Global Education as a Dynamic Policy System

Understanding how interactions by global, regional and local actors might be mutually supportive is an urgent contemporary research agenda. Diverse actors can be major agents of interpretation and positive social change. In this publication, we look at policy as a dynamic system. Ultimately based on the analysis presented in this chapter, we suggest shifting away from the typical distinctions between policy makers, policy implementers and beneficiaries to policy participants who interact with one another via their activities, including their expressive processes. Developing policy and bringing it to life involves a research design that acknowledges the system-like nature of social-political change, an analysis from the perspectives of diverse stakeholders, and, thus, their narrations of problems, goals, and practices.

“The GE Innovation Award”, launched by GENE, viewed as a policy system - a system of inter-connected activities of the Network and the Applicants. GENE and the Applicants interact directly with each other and indirectly with multi-national organisations, national government entities, non-governmental organisations, grassroots communities, and participating individuals. A major goal of this policy system is to foster relations promoting transformative learning among local, national, and global partners outside of Europe as well as within. We consider this policy system as having potential for some new developmental goals. Qualities of policy systems include an organising purpose - focal object - of change, such as Global Education, as well as policy makers with different resources and in different geo-political positions around the object of change.

The GENE policy system is dynamic, and the research approach taken views it as an interaction within and across stakeholders, rather than being in a top-down transfer by policy maker to policy implementer and subject, as is often the assumption. This inquiry design includes 32 of the applications to the Global Education Innovation Award, and it allows for bottom-up influence as well as interaction among stakeholders. Policy makers and organisations applying for the Award are depicted in an equal relation as conversing actors around GE.

This chapter reports on the meaning of Global Education innovation across the policy system enacted in the GENE 2017 Global Education Innovation Award process. The theory guiding this analysis envisions the process as a conversation – a conversation most directly between the GENE Global Education Innovation Award project and Applicants and, more broadly, with relevant national, regional, and global policy makers. The following brief excerpts set the scene for results of an analysis of values guiding that conversation across the Global Education system.

Understanding the Approach: Values Analysis for Social Change

The theory guiding this analysis envisions the process as a conversation – a conversation most directly between GENE and the Applicants for the GE Award. The focus on that specific policy system will have relevance to implications for a broader range of national, regional, and global policy makers and for other policy systems.

Consistent with the view that discourse is activity, analyses of policy systems, like the GENE system, posit that documents actually do something in the world. Values are norms and beliefs enacted in expressive activity, like narratives, policy documents, and ritualised imagery (Daiute, 2008; Daiute, Stern, Lelutu-Weinberger, 2003; Daiute, Kovacs-Cerovic, Todorova, Jokic, Ataman, 2017). Such diverse documents are, thus, not representations of ideas sitting outside of them but are interactions. Such expressive interactions connect in implicit as well as explicit ways – what they say, what they suggest, what they avoid – so listening to them carefully is also dynamic participation.

In the case of the Global Education Innovation Award, understanding it as a system, the stated goals of participants enter a variety of values into circulation among the GENE Secretariat administering the Award, the International Selection Committee, GENE Board, Applicant organisations and their constituencies, and those who learn about GE initiatives. The offered recognition – including some funding – exerts some power to conform, especially for underfunded local grassroots organisations with humanitarian and educational purposes.
Organisations advocating for social inclusion of marginalised groups, which some governments have moved against in recent years, risk being excluded from policy discourse, so entering an arena of ideas also has political currency among those organisations. Understanding discourse across a policy system organised around a call for proposals and responses to the call can reveal innovations, in spite of any rigid definition of power relations by skeptics assuming that the applicants will simply repeat the different funders’ goals. In fact, the Applicants expand the meaning of Global Education.

The analysis of the Global Education Innovation Award process brings to light dynamics of knowledge across diverse stakeholders – ones with resources to state and promote policy and ones with resources to create and change policy with their activities in everyday practice. The conversation between GENE and award applicants might also be a way of conversing with nation states, via engaged Ministries and multi-national organisations about issues, such as inclusion rather than rejection of migrants, as well as other contemporary issues. The diverse power struggles inherent in this process operate in multiple and diverse ways.

With 82 organisations applying to the 2017 GENE Global Education Innovation Award, values across a policy system focused on Global Education goals, practices, and project justifications emerge as possible catalysts of positive social political change. On the view that policy systems are negotiations interacting with power relations in potentially multi-directional ways, this study uses values analysis as a way to raise the voices of a range of stakeholders, especially the Applicant organisations, interested in defining and implementing Global Education.

We scholars and teachers authoring this chapter are committed to understanding the role of community organisations as agents of reflection and action in their activities. With this analysis that examines the GENE system as an embodied process of social change, we are stakeholders in the Global Education process rather than objective outside observers. That said, the research process we present is rigorous and transparent in ways that test the hypothesis that the GENE system is one that can create innovation and not only be about innovation.

