



Global Education at School – from Cultural to Global Competence: Teacher’s Role and Tasks¹

URSZULA DERNOWSKA

*Katedra Dydaktyki, Instytut Pedagogiki,
Akademia Pedagogiki Specjalnej im. Marii Grzegorzewskiej,
ul. Szczęśliwicka 40, 02-353 Warszawa,
E-mail: udernowska@aps.edu.pl*

Abstract

The author attempts to determine the specific role and tasks of the teacher in a global school and classroom. Nowadays, in a world that is growing smaller and flatter every day, the responsibility of a teacher gains particular importance. Teachers should perceive their students both as individuals and as members of heterogeneous, interdependent global community. In order to navigate the complexities of the 21st century, people need to be globally competent. The way to foster global competence at school is through cultural competence, transformational learning, and personalized education. Teachers who welcome and celebrate individual student differences in cultures, religions, languages, values and beliefs, interests and talents – simultaneously create the climate of education that can support learning with others and among the others. Currently, cultural and global competences appear as teachers’ professional competences, as well as a purpose of classroom interactions.

Key words: global education, teacher’s role, teacher’s tasks, culture competence, global competence, global classroom

¹ An article devoted to the shaping of global competence at school was published in *Przegląd Pedagogiczny (Pedagogical Review)* 2013 no. 2. It was an extended version of the speech delivered during the 8th Pedagogical Congress in Gdańsk. However, in that article, the problems of shaping global competence are analyzed with regard to core curriculum solutions.

SOME REMARKS ABOUT GLOBALIZATION AND GLOCALIZATION, GLOCAL AND GLOBAL EDUCATION

During the last twenty-five years, the phenomenon of globalization has gained importance. Interestingly, the notion of globalization is not new, as evidenced by Clive Gamble's research concerning prehistoric and historic colonizations. The conclusions drawn on the basis of his study are not without significance for contemporary reflection on globalization processes. Gamble has proven that even in prehistoric times people in Australia (despite ethnic, anthropological, and language differences) formed pancontinental social and symbolic networks, which enabled them to survive in a difficult and highly unpredictable environment. In the light of the conclusions of Gamble's research, contemporary processes of globalization and increasing economic, political, and cultural relations among even geographically distant countries – possible mainly due to the development of means of communication, transportation, and the media – appear to be not so much a novelty, but rather a new layer forming on a broad network of social, economic, and symbolic relationships that had existed and functioned much earlier than we used to think (Gamble, 2003; see also Strządała, 2012). The modern world, however, is undoubtedly a place which we constantly need to explore anew.

According to Zygmunt Bauman (2000), the immanent parts of the globalization process are progressive spatial segregation, separation, and exclusion. There are numerous reasons primarily due to increasing difficulty in communication among the elites who, as a result of globalization, are gradually losing their connection with their particular territory, their "local" rest of the world. Currently, the centers that formulate meanings and values are extraterritorial and liberated from the bonds imposed by the notion of being local – but not for the human condition for which these meanings and values are supposed to add sense. Globalization also implies the revival of local, regional, and ethnic communities, leading to the phenomenon of glocalization. Bauman (1997) defines "glocalization" as the process of selecting and connecting organic globalizing and localizing trends. It is the process of redistribution of privileges and disabilities, poverty and wealth, power and helplessness, freedom and constraint. It is as well the process of re-stratification of the world: rebuilding and relocating it according to new rules different from the previously existing norms. It is the process of building a new worldwide hierarchy (Bauman, 1997). Nowadays, undoubtedly two processes constantly collide in the world: the first one is connected with globalization, and the second one is the process of differentiation and

fragmentation. Both of them coexist on the political and economic, cultural and social planes (Melosik, 2001).

