WITH A GLOBAL LEARNING APPROACH. Reflecting on a paradigm change in the generations understanding model in Global Development Education.

Resumen
This article proposes a different look at Development Education (DE) currently based on the generations paradigm (Korten, 1987; Ortega, 1994; Mesa, 2000). In order to do so, a brief study is done of the advantages and disadvantages of the current model and the definitions that describe it. Then the DE mission is reviewed based on a plans and tools metaphor. Later a critical approximation of practice is undertaken based on the understanding and assumptions they have about learning. A new approximation to DE is developed from this based on emerging levels that start out from reflective practice and are based on five progressive elements, returning to analyze the generations model and establishing the relationships and differences. All of this is concretized in a “global learning approach” that goes beyond classical DE dimensions and seeks to contribute to thinking about its practices and dilemmas in a more cohesive and coherent way, as well as how development cooperation and society in general fit into improving education.
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It would be interesting to reflect on the reasons why the generations model utilized in Global Development Education (GDE) has had such a warm reception among professionals in this area, at least as a theoretical framework, especially in Spain during the last decade (Mayoral, 2011). Perhaps the most relevant event for analyzing GDE in this way is the milestone marked by its inclusion in the Spanish Development Education Cooperation Strategy (AECID, 2007), with which it is presumed to have acquired a certain official status.

As is known, this model has its bibliographical origins in an article by Harvard University professor and political activist David Korten, published in the World Development journal a little less than 30 years ago (Korten, 1987). However, its introduction into Spanish literature for GDE was done by María Luz Ortega in a classic book for the sector: “Las ONGD y la crisis del desarrollo” [DNGOs and the Crisis of Development] (Ortega, 1994) and it has passed through successive amplifications and adaptations to GDE due to the work and reflection of, among others, members of the Hegoa Development Education area (Argibay, Celorio, and Celorio, 1997), as well as Manuela Mesa, previously in the CIP and now in CEIPAZ (Mesa, 2000)².

But this article is not going to be concerned with its genesis or with the reasons for its broad acceptance (which does not mean its broad application); instead I propose to consider if there are other ways of considering and imagining GDE beyond the generations model, safeguarding the basic intuitions that this has provided for the sector. However, the first task is to evaluate the contributions it has made to the construction of global citizenship, as well as being aware of the implicit limitations that this may pose in order to continue advancing. Some of them will be inherent in the model itself and others will be external, but whatever the case, we must provide clarity when considering if other views are possible.

In my opinion, the fundamental contributions of the model include:
- Its process and historical structure, which helps us to understand how there have been discoveries by stages that have given fruit as different visions and experiences in cooperation and in GDE.

---

1 That is when the G for global was included, which it seems to me helps to avoid the polysemy that usually accompanies DE.
2 I ask forgiveness for whatever simplifications there may be in this description, since I am sure that this process had some more detailed dimensions than what I mention.
- The elements of analysis that it provides, such as the north-south approach, the action typologies it generates, the role of the actors, the underlying discourses, the contents... (Mesa, 2002).

- Its ethical and critical foundation that helps us to focus the type of GDE that we design, develop, analyze, and evaluate. Today perhaps it is important to emphasize that the model takes into consideration, even more than the type, the question of with whom, from whom, what for, and from where.

- And situated in this current context, the model in its latest stage involved what today we call global citizenship, repositioning its entire perspective from a point of view that makes it necessary to rethink all of its activity.

- With all of this, the generations model provides a scheme for thought that consciously and at times unconsciously helps to continually rethink global citizenship in a changing world in an ethical and critical way, from a processual and historical approach with a human rights-based learning (ACNUR, 2006).

In spite of such potential, the model may generate a series of limitations:

- The first does not involve the model, but rather the reality itself that it describes. The different stages may be cognitively understood, but many times there is not an appropriation of them. A real comprehension is not produced. On occasion it is not associated with one’s own or nearby experiences. This has to do with the fact that generations usually assimilate by discovery and this generates an asymmetry among actors as well as a lack of comprehension regarding the importance of the different views of development we are dealing with. So what for some is obvious and assumed, to others seems foreign and even illogical.

