a thing as *global* citizenship? It is the nation state that remains the principal site for the legal rights and duties of citizenship, and in the absence of a singular world authority, to some people the very notion of “global citizenship” is nonsense, at least in terms of a political and legal status. Such views are increasingly out of step with global developments, however. As Heater (2004) observes, although there is no formal recognition of “world citizen” status in international law, a growing body of international agreements – including the International Bill of Human Rights and the UN Convention on the Status of Refugees – has already gone some way to defining a post-national, legal identity for people *as human beings*, even if it is still nation states that are the principal guarantors of individuals’ rights. The case of the European Union in particular exemplifies

how citizenship is being re-configured to keep pace with the increasingly transnational character of modern life. Passport holders of EU member states are now simultaneously citizens of the European Union, and this includes, for example, the right to appeal to the European Court of Human Rights against unfair treatment in their home country.

It remains to be seen whether other regions of the world follow Europe's lead in evolving new forms of transnational citizenship status. In any case, citizenship education is not primarily a matter of status, but of feelings and practice – the ways in which individuals conceive their relationship to the community and the ways in which they are therefore motivated to act. Global citizenship education is thus an ethical concept, concerned with helping students develop feelings of shared humanity, a sense that they belong to a wider *global* community, an understanding of the responsibilities that entails, and the ability to act with those responsibilities in mind as *global* citizens.

Key to helping students orient themselves towards their rights and responsibilities at the global level is the notion of *multiple* citizenships – the idea that a person can be simultaneously a citizen of more than one community. In terms of legal status, multiple citizenship has long been a reality for some people – for example, those who enjoy dual national status, or for citizens of federal polities, like the US, where they are simultaneously citizens of states and the State (Heater, 1999). The EU now provides an example of multiple citizenship at the regional level. Perhaps the best-developed vision of what multiple citizenship might mean at the global level is that of cosmopolitan democracy, “an ambitious project whose aim is to achieve a world order based on the rule of law and democracy” (Archibugi, 1998, p. 198). One of its most prominent theorists, David Held (1995), argues that in the context of globalization, sovereign states can no longer be viewed as the prime locus for democracy, and new regional and global institutions of governance are needed that will override state authority on issues that are beyond state control – on environmental and security issues, for example. Cosmopolitan citizenship would involve individuals having rights and duties as citizens at multiple levels of governance – local, national, regional and global.

With its recognition of the transnational interdependence of communities and its framing of the rights and responsibilities of citizenship at multiple levels, the vision of cosmopolitan democracy has proved inspirational for global educators like Osler (2005):

Education for cosmopolitan citizenship is a route through which we may realize global education. It will involve young people in exploring the status, feelings and practice of citizenship. It will involve teachers in making explicit the connections between local, national and global concerns (p.19).

But which teachers should have primary responsibility for teaching global or cosmopolitan

citizenship? One approach has been to introduce citizenship as a “cross-curricular theme”, so that teachers of all disciplines are expected to look for opportunities to address citizenship issues. In some countries, such as England, citizenship has been introduced as a statutory subject in its own right with new cohorts of teachers being trained as citizenship specialists. More often, education for citizenship has been assigned to teachers of other subjects – typically history and geography – or, as in Japan, come under the umbrella of social studies. Until relatively recently, however, the role of foreign language teachers in citizenship education has tended to be overlooked. In its recommendations for citizenship teaching in the UK, The Crick Report makes one fleeting reference to the potential of foreign languages to “offer a contrasting perspective from other countries on national, European and international events and issues” (Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, 1998, p. 53), but gives no indication that they can also play a part in nurturing *shared* values, or in developing core skills for citizenship. Fortunately, more researchers (e.g. Brown & Brown, 2003; Doyé, 1996; Osler & Starkey, 2005) are now recognizing the important contribution that foreign language teachers can make to citizenship education, and in particular to education for *global* citizenship.

The next part of the paper outlines three distinct ways in which that contribution can be made. Foreign language teachers can promote global citizenship by adopting content that addresses global issues; by focusing on cross-cultural comparisons in order to develop students’ intercultural competence; and by training students in communication skills that are essential for democratic dialogue.

Global issues

One way that foreign language instructors are teaching for global citizenship is by working with content that is designed to raise students’ awareness of issues such as climate change, the loss of biodiversity, the welfare of refugees and international health concerns such as HIV/AIDS. These issues are “global” in the way they impact on the lives of people living in different countries and regions, and because they involve problems that are beyond the capacity of individual state governments to solve by themselves, so demand a transnational or global response. As such they are issues that require the attention of all cosmopolitan citizens.