Jerzy Nikitorowicz (2005) points out that the glocalization described by Bauman can only exist due to the educational opening of some territorial groups and can meet every expectation if it remains local. Glocal education does not contrast the phenomena and processes connected with globalization and differentiation, but emphasizes their coexistence, complementarity, mutual enrichment, and support, thus enabling an individual to function with their local world in the global one. Integration and fragmentation, globalization and territorialization are the two sides of the same process of redistribution of sovereignty and freedom of action (Nikitorowicz, 2005). Therefore, glocal education seems to fit into the broader context created by global education. The latter type of education contains two important components: cognitive and ethical. The cognitive aspect implies the need to know the global processes which reflect the interdependence and various relationships of the modern world, and thus the need to go beyond everything that is local and adopting a much broader view of reality, inevitably, not only the “here and now.” These interdependencies are also a challenge that demands taking responsibility for the actions conducted in the local area but with, after all, global consequences. Identification of an individual with the entire human species entails a sense of co-responsibility for the fate of the world (Mincer, 2012). If the responsibility is regarded as one of the primary forces motivating human actions, it becomes a starting point (adopted more or less consciously) for ethical reflection. Feeling a sense of responsibility is a consequence of relationships and dependencies which an individual –participating in social life – enters or is involved in, and the result of this participation (Ciążela, 2006).

Clearly, the ideas of responsibility and global education are not only the imperatives of the present, but also specific tasks and problems (Ciążela and Tyburski, 2012). Global education, considered as a practice, is aimed at shaping a global consciousness that allows intercultural dialogue, anticipation of change, and active participation in improving reality. It also leads to a sense of identification of an individual with the all humans and co-responsibility for the world in which we live. School instruction, focused on shaping global competence, and previously also cultural competence, fulfils the mission of education “for the future.”

Cultural competence serves glocal needs, implies learning about our own culture, mostly by comparing it with other manners of categorizing reality, and exploring ourselves, our “here” and “now” through the knowledge of our culture. The acquisition and development of these competences allow an individual free mental movement between the two dimensions so strongly inscribed in our existence: the local and global dimensions. Cultural competence enables the

formation of global competence, and thus the development of cognitive and ethical readiness of a human to coexist in the world with others and share with them the responsibility for the present and the future.

CULTURAL AND GLOBAL COMPETENCE AT SCHOOL

From the above considerations we can conclude that without cultural competence there is no global competence. Culture does not “happen” by proclamation. It “happens” as a community develops history and the beliefs, symbols, values, rituals, ceremonies, and stories that accumulate as a significant part of that history (Collins and Porras, 1998). Culture is a product of the human mind. It also shapes the mind and allows it to function. The mind could not exist without the culture. Thinking, learning, and teaching are always situated within a cultural context and depend on the utilization of cultural environment resources. Culture provides tools for organizing and comprehending our “possible worlds” in a communicative manner (Bruner, 2006). Another culture does not need to be considered a threat, but an opportunity to enrich our perception of reality (Golka, 2001). People need the ability to move graciously between cultures. Education leads people into the “world of multiple realities,” allowing us to “jump from one world to another” (Melosik and Szkudlarek, 1998).

Jerzy Nikitorowicz (2005), writing about intercultural education and the formation of multicultural societies, refers to the stand of Samuel P. Huntington. According to Huntington, culture and cultural identity on the one hand construct patterns of cohesion, but on the other hand cause conflicts and contribute to the disintegration of the world. Today, the multiculturalism of societies is “multiculturalism disclosed,” it is an undeniable social fact. Multiculturalism is a common phenomenon, a consequence of increasingly numerous processes of migration, exile, peregrinations motivated by the need to explore the world, cultures and to learn, of opening of the borders and the like. All these processes are getting stronger. And these changes have forced a redefinition of the concept of multiculturalism, which in the classical meaning included the dimension of ethnicity, junction, meeting, direct and indirect contact, implying the necessity to recognize human rights or the rights of different groups (ethnic, religious, national, etc.). This redefinition, however, entails numerous problems, new research questions, and forces us to reflect and try to find the answers. On the one hand, it can be assumed that the more differences accumulate, the more often cultural conflicts occur and the longer they last. On the other hand, societies are and will be increasingly multicultural, and the conflict does not depend on the disclosed differences, but on the democratization process taking

place in these societies, on learning about different cultures, understanding them and speaking with other cultures as a condition of one's own development (Nikitorowicz, 2005).