Values Analysis Definition

Within the Narrative Inquiry framework, the focus is on how texts express social norms, i.e. the principles we live by. Values Analysis examines the combination of organising narratives’ beliefs and norms enacted by the statements in narratives, letters, policies and other documents. Value expressions emerge in the social arrangements where people share their discourse in oral, written, or other formats. Values are, moreover, interactive in the sense that speakers / writers express them for specific purposes and audiences at the time expression. Values are portrayed by different people and organisations in different and flexible ways when it comes to everyday life. The dynamic process of narrating can reveal this diversity of values by individuals and organisations as they interact, taking up others’ values, expressing unique personal values, or creating new values together, i.e. values negotiation.

Values analysis focuses specifically on cultural products such as documents, reports, and proposals. Within such documents it considers whether and how values are performed across the various stakeholders. The texts provided by the stakeholders are analysed in terms of what is “important” and “why” for the author(s) of the text. This analysis is best carried out in collaboration with one or more co-researchers. Resulting comparison and discussion activities help to understand the reliability of the analytical work and to identify the most prevalent values organising a stakeholder position. (Adapted from Daiute, 2014).

The following brief excerpts set the scene for results of an analysis of values guiding that conversation across the Global Education system.

Excerpt from the GENE Call for Proposals:

PURPOSE OF THE 2017 GLOBAL EDUCATION INNOVATION AWARD

... To collect examples of innovative practice and disseminate learning from Global Education initiatives to policymakers throughout Europe.

...(one among 8 selection criteria): Outreach – the beneficiaries of the initiative. GENE particularly welcomes initiatives that address groups that are not engaged – for example, low-skilled unemployed populations, young people not in education, employment or training, or groups that are considering radical nationalist, religious and/ or racist ideologies as the only options available. (gene.eu/award/process-2017)
Excerpt from an Application voicing a similar goal:

Through these events, students are given the opportunity to speak with migrants instead of talking behind their back.

Excerpt from an Application extending the goal of including those in power:

We believe that our initiative has the potential to break down the silos around all the stakeholders (NGOs, UN Agencies, Ministries of Education, etc.) working in nonformal education once and for all by building meaningful and value adding relationships between programmes and peer communities working in the field.

Excerpt from an Application expressing a critical learning goal as part of the practice of Global Education:

One of the statements most cited by the trainee students in the evaluation of the workshops is that after the workshop they tend to realise that their living conditions are not given, but a matter of power-imbalance and they tend to value their chances far higher than before.

Excerpt from the UNESCO Global Citizenship Brief:

Although the notion of citizenship that goes beyond the nation state is not new, changes in the global context – for example, the establishment of international conventions and treaties, the growth of transnational organisations, corporations and civil society movements, and the development of international human rights frameworks – have significant implications for global citizenship.

The above excerpts express the educational goal for organisations to include a wide range of involved participants, including those who have previously been left out of deliberations about the future of humanity. In the aftermath of migrations and backlashes across Europe, such understandings of global consciousness are salient yet bold as educational goals. With those selected excerpts pointing to a much broader range of over 3,000 expressions across 37 relevant documents, this chapter presents results of a values analysis of the GENE policy system as actively brought to life in the 2017 Global Education Innovation Award process (referred to as "GENE system" in this chapter).

Values Analysis Process and Methodology

Although attention to the guiding nature of values on individual and institutional behaviour has had a long tradition in philosophy, classics, literary theory, sociology, psychology, discourse analysis, and, most recently, critical theory and legal studies, analysing values in discursive interactions in practical domains like education is relatively new. Listening to/reading Global Education documents for purpose, thus, acknowledges different speaker/author positions in terms of their roles, resources, assumed authority, familiarity with the expressive form, practical knowledge, and experience. Although policy makers have certain kinds of power and resources in a policy system, they typically have less direct access to experience and knowledge building in practice than do policy participants. The authority of a policy maker who has a position and resources to set agendas differs from the authority of a policy activist who knows which agendas are viable and persuasive in practice. This study considers such a relationship with an analysis of a policy conversation among mutual interacting agents in the Global Education award process via their documents.

The data set for this inquiry included 37 documents: 32 Applications for the 2017 Global Education Innovation Awards and five institutional documents related to the Award.5

Values emerged across three researchers’ multiple readings, asking “Why might this have been said (and not something else) in this way?” Value definitions were written and revised in a codebook, with indicators and examples. When the researchers (at least two of the three) achieved 82% reliability on approximately 10% of the 4069 sentences in the database, the documents were entered into an Atlas.ti 8 database, with the 48 value categories our research team identified in consecutive phases of preliminary analysis. These phases involved the research team in reading all the documents to become familiar with them, generating a preliminary analysis manual with a list of values, definitions, and examples from a small subset of different documents, discussing those preliminary values;

---

5 UNESCO Global Citizenship Education excerpt; Council of Europe Global Education Guide excerpt; GENE Policy Brief; GENE Purpose, Aims, Visions excerpt; GENE Call for Applications for the 2017 GE Award.
applying the preliminary values to another group of documents, updating the manual based on that phase of analysis and discussion, and so on. After five such rounds, the manual appeared to address all sentences, so we selected 10% of the documents for a round of analysis to test for reliability, as reported below. After that, three researchers divided the entire set of applications and institutional documents randomly for analysis. After the three researchers each analysed one third of randomly assigned documents, they checked consistency of assignment of each value category, consulting with one another if necessary and making changes about any misapplied coding. This process, thus, yields coherent mutually exclusive value categories.