Across Japan a growing number of English teachers, at high schools as well as universities, are striving to address global issues in their classes. Global Issues in Language Education (GILE) is now a thriving Special Interest Group within the Japan Association of Language Teachers. At Ritsumeikan, global issues have become a common focus for content-based language courses, and indeed, colleagues at the university have produced a number of textbooks dedicated to these topics, notably David Peaty, whose books include *You, Me and The World* (2010) and *Topics for*

Global Citizenship (2007), and Chris Summerville, author of *Looking Back, Moving Forward* (2006a, 2006b).

Where language teachers are tackling global issues with their students, in what sense are they contributing to “education for global citizenship”, and how can they defend themselves against those who say they should stick to teaching grammar and vocabulary?

As suggested earlier, citizenship education concerns itself mainly with the feelings and practice of citizenship. Students working with global issues material are potentially developing as global citizens in both of these dimensions. The approach is characterized by a strong affective element (Davies, Evans, & Reid, 2005) with students being given the opportunity to reflect upon how such problems as environmental degradation, poverty and human rights violations impact on the lives of individuals. This can evoke feelings of solidarity, and as they become more conscious of the interconnectedness of issues, students are encouraged to consider how aspects of their own day-to-day activity can have far-reaching, and even global consequences. Peaty and Summerville both aim to help students make this link between issues and practice. Summerville (2006a), for instance, provides activities in which students assess the “eco-friendliness” of their daily shopping habits, and Peaty (2010) hopes to raise awareness of the potential problems caused by international tourism by having students draw up a code of practice for ethical travelers.

There are those who object to the teaching of this kind of material in foreign language classes. Some question whether language instructors have sufficient knowledge of global issues to teach about them, while others are concerned about the possibility of teachers “indoctrinating” students. Sargent (2004), for example, warns against “advocacy-oriented ‘Global Citizen-Educators’ ... attempting to make ‘Global Citizens’ of their students in their own particular image by promoting their own worldview” (p. 2). The charge of indoctrination is a serious one and any attempt by teachers to *force* their personal views upon students would be a breach of professional conduct – not to mention a violation of their human rights¹). But indoctrination is something we can not only guard against, but also enable students to withstand. Certainly where language teachers have adopted learner-centred pedagogies and are seeking to promote critical thinking, they are doing precisely the opposite of indoctrination: encouraging students not to take things at face value, to expect beliefs to be supported by reasonable evidence, and to think for themselves.

In a direct response to Sargent, Peaty (2004) cites a number of pedagogical reasons for using global issues in EFL, including the ready availability of up-to-date resources, the “depth and diversity” of global issues, which makes them highly stimulating of discussion and critical thinking, and the argument from content-based instruction theory that “a second language is learned most effectively when used as the medium to convey informational content of interest and relevance to the learner” (Brinton, Snow, & Wesche, 1989, p. vii). But these pedagogical benefits are “insignificant”, Peaty (2004) says, “when compared to the main reason for introducing global

education in all subjects across the curriculum, including foreign languages, which is that the future of our planet is at stake” (p. 1). Given the gravity of problems like climate change, many teachers are with Peaty in feeling a moral obligation to address global issues with their students. Cates (2005) points to the additional onus placed on teachers by international agreements such as UNESCO’s 1974 *Recommendation Concerning Education for International Understanding*, and similarly Peaty (2004) argues that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) provides a mandate for language teachers to promote global citizenship values in their classes.

The seriousness of many global issues and their relevance to human beings everywhere are sufficient reasons for all students to engage with them during the course of their education. But this does not amount to an argument for why global issues should be covered in *EFL classes* specifically. Indeed, given their importance to all students, and not just those with good English skills, it could be argued that this learning is best done in the students’ first language, greatly facilitating comprehension and allowing issues to be explored more deeply. The most commonly heard pedagogical rationale for teaching Japanese students about global issues *in English*, comes, as we have seen, from CBI theory: as long as students comprehend the English material, they are simultaneously acquiring the language. But of course, this argument can be extended to comprehensible input on *any* engaging topic²⁾, so falls short of articulating a distinctive role for foreign language teachers in citizenship education. This is not to say that English teachers at Ritsumeikan should stop working with global issues in their classes; but it is important to extend the discussion beyond considerations of content in order to be clear about the special contribution foreign language teachers can make to education for global citizenship.