- Another aspect is that its approach is based on ethics and the economy of development. This, which we consider to have potential in the section above, becomes a limitation when it is the only perspective. So even though the model talks about education, it hardly speaks of pedagogy or psychology. Even though it talks about values, it is not greatly or systematically concerned with how this process occurs in people’s development. To put it baldly, it’s as if the ideas that are the basis of the model could be taken up as if they were pills you take and then you acquire them naturally and instantaneously. Perhaps we can find the exception to this limitation in Paulo Freire and his educational method, which in a certain way reflects the third generation of GDE. However, perhaps we have ended up with his basic intuitions and not with his methodology (Mendes, 2009).
- Due to this insufficiency, the model, although suggestive, has difficulty adapting to school systems and their reality, and this is a great obstacle for something that includes the word “education” in its name. Even the pretension to an alternative educational policy model is situated in theoretical frameworks that are foreign to educational contexts and everyday life in them. So DE interventions are many times interesting but also often specific and especially foreign to the ways of thought dealt with in schools. It is true that formal schools have a conservative profile in their base proposals (which is necessary in part), but it could have another practical, defiant, and revolutionary counterpart that looks to the future and its construction, about which GDE does not concern itself, for various reasons.

- The generations model has answers to some questions, but it does not respond to other relevant questions about how both the personal and community social transformation process occurs and its possible directions, which opt for inclusion, whether in a local and/or global key. It doesn’t clearly delimit the connections and differences among awareness raising, communication, and development education either. Some explanatory models put them together and others reduce GDE to training, but none represents a very clear integration.

- In spite of its acceptance, there is a certain controversy over the first two of the five generations being considered to have been overcome and subject to being overcome. This fact, although it is completely logical, presents some difficulty especially since some political and social agents have still not assumed this processual reality.

- The root of all this difficulty probably has to do with something that is not really assumed and that has to do with the base metaphors (see Table 1) of each generation, as well as the definition of GDE itself. And the fact is, as we have mentioned, that the generations model is very much accepted by the professionals of the sector, but not so much in the sector of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key word</td>
<td>Social service</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Diverse</td>
<td>Civic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base metaphor</td>
<td>Father/mother</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Anthropologist</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction-geometry</td>
<td>Up-down</td>
<td>Up-down</td>
<td>Down-Up</td>
<td>Horizontal</td>
<td>Circular</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: GDE words, metaphors, and geometry according to the generations model.
cooperation itself, among political managers and technicians, among educators, and in society itself. And this is so due to various causes, which range from ignorance or incomprehension to created interests. However, it is necessary to remember that there are many people in different social organizations, in public administrations, or in educational spheres who, in spite of these limitations, are developing interesting work for the continuing construction of global citizenship. During recent years there have been diagnoses, experience panels, studies, and other efforts that have been confirming this complex situation. However, it is good to start dialoguing about the future more than the past. It is necessary to clarify aspects that may still be confusing, as well as to plan and see how they can be concretized. If the people who work in GDE are experts in imagining a different and better world, this should be a mission that stirs us.

THE MISSION OF GDE: 3 MAPS AND 4 VEHICLES

In light of what has been reviewed so far, it seems that it would be interesting to do a study on the definition of GDE in order to thus clarify the starting point. However, on this occasion we will begin from another perspective. I believe that it is possible to accept the two definitions that are probably most widely employed in our context: the first is the one from the DNGO Coordinator of Spain (CONGDE, 2005, p. 19) and the second is from the Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation (AECID, 2007, p. 19). Both definitions, along with their advantages and disadvantages, have developed a positive role in the construction of the concept we have of it. However, there are other perspectives that may help us to place it in a broader context.

Among these we can find Anglo-Saxon approaches, where education is not talked about a great deal, but rather learning, and therefore global learning and, more generally the global

---

3 “DE should be understood as a process for generating critical awareness, making each person responsible and active (committed), so as to build up a new civil society, both in the North and in the South, committed to solidarity understood as co-responsibility—we are all involved in development, there are no longer borders or geographical distances—and as participatory, whose demands, needs, concerns, and analyses are taken into account when making political, economic, and social decisions.”

4 “A constant (formal, not formal, and informal) educational process through knowledge, attitudes, and values to promote global citizenship generating a culture of committed solidarity in the struggle against poverty and exclusion, as well as the promotion of human and sustainable development (Ortega Carpio, 2006b: 15). The reference refers to this definition arising from the work of Maria Luz Ortega at the Ill Education for Development Congress of Hegoa, so its authorship is broader than that of the AECID.
dimension or global citizenship. In any event, it is necessary to point out that this is a term that arose and is used mainly in an educational context (in school centres, educational administrations or specifically educational DNGO), but it has come to influence other spheres. In any case, although we can find shades of meaning and some differences in the definitions, it seems to be clear that what is important is not so much the definitions themselves as achieving clarity regarding the key elements configuring global learning, i.e. its practical application.