Figure 1 illustrates values analysis applied to an excerpt from an application. The excerpt begins with an application question “Why should you receive the Award?” and continues with the Applicant’s response to the question. Sentences of the response are numbered (beginning with 19 in this example) because the unit of analysis for identifying values is the sentence.

![Figure 1. Excerpt of an Application with Values Analysis](image)

The value categories appearing on the right side of Figure 1 indicate that the Applicant expressed a range of diverse values in this explanation of why the project should receive the award. The paragraph begins by emphasising the goal of extending the history of this project (GPr:Ex is an abbreviation for the value “Replicating the collaboration is important”). The next two sentences summarise goals of this project to decrease discrimination... (G:Ex) and the importance of including local as well as regional organisations (G:G1). The fourth sentence expresses the goal of emphasizing beneficiaries of the project as all in society (G:B). The next sentence shifts to practice, in this case, an integrative holistic approach (M:IM). The paragraph concludes by stating an emphasis on changing perspectives (G:C). Such a range of diverse values is then compiled by a stakeholder, in this case an Applicant, across stakeholder groups, such as all Applicants and Institutions.

After identifying the values for each sentence, the next phase of analysis was to identify patterns of values in terms of relatedness of their meaning. In that phase of analysis, the 48 values were organised into 14 groups based on similar meaning, such as the goal of social change. Moving further toward interpreting the analysis, a final grouping of the values in terms of general discursive purpose identified Goal Values (with seven related major values), Practice Values (with four major values), and Project Justifying Values (with three major values).

In this way, the research team used a “bottom-up” process, first identifying specific values sentence-by-sentence to be attentive to details and nuances, thereby allowing for unexpected priorities among Applicants and Institutions. A “top-down” process would, in contrast, have begun with the institutional values, followed by determining whether those values were also present among the applications. In addition to examining the range of values expressed across the 32 Applications, the analysis identifies similarities and differences in values across the GENE system. We expected that Applicants would echo some of the Institutional values, but that Applicants would also introduce different values.

**Values across the GENE Global Education Award System**

The analysis revealed 48 values, accounting for every sentence in the database. Those 48 values were then organised into 14 major values by meaning and, ultimately, three rhetorical processes: emphasising goals (what), practices (how), or project justifying processes (why). Table 1 presents the list of values that emerged from our analysis process.

---

6 Project Justifying Values are referring to the values expressed in the explanations of the applicant initiatives descriptions.
**GOALS** are important in Global Education innovations, including:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMPHASISING CHANGE</th>
<th>Transforming values into action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changing perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engaging youth/focal participant leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changing and/or questioning values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fostering a sense of the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasising innovative emancipatory goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMPHASISING GLOBAL-LOCAL CONNECTIONS</th>
<th>Pursuing international collaborations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fostering mutual knowledge, respect, solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fostering global-local connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Including community organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMPHASISING LEARNING AND EDUCATION</th>
<th>Emphasising knowledge building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasising quality education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highlighting mentorship of formal and non-formal teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMPHASISING THE ISSUE OF EXCLUSION, SPECIFICALLY</th>
<th>Decreasing exclusion, xenophobia, stereotyping, gender exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledging challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledging difficulties collaborating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledging lack of resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGHLIGHTING BENEFICIARIES</th>
<th>Teachers, parents, others responsible (including those in power)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reaching all in society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other specific beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focusing on the plights of vulnerable persons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACKNOWLEDGE CHALLENGES</th>
<th>Acknowledging histories and traditions of exclusion counter to goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledging challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledging difficulties collaborating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledging lack of resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EMPHASISING UNIVERSAL VALUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working for social justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emphasising ecological, environmental sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working for human rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRACTICES** are important in Global Education innovations, including:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTEGRATING INNOVATIVE PRACTICES</th>
<th>Addressing goals with non-traditional means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrating a holistic humanistic approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fostering critical discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMPHASISING FIRST-HAND EXPERIENCE AND IMMERSION</th>
<th>Emphasising first-hand experience and immersion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasising participation BY subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrating knowledge and practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROVIDING NECESSARY TOOLS</th>
<th>Providing necessary tools and supports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using/incorporating e-media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employing cost-effective means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addressing means and materials (generally)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLABORATING IS IMPORTANT</th>
<th>Collaborating (when global-local connections not mentioned)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasising incentives for teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT JUSTIFICATIONS** are important, including:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXTENDING PROJECT</th>
<th>Sustainability of the project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disseminating program and results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Replicating the collaboration process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extending the life of this innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRESENTING THE PROJECT**
Goal values were the most numerous across the sentences in a full database of applications and institutional documents (1,471 sentences), followed by practice values (884) and project justifying values (783). Figure 2 illustrates this pattern with emphases on goal values as the most prevalent, followed by practice values, followed in turn by project justifying values.