Intercultural competence

Global citizenship implies not only a commitment to the values of peace and justice enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, but also a respect for diversity, and an ability to engage with people who are “all equal, all different”³⁾. It is in nurturing the capacity to embrace difference as part of our shared human identity that foreign language teachers can make a distinctive contribution to global citizenship education. This is the thrust of Michael Byram’s work on language teaching for intercultural citizenship. One of Byram’s (e.g. 2006, 2008) main objectives has been to re-emphasize the centrality to language teaching of *culture*, which he believes has been neglected in the general shift towards communicative language teaching:

There has been more emphasis on sociolinguistic than sociocultural appropriateness, perhaps because of the influence of speech act theory and discourse analysis. As a consequence FLT [Foreign Language Teaching] has remained concerned with the indoctrination of ‘skills’ and,

in its focus on technical issues, forgotten that communication is not just a matter of passing information or obtaining goods and services, but of interacting with other human beings in socially complex and rich environments (Byram & Guilherme, 2000, p. 71).

Byram argues in part for a return to the more “humanistic” goals of traditional, “pre-communicative” language education where a language was studied not so much to facilitate communication, but more as a means of gaining access to culture (albeit with a focus on the “high Culture” of art and literature). Of course, nowadays foreign language education is primarily concerned with developing communication skills, but according to Byram (2006), it “must go beyond the assumption that linguistic competence is sufficient, and must take intercultural competence as one of its aims” (p. 127).

Byram (2008) is with Doyé (1996) in seeing considerable overlap between the goals of “language-and-culture teaching” and those of citizenship education. He proposes a model for “intercultural citizenship education” to develop students’ competences in three dimensions: *attitudes*, *knowledge* and *skills*¹). Intercultural competence comprises such *attitudes* as “curiosity and openness, [and a] readiness to suspend disbelief about other cultures and belief about one’s own” (p. 163). It requires *knowledge* of social practices among different groups, both in one’s own country, and in other countries; and *skills*, such as the ability to seek out new information about other cultures, to interpret it and relate it to aspects of one’s own culture.

The principal task of language educators then, is not to teach language *per se* but rather “to introduce young people to experience of other ways of thinking, valuing and behaving” (Byram, 2003, p. 127), and at the same time to encourage them to reflect critically upon their own cultural assumptions. In this way foreign language teachers can contribute to a process of “tertiary socialization” which has the potential to transform the narrower perspectives acquired through primary and secondary socialization in the family and home community, and develop in students the cognitive, moral and behavioural flexibility needed to engage effectively with people from different cultures (Byram, 2008). Here Byram (2003) frames foreign language teaching as a *political* project, which “can and should be a challenge to the isolationism of the nation-state” (p. 20).

Foreign language teachers are ideally placed to prepare students for the culturally diverse context of global citizenship. Whereas teachers of history or geography are often drawn into citizenship teaching because of their specialist subject knowledge, “language teachers have much more personal experience of the issues at the heart of citizenship education” (Brown & Brown, 2003, p. 9), in particular experience of communicating across cultures. This is true not only for native-speakers of the target language, but also for non-natives who will be able to draw on their experiences of study and travel abroad, of interacting with overseas visitors and so on. Even where “culture” is not included in lessons as a formal teaching point, language teachers often have

opportunities to introduce an intercultural perspective, offering an example from a culture they are familiar with or challenging a cultural stereotype, for instance.

Along with global issues, cultural topics are also well represented in content-based English classes at Ritsumeikan, where popular textbooks include *People Like Us* (Greenhall, 2002) and *Identity* (Shaules, Tsujioka, & Iida, 2003). These books present information about aspects of everyday life in other cultures, such as shopping habits, attitudes towards dating and gender roles, and students are invited to make comparisons with their own habits in Japan. While these textbooks provide opportunities to explore cultural differences with students, however, the treatment of topics tends to be rather superficial, and compared with the more issues-focused textbooks by Peaty (2010) and Summerville (2006a), they are less likely to problematize topics. Information about other cultures is presented in a matter-of-fact way and it is generally left to the teacher or student to provide a critical perspective. Nevertheless, such textbooks can provide a convenient springboard for further discussion in classes focusing on culture-as-content.

