# Christian educators and educationists called to expect the unexpected: Implications for citizenship education

**Prof. C.C. Wolhuter (Corresponding author)**
*Charl.Wolhuter@nwu.ac.za*

**Prof. J.L. van der Walt**
*Hannesv290@gmail.com*

**Prof. F.J. Potgieter**
*Ferdinand.Potgieter@nwu.ac.za*

**North-West University, South Africa**

The trouble with our times is that the future is not what it used to be… (Paul Valery, 1914).

I am not worried about the future at all. In fact, I think it is the most wonderful future I ever had. I have got to spend all the rest of my life in that future, and I don't want to run it down. It is going to be a wonderful place to live, I think (Charles F Kettering, 1938).

## Abstract

*The school, religion and the state have through the ages been in a relationship that has rarely been to the benefit of the former two, and this will probably continue to be the case in the foreseeable future. As to the question: "How can Christian educators and educationists successfully and effectively brave future challenges with regards to the interrelationship between these three entities?" it is suggested that they adopt a strategy consisting of three "steps". The first is to identify a theory that might help them understand the dynamics of current and future events concerning*

*this interrelationship. The Cultural-Historical Activity Theory could be considered for this purpose. Secondly, they should identify and hold on to constants surrounding these three entities and avoid focusing on the contingencies. Thirdly, they should assign significance/meaning, based on Scriptural principles and perspectives, to the interrelationship and interplay between the three entities. The discussion is concluded with an indication of how the insights flowing from the discussion of this strategy could be applied in schools in the subject Citizenship Education, the subject currently charged in South Africa with the specific task of preparing learners for their place, task and role as future citizens.*

## Opsomming

*Deur die eeue heen was die verhouding tussen skool, religie en staat van so 'n aard dat dit selde tot voordeel van die eersgenoemde twee gestrek het. Met betrekking tot die vraag: "Hoe kan Christenopvoeders (-onderwysers) en opvoedkundiges toekomstige uitdagings suksesvol en effektief die hoof bied vir sover dit die interverwantskap tussen hierdie drie groothede betref?", word voorgestel dat hulle 'n strategie oorweeg wat uit drie "stappe" bestaan. Die eerste stap is die identifisering van 'n teorie wat hulle kan help om die dinamiek van hierdie interverwantskap sowel as toekomstige gebeure daaromheen te verstaan. Die Kultureel-historiese Aktiwiteitsteorie kan vir hierdie doel oorweeg word. Die tweede stap behels dat hulle die gelykblywendhede (konstantes) wat vir elkeen van hierdie groothede geld, behoort te identifiseer en daarop te fokus, en nie op die kontingensies nie. Derdens behoort hulle op grond van skriftuurlike beginsels en perspektiewe sin/betekenis aan die interverwantskap en tussenspel tussen hierdie drie groothede toe te ken. Die bespreking word afgesluit met 'n aanduiding van hoe die insigte voorvloeiend uit hierdie strategie toegepas kan word in Burgerskapopvoeding in skole, die vak wat volgens huidige beleid getaak is om leerders vir hulle plek, taak en rol as toekomstige landsburgers voor te berei.*

# 1. Introduction and problem statement

School educators, that is, school teachers, operate in an arena in which at least three forces or entities are constantly interacting, namely the school itself as a teaching-learning institution, the religious character of the community or society in which the school is located, and the state (as one of several other societal structures in the school environment). In other words, school educators (teachers) as well as those who are responsible for their professional training, that is, educationists, have to prepare themselves not only for coping with the possible future challenges that the school, as a teaching-learning institution, is expected to face, but also the challenges emanating from the religious context in which the school is located, and from the state as the school's chief financier and policy-maker. Individually and in combination, these three societal forces confront both teachers and teacher educators (educationists) with a variety of challenges:

o Schools are already and will be experiencing changes such as the following: the increased application of social media, the application of distance and open learning and of new technology such as robotics, and the introduction of different types of schooling such as home schooling and borderless classrooms (Arseven, Orhan, & Arseven, 2019:26-32; BurcuTopu, & Goktas, 2019:2-8; Chang, 2004:180-192; Hendriksen, Creely, Ceretkova, Cernochova, Miroslava, Evgenia, Erkko & Tienken, 2018:410-417; Huddleston, 2016; Karademir, Alper, Soğuksu, & Karababa, 2019:2-14; Pennington & Rogerson-Revell, 2019:235-282; Sheng, 2019:220-224).

o The religious environments of schools are already facing, and can be expected to continue facing challenges such as secularisation, the abandonment of mainstream religious affiliation, a growth in spirituality and in the number of sceptics (e.g., atheists and agnostics), increasing dogmatic and confessional fusion between followers of different religious denominations (Pew Research Center, 2017:4-5; De Muynck, 2008), deinstitutionalisation, religious de-pillarization (as in the Netherlands, cf. Huyse, 1987; Akkermans, 1997; Miedema, Bertram-Troost, Ter Avest, Kom & De Wolff, 2013; Vermeer, 2013; Bernts & Berghuijs, 2016; Franken & Vermeer, 2017; Broer, Hoogland & Van der Stoep, 2016).

o States already contend with, and can be expected to continue contending with the challenges of globalization, transnationalism, internationalism, porous boundaries, increased migration, xenophobia in their populations, increased unemployment, corruption and the problems associated with these trends (Friedman, 2009; Urry, 2000). Trends such as these might become a commonplace feature of the future.