Values emphasising goals to make social changes through Global Education and goals to foster global-local connections were the most numerous among the goal values (381 each), followed by goal values emphasising learning and education (211), emphasising eliminating exclusion (137), highlighting beneficiaries, emphasising universals (treaties, truths…) and challenges. As we discuss below, the focus specifically on eliminating exclusion was most frequently expressed by the Applicants, whereas emphasis on universal values was the most interesting of the Institutional documents.

Practice values and project justification values were expressed primarily by the Applicants. This may not seem surprising, given the Applicants’ role to advocate for their projects, yet it is worth noting that they could also have advocated for their project simply by emphasising goals with some illustrative practices. Practice values emerged in some predictable ways, with an emphasis on innovations (296), which was the name of the Award, but also, more uniquely with goals emphasising first-hand experience and immersion in practices (241), providing necessary tools and supports (207), and collaborating (77).

How are Values Expressed?
As explained previously, participants in policy development and practice, tend to express values (explicitly and implicitly) in relation to others focused on a similar object – in this case Global Education. Although policy makers may sometimes state their values explicitly, such as in their mission statements and governing documents, they also convey values implicitly, such as by implying a value or by lacking a value, as becomes apparent in examination of values across a document. For example, in another study, values analysis indicated that a Treaty for Roma Inclusion emphasised obstacles facing Roma people while not stating the need for self-defined positive outcomes which the Roma participants themselves emphasised (Daiute et al., 2017). The Treaty stated “…we pledge that our governments will work toward eliminating discrimination and closing the unacceptable gaps between Roma and the rest of society, as identified in our Decade Action Plans,” while not mentioning specific strategies of the Roma participants, as they prominently stated: Accept your duties and try to accomplish them well. Don’t let yourselves be humiliated or underestimated; take a stand from the very beginning.

Because values are implicit as well as explicit, we present illustrative examples. The following expressions indicate goal values. Words marking the emphasis of a goal, such as change, or global-local connection appear in bold.
When these people begin to interact through meaningful relationships, the potential is incredible.

... Being able to see the effects of this first-hand, as they live in the community that they are collaborating with, encourages and inspires them to continue with similar work in the future.

... The change of perception is maybe best characterised with the words of the high-school student, participating in our workshops. “The workshops have been very useful as my perspective on migrants and refugees has changed a lot. Before I was against them, now I understand them somehow.”

... Namely, its intervention logic implies a comprehensive strategy to influence individual attitudes of boys and men, girls and women on gender equality, non-violence and healthy lifestyles, and indirectly – social norms on gender equality.

... The game we are experiencing is helping us to understand the moves to make, the parts to get rid of to better understand the world around us but mostly ourselves.

... Our programme is grounded in the belief that if students learn to recognise harmful gender norms and are provided safe spaces to practice questioning these constructs, there is a greater likelihood of internalising new ideas in support of gender-equitable, healthy, and non-violent behaviours.

... What shook me the most, was the chance to experience this journey, that these people went through.

... Innovative methods in Global Education allow one to be bold and question oneself, get outside of one’s comfort zones and question and modify one’s viewpoints.

... These children have to immerse themselves and truly feel that their help is needed around the world because when they tell me that there are kids around the world that are poor and starving but that’s not enough for them to emotionally invest themselves.

... The participants themselves, in each programme, come from a variety of backgrounds and cultures, and by spending time together they are able to learn about one another, to appreciate each other’s differences and to behave respectfully around each other.

... Using storytelling with people from a refugee background, we eliminated the wall between “them and us” and created real relationships and connections between people.

The following excerpts indicate practice values.

Addressing gender norms, both in terms of promoting gender equality and addressing some behaviour risks young people face related to health and violence requires educating, engaging, and supporting young people.

... At DDD⁷, we feel it is not possible to deal with increasing hate speech, intolerance and growing negative attitudes of the general public against refugees and migrants only using the arguments on a rational level.

... Which not only includes learning and unlearning (HEAD) and trying to rationally grasp new realities and experiences, but also working with feelings (HEART), experiencing global issues through experiential methods and the impact that this has on our feelings and emotions, and then (HANDS) doing something about it and actively changing the world, so that it becomes more just, inclusive and fair.

The following excerpts indicate project justification values.

