

Original Article

Professional Development Workshop on Global Citizenship Education: Experiences of University Teachers

 Mubeshera Tufail*

Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to assess the experiences of teachers about professional development workshop on global citizenship education (GCE). The workshop as a research method (Ørngreen & Levinsen, 2017) was used for conducting this study. The workshop was of 04 days duration. Twenty-one regular university teachers were participants of the workshop. No prerequisite experience with GCE was required for attending this workshop. The workshop involved sessions on thematic dimensions and learning domains of GCE, integration of GCE in the curriculum and teaching-learning process at the university level, and facilitating safe and productive dialogue in various learning environments. Field notes and the feedback form were used to collect data about the workshop content and the experiences of the workshop participants. Data were analyzed through descriptive and inferential statistics. The study results showed that the faculty members found the workshop content relevant and useful, and the workshop instructional experiences and the arrangements as helpful and effective. It is recommended to adjust the training content and duration according to the needs of the faculty members in future workshops. The study results may be helpful to arrange professional development opportunities for university teachers in future.

Keywords: Global citizenship education (GCE), sustainability, respect for diversity, critical citizenship education practice, professional development

1. INTRODUCTION

Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) and Global Citizenship Education (GCE) are important aspects of sustainable development i.e., meeting the needs of today's generation without compromising the needs of next generations (UNESCO, 2021). Universities may play their role to make students aware and participate in the global world. However, the teachers and the institutions must consider the purpose of Global Citizenship Education (GCED) for the benefit of the students and the society. For its sustainability, the mission, vision and the strategic plans, and the curriculum may reflect the significance of education for preparing students as global citizens. GCED may be closely linked to the societal values and goals along with an active role of global citizens in the world (Jorgenson & Shultz, 2012).

GCE is a transdisciplinary concept that encompasses concepts from civic education, global learning, intercultural education, sustainable development, diversity and peace education (UNESCO Chair, n.d.). GCE is aimed to promote global understanding of local practices and cultures. For this purpose, flexible teaching, use of technology, experiential learning and critical thinking skills may be used for teaching GCE (Saperstein, 2020). Teacher merge citizenship education and intercultural education. They focus on the economic (i.e., preparing the graduates to participate in global economy), moral (i.e., taking care of each other) and cultural (i.e., fostering understanding and tolerance) agenda of the GCE. All of these



Copyright © The Author(s). 2024

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribute 4.0 International License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and source are credited.



How to cite:

Tufail, M. (2024). *Professional Development Workshop on Global Citizenship Education: Experience of University Teachers*. *Siazga Research Journal*, 3(1), 66-75.

<https://doi.org/10.58341/srj.v3i1.45>

concepts are overlapping and integrated (Franch, 2020a).

Citizenship education promotes respect, non-discrimination, human rights, democracy, justice and international understanding. It can be offered by integrating it with other school subjects such as social studies, languages, Geography, civics etc. (UNESCO, 2017). For its inclusion into the education process, teacher education is the crucial part (Dean, 2005). Teacher education, pre-service and in-service, must involve awareness about social, cultural and environmental issues and strategies/beliefs to take actions for it (UNESCO, 2017). For this purpose, there is a need for professional development opportunities for teachers to update their knowledge and skills (Kopish, 2017; UNESCO, 2017) to apply GCED themes such as climate change, poverty and human rights in their classrooms. These opportunities can be of short duration such as one day or a week to longer duration such as series of workshops or courses (UNESCO, 2017). Educationists and curriculum developers emphasized the inclusion of themes of SDG such as human rights, peace, gender equality, health education and global citizenship in pre-service teacher education curriculum either as a part of offered subjects or as a separate subject (Bano & Hina, 2021). The impact of these professional development opportunities may be assessed its contribution to SDGs (UNESCO, 2017).

There is a need of research and collaboration on teacher professional development for global citizenship education (Saperstein, 2020). Keeping in view the perspective on GCE, this study involved arranging a professional development for university teachers and perspective of the workshop participants about the effectiveness of workshop content and arrangements.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Global citizenship involves the development of knowledge, attitude, skills and values of individuals so that they can participate and play their role in a peaceful and just world. Global Citizenship education is the transformative education process to train the individuals about global citizenship (APCEIU, 2018). Global citizenship encompasses collective civic actions by the global community to promote a better and sustainable world for all (UNESCO, 2017). Global citizenship involves teaching about complex issues of the world but it is recommended to start teaching about these topics since early school years so that students are aware about it from the very young age. The secondary and post-secondary school years may involve these topics at an abstract level. The themes of global citizenship may be discussed in the class by selecting the theme, subject and the learning objectives according to the age of the students. For teaching about diversity and inclusion, the students at primary school level, may be taught about the rights and responsibilities of people irrespective of the wide variety of differences among them. At secondary school level, the students can discuss about discrimination in the society they have observed or faced it (APCEIU, 2018).