It is clear from this brief sketch of the context in which educators (teachers) and educationists (teacher educators/scholars) and students/learners find themselves that they face an uncertain and challenging future. The purpose of this article is to disseminate the results of research into how school educators (teachers) and educationists (teacher educators) could cope with challenges such as these. The research was aimed at finding an answer to the following question: How will Christian educators and educationists, in particular, be able to successfully cope with the challenges of both the foreseeable and an unexpected future associated with the three forces described above, and how could the findings flowing from this research impact on citizenship education (henceforth: CE) in schools? Without denying that all other school subjects should be forward-looking and contribute to learners'/students' capacity to cope with the expected and unexpected future, we placed the emphasis in this research on CE since that is the subject that, according to South African education policy as it currently stands, has been entrusted with the task of preparing young South Africans for their future duties and responsibilities, also in regard to the other societal relationships that they might encounter in their future lives (such as the close and extended family, religious institutions, the state, business, to name a few). According to paragraph 2.1 of the *Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement/National Curriculum Statement* (2011) for the Further Education and Training Phase,

> Life Orientation (the subject in which CE is mainly located – authors) is the study of the self in relation to others and society. It addresses skills, knowledge and values about the self, the environment, responsible citizenship, a healthy and productive life, social engagement, recreation and physical activity, careers and career choices. These include opportunities to engage in the development and practice of a variety of life skills to solve problems, to make informed decisions and choices and to take appropriate actions to live meaningfully and successfully in a rapidly changing society. It not only focuses on knowledge, but also emphasises the importance of the application of skills and values in real-life situations, participation in physical activity, community organisations and initiatives (RSA, 2011).

As Smith and Arendse (2016:68) correctly pointed out, Life Orientation is the subject intended to prepare learners to become active citizens by ensuring that they have the necessary knowledge, skills and attitudes to contribute to the development and well-being of the society in which they live.

For purposes of arriving at an answer to the research question, the remainder of this article is structured as follows. It commences with a discussion of the pressures already exerted on each of the three entities or forces: the school, religion and the state, in the process demonstrating how the interrelationship

between them has increasingly become problematic and probably will remain so in the foreseeable future. That is followed by a discussion of how Christian educationists and educators arguably could cope with the challenges unfolding in the future. The discussion culminates in an application to CE of the insights flowing from the proposed "strategic plan".

## 2.  The three forces: pressures exerted on each

### 2.1  The state

Schools appeared for the first time in Egypt and Mesopotamia by about 3000 BC (Bowen, 1982:8). According to Cohen (1970), they came into existence for the purpose of maintaining the integrity of the state in that scribes (the teachers) promoted loyalty towards the state. Since these states were also theocracies, a strong bond developed between school, state and religion; schools were used to impose a preferred culture (including religion) and a particular brand of state loyalty on the learners/students. Such imposition by the dominant class continued throughout the ensuing centuries (for instance, in the Cathedral and Monastic schools, and also the public schools in Western Europe and North America till well after the Second World War). The same tendency can also be detected in the purpose of the missionary schools in the 19th and 20th centuries. Terreblanche (2014) refers to these schools as instruments of European domination. Even after the attainment of independence by the erstwhile colonies after the 1960s, many of the new governments used the schools to promote a particular political culture and religion (Iran, cf. Kamyab, 2014; Malaysia, cf. Loo, 2014; Israel, cf. Wolhuter, 2012:181-182; Latin America, cf. De Fugueiredo-Cowen & Gvirtz, 2009:837; Lesotho, cf. Lesoli, Van Wyk, Van der Walt, Potgieter & Wolhuter, 2014). Exceptions to this "rule" were erstwhile East bloc countries during the early twentieth century, but this trend was reversed after 1990 when their governments allowed the dominant religion to return to public schools, as in Armenia (cf. Terzian, 2014:27-52).

It is clear from the above brief overview of the history of the state-religion-school relationship that the school has through the ages always been under external (that is, non-pedagogical) socio-political and state pressure. Instead of being acknowledged as an independent societal institution in its own right, with sovereignty in its own sphere of competence (Strauss, 2009:595), with its own defined space and function as a teaching-learning institution, it has often been subjected to socio-political pressures in principle alien to the primary function of the school.

## 2.2 Religion

Religion has through the ages formed a presence in the world, but like the school it has always been expected to undulate with the ebb and flow of other societal forces. The number of people today still practising religion as part of a formal, organised religious community has been dwindling, in some cases in favour of increased interaction between adherents to the different religions owing to globalism, migration, hypermobility, hyper-connectivity, the individualisation of religion and the loss of the strong organised group character of religion. This has led to dogmatic and confessional equalisation (cf. Pew Forum on Religious and Public Landscape, 2012; Dalferth, 2000). A growing religion-spirituality continuum also seems to have been contributing to the smoothing out of religious differences (Wolhuter & Van der Walt, 2018). In Western Europe and North America, due to insistence by the Human Rights lobby and the increasingly multicultural composition of societies, school authorities felt compelled to either ban religion from the schools as part of a secularisation drive (for example in Norway; cf. Hagesaether & Sandsmark, 2006) or to offer students the option of attending Religious Education classes in one of a limited number of recognised religions (such as in Belgium, where students can choose between one of six religions; cf. Loobuyck & Franken, 2011).