Finally, the AAA successes are fully based on extensive expertise in gender equality and related topics, as well as managerial experience, professional enthusiasm, and the personal beliefs of the BBB and partner organisations.

... It is not surprising that the long-term results of our workshops are often further spontaneous actions or campaigns and thus has a kind of radiating effect in the society.

---

⁷ The names of Applicant organisations are replaced with letters for anonymity.
What Values Organise the GENE GE Policy System?

Major value groups further indicate the organising principles of the 2017 applicants, as representatives of civil society purposes. Figure 3 presents frequencies of those 14 major value categories across the applications. To understand that these categories are principles, read each category of active statements, including the phrase "... is important", such as "Emphasising inclusion goals is important".

To identify broader expressive purposes, we gathered the Goal values, Practice values, and Project justification values. The most prevalent group was Goal values (1492 sentences), such as "Fostering mutual knowledge, understanding, and respect" — "The students in Benin were very surprised and moved to learn that Belgian students did not feel safe in their country and advised them not to be afraid and to continue living normally."

The next most prevalent group was Practice values (884 sentences), such as "Providing tools and supports required for the innovation" - "Lastly, movies are tools that can easily reach an audience that is not necessarily already sensitive to the issues of migration and allows a greater public inclusion."

Somewhat less prevalent were project justification values (782 sentences), such as "Presenting our project with compelling information like measurement" - such as "CCC has held 20 incredible youth leadership conferences in five countries, with more than 1000 youth participants, from over 80 different inner-city and rural village communities."

Shifting from the Applicant position in the virtual conversation via the GENE Award system, the next section considers the values emphases in the GENE documents compared to those by the Applicants. GENE documents are two of the five institutional documents. GENE documents, in particular, because they are in the most direct relation to the Applicant documents.

Values across Diverse Stakeholders in the GENE System

In this section, we focus on the GENE documents (among all the Institutional documents) and the applications, as that is the most direct interaction within the broader policy system. Figure 4 presents the percentage of sentences for each of the 14 major value categories.
Values Differ

As illustrated in Figure 4, specific areas of difference between the GENE documents and the applications include GENE expressing relatively more than twice the emphasis (in terms of percentages) on the importance of global/local connections, acknowledging and addressing challenges, emphasising universals, and presenting the project with rhetorical flair. On the other hand, Applicant documents emphasised the importance of first-hand experience and immersion, the importance of providing tools and supports, and the importance of extending (disseminating) project values, with slightly under double relative statements on emphasising an integrative humanistic approach.

Examining emphases within the GENE and Applicant roles is also illuminating. The most prominent within the GENE is emphasising global-local connections (24.1%), followed at a considerable distance by emphasising universals (9.6%) and emphasising measuring project outcomes (9.0%). Applications tended to balance emphasis across a wider range of categories, including emphasising measuring project outcomes, emphasising change, emphasising global-local connections, emphasising integrative humanistic practices, and extending project outcomes (at 12.3%, 11.7%, 10.7%, and 10.0%, and 9.0% respectively). Emphasising first-hand experience and immersion (8.2%) and emphasising tools and supports (7.0%) follow closely.

Two possible reasons why the range of values is engaged more broadly across the applications could be the discursive genres involved in the application than in presenting policy in a call for proposals or policy documents. While the Award Call for Proposals is relatively brief, the GENE Policy Brief is many pages. In addition, policy documents tend to occur as paradigmatic discourse, that is statements of principle, fact, truth, while the applications, especially as designed by the GENE application to request persuasive and narrative as well as informative responses, are narrative discourse. Interestingly, because policy making is considered and some ways occurs from a position of authority, influence, and resources, its actual engagement with the object of policy emerges as much less frequent than the engagement of policy subjects.
Zooming back to differences across the roles, purposes, and knowledge of collectives working across countries for Global Education policy – in this case GENE and Applicants for the Award – is helpful for interpreting these results. That the analysis identified shared values attests to common purpose, yet differences in how shared values occur within and across the stakeholders is also important. Policy documents tend to foreground concepts, as in the following excerpt: *In summary, these concepts appear to have a common core in that they seem to share: …an analysis that includes a justice perspective, an awareness of interconnectedness, and a valuing of solidarity.*

In contrast, applications tended to include person agents, as in the following excerpt: *…develop and promote global competencies of young people who truly need them for a life in a rapidly changing world, and equip them with the necessary social skills such as critical thinking, action and cooperation in the group, social engagement and active global citizenship for a life in a multicultural environment.*

This more and less abstract language may be relevant to the discursive styles of diverse kinds of organisations and roles in the policy process. To the extent that our identification of the shared value is apt, these specific differences in agents of global-local connectedness indicate a complementarity worthy of theory and inquiry in the future.

Two other relatively prominent values in the institutional documents - emphasising universals and acknowledging and addressing challenges - are worth considering in further detail. This excerpt is from a policy document, emphasising gender equality, in particular.