The approach to integrate GCE in educational and training institutions may be influenced by the perspective of GCE. There are four different perspectives to adopt and practise GCE, as mentioned by Franch (2020b): neo-liberal human capitalism, cosmopolitan humanism, social-justice activism and critical citizenship education practice. Neo-liberal human capitalism perspective of GCE emphasize the development of knowledge and skills of individuals so they can contribute in the productivity and global competitiveness of the economy of their country (Sant, et al., 2018: as cited in Franch, 2020b). Cosmopolitan humanism perspective involves moral, cultural, economic and political approach to GCE so that the relationship and positioning of individuals with groups, labour resources, power, state and society can be understood (Oxley & Morris, 2013). Social-justice activism focuses to transform the political and economic structure of the society to achieve democracy, social justice and equality in the local and global community (Franch, 2020b). Critical citizenship education perspective, in contrast to soft GCE, asserts to give voice to and protect indigenous knowledge and values which have been kept down by colonial violence. Instead of expecting people to follow pre-set model or principles, it provides them the opportunity to analyze and reflect on their context and experiment with various forms of thinking or actions to bring change (Andreotti, 2014).

There is a need to move from neo-liberal concept of GCE to more critical reflexive concept of GCE for deconstructing the established knowledge, discussion and practice. This deconstruction process may emphasize the empirical knowledge and discourse of GCE. It is also important to revise research designs and analytic tools to analyze social structures, inequalities, power dynamics and global citizenship education within and beyond the country (Schippling, 2020). As the global citizenship education involves the development of knowledge, skills and values of individuals to play their role in the society. The particular perspective chosen for GCE affects the knowledge, skill and values to be emphasized for

training the people. The table 01 provided an overview of knowledge, skills and values empathized by each of the four perspectives of GCE.

Learning Area	Neo-liberal human capitalism	Cosmopolitan humanism	Social-justice activism	Critical counter perspective
Cognitive knowledge	Foreign languages, Knowledge of economic system and the job market, Workplace information	Human rights and global issues	political and economic structures of domination	political, economic and cultural structures of domination; other cultures and minorities to diversify perspective
Cognitive skills	Digital skills, Problem-solving skills	Conflict-resolution skill	critical literacy	cognitive decentralisation; hyper-self-reflexivity
Socio-emotional skills	Inter-cultural communication	Sense of belonging to a human community, empathy	multiple identities, commitment to social justice	reflexive identifications, commitment to social justice
Behavioral skills	Entrepreneurial skills Flexibility	Ethical consumerism, sustainable living, community work, volunteering, charity	political activism	ethical, responsible and responsive ways of seeing, knowing and relating to others 'in context'

Figure 1. Learning Areas according to four perspectives of GCE (Franch, 2020b)

There is a concern among the education community about the access to education, and the quality of learning and the content i.e., is the education accessible for all children? What students are learning? And whether, whatever they are learning would contribute to make the world a better place? (UNESCO, 2017), There can be three major functions or pedagogical frameworks for global citizenship education: qualification, socialization and subjectification. Qualification refers to the development of knowledge, skills, and attitude of students to perform a specific (such as job, training or profession) or a general work (such as life skills, world civilization). It may include cultural literacy, political literacy and civic literacy. Socialization function involves the individual for understanding and transmission of social values and norms, and getting along with the political, social and cultural underpinnings of a society. Subjectification refers to the individuation of the students that aims to build the ways of being and doing based on the qualification dimension of GCE (Biesta, 2009). All the three perspectives are inseparable and may be included in the citizenship education.

Teacher training is crucial for educating students about GCED. However, the GCED needs to be contextualized into the local circumstances of a society to make it relevant and sustainable. Therefore, Franch (2020b) suggested that teacher education for GCE may provide an opportunity to study various GCE discourses and pedagogical frameworks, and analyze and implement it in the classrooms. It also offers a platform for teachers to discuss the practical aspects related to the integration of GCE into the curriculum, and its implementation and alignments with the practices in the school and the classroom. Teachers, in teacher education classes, can share with each other the success stories and their learning experiences of teaching GCE in their classrooms.