Cultural identity is a result of interaction between multiple dimensions: personal awareness of one's very self ("Me") and its own identity, awareness of belonging to a particular "We," social recognition, acceptance, and approval in the "We" dimension. The separateness of "Me" creates not only a genetic potential, inherited from biological ancestors, but also the cultural heritage in which an individual is immersed from the beginning of their existence, in which they participate, although not always and not from the very beginning with full consciousness (Nikitorowicz, 2001). Cultural identity is the consciousness of one's own characteristics that constitute the sense of separateness, and also similarities shared with others, with the simultaneous sense of duration, continuity in time and the feeling that, despite the changing of external environment conditions and development, we are still the same person. Identifying oneself with a community is an important prerequisite for participation in the culture of a given group, belonging and being loyal to it (Nikitorowicz, 2001). Identity is a meeting of the present with the past and the anticipated future. It stems from a conscious orientation of people in the group on the group's values that determine its specificity and autonomy, expressed in an emotional relation to these values. If personal identity is anchored in the need of uniqueness, social identity is based on the needs of belonging and similarity to others. Cultural identity is a set of values and objectives that constitute life of an individual and are inseparable from human existence and such concepts as: freedom and choice, responsibility and commitment to oneself and the group. A man without commitment does not have a responsibility and is thus deprived of their freedom; therefore personal identity is always a social identity (Nikitorowicz, 2001).

Thus, if teachers do not make an effort to determine how cultural differences that characterize their students influence the students' perception of themselves as those who learn and how these differences determine the process of learning, then in numerous classrooms and schools in the world culture might become a kind of a "bull in a china shop" – an "element" completely undesirable there, an awkward "creation" which does not fit into the official mainstream of education focused on duplicating the content of the familiar order. In this sense, culture may therefore be considered as a factor interfering with the teaching-learning process. As William Powell and Ochan Kusuma-Powell note:

Although culture is usually an almost invisible category for those immersed in it, it nevertheless provides a framework for their personal identity. If we disregard someone's culture, even unintentionally, we always do it at our own risk. But when we, educators, ignore the cultural

context in which the development of our students is inscribed, or pretend that this context does not influence learning in the classroom, we assume an attitude of arrogance, disrespect for our students or, even worse, cause their alienation and destroy their sense of belonging to a teaching-learning community that our classroom or school should become. (Powell and Kusuma-Powell, 2011, p. 20)

If schools lack emotionally favorable conditions for learning, circumstances for students to “know how” to overcome the fear of being different and foreign, and replacing the original distance or perhaps even prejudice with an attitude of curiosity and the desire to learn, no shaping of cultural competence will occur and, as a result, neither will global competence (Powell and Kusuma-Powell, 2011). Cultural competence is expressed in the attitude of learning about other cultures and people who are culturally different, an attitude marked by curiosity, the desire to explore and being open to differentness. But exploring our own culture is a starting point for learning about other cultures and other cultures provide a new lens for observing our own culture (Powell and Kusuma-Powell, 2011). Thus, this type of an “interdependence” is of profound importance not only for an individual, but in an anthropological sense.

Wendy Griswold (2013), analyzing cultures and societies in a changing world, points out that many of the most persistent conflicts taking place after the Cold War have cultural backgrounds, for example those connected with ethnic unity or religious fundamentalism – matters for which a lot of blood was spilled and which are specifically related to meanings, values, and emotions, and thus go beyond the sphere of economy or politics. Griswold also emphasizes that even business negotiations or talks between politicians from different countries – so between people of often different cultural backgrounds – can proceed more smoothly and be more effective if the participants are aware of the importance of cultural differences. Understanding the cultural context of past and present conflicts or misunderstandings is the first step to quickly resolve them or avoid them altogether in the future. Due to the knowledge of their own culture as well as other, often completely unfamiliar ones, students can become intelligent and effective citizens of the world in which cultures and societies change faster than ever before (Griswold, 2013).