*Priority Gender Equality: Global citizenship education can play an important role in contributing to gender equality, which is one of the two overarching priorities of UNESCO. Global citizenship education is based on human rights, and gender equality is a basic human right. (From the UNESCO Global Citizenship Manual)*

The following excerpt from an application does the same in a dynamic way. DDD project “engages young men for gender equality”.

As might be appropriate for initiating policies, institutional documents also emphasise the value of acknowledging and addressing challenges.

One interesting challenge by policy makers is the relation between UN Goals and Global Education:

*While this has unifying power, it also carries some conceptual vagueness that may create a lack of clarity and frustration and prevent meaningful and constructive exchange of ideas and debate.* (GENE Policy Brief)

A similarly expressive value by an Applicant is relatively specific: *Technique becomes more and more complicated and users want more and more.*

Applicants emphasised other values, especially practice values highlighting first-hand experience and immersion, having access to necessary tools and supports, initiating integrative humanistic approaches, and project justification values such as the importance of extending (disseminating) the project. The following section illustrates how applications animated such practice and project justification values with goal values.

**Bringing Values to Life in Practice**

As illustrated in Figure 1, applicants wove goal values and practice values interactively in explaining their initiatives: Values around how to achieve goals expands the meaning of the goal as in the following excerpt. The goal of integrating those who have been excluded is advanced by practices for doing so, such as creating a programme with refugees as authors of theatre in which locals act in refugee roles.

In this following extended excerpt, notice how the goal of social inclusion is animated in a way that emphatically foregrounds the perspective of the excluded people – in this case “migrants”.
1.4 What is your initiative about? *Please describe your motivation to receive the Award.

...The migrants enrolled in a training course which was specifically designed for them and attended movie projections and debates in higher secondary education institutions, together with their tutors and partners of the project. Migrants participating (as trainees) in this course were given training on specific themes – racism, job market, stereotypes and prejudices, second generations and values – and how to address these issues with students using the cinema as a medium. They then manage projections followed by debates in higher secondary schools, including vocational education institutes, with the aim to debunk myths and misconceptions about migration and what it means to be a stranger. Through these events, students are given the opportunity to speak with migrants instead of talking behind their back. During this training, migrants (as trainees) discuss the movie, underlying important aspects - of the movie and of their lives - to point out during the second phase of the project carried out in the school with students. After the interventions at the partner schools, a learning kit is distributed to the teachers. This kit should help the teachers to further develop the issues raised during the meeting with migrants (as key informants). At the end of the project cycle, three public events were organised to watch the movies in a public space and discuss the outcomes of the interventions with stakeholders, the Trentino citizens and all participants.

The project has two aims:
- empowering migrants whose experience becomes a driver for the awareness raising on intercultural education for the new generations;
- encouraging and promoting the increase of students’ awareness, knowledge and empathy about the migrants’ experiences, their countries and their travel.

The initial phase of “training” shifts from seeming like it could be meant to dictate values and eventually appears to be a sharing of organisational vocabulary that they can then use or not to “train” the public about issues of migration. Practices include integrating ethical knowledge about inclusion via a holistic approach, in this case using film media to transform education into action and as a foundation for critical discussion. While detailed, this explanation of how a programme works is not just technical. Instead, it transforms the concept of inclusion into a deliberate shifting of power relations through effortful close encounters to open minds and hearts in the face of contemporary xenophobia.

The following excerpt highlights practices of first-hand experience and immersion so that through self-inquiry, participants might achieve other inquiry. Self-inquiry in affective as well as cognitive terms might seem outside the global-local education realm, yet this practical explanation shifts the boundaries around Global Education.

2.1 This initiative is innovative because: *Please describe in which way the initiative uses creativity and innovation.

...So, what is “Our Initiative?” it’s a game about creating community, growing community together and activating. It is a game that supports people to explore themselves, helps groups to work together, and helps communities to get in touch. So, it’s a game for community building, team building, and personal awareness. Our Initiative is a European project that is part of Erasmus+ funding born from the collaboration of 5 European partners, two Italians, one Spanish, one Scottish, and a Dutch one, and Brazil as international partner. The idea we have worked on is to put together two techniques of participatory processes to work in communities: Process work and the Oasis Game.

The game is created for groups working in the social field, to strengthen the relationship dynamics within the community they work with. When we begin to find out who are the people around, what they do, what they know, we realise the richness we have in the community. When these people begin to interact through meaningful relationships, the potential is incredible. Expressing your potential at best through facilitation, and being able to grow, also empowering the community at the same time, experiencing how different communities can interact. The game is based on a systemic approach, which means that what I’m feeling is related to the group feelings, and to what the community around me is feeling right now. We’ve chosen the metaphor of the Underground: there are travellers who leave, each one from their own home with their own bag of experiences, skills and talents. They meet, play together to explore the potential of the group, and then go to meet the community they work within. After making this journey they choose the metro
Notice in the following excerpts how social justice shifts from being an abstract goal to an effortful process.