It is clear from this brief sketch that religion taught in schools in the form of Religion Education and/or Religion Instruction has also been constantly under pressure from societal forces. The situation has been exacerbated by developments within religious communities themselves, such as the tendency to secularise and to abandon adherence to a mainstream religion in favour of spiritual experiences (Stewart, 2017; Sheldrake, 2013). In most cases, the state as the chief policy-maker regarding the structure and functions of the education system and the main financier of the school education in its domain, has had a decisive say about the accommodation of religious/ religion education and religious observances in schools.

## 2.3 The school and education

Education in general (that is, as the broad forming and equipping of youngsters) and school education (that is, teaching and learning in an institutionalised setting) in particular, will probably remain what it has been for centuries now: a situation where one person, the educator/teacher, interacts with a number of other persons, the learners/students/pupils, for the purpose of assisting them to master a particular body of knowledge, particular values or skills. As Nussbaum (2011:23) correctly observed, human development through

education entails the leading, guiding, unfolding, nurturing, equipping, shaping, developing and training of the potential capabilities that human beings bring into this world.

In the process of schooling, De Muynck, Vermeulen and Kunz (2017:13) contend, the teacher unlocks and unfolds reality for the learner, and at the same time he or she encourages the learner to participate actively in the process of understanding reality; he or she guides the learner on a journey of discovery. However, education, in the form of teaching and learning, from a Christian point of view is not only to master knowledge and skills, but also preparation of the younger generation for their role and task in this world as future citizens in society. Even that is not the final aim of Christian education: Christian teachers understand that people have only attained their purpose when they find themselves consciously serving God. They understand that guiding young people toward a future without Jesus Christ would be futile (cf. Psalm 78).

Although school education (teaching and learning) could be expected to remain the same when offered in traditional institutional contexts such as schools and classrooms, it could be expected that a variety of technological developments such as improved communication media will lead to changes in how the teaching and learning is conducted by the parties concerned. Space does not allow a detailed discussion of the possibilities and possible hazards of future technological developments in educational contexts. There is, however, a distinct possibility that the personal interaction between a teacher as educator and the young person as learner typical of much current teaching and learning that occurs in institutional settings such as schools might disappear as new technology (the Fourth Industrial Revolution) increasingly comes into effect. Another concern is that the emphasis in these new technologically dominated conditions might be on the transfer and mastery of (technological) skills and pragmatic knowledge, and this might be to the detriment of the formative aspect of true education. What comes to mind here is the rise of Mode II knowledge (Estabrooks, Norton, Birdsell, Newton, Adewale & Thornley, 2006).

## 3. A Christian education perspective on how to deal with the challenges outlined above

The discussion above tells the tale of how the state, religion and school (education) are being catapulted into a future that is already upon us, and also a more distanced future that we anticipate but cannot predict in precise

terms. The question now is: How should Christian educators (teachers) and educationists (teacher educators) cope with these challenges? It is suggested that they follow a strategy consisting of the following three steps.

### 3.1 Employ a theory that might assist to understand the dynamics of current and future events

A possible first step is to engage with a scholarly theory that could explain to the Christian educator and educationist how the task of keeping abreast with new developments in the three areas (referred to above as "forces") could be approached. Several theories could serve this purpose, but we opted for the cultural-historical activity theory (henceforth referred to as the CHAT), in itself not a theory rooted in Christian or reformational precepts, but useful for making the point that, despite the turbulence of an unpredictable future, there will always be fixed points that Christian educators and educationists can hold on to. This theory gains depth of meaning when understood in light of the second part of the strategy discussed hereafter, the reformational-philosophical distinction between structure and direction.

The CHAT is based on a neo-Vygotskian notion of activity theory (De Beer & Henning, 2011:1-2). Modernised by Engeström (2009), it argues that human practice (hence also life- and worldview, faith-based, religious and educational practice) as a constant is always mediated by tools (Mentz & De Beer, 2017:90). It explains that no human activity or interaction can be understood without reference to the social and cultural contexts that are at play. This implies that the religious, citizenship-related and pedagogical behaviour of people will always be embedded in a particular socio-cultural activity system that operates on three levels, namely the personal, interpersonal and institutional (or community) level (Van Jaarsveld, Mentz & Ellis, 2017:805, 806).

Viewed from a CHAT-perspective, activities are made up of the shared, coordinated actions of a wide variety of (structurally constant) role-players and stakeholders, though with diverging roles and expertise. In a school, the learner(s), the classroom-based teacher, the subject head, the grade head, members of the professional management team of the school, members of the school's governing body, faith-based leaders in the community, parents and legal caregivers and the state are all involved as agents or subjects in the activity of schooling/teaching and learning. A 'subject' (for instance, the classroom-based teacher) initiates and coordinates the relevant pedagogical activities of his/her learners. While the resultant behaviour of all individual role-players and stakeholders has relevance to their respective roles,

mandates and objectives, all action is steered by a concerted, conjoint motive (e.g. to assist the learners in their attempts to practise and hone their personal knowledge and skills) (Van Jaarsveld, Mentz & Ellis, 2017:805). The interplay between structure and direction (contingencies, including regarding life-view), to be discussed as the next step of the strategy, is already evident in this example.