As suggested earlier, the special contribution foreign language teachers can make to global citizenship education goes beyond choosing the “right” content. The challenge identified by Byram (2003) is to help students *experience* other ways of thinking, valuing and behaving, and this calls for considerable creativity by teachers in designing experiential activities. Williams’ (2001) suggestions include word association, role play and “cultural bump” analysis, all of which involve students directly in interpreting culture. Carel (2001) describes how her students of French became “virtual ethnographers” and through close observation of video clips tried to derive “rules for communication in France”. In my own classes, students have carried out surveys in which they interviewed international students about their experiences as foreigners in Japan, and then used their findings to present critical evaluations of Japanese culture⁵.

Byram’s work on intercultural citizenship touches inevitably on fundamental questions about the nature of human values. Our cultural encounters must be *critical* he says, defining “critical cultural awareness” as “an ability to evaluate, critically and *on the basis of explicit criteria*, perspectives, practices and products in one’s own and other cultures and countries” (Byram, 1997, p. 53 my emphasis). But what are these explicit criteria exactly? Many global educators look upon the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a clear standard for evaluating cultural practices (Osler & Starkey, 2010; Peaty, 2004), but Byram (2008) is more circumspect. He is adamant in his rejection of cultural relativism – the view that there are no universal ethical standards by which different cultures can be judged – declaring it to be “a betrayal of the common humanity of individuals” (p. 190). But although he acknowledges the UDHR as a “starting point for a discussion” of which cultural practices should be outlawed as “beyond the pale” (Byram, 2008, p. 175), Byram seems hesitant to embrace some aspects of the Declaration as universal, in particular the right to democratic governance.

The common assumption in the West is that citizenship education is education for *democratic* citizenship. “This unquestioned assumption may be appropriate for North American and European societies,” Byram (2008) argues; however, “... One of the issues that will arise from taking an intercultural perspective on citizenship is that even these assumptions should be questioned” (p. 159). Although we may seek common ground with people from other cultures we will also need to accept difference, and “This includes, in principle, the acceptance of other concepts of democracy and *other systems of governance than democracy*” (Byram, 2008, p. 165 my emphasis).

Byram is undoubtedly right to stress the multiple possibilities for democratic innovation. The cosmopolitan democrats themselves view democracy as an “unfinished”, even “endless” journey (Archibugi, 1998, p. 200) which will continue to evolve according to changing human needs. Parekh (1992) has argued that much of what constitutes modern *liberal* democracy *is* particular to Western culture and cannot be universalized. Nevertheless, some democratic principles “have a genuinely universal core, such as the respect for human life and dignity, equality before the law, equal protection of the law, fair trial and the protection of minorities” (Parekh, 1992, p. 174), and there are good grounds for viewing the UDHR, including the right to democracy, as at least a set of moral *guidelines* that have universal appeal. It is in this way that Sen (1999), considers democracy to be a “universal value”: there are strong reasons for people anywhere to see it as valuable, particularly in the way it enables a constructive dialogue:

the practice of democracy gives citizens an opportunity to learn from one another, and helps society to form its values and priorities. Even the idea of “needs”, including the understanding of “economic needs”, requires public discussion and exchange of information, views, and analyses. In this sense, democracy has *constructive* importance, in addition to its intrinsic value for the lives of the citizens and its instrumental importance in political decisions. (Sen, 1999, p. 10)

Foreign language teachers are key to educating global citizens who can participate effectively in this democratic, cross-cultural dialogue. They not only equip learners with the linguistic tools and the intercultural competence needed to engage successfully with people from other cultures; they can also promote the values and skills of democratic dialogue. It is to this aspect of their role in citizenship education that we now turn.

Education for dialogue

Notwithstanding Byram’s reservations, the communicative approach to language teaching has helped establish pair and group discussion activities as standard features of the foreign language

classroom making it a prime site for what Tardieu calls “education for dialogue” (cited in Starkey, 2005). Discussion skills are a fundamental aspect of training for democratic citizenship, something recognized by the Advisory Group on Citizenship in its recommendations for citizenship education in England.

The curriculum should also cover practical skills that enable young people to participate effectively in public life and prepare them to be full citizens. It should enable children and young people to develop discussion, communication and teamwork skills. It should help them learn to argue cogently and effectively, negotiate successfully and co-operate with others. It should also enable them to think for themselves, solve problems and make decisions effectively (QCA,1998, p. 19).