1.4 What is your initiative about? *Please describe your motivation to receive the Award.

... Our Initiative's gender transformation education (school-based programme) initiative: It has been a documented success in the Western Balkans.

The programme is focused on transforming the school environment to one that supports and nurtures gender equality and promotes a culture of nonviolence. Our programme is grounded in the belief that if students learn to recognise harmful gender norms and are provided safe spaces to practice questioning these constructs, there is a greater likelihood of internalising new ideas in support of gender-equitable, healthy, and non-violent behaviours. Within this project, young men and women are inspired to become innovative leaders in their schools for the promotion of non-violence, healthy lifestyles, and gender equality among their peers. Our Programme curriculum teaches young people how to make informed decisions for their own health and well-being, become role models in their social milieu, and cultivate a peer environment that favours non-violence, gender equality, tolerance, and greater choice. On the other side, our initiative supports high school educators who seek an effective educational tool to prevent gender-based and other forms of violence among adolescents. Our Programme pairs an accredited curriculum with a social norms campaign that is proven to reduce harmful gender-related stereotypes and a culture of violence among adolescents.

Teachers are certified and given professional points for their continued educational development. Furthermore, this initiative offers solutions to Ministries of Education who seek an affordable, easy-to-adapt, mainstreaming solution to adolescent violence that is tied to gender inequitable norms and addiction. The Programme offers them a piloted and widely implemented professional education programme for teachers, adapted to different resource levels and school settings, as well as an educational programme for Pedagogy students. Also, the project targets parents, especially fathers to take more active role in care-giving and upbringing of children. In essence, the project targets all the individuals or groups of people who have an impact on the lives of youth, and who are living in their surroundings, enabling the environment for their safe transition to adulthood.
These extended excerpts from Applications illustrate major findings of this study. The activity of writing an application in relation to the GENE process is a developmental process. "Developmental" in this case means relational and expansive in several senses. Applicants responded to the call for proposals in a conversational way, albeit, as the genre requires, in writing and with video statements, by responding to application questions, taking up major goals, like fostering global-local connections, and, most importantly, by extending the conversation with values from their practice. In the effortful process, indicated by results of the values analysis and in the extended excerpts, goal values like Global Education for universal values including social justice are defined by how such goals must play out in practice to ensure they are more than goals. With details expressed in the value of perspective-taking practices, first-hand experiences, and dissemination of programme practices, Applicants insist on the extensive and diverse expressions emphasising the priority of policy subjects – refugees, young men who might have been raised in cultures of violence, and so on – to define values in supported embodied activities rather than to learn and endorse. With their indication of values integrating goals, practices, and project justifications, these extended excerpts also should assuage concerns that interactions between policy makers, policy implementers, and policy subjects would be mere social reproduction of the values of the more influential stakeholders. While that can certainly occur, the discursive engagement around Global Education in this system is that it emerges as generative not only of values from the field of practice but also as a basis of ongoing institutional work in the development of this arena of civil society in challenging times.

Discussion

For me, Innovation is "asking the question "Why?" repeatedly until the problem becomes an opportunity.

Refugees involved in the making of the play and designing the workshops with us are showing the society, and especially the pupils we are visiting, that they are not just passive "mascots" of the workshops but co-trainers of the whole module, bringing new perspectives, cultural practices and their own (sometimes very painful) experiences to the process.

These two excerpts indicate the critical perspective at play in conversations among actors in different positions of a policy system. The first statement from an Applicant connects with the GENE agenda and application process by presenting an aspect of their initiative in terms of the concept of innovation, while also introducing practices, i.e. “asking ‘why?’” and highlighting a problem rather than defining “innovation” as solutions. The second statement also expresses complex affects (pain) and categories (refugees are not “mascots”), thereby adding breadth to their applications beyond institutional values which emphasise universal and cognitive processes. In this way, Applicants connect and diversify beyond what may be implied as a requirement for winning an award.

Values expressed by Applicants and the GE documents overall indicate a shared foundation of Global Education. In addition to those echoes of values across the system, the applicant organisations introduced values, in particular those values emphasising their practices, which extend and sometimes challenge goals, which are often expressed in more abstract terms. Perhaps because the process provided a platform for sharing values through the Applicants’ experience in practice, in spite of their relative lack of power and resources, applications used precise and lively descriptions and examples to show what matters in community activism, such as “asking ‘Why?’” and being vulnerable in open relationships beyond humanitarian postures with “mascots”.

The Applicants emphasised goal values, followed by practice values, followed by project justification values. The purposeful, activist and responsible commitments of these Applicants is evident from these three major groups of values. Interesting for future GE policy making is that goals emerge in practice and become especially salient in practice. Although slightly less of an emphasis than on practice, project justification values indicated that the Applicants’ commitment to their initiatives included generating ideas for how to assess them for future development and dissemination.