Objectives of the Study

- To interpret the experiences of university teachers about professional development workshop on global citizenship education
- To analyze the challenges and opportunities for organizing workshop on global citizenship education in university settings.

3. METHODOLOGY

In this study, workshop was used as a research method. In workshop based research, the participants and the facilitators collaboratively work in a facilitated environment; the group dynamics contribute to discuss and understand the issues and scenarios. It leads to negotiate about the meaning and interpretation of scenarios (Ørngreen & Levinsen, 2017). In order to assess the workshop materials and workshop outcome quality, surveys and questionnaires are one of the most suitable tools (Thoring, Mueller & Badke-Schaub, 2020).

There were twenty-one participants of this workshop serving as the regular university teachers. All the workshop participants were accessed to collect data for this study. The participants of the workshop registered themselves for this workshop based on their personal preferences for the topic. There were eight sessions of the workshop completed in four days; four sessions for the content of the workshop and four sessions for the activities based on the workshop content. The workshop was conducted in a blended mode; few sessions were conducted online whereas other sessions were arranged in the face-to-face mode. The online sessions were conducted through MS Teams and Zoom. The workshop coordinator served as a moderator for the online sessions to connect the workshop facilitator/resource person and the participants. The activity-based sessions of the workshop were also moderated by the workshop coordinator.

The data were collected through field notes during workshop sessions and a feedback form administered through Google Forms for all workshop participants at the end of workshop. The feedback form consisted of structured and unstructured items. The structured items consisted of the workshop content (06 items related to the relevant, interesting, understandable and need-based content of the workshop), instructional quality (09 items related to interesting, encouraging, conducive to learning, objective-based and participatory nature of the instruction during sessions), workshop facilitators (05 items related to sessions as effective, well-managed, well-prepared, helpful for learning by workshop experts) and workshop organization (03 items related to duration and venue of workshop, and the workshop material). The unstructured items involved questions related to the feedback about this workshop and the future training needs of the workshop participants. The field notes were related to detailed notes related to the sessions and activities of the workshop. The data were analyzed through mean, standard deviation, percentage, Spearman Correlation coefficient, and Mann-Whiney U-test. The field notes and the open-ended responses were analyzed through coding and thematic analysis.

Workshop Details

The workshop was designed to achieve the following objectives:

- To understand the concept of global citizenship and its significance in higher education.
- To explore the key principles and approaches to global citizenship education.
- To identify the challenges and opportunities in implementing global citizenship education in university settings.
- To equip participants with innovative teaching methodologies and activities that foster global citizenship competencies.
- To develop a plan for integrating global citizenship education into participants' respective courses and curricula.

The workshop consisted of four sessions about the concepts and aspects of the Global Citizenship Education (GCED), and four activities based on the content covered in the sessions. There was no pre-requisite requirement of expertise in GCED for attending this workshop. Therefore, the workshop sessions covered the awareness to key concepts related to GCED, its integration into the curriculum, teaching and arranging dialogue in the classroom. The activities were conducted keeping in various academic tasks the faculty members were engaged. The content-based sessions of the workshop were arranged online through Zoom and MS Teams because the workshop experts were from outside of the country. The workshop material was shared with the workshop participants. They participated in workshop activities through using charts, brainstorming, discussion and presentations in groups of different sizes. The workshop activities were conducted in face-to-face mode in the presence of workshop facilitator.