If, in terms of the CHAT, the objective, aim or purpose of teachers' (subjects'/agents') activities includes the pedagogic accompaniment of learners and the development of their knowledge and skills, then any classroom-based enactment of the above presupposes two outcomes: a deeper understanding of what lies at the root of one's own as well as others' views and actions, and second, openness to self-critique of one's own views and actions.

This brief attempt at highlighting the affordances of CHAT as theoretical instrument for examining and understanding both the constant/erennial/structured aspects of schools as opposed to the more fluid and dynamic contingencies and hence directional changes that schools as structures have to contend with, illustrates how educators (teachers), learners and educationists could search for a sustainable *modus vivendi* in the society of the future, one that will be amenable to the social and moral good of all members of society despite all the turbulence thrown at them by future challenges.

### 3.2 The reformational-philosophical distinction between structure and direction

Since the introduction of the first schools, this societal institution has always been built on three agential mainstays: educators (teachers), learners/students/pupils and parents/community members. Through the years, these mainstays have provided the basic support structure for the official operationalisation of organised teaching and learning activities. The other two societal forces discussed above, religion and the state, have, since the early days, provided essential and valuable ancillary assistance to all the relevant role-players and stake-holders who happened to be populating the structure referred to as 'school', and as a result, the school (as institution or structure) has always managed to survive a variety of contingencies. 'Contingencies' refers to changes (changes in direction: religious, spiritual, life-conceptual, cultural or otherwise) with respect to the school's nature and purpose, curricular content, curriculum structure and educational functionality. As Strauss (2012) has indicated, the distinction between structure and direction is particularly relevant with respect to created structure and religious/life and

world view direction. He quotes Wolters who in 1981 stated that all aspects of created life and reality are in principle (structurally) equally good, and all are in principle equally subject to (directional) perversion and renewal.

Christian educators and educationists should therefore apply their efforts to keeping schools functioning despite continuous changes in the prevalent *Zeitgeist*, context or circumstance (direction); they should devote themselves to the task of steering the school (as constant societal structure in reality) through the myriad of contingent variables, including those of a technological nature, in the best *pedagogical* interest of the learner/student (Wessels, 1998:107-110).

Even schools that have become border-less or wall-less (i.e. internet-based or open-distance learning schools) manifest a firm structure (ontic core) that remains constant in the midst of a wash of contingencies/changes of direction, such as changes in *Zeitgeist*, context and methods of teaching and learning. Christian educators should keep a firm grip on the notion that, despite all the contingencies that might impact on the school and teaching and learning, the school should retain its basic structure: there will always be those who learn and have to be taught and guided, those who teach, content to be mastered, and methods of learning, teaching and assessment to be applied. Technological advances, however, will cause schooling not to be necessarily confined to the four walls of a classroom.

### 3.3 Christian educators and educationists should be intent upon finding meaning in life and the world and on guiding others to discover this meaning for themselves

The most fundamental command of the Creator to his first created people was to be fruitful and to multiply, and to replenish the earth, and to subdue it (Gen. 1:28). In the next chapter of Genesis, we read that the Lord God took the man and put him into the Garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it (Gen. 2:25). Humankind has to care for the worldwide creation. Moreover, as humans are created in close relation to one another, many commands in the Bible point to how they should live together. To mention only one guideline that the apostle Paul gave to the Romans: If it is possible, inasmuch as you are able, live peaceably with all men (Rom. 12:18). The teaching of Jesus centres on the command that believers should love the Lord God with all their heart, and with all their soul, and with all their might, and their neighbour as much as the self (Deut. 6:5; Lev. 19:18; Mat. 7:12). The Sermon on the Mount, where these words were spoken, offers a vision of life as part of the family of God who is fully inclusive in loving. This loving becomes visible in

the person, teaching and example of Jesus who said: I have come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly (John 10:10).

While things tend to change and very little seems to be stable and constant about and around them, there are particular anchor points that Christian teachers and educationists can hold on to as meaning-givers in life. Although everything is in flow and flux, God, the Creator and loving Maintainer of everything is Himself eternally constant and remains in charge of all; all the ebb, flow and flux form part of his eternal plan with creation and his children; nothing will ever separate Him from those who are his children in Jesus Christ, in whose hearts the Holy Spirit constantly witnesses. It is important to alert young people to the fact that God has endowed them with the freedom and hence the responsibility for making choices in life, and also accountability to Him regarding such choices, whether they were made to his glory or against Him.