In this sense we can identify an abundance of materials with a description of key concepts of GDE expressed as educational skill keys. So we can find a list of 8 keys for concrete application by course and level (see Table 2) in a project generated by the British Department for International Development (DFID) and, among others, one of the curriculum offices of the English Ministry of Education (the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, QCA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global citizenship</td>
<td>Developing the knowledge, skills, and understanding of ideas and actors necessary to become informed, active, and responsible citizens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict resolution</td>
<td>Understanding the nature of conflicts, their impact on development, and why it is necessary to resolve them and promote peace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Understanding and respecting differences, relating them to our human condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights</td>
<td>Knowing about human rights, including the United Nation's Convention on the Rights of the Child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependence</td>
<td>Knowing how people, places, economies, and territories are all interrelated, as well as the decisions and events that have an impact on a world scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social justice</td>
<td>Understanding the importance of social justice as an element that accompanies sustainable development and improves people's wellbeing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable development</td>
<td>Understanding the need to maintain and improve the quality of life without damaging the planet for future generations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values and perceptions</td>
<td>Educating for critical evaluation of the representations we make of global matters, as well as appreciating their effects on people's attitudes and values.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: 8 key concepts in the British model (DFID, 2005, pp. 12-13)

---

5 “The global dimension explores what connects us to the rest of the world. It enables learners to engage with complex global issues and explore the links between their own lives and people, places, and issues throughout the world. The global dimension can relate to both developing and developed countries, including countries in Europe. It helps learners to imagine different futures and the role they can play in creating a fair and sustainable world” (QCA, 2007: 2).
Without a doubt, if we opened up a debate about the above keys and their descriptions, we would get a long and perhaps costly debate about this. However, I think it is interesting to take note of a small detail in how they are expressed: they are expressed in a positive way and the explanation is very clear and descriptive. They do not start out from a problem or a situation in which we have to “save” someone (a perspective in line with the fifth generation) but rather they generate a circular perspective of co-responsibility. This does not mean that this way of understanding global citizenship is neutral, not at all. It is not removed from local or global situations of injustice that require our exposure either. It simply, in my opinion, departs from vertical views and those focused on the past in order to propose a view toward the future focused on everyone’s responsibility.

Another perspective is to also speak from a skills approach, as we try to do in the Utopian Skills proposal that we presented recently (Ardanaz and García-Rincón, 2013): “it presupposes being able to cooperate in a transforming way with diverse local and world surroundings, as well as to develop a global vision from the perspective of interdependence, so as to imagine and generate a present and future society with social justice, happiness, and love on a personal and community level.”

So where do we begin then? Exploring the “Mission” that GDE has today, with its own characteristics, which we must be clear will continue to evolve and change (with the hope of growing and improving). We express this in Graphic 1 in a visual way, borrowing some suggestive images.

---

6 We also developed the associated skills:
- Transforming cooperation, understood as the ability to socialize in the human key from a perspective of solidarity, fraternity, co-responsibility, and pro-sociability that leads to participation and commitment with diverse and plural societies and people.
- Global interdependence, understood as a profound comprehension and vision of the complexity of and between present and future people and ecosystems, in all their dignity, in the social justice and human rights key.
- Utopian thought, understood as meta-cognition regarding the foregoing skills, with emotional, critical, and creative thought, expressed in the imagination of an improved society and the commitment to alternatives in the social justice, happiness, and love key (Ardanaz and García-Rincón, 2013: 16).

There are other proposals from the skills sphere, such as Alejandra Boni’s university teaching proposal (Boni, 2010).

7 Following María Acaso’s recommendation: “The call to place visual language on the same level of transmission as other languages. We look around us and we see that images are everywhere, except in books and, specifically, in theoretical books on education” (Acaso, 2013: 20-23). And I extend this to articles, so this is the reason for the use of these and other illustrations.

These illustrations are from ladydesidiashop.bigcartel.com. These tree hats that describe, without words, processes, experiences, relations, and learning seem to me to be especially suggestive and interesting.
Here I try to explain, at a glance, the process or the dynamics involved in the mission we are talking about. In this way, each person, interrelated with many other people or social groups, is a real motor that aims toward a certain society (circle + arrow). We should be aware that in the current context—especially since the French Revolution\(^8\)—complexity is a key element in

\(^8\) “The awareness that the established order—or disorder—is a cultural product and, therefore, it can be modified is a recent possibility that has only existed since the French revolution” (González- Carvajal, 2004).
the construction of societies of whatever scale (although it is true that the larger they are, the more complexity they seem to develop). And this complexity in turn generates phenomena of invisibility that hide the roots of the lack of justice, happiness, and love in the social structures and in people.