Table 1

Workshop Sessions and activities

S#	Session
1.	Session 01 Introduction to Global Citizenship Education [Global citizenship education is the transformative education, which involves the development of knowledge, attitude, values and skills of students for a sustainable and peaceful global society (APCEIU, 2018). The global citizenship education involves the agreement on the rights and responsibilities of a global citizen and the commitment to follow it. It may be related to the human rights, society, climate, environment, economy, health, education, peace and prosperity. It could also cover the analysis of root causes of the problems related to these areas and the proactive behaviour to present it in future.]
2.	Activity 01 Personal Reflection and Sharing The workshop participants reflected on their own understanding of global citizenship education (GCED) and shared their thoughts in the group. Secondly, they discussed the relevance of (GCED) for teachers, students, university, and communities.
3.	Session 02 Core dimensions of Global Citizenship Education Five core areas for teaching of Global Citizenship Education (GCED) i.e., human rights, globalization and social justice, sustainability, respect for diversity, conflict and peace-building) were discussed in detail. GCED involves local and global problems related to these areas, and taking collective action to solve these problems at local, national and global level. These thematic areas correspond to three learning domains: cognitive, socio-emotional and behavioral (APCEIU, 2018).
4.	Activity 02 Incorporating GCED into Curriculum The workshop participants reviewed one course developed by them and identified the opportunities to integrate GCED in it. They suggested the changes in the learning material to incorporate thematic areas of GCED.
5.	Session 03 Strategies for Teaching GCED in Higher Education (distance and online learning system) The teaching of GCED involves development of awareness, attitude, actions and values of students about local and global phenomena and issues. The use of student-centered strategies is recommended for grooming and use of critical thinking and informed decision-making, collaboration, dialogue and group discussion to understand each other's perspective. The teaching for GCED involves interdisciplinary, multi-modal and multi-sensory approach for teaching and assessment of students' knowledge, skills, attitude and values.]
6.	Activity 03 Brainstorming and Reflection The participants discussed about the nature of various issues of the society and root cause of these issues. At this stage, it would be helpful to think about how it can be discussed with the students in the classroom.
7.	Session 04 Facilitating safe & productive dialogue in various learning environments [For creating a safe and productive dialogue in the classroom, the student diversity, critical questioning and student experiences and reflection are valued. The community of learners is developed through the exercise of flexibility, openness, empathy, curiosity, sensitivity and objectivity. The points of view and perspective are interpreted by taking into account the context of the situation.]
8.	Activity 04 Brainstorming and Reflection The workshop participants might plan teaching a topic related to their course using dialogue to listen to each other's perspectives, and to understand and empower their students.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

The demographic information of the workshop participants was provided in table 2.

Table 2

Demographic information of workshop participants

S#	Demographic Variable	Categories	Frequency (Percentage)
1.	Gender	Male	13 (62%)
		Female	8 (38%)
2.	Teaching Experience	Less than 03 years	3 (14.3%)
		03-05 years	-
		06-08 years	6 (28.6%)
		09-11 years	3 (14.3%)
		12-14 years	2 (9.5%)
		15-17 years	5 (23.8%)
		18-20 years	-
		21-23 years	1 (4.8%)
		24 years and above	1 (4.8%)
3.	Mode of Courses coordinated by the faculty members	Distance & Online Learning	17 (81%)
		Face-to-Face	16 (76.2%)
		Blended	13 (61.9%)

Table 2 displayed the gender wise distribution of the workshop participants, their teaching experience and the mode of courses they were coordinating in the ongoing semester. The workshop participants were with a range of teaching experience. The teachers were coordinating courses in more than one mode at the same time that is why the table showed the percentage for a particular mode of courses with respect to the total number of participants of the workshop.

Table 3

Feedback of participants on GCED workshop

S#	Factor	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
1.	Workshop Content	21	4.68	.39
2.	Quality of Instruction	21	4.75	.34
3.	Workshop Facilitators	21	4.81	.31
4.	Organization of Workshop	21	4.59	.58
5.	Total Score on Feedback Form	21	4.71	.37

Table 3 showed the feedback of participants on structured items related to various aspects of GCED workshop. The mean score of responses of the faculty members showed higher level of satisfaction with these aspects. It indicated that they were satisfied with the workshop content, quality of instruction, workshop facilitators, and organization of the workshop. The unstructured items related to workshop content, quality of instruction, workshop facilitators, and organization of the workshop provided the opportunity to the participants to share their feedback in detail. These open-ended responses were analyzed separately for each of the four factors.

The teachers said that the workshop content was highly relevant, understandable, practicable, comprehensive and engaging however the content may be improved by addressing local needs. It maintained that there was a need to link it with the local matters and issues. The instruction, according to the participants, was effective, informative, and cooperative, context- and activity-based for the concepts covered in the workshop however the national speakers may be involved to make it more relevant to the local circumstances. The workshop facilitators had a command on the subject matter; they were professional, cooperative, dedicated and committed as mentioned by the participants. According to participants, the workshop organization was good.