## 4. How the insights flowing from this strategy could be applied in schools in the subject Citizenship Education

As far as can be seen at this point in time, the interrelationship between the school, religion and the state will continue unless some catastrophe or another unforeseen occurrence intervenes. From what we have observed so far about this relationship, it seems clear that the state will in future still attempt to dominate the school since it will in all likelihood remain the main financier and education policy-maker (of the entire education system within its domain). According to Verburg (2015:20), "simple experience tells us that on the one hand man by nature desires freedom but that on the other hand the state constantly and in many ways limits this freedom … Ideally speaking, there must be a point at which the state and individual freedom converge and coincide". This point, we argue below, is located in the principle of enkapsis or sphere universality.

The school, as has been the case so far through its history, will in future have to live in symbiosis with the state and with all other societal relationships which it encounters in conducting its special task of teaching and learning, such as the parents, the churches and other religious institutions and business. The service rendered in this regard, however, should be of a reciprocal nature, to the benefit of all parties concerned. Neither the state (as previously discussed) nor religious institutions (cf. the role of the church in Mediaeval times) should be allowed to dominate the school and abuse it for its own selfish purposes.

As mentioned at the outset, the purpose of this research was to specifically examine the interrelationship and the interplay between the school, the state and religion, with special reference to CE. As much has been published already about the relationship between school and religion, and school and religious institutions (cf. Lutz & Klingholz, 2018; Sivasubramaniam & Hayhoe, 2018), the rest of this section is now devoted to the current and expected future challenges associated with CE as a service of the school rendered to the state.

In a differentiated society, it is typical of the school's interrelationship with the state to render service to the state by preparing each young generation for its role and function as the future citizenry of the state. This is a service rendered in accordance with the reformational principle of enkapsis or sphere universality (Verburg, 2015:107, 145, 205-6, 281-2, 394), the interwovenness of societal relationships: the children receiving tuition in the schools are at the same time minor future citizens of the state, and have to be prepared for their duties, tasks, responsibilities and accountabilities as such.

The term 'citizenship' has taken on many meanings throughout history, but the definition given by British sociologist T.H. Marshall, in his book *Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays* (1950) can be taken as a starting point. According to him, 'citizenship' refers to a status bestowed on those who are full members of a political entity. That status entails both rights and obligations. These rights and obligations vary from time to time and from place to place; they are usually of a civil, political and a social kind. Civil rights and duties refer to individual freedoms (e.g. freedom of expression and of speech), political rights such as the right to participate in the exercise of political power, while the social element means to be able to live in a society as a civilized being according to the prevailing standards in society with economic welfare and security, for the purpose of exercising the right to share fully in that social heritage.

Hitherto, in the public discourse in general, in education policy and practice, and in scholarly inquiry regarding citizenship and CE in particular, citizenship has been demarcated within the parameters of the modern nation-state (Evans & Kiwan, 2017:236; UNESCO, 2017-2).  Because of a plethora of socio-political developments around the globe and because of much improved communication and information technology, transportation technology, the demise of the nation-state since the 1980s (Steyn & Wolhuter, 2008), the neoliberal economic revolution and the increased international mobility of people (Wolhuter & Van der Walt, 2018), CE can no longer be restricted to this task alone. Each state has now become a player on the world stage, which

explains why Torres (2017:15-17) and others such as UNESCO and UNICEF have recently been insisting that the global dimensions of citizenship should also be attended to. By 1990, the international community commenced with a synchronised education drive towards global citizenship education (henceforth: GCE). The term GCE itself appeared in the 2015 INCHEON vision of the international community for education in the world by 2030 (UNESCO, 2015). The Global Education First Initiative (GEFI), launched by the United Nations in 2012, brought GCE centre-stage by developing three pillars for GCE: putting every child in the world in school, improving the quality of education and attention to Global Citizenship Education as such (United Nations, 2012). Since then, UNESCO has organised three Global Citizenship Education fora in various parts of the world (cf. Torres, 2017:8-10) and published three documents on GCE: *Global Citizenship Education: Preparing learners for the twenty-first century* (UNESCO, 2014), *Global Citizenship Education: Topics and learning objectives* (UNESCO, 2015), and *A Review of Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship Education in Teacher Education* (UNESCO, 2017-1). (Despite these developments, GCE remains a contested term, a matter that falls outside the ambit of this article, cf. UNESCO, 2017-2:9; also cf. Torres' (2015) concept of the three global commons, the common interests all human beings share: We all have only one planet; We all desire peace; We all have a right to pursue life, prosperity and happiness; O'Sullivan, 1999; Andreotti, 2006)

It is clear from the above that citizenship and hence CE are not only restricted anymore to the interests associated with being a citizen of a single nation-state but that it should also attend to the demands of internationalism and transnationalism; citizenship transcends international borders and boundaries, and therefore, CE has to be transformed into GCE so that it can produce world citizens able to operate effectively in the nebulous world of hyper-connectivity and -mobility and other technological advances. It is contended that GCE gives the student a more complete and accurate view of the world than CE based on narrow nationalism (Harari, 2018; Barrow, 2017:165-162).

This new development, the transformation of CE into GCE, imposes a new task on Christian school educators (teachers) and educationists (teacher educators). They are called upon to develop Christian perspectives on the three global commons identified by Torres (we all have only one planet; we all desire peace; we all have a right to pursue life, prosperity and happiness) and also regarding the themes that already have become typical of GCE (ecological crises; sustainable development; global food

security; global peace; human diversity; conflict and conflict resolution; global terrorism; intercultural education, tolerance and respect; the information, communications and transport revolution; social media; news literacy; human rights; democracy; structures of global, national and local governance; International Law; international economy; human happiness; the Human Happiness Index, and social justice), to mention just a few (also see UNESCO 2015 & 2017:2, Evans & Kiwan, 2017).