Modern language teaching pedagogies are highly supportive of the participatory, discursive skills referred to here. English teachers strive to maximize participation by making their classes “learner-centred”; they encourage teamwork through “collaborative learning”; and they help students “think for themselves” by equipping them with effective language-learning strategies, for example. These techniques can be found right across the foreign language curriculum. In oral communication courses, students regularly work together to prepare for presentations, discussions and debates; in literacy classes, teachers can encourage collaboration through peer-editing, jigsaw-reading activities and the like; and even in the case of grammar teaching, an area traditionally characterized by teacher-fronted methods, learner-centred grammar activities such as “dictogloss” are now commonplace. In all these cases, students are not only gaining the linguistic tools needed to express their ideas in a second language, but also developing a general capacity to engage in dialogue. They gain confidence in expressing themselves, learning the importance of clarity and supporting their opinions with reasons and examples. They become accustomed to listening critically to what other people say, to requesting clarification and responding to other speakers’ ideas. These are all essential skills for active citizenship.

The extent to which communicative language activities contribute to education for global citizenship will, however, depend on the kinds of topics that students are asked to discuss. Typical EFL materials, particularly those aimed at beginners and intermediate learners, tend to focus on day-to-day activities in the home or at work, or on everyday situations that the learner might encounter as a tourist – “at the post office” or “at the airport”, for instance. This reflects the strong instrumental motive that many students have for learning a foreign language, as well as an important tenet of the communicative approach that activities and materials need to offer ample opportunities for “personalization”. But as Starkey and Osler (2003) note, “Citizenship is about the public sphere and about understanding of and engagement with policies” (p. 29). It is important

to facilitate talk about personal topics such as family and hobbies in order to help the learner develop a personal identity as speaker of the target language, but encouraging students' growth *as citizens* requires them to engage with the public-sphere. In their capacity as educators for global citizenship, language teachers need to strive for a balance between personal topics and public-sphere issues, as well as drawing attention to important areas where private activities interconnect with matters of public concern.

Even where students are engaged directly in discussions of social issues, language teachers can enhance the pedagogic value of these activities by focusing explicitly on the *process* of dialogue and promoting the democratic values that should underpin it. Pair and group discussion activities have become such an entrenched feature of university language classes that there is perhaps a risk of their full pedagogic value being overlooked. "Education for dialogue" requires that teachers do more than simply assign students to pairs or groups and ask them to "discuss". Starkey (2005) argues that students need to be reminded regularly of the ground rules for discussion, especially where sensitive issues are being addressed. One learner-centred approach to this is to have students draw up their own guidelines for discussion, and Starkey cites an example of the kinds of rules arrived at by school pupils in the UK:

- Listen to each other
- Make sure everyone has the chance to speak
- Don't use "put downs" or make fun of what others say or do
- Be helpful and constructive when challenging another's viewpoint
- Offer help and support when it is needed
- You have the right to "pass" when you do not want to speak on an issue
- Show appreciation when someone explains or does something well, or is helpful in some way to you.

(QCA, 2001, cited in Starkey, 2005, p. 33)

Starkey (2005) suggests further guidelines that teachers may wish to add to this list:

- Where a discussion is chaired, the authority of the chair is respected.
- Even heated debates must be conducted in polite language.
- Discriminatory remarks, particularly racist, sexist and homophobic discourse and expressions are totally unacceptable at any time.
- Participants show respect when commenting on and describing people portrayed in visuals or texts.
- All involved have the responsibility to challenge stereotypes.
- A respectful tone is required at all times

(p. 33)

Establishing a clear role

In addition to helping learners improve their English language proficiency, using the three approaches outlined above – the global issues approach, the intercultural competence approach and the dialogic approach – EFL teachers can also make a significant contribution to their students’ development as global citizens, particularly in the “feeling” and “practice” dimensions of citizenship. Clearly these approaches are not mutually exclusive, and many teachers will combine all three. Nor is the list exhaustive and there are no doubt additional ways for language teachers to promote global citizenship, for example by helping to develop media literacy skills.