Table 4

Relationship among responses of teachers on factors of feedback form for GCED workshop

Factors	M6	SD7	N	WC1	QI2	WF3	OW4	TFF5
WC1	4.68	.39	21	-	.959 (.000)	.764 (.000)	.669 (.001)	.892 (.000)
QI2	4.75	.34	21	.959 (.000)	-	.818 (.000)	.716 (.000)	.925 (.000)
WF3	4.81	.31	21	.764 (.000)	.818 (.000)	-	.707 (.000)	.825 (.000)
OW4	4.59	.58	21	.669 (.001)	.716 (.000)	.707 (.000)	-	.890 (.000)
TFF5	4.71	.37	21	.892 (.000)	.925 (.000)	.825 (.000)	.890 (.000)	-
WC1=Workshop Content; QI2=Quality of Instruction; WF3=Workshop Facilitators; OW4= Organization of Workshop; TFF5= Total score on Feedback Form; M6= Mean score; SD7= Standard Deviation								

Table 4 showed the output of Spearman correlation coefficient between responses of faculty members on various factors of the feedback form. There was a statistically significant and strong positive correlation among various factors of feedback form, which indicated that experiences of workshop participants on various aspects of workshop were strongly related to each other and it led to their overall positive experience with the GCED workshop.

Table 5

Feedback of faculty members with respect to mode of courses coordinated by them

Factor	Distance & Online Learning			Face-to-Face			Blended		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Workshop Content	17	4.74	.39	16	4.69	.40	13	4.72	.46
Quality of Instruction	17	4.81	.32	16	4.75	.34	13	4.76	.39
Workshop Facilitators	17	4.84	.27	16	4.86	.27	13	4.77	.37
Organization of Workshop	17	4.61	.62	16	4.54	.62	13	4.49	.66
Total Score on Feedback Form	17	4.75	.36	16	4.71	.38	13	4.68	.44
N=Sample size; M= Mean; SD= Standard Deviation									

Table 5 showed the mean score of faculty members on the feedback form with respect to the mode of courses coordinated by them. It was evident from the mean scores that the response of faculty members was highly positive about the various aspects of the workshop. It showed that this workshop was found helpful and relevant by the faculty members coordinating the courses offered in different modes.

Table 6

Gender wise comparison of responses on factors of workshop feedback form

Factor	Male Teachers			Female Teachers			Mann-Whitney U test		
	N	Mean rank	Sum of ranks	N	Mean rank	Sum of ranks	Mann-Whitney U value	Z value	Sig value
Workshop Content	13	10.96	142.50	8	11.06	88.50	51.50	-.038	.969
Quality of Instruction	13	11.27	146.50	8	10.56	84.50	48.50	-.265	.791
Workshop Facilitators	13	12.15	158	8	9.13	73	37.00	-1.211	.226
Organization of Workshop	13	11.54	150	8	10.13	81	45.00	-.564	.572
Total Score on Feedback Form	13	11.15	145	8	10.75	86	50	-.149	.882

Table 6 displayed the output of Mann-Whitney U-test for gender wise difference in the feedback of faculty members about the workshop. There was no statistically significant difference between male and female faculty members on factors 'workshop content', 'Quality of instruction', 'workshop facilitators', 'Organization of Workshop' and 'cumulative score on feedback form'. It indicated that all the faculty members perceived the significance of various aspects of the workshop.

Table 7

Comparison of responses of workshop participants with respect to their teaching experience on factors of workshop feedback form

Factor	Teachers with experience 11 years & below			Teachers with experience 12 years & above			Mann-Whitney U test		
	N	Mean rank	Sum of ranks	N	Mean rank	Sum of ranks	Mann-Whitney U value	Z value	Sig value
Workshop Content	12	10.92	131	9	11.11	100	53	-.075	.940
Quality of Instruction	12	11.00	132	9	11.00	99	54	.000	1.000
Workshop Facilitators	12	11.67	140	9	10.11	91	46	-.634	.526
Organization of Workshop	12	11.88	142.50	9	9.83	88.50	43.50	-.831	.406
Total Score on Feedback Form	12	11.63	139.50	9	10.17	91.50	46.50	-.548	.584

Table 7 displayed the output of Mann-Whitney U-test for the difference in the feedback of faculty members about the workshop with respect their teaching experience. There was no statistically significant difference between faculty members with teaching experience 11 years and below, and 12 years and above on factors 'workshop content', 'Quality of instruction', 'workshop facilitators', 'Organization of Workshop' and 'cumulative score on feedback form'. It indicated that all the faculty members equally agreed upon the significance of various aspects of the GCED workshop.