The (potential) value of Christian-based education in the identity formation of children has been repeatedly demonstrated (Grajales, Leon, Nasser, Hooley, Sample & Sommers, 2016). Globalisation, hence also GCE, has opened new opportunities for Christian young people to become world-citizens as one of the multitude of identities available to them. Christian educators, educationists and learners have no option but to engage in education that is in step with the twenty-first century world, and hence also in GCE. In doing so, they deliver a service to their own nation-state and to the formation (forming, education) of the new generations to become responsible citizens of the globe.

## 5. Conclusion

Global Citizenship has become a reality in the lives of Christian educators, educationists and students/learners. It has to be met head-on as part of the continuous service rendered by the school to the state. Education that also embraces GCE, particularly Christian education of this nature, should be in step with the unfolding world of the twenty-first century but should at the same time hold fast onto the key tenets of the Christian religion and life and world view. Mindful of the goals of GCE, namely to actively, informedly, reflectively, independently, creatively and critically engage the learner/ student with the challenges facing the global society, the challenge for Christian educators and educationists is to develop and apply a pedagogy in step with the requirements for the teaching and learning of GCE, in the process intent on maintaining a balance between the interests of the school, the state and religion.

# Bibliography

AKKERMANS, P. 1997. De juridische vormgeving van de onderwijsverzuiling [The Legal Shaping of Pillarization in Education]. In: Dijkstra, A. B., Dronkers, J. & Hofman, R. H. (Eds.) Verzuiling in het onderwijs: Actuele verklaringen en analyse [Pillarization in Education: Actual Explanations and Analysis] (pp. 57-83). Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff.

ANDREOTTI, V. 2006. Soft versus Critical Global Citizenship Education in Development Education. *Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review* 3:40-51.

ARSEVEN, I., ORHAN, A.T. & ARSEVEN, A. 2019. Proficiency Perceptions and Attitudes of Pre-Service Teachers on İnformation and Communication Technologies, *International Education Studies* 12(1):24-36.

BARROW, E. 2017. No Global Citizenship? Re-envisioning Global Citizenship Education in times of growing nationalism. *High School Journal* 100(3):163-165.

BERNTS, T. & BERGHUIJS, J. 2016. *God in Nederland 1966-2015* [God in the Netherlands 1966-2015]. Utrecht: Ten Have.

BOWEN, J. 1982. *A History of Western Education*, vol. 1. Methuen, London.

BROER, N.A., HOOGLAND, J., VAN DER STOEP, J. 2016. Christian Higher Education in a Changing Context: Shifting from Pillars to Practices. *Christian Higher Education* 16(1-2):55-66.

BURCUTOPU, F. & GOKTAS, Y. 2019. The effects of guided-unguided learning in 3d virtual environment on students' engagement and achievement. *Computers in Human Behavior* 92:1-10.

CHANG, T.C. 2004. Transborder Tourism, Borderless Classroom: Reflections on a Hawaii-Singapore experience. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 28(2):179-195.

COHEN, Y. 1970. Schools and Civilization States. In: Fischer (Ed.), *The Social Sciences and the Comparative Study of Educational Sciences*. Scranton: International Textbook Company.

DALFERTH, I.U. 2000. "I determine who God is". Theology in an age of "Cafeteria Religion". *Theology Today* 57(1):5-23.

DE BEER, J. & HENNING, E. 2011. Retreating to a Vygotskian stage where pre-service teachers play out social, "dramatical collisions". *Acta Academica* 43(4):1-26.

DE BEER, J.J. & MENTZ, E. 2017. 'n Kultuurhistoriese aktiwiteitsteoretiese blik op die houers van inheemse kennis as selfgerigte leerders: Lesse vir onderwys in Suid-Afrikaanse skole. Suid-Afrikaanse *Tydskrif vir Natuurwetenskap en Tegnologie* 36(1). a1398. https://doi.org/10.4102/satnt.v36i1.1398.

DE FUGUEIREDO-COWEN, M.C.S. & GVIRTZ, S. 2009. The Church and the State in Argentina and Brazil: Knowledge, religion and pedagogy. In: Cowen, R. & Kazamias, A.M. (Eds). *International Handbook of Comparative Education*. Dordrecht: Springer: 837-855.

DE MUYNCK, A. 2008. *A godly vocation. Paper read at a conference on spirituality and education*. De Driestar-educatief, Gouda, Netherlands. 14 January.

DE MUYNCK, B., VERMEULEN, H. & KUNZ, B. 2017. *Essenties van Christelijk leraarschap*. Gouda: Driestar-educatief.

ENGESTRÖM, Y. 2009. From learning environments and implementation to activity systems and expansive learning. *Actio: An International Journal of Human Activity Theory* 2(1):17-33.