Shaping and developing global competence in the educational process cannot be reduced to the “three Fs.” In other words, it cannot be reduced to describing “flags,” “festivals,” or “food” of “others” who are discussed in a classroom. Global competence includes knowledge of other people, but it has to be complemented with the ability and willingness to coexist and cooperate with people defining themselves and the reality in a variety of different ways. Such coexistence and cooperation are not possible without the values that an individual has to

recognize and accept, such as respect for the dignity of other people, openness to others, responsibility for oneself and another person of a different culture, and understanding the meaning of a dialogue constitution of relationships with others.

Global competence includes three dimensions: affective, cognitive, and practical. The first one includes ethical considerations. The affective dimension concerns values and thus is of axiological nature. It is about the willingness and disposition of an individual to perceive cultural differences. This perception is characterized by universal values which are inscribed in active learning about these differences. The cognitive dimension implies knowledge of the world, not only geographical or historical but, above all, knowledge of global issues and sensitivity to such matters as those connected with environmental protection, economy or health. The practical aspect of global competence includes the ability to communicate with others, disposition to capture the subtleties and nuances present in other cultures (Zhao, 2009).

TEACHER IN GLOBAL CLASSROOM

Teachers, their education and actions, can be discussed in two types of language: the language of “closed systems” dominated by a clear understanding of conceptual and terminological structures as well as a strict hierarchy of teaching activities, and the language characterized by “soft styles” of the humanities, strongly associated with open systems and divergent thinking that dominates in them. The creativity of open systems is closely related to the notion of culture defined as the development and upgrading of human life. With respect to teachers and their educational activities, this term is associated with the communicative nature of the process of education. Therefore, the communicative culture of a teacher would require, with reference to the definition of culture assumed here, supporting the development of learners and refining them by having communicative interactions with them (Koc-Seniuch, 2000). The concept of communicative culture includes a powerful charge of educational values. It is very important because the changed nature of modern challenges demands including values in the process of education as well as presenting learners with those values that should guide them in everyday lives (Dzwonkowska, 2012). This culture is also a kind of measure of ethical and intellectual condition of teachers who now more often play the role of creators—organizers of the learning environment and its culture than of sources—media of information (Koc-Seniuch, 2000). After all, educational interaction without values (such as recognition, respect or responsibility) is always futile, hence – in addition to the undoubtedly desirable intellectual partnership of students and teachers in a classroom – the learning process cannot lack values which, on the one hand, will be universal enough to be accepted and adopted by students representing different ethnic, religious or national groups, and

on the other hand, will allow to identify elements shared with the local culture, permanently inscribed in a broader axiological area in which a particular school, and the process of education conducted in it, is situated (Dzwonkowska, 2012).

According to Powell and Kusuma-Powell (2011), the last twenty years have changed our classrooms and professional perspectives. “Around the world, seismic demographic shifts have made monocultural enclave schools, ..., increasingly rare” (p. 3). Today it is common for many schools to have numbers of nationalities represented among their students. The last decades have also changed our understanding of learning process as well as how the human brain works. It means that now teachers have to recognize that students bring to the classroom not only different learning styles or intellectual preferences, but also different cultural backgrounds. Global classrooms can open new opportunities for the learning process for its participants, but it can also significantly reduce this process and, as a result, the development of the learners. The role of teachers in such a specific learning environment is thus truly special. They have to be prepared for this role, not only in terms of subject-matter and methodological expertise, technical and organizational competence, communicative and interactive culture, and not only in terms of their willingness to reflect on their own performance, or creativity, although without all of these qualities it is hard to imagine a contemporary teacher. We have to remember that cultural equality is (should be) the foundation of globalization processes in education (Konstańczak and Żuk, 2012).