Unfortunately, Japanese university administrators may not always be ready to recognize a role for foreign language instructors beyond their traditional remit of teaching grammar and vocabulary. Where foreign language teaching has been outsourced, for example, it has been to companies who specialize in delivering conventional language skills courses. Although most university departments still exercise direct control over foreign language curricula, they find themselves under increasing pressure to set quantifiable teaching outcomes, with a focus on gains in language proficiency. There is a strong preference among administrators for standardized test scores, which are viewed as an “objective” means of evaluating the effectiveness of language programmes. At Ritsumeikan, a continued preoccupation with TOEFL and TOEIC scores could threaten the content-based curricula that have allowed teachers to develop courses focusing on global issues since with very little explicit language instruction taking place in these classes, it can be difficult to demonstrate a clear correlation between the content-based syllabus and students’ test scores. Developing effective evaluation criteria for content-based teaching remains a vital task for university English departments and there has been some recent progress in this regard – with the creation of new “can do” lists, for instance. More important still is the need to ensure a clear understanding at all levels of the administration of the many ways in which language teachers can contribute to the broader objectives of a university education.

Content-based instruction has given EFL teachers at Ritsumeikan the opportunity to explore a wide range of subjects with their students, and many are focusing on such global topics as climate change, sustainable development and human rights issues. But while an awareness of such issues is vital for all global citizens, it has been suggested in this paper that language teachers need to articulate a broader role for themselves in teaching for global citizenship, one that does not rely exclusively on the selection of “global” content, but which emphasizes the distinctive contribution they can make *as language teachers*, for example by nurturing intercultural competence and skills for engaging in democratic dialogue.

Notes

- 1) Crick and his colleagues in the Advisory Group on Citizenship recognized concerns about “indoctrination” and addressed the issue at some length in the section of their report entitled “Guidance on the teaching of controversial issues”(Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, 1998, pp. 56-61).
- 2) Ritsumeikan colleagues may recall that when the shift to Content-Based Instruction was being discussed, Tim Murphey was invited to give a talk about a CBI programme he had helped set up at Nanzan university. He described how teachers had been asked to put together lessons on subjects they were knowledgeable about. This resulted in some courses with an apparent global issues focus like *Environmental Concerns* and *Women’s Studies*, but also courses on other miscellaneous topics such as *Rock ‘n’ Roll History, Health and Fitness Awareness* and *TV Commercials*. See Murphey (1997).
- 3) “All Equal, All Different” was the slogan chosen by the Council of Europe for its 2006 campaign for diversity, human rights and participation.
- 4) Many writers have adopted a similar tripartite conceptualization of citizenship education. In its recommendations for citizenship teaching in the UK, the Crick Report (QCA, 1998) proposed the three strands of social and moral responsibility, political literacy, and community involvement. Citing Gagel, Doyé (1996) argues that language education shares the aims of political (i.e. citizenship) education in three areas: cognitive, evaluative and action orientations.
- 5) For teachers wishing to develop these sorts of intercultural activities, helpful resource books include Tomalin and Stempleski (1994), and Utley (2004).

References

- Archibugi, D. (1998). Principles of Cosmopolitan Democracy. In D. Archibugi, D. Held & M. Köhler (Eds.), *Re-imagining political community: Studies in cosmopolitan democracy* (pp. 198-228). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Arthur, J., Davies, I., & Hahn, C. (2008). Introduction to the SAGE Handbook for Citizenship and Democracy. In J. Arthur, I. Davies & C. Hahn (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Education for Citizenship and Democracy* (pp. 1-10). London: SAGE Publications.
- Arthur, J., Davies, I., Wrenn, A., Haydn, T., & Kerr, D. (2001). *Citizenship through secondary history*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Brinton, D., Snow, M. A., & Wesche, M. B. (1989). *Content-based second language instruction* (Michigan classics ed.). Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press.
- Brown, K., & Brown, M. (2003). Introduction - Opening the debate on citizenship and modern foreign languages. In K. Brown & M. Brown (Eds.), *Reflections on citizenship in a multilingual world* (pp. 1-14). London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research (CILT).
- Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Byram, M. (2003). Teaching languages for democratic citizenship in Europe and beyond. In K. Brown & M. Brown (Eds.), *Reflections on citizenship in a multilingual world* (pp. 15-24). London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.