Field Notes and Open-Ended Responses About Most and Least Valuable Aspect(s) of the GCED Workshop

Based on field notes, it was noticed that the computer system and internet must be efficient to smoothly run the online sessions. The participants of the workshop were from different disciplines that helped to incorporate GCED concepts in a variety of courses. It also provided insights into the nature of integration of thematic areas of GCED concepts into various topics. One topic integrated one thematic area of GCED

while another topic involved two or more thematic areas of GCED due to nature of concepts covered in that particular topic. For example, one unit of “Professionalism in Teaching” involved incorporating respect for diversity, interfaith harmony, and social justice whereas another course related to ‘Concepts and Principles of Islamic State’ integrated the concepts of globalization, social justice, equitable distribution of resources in society, conflict resolution, and sustainability and development. All the workshop activities involved sharing of experiences, expertise and discussion in small groups of 3-5 workshop participants; this strategy was found to be interactive for knowledge sharing and the learning process. The duration of the workshop was observed to be appropriate for keeping workshop activities throughout the workshop sessions.

The faculty members mentioned about the most valuable of the GCED workshop that it covered the new themes of GCED and its integration into the curriculum, new perspective about the pedagogy, content selected for this workshop along with active learning technique, interactive environment and hands-on activities. The least valuable aspects of the workshop included less engaging interaction with online speakers, time constraint and relating the content to the local needs. The suggestions for improving this workshop in future involved extending the time duration for this workshop and integrating the GCED concepts into subject specific contents. The preferred formats for the faculty members to learn more about GCED were seminar, professional development workshop and the interactive distance learning opportunity but not the self-study material. The reason for it may be that the self-study material may not offer the opportunity for engaging in group discussion in the local context.

Discussion

The workshop involved the content and practice sessions about awareness about GCE, integration of GCE into curriculum and teaching practices and use of dialogue in the learning environment. The international resource persons participated in this workshop. The workshop participants were very satisfied with the instructional quality, resource persons, workshop organization and the workshop content. The lecture, reflection, dialogue, group work and presentation were adopted during this workshop. Teachers may adopt inclusive teaching practices to support learning for critical inquiry, critical self-reflection and critical literacy (Kopish, 2017). If the course structure allows, the explicit modelling (Appleyard & Mclean, 2011), experiential learning opportunities (Appleyard & Mclean, 2011; Jorgenson & Shultz, 2012) such as the cross-cultural exchange/experiences of students and the community service such as a social campaign for child safety or clean-green environment can be used to develop global citizenship (Jorgenson & Shultz, 2012).

The workshop participants recommended to enhance the duration of the workshop to study GCE in detail. The workshop activities involved the hands-on practice of the concepts however, the workshop participants found the content-based sessions by international resource persons not very much relevant to local context of the Pakistani society. Local context and Local needs GCE is about global understanding of local practices and cultures (Saperstein, 2020) for making a peaceful and just world. GCE cannot achieve its goals without considering social and public dimensions of the global issues and interventions by government to tackle these problems (Estellés & Fischman, 2020). Universities may provide their students a variety of opportunities such as group discussions, seminars and curricular activities for their development as a citizen (Rehman, Majoka & Naz, 2018).

4. CONCLUSION

The study involved interpreting the experience of faculty members with a professional development workshop on GCED. The paper entailed the content of the workshop and the experiences and feedback of the teachers collected through open and closed-ended responses on a feedback form. The study found the workshop content useful and relevant for faculty members teaching courses in distance and online, blended and face-to-face mode. There was no gender wise difference in the mean response of faculty members about their experiences of the workshop. However, making the workshop relevant to the local societal context and extending the time duration of the workshop were the major recommendations for conducting future workshops on this topic.

The experiences of the faculty members may be interpreted keeping in view that it was based on small group of participants and they did not have any detailed exposure or expertise on GCED. As this study involved conducting the professional development workshop on GCED and assessing the experiences of workshop participants, it can be used for guidance to arrange future workshops on this topic at university level. The various aspects of a workshop such as content, instructional experiences, behavior and support from workshop facilitators and the workshop arrangement created a holistic positive experience for the

teachers. Therefore, it is significant to keep all the aspects of a workshop aligned with the purpose of the workshop and for serving the learning needs of the faculty members. This study may be helpful to arrange professional development workshops for the university teachers especially for arranging workshops on Global Citizenship Education (GCED). Universities and colleges may offer the courses and certificate programs for teachers and students to promote GCED.