Cultural and global competence should therefore be regarded also as among the key professional skills of a teacher. Teachers must first carefully observe themselves, their culture, to be able to perceive students with the same accuracy. Only those teachers who probing their own cultural biases and assumptions, discovering their own preferences in learning styles that may have translated into their own preferred and dominant teaching style, and recognizing based assumptions and expectations that they have about children can be prepared to more clearly understand and serve their students. Every teacher who is focused in the classroom on something more than only the distribution of information or skills development, even only on an intuitive level knows that it is impossible to have a genuine meeting with students and engage in deep interactions with them without reflection on “who am I as a teacher?” and answering the question of how a sense of cultural and professional identity of a teacher can affect the students’ learning. Simply speaking, teachers have to see themselves clearly before they will be able to see their students (Powell and Kusuma-Powell, 2011).

Art Costa and Robert Garmston (2002) identify five “states of mind” which, taken together, influence an individual’s perceptions of the reality as well as personal identity. These

states – efficacy, consciousness, flexibility, craftsmanship, interdependence – “drive, influence, motivate and inspire our intellectual capacities, emotional responsiveness, high performance, and productive human action” (p. 124). The first one predicated on an internal locus of responsibility – the individual’s belief that the action she or he does will make a difference in the outcome of a situation. People with high degrees of efficacy are self-confident, they set challenging goals and persevere in the face of adversity. There are opinions that neither the curriculum nor the professional skills mattered nearly as much as the teachers’ belief in themselves. Highly efficacious teachers are able to control performance anxiety in the classroom and, in so doing, they reduce stress and teach much more effectively. They are also more likely to get feedback from their students on their performance and therefore to be self-assessing and self-modifying.

Consciousness implies insight into our thoughts, emotions, decisions, or behaviours. It is also awareness of the influence that they may have on others. Particularly in global classroom, teachers need to be aware of how they select and construct their perceptions, and how congruent their values and behaviours are. It involves being cognizant of the personal and cultural experiences they carry into educational situations. Consciousness begins by being attentive to both verbal and nonverbal behaviours of self and others.

Flexibility instead is the ability to perceive and analyze situation from multiple points of view, to shift between egocentric and allocentric perspectives, from *self-* to *other-*centered. The capacity to understand other minds, or “mindreading,” plays an enormous role not only in our daily life, but also in school. Human beings are able to project themselves into the minds of other people and anticipate reactions and consequences. This is very important when multiple cultures are present in the classroom and multiple opportunities for misunderstanding.

Craftsmanship should be a goal for every teacher. Nurturing craftsmanship in self and others is an explicit professional responsibility. In the global classroom teachers have to understand and appreciate the diverse frames of reference of the students in order to frame lessons in a way that will be significant. It is one of the challenges of the master craftsman in such place and circumstances. Craftsmanship in the classroom might include personalizing instruction, or implementing a targeted program of professional development, coaching a colleague, and successfully boosting one’s own teaching skills (Powell and Kusuma-Powell, 2011).

Interdependence implies shared responsibility for the education and implementation of the core mission of the modern school which aims at providing everyone with means to understand other people – their identity – and to understand the world in its chaotic march towards a certain unity (Delors, 1998). We should, however, remember that we have to start from the understanding of ourselves, taking a kind of an inner journey the direction of which is set by