ESTABROOKS, C.A., NORTON, P., BIRDSELL, J.M., NEWTON, M.S., ADEWALE, A.J. & THORNLEY, R. 2006. Knowledge Translation and Research Careers: Mode I and Mode II activity among health researchers. *Research Policy* 37(6-7):1066-1078.

EVANS, M. & KIWAN, D. 2017. Global Citizenship in Schools: Evolving understandings, constructing practices. In: Bickmore, K., Hayhoe, R., Mundy, K. & Read, R. (Eds). *Comparative and International Education: Issues for teachers*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars: 234-267.

FRANKEN, L. & LOOBUYCK, P. 2013. The Future of Religious Education on the Flemish School Curriculum: A Plea for Integrative Religious Education for All. *Religious Education* 108(5):482-498.

FRANKEN, L. & VERMEER, P. 2017. Deconfessionalising RE in pillarised education systems: a case study of Belgium and the Netherlands. *British Journal of Religious Education*, DOI: 10.1080/01416200.2017.1405792.

FRANKEN, L. 2017. Islamic Education in Belgium: Past, Present, and Future. Religious Education: *The official journal of the Religious Education Association*. Online: 1-12. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00344087.2017.1303300. Accessed 30 September 2017.

FRIEDMAN, T. 2009. *Hot, flat and crowded*. London: Penguin.

GIBBONS, M., LIMOGES, C., NOVOTNY, C., SCHWARTZMAN, S., SCOTT, P. & TROW, M. 1994. *The New Production of Knowledge: The dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies*. London: Sage.

GRAJALES, T.E., LEON, V., NASSER, F.A., HOOLEY, E., SAMPLE M. & SOMMERS, B. 2016. Examining Identity Styles and Religiosity among Chilean Undergraduate Students. *Journal of Research on Christian Education* 25(3):290-301.

HAGESAETHER, G. & SANDSMARK, S. 2006. Compulsory education in religion – the Norwegian case: an empirical evaluation of RE in Norwegian schools, with a special focus on human rights. *British Journal of Religious Education* 28(3):275-287.

HARARI, Y.N. 2018. *21 Lessons for the 21st Century*. London: Penguin.

HENDRIKSEN, D., CREELY, D., CERETKOVA, E., CERNOCHOVA, S., MIROSLAVA, M., EVGENIA, S., ERKKO, T. & TIENKEN, C.H. 2018. Creativity and Technology in Education: An international perspective. Technology, *Knowledge and Learning* 23(3):235-286.

HUDDLESTON, B. 2016. *Digital Cocaine*. Cape Town: CUM Books.

HUYSE, L. 1987. *De verzuiling voorbij*. [Beyond Pillarization]. Leuven: Kritak.

KAMYAB, S. 2014. Education and religion in Iran: An annotated bibliography. In: Wolhuter, C. & De Wet, C. (Eds), *International Comparative Perspectives on Religion & Education*. Bloemfontein: Sunmedia: 255-270.

KARADEMIR, T., ALPER, A., SOĞUKSU, A.F. & KARABABA, Z.C. 2019. The development and evaluation of self-directed digital learning material development platform for foreign language education, *Interactive Learning Environments*, https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2019.1593199. Pp.1-18.

LESOLI, M.K., VAN WYK, C., VAN DER WALT, J.L., POTGIETER, F.J. & WOLHUTER, C.C. 2014. The Elusive Goal of Universal Free Primary Education in Africa: The case of Lesotho. *Journal of Third World Studies* 31(2):197-218.

LOO, S.P. 2014. Malay is Malay, non-Malay is non-Malay, and never the twain shall meet: a critical analysis of religion and education in Malaysia. In: Wolhuter, C. & De Wet, C. (Eds). *International Comparative Perspectives on Religion & Education*. Bloemfontein: Sunmedia, pp. 235-254.

LOOBUYCK, P. & FRANKEN, L. 2011. Towards Integrative Religious Education in Belgium and Flanders: Challenges and Opportunities. *British Journal of Religious Education* 33(1), 17-30.

LUTZ, M. & KLINGHOLZ, R. 2018. *Education First! From Martin Luther to Sustainable Development*. Stellenbosch: Sunmedia.

MARSHALL, T.H. 1950. *Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MENTZ, E. & DE BEER, J. 2017. The affordances of Cultural-Historical Activity Theory as a research lens in studying education from a socio-economic perspective. Paper read at 4th Teaching & Education Conference. Italy: Venice.

MIEDEMA, S., BERTRAM-TROOST, G., TER AVEST, I., KOM, C. & DE WOLFF, A. 2013. *De impact van ontkerkelijking op open protestants-christelijk basisonderwijs* [The Impact of Decreased Church Attendance on Open Protestant-Christian Primary Education]. In: Te Grotenhuis, M., 2013. Ontkerkelijking , nou en...? Oorzaken en gevolgen. Nijmegen: Eburon.

NUSSBAUM, M.C. 2011. *Creating capabilities*. Cambridge: Belknap Press.

O'SULLIVAN, B. 1999. Global change and educational reform in Ontario and Canada. *Canadian Journal of Education* 24(3):311-325.

PENNINGTON, M.C. & ROGERSON-REVELL, P. 2019. Using Technology for Pronunciation Teaching, Learning, and Assessment. English Pronunciation Teaching and Research, *Research and Practice in Applied Linguistics*, https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-47677-7_5. Pp. 235-286.