- Byram, M. (2006). Developing a concept of intercultural citizenship. In G. Alred, M. Byram & M. Fleming (Eds.), *Education for intercultural citizenship : concepts and comparisons* (pp. 109-129). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Byram, M. (2008). *From foreign language education to education for intercultural citizenship: Essays and reflections*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Byram, M., & Guilherme, M. (2000). Human rights, cultures and language teaching. In A. Osler (Ed.), *Citizenship and democracy in schools: Diversity, identity and equality* (pp. 63-78). Stoke: Trentham Books.
- Carel, S. (2001). Students as virtual ethnographers: Exploring the language-culture connection. In M. Byram, A. Nichols & D. Stevens (Eds.), *Developing intercultural competence in practice* (pp. 146-161). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cates, K. (2005). Teaching for a better world: Language education in Japan. In A. Osler & H. Starkey (Eds.), *Citizenship and language learning: International perspectives* (pp. 59-73). Stoke: Trentham Books.
- Davies, I., Cunningham, P., Evans, M., Fredriksson, G., Pike, G., Rathenow, H.-F., . . . Tesch, F. (2003). International citizenship education: Changing priorities, exchanging teachers. In K. Brown & M. Brown (Eds.), *Reflections on citizenship in a multilingual world* (pp. 43-52). London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research (CILT).
- Davies, I., Evans, M., & Reid, A. (2005). Globalising citizenship education? A critique of 'global education' and 'citizenship education'. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 53(1), 66-89.
- Doyé, P. (1996). Foreign language teaching and education for international understanding. *Evaluation and research in education*, 10(2,3), 104-112.
- Greenhall, S. (2002). *People Like Us: International Version*: Macmillan Languagehouse.
- Heater, D. B. (1999). *What is citizenship?* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Heater, D. B. (2004). *Citizenship: The civic ideal in world history, politics and education* (3rd ed.). Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Held, D. (1995). Democracy and the new international order. In D. Archibugi & D. Held (Eds.), *Cosmopolitan democracy: An agenda for a new world order* (pp. 96-120). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Ikeno, N. (Ed.). (in press). *Citizenship education in Japan*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement. (2009). International Civic and Citizenship Education Study. Retrieved November 15, 2010, from <http://www.iea.nl/icces.html>
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Murphey, T. (1997). A CBI Curriculum Innovation: Nanzan's revolving six-week workshops. *The Language Teacher*, 21(6), 25-29.
- Osler, A. (2005). Education for democratic citizenship: New challenges in a globalised world. In A. Osler & H. Starkey (Eds.), *Citizenship and language teaching: International perspectives* (pp. 3-22). Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.
- Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2010). *Teachers and human rights education*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.
- Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (Eds.). (2005). *Citizenship and language learning: International perspectives*.

- Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.
- Parekh, B. (1992). The cultural particularity of liberal democracy. *Political Studies*, XL(Special Issue), 160-175.
- Peaty, D. (2004). Global Issues in EFL: Education or indoctrination? *The Language Teacher*, 28(8), 15-18. Retrieved from The Language Teacher Online website: <http://www.jalt-publications.org/tlt/articles/2004/08/peaty>
- Peaty, D. (2007). *Topics for global citizenship*. Tokyo: Kinseido.
- Peaty, D. (2010). *You, me and the world: A course in communicative English for global citizenship* (2nd ed.). Tokyo: Kinseido.
- Qualifications and Curriculum Authority. (1998). Education for citizenship and the teaching of democracy in schools. Crick Report. London: QCA.
- Sargent, T. (2004). Advocacy-oriented global education in TLT special issues. *The Language Teacher*, 28(2), 9-13. Retrieved from The Language Teacher Online website: <http://www.jalt-publications.org/tlt/articles/2004/02/sargent>
- Sen, A. (1999). Democracy as a universal value. *Journal of Democracy*, 10(3), 3-17.
- Shaules, J., Tsujioka, H., & Iida, M. (2003). *Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Starkey, H. (2005). Language teaching for democratic citizenship. In A. Osler & H. Starkey (Eds.), *Citizenship and language learning: International perspectives* (pp. 23-39). Stoke: Trentham Books.
- Starkey, H., & Osler, A. (2003). Language teaching for cosmopolitan citizenship. In K. Brown & M. Brown (Eds.), *Reflections on citizenship in a multilingual world* (pp. 25-35). London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.
- Summerville, C. (2006a). *Looking back, moving forward: Listening and speaking*. Tokyo: Macmillan Languagehouse.
- Summerville, C. (2006b). *Looking back, moving forward: Reading and discussion*. Tokyo: Macmillan Languagehouse.
- Tomalin, B., & Stempleski, S. (1994). *Cultural awareness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Utley, D. (2004). *Intercultural resource pack: Intercultural communication resources for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, M. (2001). 'It must be cultural because I don't do it' : Cultural awareness in initial TESOL teacher education. In M. Byram, A. Nichols & D. Stevens (Eds.), *Developing intercultural competence in practice* (pp. 111-129). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.