knowledge, reflection, critical attitude towards ourselves (Delors, 1998). Interdependence is a value. People who interpret interdependence in the above-mentioned manner are capable of appreciating cooperation, and in interaction situations can – if necessary – present their point of view, or – if necessary – rely more on the judgement of others. “Teachers who have a high sense of interdependence are willing to give and receive help and support and are able to be simultaneously an autonomous individual and a member of a collective learning community” (Powell, Kusuma-Powell, 2011, p. 76). Human being is conditioned by numerous factors and dependant on others, but also is an independent unit. Human being is a representative of the species, yet a unique phenomenon. Human being is open and closed, obliged to the others but also autonomous. Pluralization of cultural behaviors, systems of values and attitudes, so typical of our times, leads to an increase in the range of acceptable diversity, but also arouses existential tensions arising from the realization of the necessity of making choices, non-obviousness or even certain decomposition of the existing forms of social life. Moreover, the multitude of conventions, indeterminacy of communication codes requires constant negotiation of meaning, generating the need to learn a new type of communication skills (Nikitorowicz, 2005). The global classroom – due to its internal diversity and richness of cultural behaviors, systems of values, and also because of this non-obviousness, various kinds of interactions and areas of tension – reflects the out-of-school reality, becoming the area of searching own cultural identity of individuals spending time together, and the plane of discovering the identity of others and building relationships.

TEACHER – STUDENT RELATION IN GLOBAL CLASSROOM: NEW CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

The question of how to enable students not only to be successful in their learning process, but also to effectively function in globalized reality – is, most of all, a question about teachers and their qualifications, functions, and essential tasks. Migration and mobility are now not only the elements permanently inscribed in the categories of postmodern socio-cultural changes on a global scale. These are also educational challenges at the level of a classroom, school and entire school systems. The importance of these challenges is evidenced by the Green Paper published by the Commission of the European Communities entitled *Migration and Mobility: Challenges and Opportunities for EU Education Systems*.² Due to a considerably high inflow of people from the so-called third countries to the EU member states, as well as high internal mobility, schools in numerous member states have faced a sudden and rather rapid increase in the number of migrant

² COM(2008) 423.

learners. The authors of the paper refer to the data of PIRLS and PISA – the latter show that in 2006, for instance, in the fifteen so-called “old” EU countries at least 10% of students population aged 15 either were born abroad or had parents from another country; among children in the fourth grade of primary school this estimation was 15%, and in some countries (Ireland, Spain, Italy) the percent of students born abroad increased three or four times since 2000. The presence of significant numbers of migrant pupils – we read in the aforementioned document – has important implications for education systems. Schools must play a leading role in creating an inclusive society, as they represent the main opportunity for young people of migrant and host communities to get to know and respect each other. Migration can be enriching for the educational experience of all: linguistic and cultural diversity may bring an invaluable resource (2008). In another part of the document we read: being confronted with other viewpoints and perspectives has the potential to be enriching both for students and teachers. Intercultural skills and the capacity to enter into a tolerant and respectful dialogue with others from a different cultural background are competences that need to be built, and can be built.

The Green Paper is full of similar declarations – catchy phrases connected with an attempt to identify the situation of migrant children (especially those in a difficult social and economic situation) along with the establishment of a framework for considering a whole group of issues related to the education of migrant children. The authors of the paper also encourage the parties in question to share ideas about ways in which the European Commission could support Member States in formulating their education policies in this respect and organize a possible process of exchanging experiences in this field. The initiative should without a doubt be appreciated, although the road from words to practical solutions sometimes happens to be quite long. All the more noteworthy is the road of the implementation of global education, travelled and described by the Powells (2011), with clearly defined landmarks leading from cultural competence through personalized and transformational learning to global competence. Over the last four decades they have worked with thousands of teachers in more than forty countries. They also have taught students that were diverse in terms of ethnicity, culture, linguistic background, or socioeconomic status. These students also brought remarkable learning diversity to their classroom: “Some were in the early stages of learning English. Others had learning disabilities, remarkable talents, academic gifts, or attention issues. Many were experiencing profound relocation stress as they moved from country to country and school to school” (p. 1).