In summary, the 3 value groups – emphasising goals, practices and project justifications – include more specific values that are consistent with Global Citizenship and Education discourse, thereby illustrating and not only stating concepts including justice, equity, diversity and belonging, and sustainable development. Nevertheless, the values also analysis revealed some important
innovations beyond previous discourses. For example, applications tended to emphasise universal rights and abstract justice less than the policy documents did and more on specific local practices. Interestingly, identity, which is also prominent in global citizenship and education discourse, was not a prominent value expressed in the data for this study, in part, perhaps because global-local connections are meant to go beyond individual national or other identities. Another unique finding is that our bottom-up analysis, which raises the voices of policy activists, who advocated for their group's initiative. This would make sense in an application for funding and did not mimic the GE discourse. Instead, the Applicants made strong cases for assessing, replicating, advocating for their projects, often with passionate as well as detailed language.

Research by Biesta (2014: XIV) is relevant, with a focus on complex relationships between education and democracy – loosely referred to as processes and practices of ‘civic learning’ –; particularly interested in the public dimension of such processes and practices. ‘Public’ here does not simply stand for the physical location of civic learning – although the question of the physical location of democratic processes and practices is, of course, important as well – but rather highlights a particular quality of social action and interaction, one that is aimed at fostering and maintaining interaction ‘across difference’, with an orientation towards the democratic values of equality, freedom and solidarity. Public relationships are in this sense different from private relationships of family and kinship, but also from economic relationships of transaction and exchange. This particular ‘location’ of the public sphere, as the sphere where and through which democratic relationships can be established and enacted, also shows one of the enduring problems for democracy – a problem that has become more prominent in an age of identity politics and neoliberalism – namely that the public sphere is being replaced or even destroyed by private relationships of identity or market relationships of competition and financial gain.

Our findings also relate to research by Wegimont and Hartmeyer (2016:245-6): (a) current educational debates at a European level, including the development of competencies and emerging forms of citizenship, can benefit from, and should be informed by a global learning perspective. (b) A Global Learning perspective will also be needed in the continuing debate about the relationship between education and social change; whether and how Global Education will or can change the situation in the world locally, nationally and globally. (c) Necessities for Global Education: the need to be challenged by differing and previously excluded perspectives; the need to include challenging, alternative and Southern voices; the need to go beyond the North-South paradigm, and the development paradigm to include a more Global Education perspective.

This analysis also goes beyond such discourse about the goals of Global Education to express values of how goals are developed in practice; over half of the sentences express values of practices. In other words, a rich yet concentrated group of values in how Global Education goals can or, according to these Applicants, must be carried out expands the discussion beyond policy as an abstraction to policy as activity. The emphasis on four major practice values, including the need for first-hand immersion in the experiences of others – especially those who are different and remote – is precisely expressed as required for the enactment of global-local connections.

Finally, to put policy making into a broader context that asks when and why policy is required, we observe, that policy is required when the normal course of events is not going well (as perceived by some for some others) and requires intervention. When policy making is not collaborative and transparent among diverse stakeholders around adversity, insincere motives might be operating. Such insincerity was, for example, identified in a study of the policy system around Roma inclusion, when Roma Pedagogical Assistants realised that leaving monitoring of inclusion policies to them and the Roma community neglected the responsible participation of local, national and regional mainstream school and government authorities to do their part in following through on policy promises (Daute et al., 2017). This following quote from another study underscores the problem and the need for shared and extended policy conversations among diverse stakeholders: Policies must “facilitate cultural spaces where people—faced with social upheaval and conflicts or in the aftermath of violence and tragedy—can participate in building communities and inter-communal relationships characterised by shared power, mutual recognition, and awareness in order to work together to shape the future.” (Senehi, 2002, p. 55)

In addition to this theory-based method of studying policy systems, this analysis suggests ideas for further exploration in policy studies. Discussions of policy tend
to be phrased and thus designed in hierarchical terms. Beyond the more general and abstract expression of policy goals, is also the assumption that certain actors make policy, others implement and others are beneficiaries. When researchers and practitioners discuss policy it's often in terms of presenting findings in ways that influence policy. Instead, considering policy systems as interactive via concrete discursive activities, in person or in written/visual communication, acknowledges the reciprocal nature of power across the system. The Global Education Innovation Award is clearly a strategy to learn about and to support Global Education activities by community, civil society organisations, and educational institutions. This analysis shows that the applications are more than tactics to carry out or defy those strategies. As was perhaps desired in this policy system, Applicants were precise advocates of their knowledge and experience and, in that sense, also strategic. Extending social theory, narrative activity theory, and Global Education theory, we propose that policy with a capital "P" – that is, the hierarchical notion of policy as trickle-down from designer to subject – be revised to studying policy with small "p" – relational policy. This suggested stance is for policy making as a conversation among equal reciprocal policy makers in diverse positions around the object – the goal – of policy.
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