Competing Interests

The authors did not declare any competing interest.

References

- Andreotti, V. O. (2014). Soft versus Critical Global Citizenship Education. In S. McCloskey (ed.), *Development Education in Policy and Practice* (21-31). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- APCEIU. (2018). *GCED: A guide for trainers*.
<https://www.gcedclearinghouse.org/sites/default/files/resources/180322eng.pdf>
- Appleyard, N. & Mclean, L. R. (2011). Expecting the exceptional: Pre-service professional development in global citizenship education. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 7(2), 6-32.
- Bano, N. & Hina, K. (2021). Inclusion of global citizenship education and sustainable development in pre-service curriculum: A perspective study. *International Journal of Innovation in Teaching and Learning*, 6(2), 95-112.
<https://doi.org/10.35993/ijitl.v6i2.855>
- Biesta, G.(2009). Good education in an age of measurement: On the need to reconnect with the question of purpose in education. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21, 33-46.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9064-9>
- Bourn, D. Hunt, F. & Bamber, P. (2017). *A review of Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship Education in Teacher Education*. Retrieved from
<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000259566>
- Dean, B. L. (2005). Citizenship education in Pakistani schools: Problems and possibilities. *International Journal of Citizenship and Teacher Education*, 1(2), 35-55.
- Estellés, M. & Fischman, G. E. (2020). Who needs global citizenship education? A review of the literature on teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 72(2), 223-236.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487120920254>
- Franch, S. (2020a). Global citizenship education discourses in a province in northern Italy. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 12(1), 21–36. DOI
<https://doi.org/10.14324/IJDEGL.12.1.03>
- Franch,S. (2020b). Global citizenship education: A new ‘moral pedagogy’ for the 21st century?. *European Educational Research Journal*, 19(6), 506-524.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1474904120929103>
- Jorgenson,S. & Shultz, L.(2012). Global citizenship education (GCE) in post-secondary institutions: What is protected and what is hidden under the umbrella of GCE?. *Journal of Global Citizenship & Equity Education*, 2(1), 1-22.
- Kopish, M. A. (2017). Global Citizenship Education and the Development of Globally Competent Teacher Candidates. *Journal of International Social Studies*, 7(2), 20-59.
<https://www.iajiss.org/index.php/iajiss/article/view/302/265>

- Ørngreen, R. & Levinsen, K. (2017). Workshops as a research methodology. *The Electronic Journal of eLearning*, 15(1), 70-81.
- Oxley, Laura & Morris, Paul (2013). Global Citizenship: A Typology for Distinguishing its Multiple Conceptions. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 61(3), 301–325. doi:10.1080/00071005.2013.798393
- Rehman, Zia Ur, Majoka M. I. & Naz, S. (2018). Role of universities in developing citizenship among students: The case of Pakistan. *Global Social Sciences Review (GSSR)*, 3(3), 142-157. DOI: 10.31703/gssr.2018(III-III).09
- Saperstein, E. (2020). Global citizenship education starts with teacher training and professional development. *Journal of Global Education and Research*, 4(2), 125-139.
<https://www.doi.org/10.5038/2577-509X.4.2.1121>
- Schippling, A. (2020). Researching global citizenship education: Towards a critical approach. *Journal of Social Science Education*, 19(4), 98-113. DOI: 10.4119/jsse-3466
- Thoring, K., Mueller, R. M. & Badke-Schaub, P. (2020). Workshops as a research method: Guidelines for designing and evaluating artifacts through workshops. *Proceedings of the 53rd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, Maui*, 5036-5045.
<http://hdl.handle.net/10125/64362>
- UNESCO. (2017). *The ABCs of global citizenship education*.
<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000248232>
- UNESCO. (2021). *Teachers have their say: Motivation, skills and opportunities to teach education for sustainable development and global citizenship*. Retrieved from
<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000379914>
- UNESCO Chair. (n.d.). *Global citizenship education: Culture of diversity and peace*. Universitat Klagenfurt. Retrieved from
<https://www.aau.at/en/unesco-chair-global-citizenship-education/#tab-id-2>