PEW FORUM ON RELIGIOUS AND PUBLIC LANDSCAPE. 2012. www.pewforum.org/global-religion-landscape-exec-asp    Date of Access: 30 December 2018.

PEW RESEARCH CENTER. 2017. Five Centuries After Reformation, Catholic-Protestant Divide in Western Europe Has Faded. www.pewresearch.org. Date of access: 1 September 2017.

REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA, RSA, Department of Basic Education. 2011. Curriculum Assessment Policy Statements (CAPS) https://www.education.gov.za  Date of Access: 12 November 2019.

SIVASUBRAMANIAM, M. & HAYHOE, R. (Eds) 2018. *Religion and Education: Comparative and International Perspectives*. Oxford: Symposium.

SHELDRAKE, P. 2013. *Spirituality: A brief history*. Hobroke: John Wiley.

SHENG, X. 2019. Christian Home Schooling in China. *British Journal of Religious Education* 41(2):218-231.

SMITH, J. & ARENDSE, A. 2016. South African curriculum reform: Education for active citizenship. In: Popov, N. (Ed.) *Education provision to everyone: Perspectives from around the world*. BCES Conference Books Vol 14(1):65-72.

STEWART, E. 2017. *New Trends in Selective Spirituality*. https://thesocietypages.org/discoveries/2017/05/30/new-trends-in-selective-spirituality/ Date of Access: 10 April 2019.

STEYN, H.J. & WOLHUTER, C.C. 2008. The education system and probable societal trends of the twenty-first century. In: Steyn, H.J. & Wolhuter, C.C. (Eds). *Education Systems: Challenges of the 21st Century*. Noordbrug: Keurkopie. Pp 1-34.

STRAUSS, D.F.M. 2009. *Philosophy: Discipline of the disciplines*. Grand Rapids: Paideia Press.

STRAUSS, D.F.M. 2012. Articulating (ultimate) commitments: historical, factual and systematic considerations. *Acta Theologica* 32(2):203-226.

TERREBLANCHE, S. 2014. *Western Empires, Christianity, And the Inequality Between the West and the Rest*. Johannesburg: Penguin.

TERZIAN, S. 2014. Central Effects of Religious Education in Armenia from Ancient Times to Post-Soviet Armenia. In: Wolhuter, C. & De Wet, C. (Eds). *International Comparative Perspectives on Religion and Education*. Bloemfontein: Sunmedia.

TORRES, C.A. 2015. Neoliberalism, Globalization Agendas and Banking Educational Policy (Paper prepared for a keynote at the University of British Columbia Research Week, May 12, 2015). http://yre-dev.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2015/04/Dr-Carlos-A-Torres-Power-Point-Presentation.pdf Date of Access: 16 February 2017.

TORRES, C.A. 2017. *Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Critical Global Citizenship Education*. New York & London: Routledge.

UNESCO. 2014. *Global Citizenship Education: Preparing learners for the twenty-first century*. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO. 2015. *Global Citizenship Education: Topics and learning objectives*. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO. 2017-1. *A Review of Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship Education in Teacher Education.* http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0025/002595/259566e.pdf Date of Access: 10 March 2018.

UNESCO. 2017-2. *Global Citizenship Education Concepts in Curriculum Guidelines of 10 Countries: Comparative analysis*. Paris: UNESCO.

UNITED NATIONS. 2012. *Global Education First Initiative*. http://www.unesco.org/new/en/gefi/about/an-initiative-of-the-sg/ Date of access: 10 March 2018.

URRY, J. 2000. *Sociology beyond Societies*. London: Routledge.

VAN JAARSVELD, L., MENTZ, K. & ELLIS, S. 2017. Skoolhoofleierskapstyl deur die lens van die kultuurhistoriese aktiwiteitsteorie (KHAT)/The cultural-historical activity theory (CHAT) as a lens to study school principal leadership styles. *Tydskrif vir Geesteswetenskappe*, October, Vol 57(3):799-813. doi.10.17159/2224-7912/2017/v57n3a9.

VERBURG, M. 2015. *Herman Dooyeweerd. The life and work of a Christian philosopher*. Jordan Station: Paideia Press.

VERMEER, P. 2013. Religious Indifference and Religious Education in the Netherlands: A Tension Unfolds. Theo Web. *Zeitschrift für Religionspädagogik* 12(1):79-94.

WESSELS, F.J. 1998. Die rol van die vrou in die onderwys met spesiale verwysing na Bruinonderwys. Ungepubliseerde DEd-tesis. Pretoria: UNISA.

WOLHUTER, C.C. 2012. Godsdiens in Onderwys in Suid-Afrika: Beligting vanuit internasionaal-vergelykende perspektiewe. *Tydskrif vir Christelike Wetenskap* 48(1&2):171- 201.

WOLHUTER, C.C. & VAN DER WALT, J.L. 2018. Huidige demografiese, politieke en religieuse tendense in die wêreld en onderwys ter bevordering van interreligieuse toleransie. *Tydskrif vir Geesteswetenskappe* 58(1):56-75.