According to the Powells, a successful education in the world that is growing smaller every day, requires focusing on students both as individuals and members of a multicultural and interdependent community. Drawing on the years of experience in international schools, they

identify five critical keys to effective instruction. So, nowadays teachers must work to know their students as learners, know themselves as teachers, know the curriculum, know their assessments, and know their collegial relationships. Pursuit of advanced knowledge in all these five domains is critical to success. Moreover, the Powells emphasize that the focus of a teacher on one or two domains significantly reduces the ability to personalize student's learning process, and thus also the effectiveness of education. We can imagine teachers who know their learners, with deepened self-awareness, but insufficient knowledge of the curriculum and teaching materials. Although they may be well-liked by students and enjoy their trust, such teachers present a weak educational potential and poor cognitive effects of educational situations created by them. We can also think of teachers who demonstrate proficiency in their subject matter but do not know their learners, limiting the potential achievements of their students. A teacher who notices and exposes differences between students, recognizes their value of enriching the learning environment, at the same time forms favorable atmosphere in the classroom or school for the need of deeper exploration of these differences. To enhance the sense and cognitive qualities of these actions, the Powells use the term "transformational learning." It means the process that involves taking a critical look at beliefs and assumptions in order to develop new ways of knowing. Information learning, the essence of which is quite well described by the metaphor of a factory, is replaced by learning focused on exploring "otherness" and detection of everything that is, after all, common. A deep axiological meaning given to a teacher's activities differentiates the personalization of students' learning from the "individualization" of this process postulated in didactics. To personalize learning means to make the teaching material as attractive and important for the widest group of learners as possible. Powell and Kusuma-Powell observe:

This is accomplished by providing multiple access points to a high-quality curriculum – access points that will entice students with different readiness levels, interests, cultural backgrounds, intelligence preferences, and learning styles. Once students connect with the curriculum, personalized learning aims to keep them engaged, maximizing their understanding and achievement. (Powell and Kusuma-Powell, 2011, p. 7)

Such relationships of the teacher with learners have a primarily ethical dimension. This requires teachers to strive for the fullest possible knowledge of their students and themselves as those who teach and also learn a lot by being among others, with others. It is important that in a school or classroom learners can understand that they have the right to perceive reality differently and they also have the right to fully express emotions connected with it, but in a way that does not violate the dignity of others.

TEACHER AND GLOBAL EDUCATION AT SCHOOL

“Responsibility” is now a word permanently inscribed in the discourse on the contemporary world and the challenges entailed by its transformations. Today, it is difficult even to imagine a deeper axiological, socio-political, and educational reflection without reference to this term, although this reference has different levels of intensity, different power. In global reality and education, in global school and classroom, the responsibility of a teacher gains particular importance. Zbigniew Kwieciński (2000) writes that responsible teachers are those who are open to people and loyal to them, who understand the world and are able to direct themselves towards helping students understand the world and the others, and thus understand themselves better. In addition to numerous competences characterizing a contemporary teacher, all well described in the pedagogical literature, we cannot forget about the cultural and global competences. On the one hand, they appear as professional competences of teachers, and on the other hand, as a purpose of their interactions with learners. Such interaction should be focused on the development of students’ knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to explore/determine their place in the existing reality which is getting “fast, faster and faster,” and on building productive interactions with others, interactions marked by the desire to teach-learn about what is different and how to responsibly construct the future based on what is common.

Global education aims allowing a better mutual understanding, enhancing the sense of responsibility and solidarity through accepting mutual spiritual and cultural identities (Delors, 1998). This statement imposes certain conditions of education on the school and teacher; caring for students and effective preparation of the young generation to function in ever-changing reality currently requires the teacher to organize teaching situations to not only practice “intellectual cleverness” of students, but also develop a kind of “task aggression” – a courageous desire to “attack” problems and effective search for methods of solving them. It is also necessary to create an opportunity to reflect on the complexity of the world, its condition, problems that are not local matters today but global; an opportunity to expose values so that students could experience them, then accept them and include in their already shaped system of values; finally, opportunities for rich and enriching interactions with other people, other cultures.

REFERENCES

- Bauman, Z. (1997). Glokalizacja, czyli komu globalizacja, a komu lokalizacja. *Studia Socjologiczne*, 3.
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Globalizacja. I co z tego dla ludzi wynika*. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Bruner, J. S. (2006). *Kultura edukacji*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Ciążela, H. (2006). *Problemy i dylematy etyki odpowiedzialności globalnej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademii Pedagogiki Specjalnej.
- Ciążela H., Tyburski W. (2012). Wprowadzenie. W: H. Ciążela, W. Tyburski (red.), *Odpowiedzialność globalna i edukacja globalna. Wymiary teorii i praktyki*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademii Pedagogiki Specjalnej.
- Collins, J. C., Porras, J. I. (1998). *Building your company's vision*. In: Harvard Business Review on Change. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Costa, A. L., Garmston, R. J. (2002). *Cognitive Coaching*. Norwood: Christopher-Gordon.
- Delors, J. (1998). *Edukacja: jest w niej ukryty skarb*. Warszawa: Stowarzyszenie Oświatowców Polskich.
- Dzwonkowska, D. (2012). Rola wartości w edukacji globalnej. W: H. Ciążela, W. Tyburski (red.), *Odpowiedzialność globalna i edukacja globalna. Wymiary teorii i praktyki*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademii Pedagogiki Specjalnej.
- Gamble, C. (2003). *Timewalkers: The Prehistory of Global Colonization*. Stroud: Sutton Publishing.
- Golka, M. (2001). Problemy i dylematy edukacji dla wielokulturowości. W: J. Nikitorowicz, M. Sobiecki, D. Misiejuk (red.), *Kultury tradycyjne a kultura globalna. Konteksty edukacji międzykulturowej*. Białystok: Trans Humana.
- Griswold, W. (2013). *Socjologia kultury. Kultury i społeczeństwa w zmieniającym się świecie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Koć-Seniuch, G. (2000). O kształtowaniu kultury komunikacyjnej współczesnego nauczyciela. W: H. Kwiatkowska, T. Lewowicki, S. Dylak (red.), *Współczesność a kształcenie nauczycieli*. Warszawa: Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna ZNP.
- Konstańczak, S., Żuk, M. (2012). Edukacja wobec globalizacji. W: H. Ciążela, W. Tyburski (red.), *Odpowiedzialność globalna i edukacja globalna. Wymiary teorii i praktyki*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademii Pedagogiki Specjalnej.
- Kwieciński, Z. (2000). *Tropy – ślady – próby. Studia i szkice z pedagogiki pogranicza*. Poznań–Olsztyn: Edytor.
- Melosik, Z. (2001). Edukacja globalna: nadzieje i kontrowersje. W: T. Jaworska, R. Leppert (red.), *Wprowadzenie do pedagogiki. Wybór tekstów*. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls.
- Melosik, Z., Szkudlarek, T. (1998). *Kultura, tożsamość i edukacja. Migotanie znaczeń*. Kraków:
- Mincer, T. (2012). Na ile globalna jest edukacja globalna? *Kultura – Historia – Globalizacja*, 12, 197-206.

Nikitorowicz, J. (2001), Wielopłaszczyznowa i ustawicznie kreująca się tożsamość w społeczeństwie wielokulturowym a edukacja międzykulturowa. W: J. Nikitorowicz, M. Sobecki, D. Misiejuk (red.), *Kultury tradycyjne a kultura globalna*, t. 1. Białystok: Trans Humana.

Nikitorowicz, J. (2005). *Kreowanie tożsamości dziecka. Wyzwania edukacji międzykulturowej*. Gdańsk: Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.

Powell, W., Kusuma-Powell, O. (2011). *How to Teach Now. Five Keys to Personalized Learning in the Global Classroom*. Alexandria: ASCD.

Strządała, A. (2012). Człowiek – gatunek globalny? Globalna tożsamość według Clive’a Gambele’a. *Kultura – Historia – Globalizacja*, 12, 233-245.

Zhao, Y. (2009). *Catching up or Leading the Way: American Education in the Age of Globalization*. Alexandria: ASCD.