GDE seeks precisely to generate visibility regarding the conquest of these three great social objectives. Justice would group the two elements in tension in the historic attainment of human rights: freedom and equality. Happiness and love, however, expand the third of the slogans of the French Revolution: fraternity. This speaks to us of visibility in regard to what is achieved but also about the road that is still to be travelled.

With this perspective, GDE is learning about how to view things together and how to unveil what there has been an attempt to hide in our societies, both consciously and unconsciously (when being included in the wheel of complexity). For this purpose, DE has three fundamental missions, which I present with the metaphor of a map that orients us within a broad view of the matter:

A. First map:

The reason why Education needs adjectives today is because it involves conditions that should be natural in the world of the XXI century, but that are not met. For example, if we speak about Education for Peace, Development Education, or Intercultural Education, it is because we do not learn—and we are not taught—how to generate or visibilize peace, development, and integration in society and in the different educational spheres in a decisive and significant way. In the same way, if we find a gender approach to be necessary in education (and in general), it is because we do not take it into account. Based on this, we should understand that the mission of GDE is to improve Education in order to foster those skills in people’s lives and make them visible in our societies.

Viewed in this way, the task is immense. Especially if we understand education to be the set of social interrelations that influence, organize, and develop people’s learning throughout their lives. And what stands out in the broad spectrum of this description are the formal educational structures that without a doubt need revision in order to visibilize all those elements that contribute to hiding the processes of injustice. In order to undertake such a task, I think it is fundamental strive for a society that learns from a systemic view of educational spaces—as broad as possible—in order to then concretize this in specific processes and very clear
objectives that are small laboratories or large windows toward that improvement that bears another adjective: inclusive education (Echeita and Sandoval 2002; Echeita and Ainscow, 2010).

And I understand that this makes sense in any educational sphere. Although useful, I think that we might consider the distinction between formal, not formal, and informal (also used a lot in the sector) to have been surpassed. Instead of concentrating on the differences among these spheres, I think it would be better to pay attention to what they have in common, so as to then consider their particularities from that standpoint. If we really develop a systemic view of educational spaces and processes, we cannot create these simplifying compartments, precisely because they then come to compete among themselves. Let’s keep in mind that common denominator, let’s look for the interrelationships, and let’s see the possibilities they have as a whole (although we may then go more deeply into some more than others if the overall analysis indicates this).

B. Second map

Another mission that GDE has, in my opinion, is to improve Cooperation, and especially Cooperation for Development (CFD). In times of economic crisis, CFD has been placed in doubt due to ways of reasoning that have had a certain degree of success within the population. But whether in times of boom or bust, GDE provides the elements to visibilize the incoherences in these arguments, as well as the actions of public institutions and DNGOs inside organizations and in the development of their programs and projects. From this perspective, GDE puts CFD on alert about learning that may produce a certain decision or intervention.

It would be an interesting exercise to apply the cooperative learning (CL) principles that are being introduced very slowly in some educational centers. In Table 3 we find the basic conditions considered in CL for it to be likely for this to occur:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Linked emotions and attitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive interdependence</td>
<td>I am only successful if everyone is successful (in learning).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal commitment</td>
<td>I can improve by participating, without hiding myself in the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional interaction</td>
<td>The mission to be developed is important for everyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td>We all enjoy working together. We know how to do it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic evaluation</td>
<td>We know how to assess spheres for improvement. We know how to celebrate successes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Elements in order for CL to occur (Torrego and Negro (eds.), 2012: 26-34)
And these conditions are studied because, these days, cooperative learning does not occur naturally. We may even say that it is a way of relating to one another that requires certain sophistication. Really cooperating requires special attention in a sustained way and over a considerable length of time. This may be observed fairly easily in the first attempts that are usually made at CL in educational centres. At the most what is usually achieved is for them to work together in a group. Many times the vertical model is reproduced that we reproduce in society as adults (in the best case): the most well prepared help the less fortunate...

But the condition of positive interdependence expresses precisely the importance that everyone has in the construction of learning. Its thesis is that absolutely everyone has complementary capabilities and we will strengthen one another. That is why some authors talk about the importance of forming heterogeneous groups, where each person feels valuable because of contributing what they have of value.

In this practice, there is also a very clear differentiation between collaboration and cooperation:

Cooperating isn't the same as collaborating. Cooperation adds the plus of solidarity, mutual aid, and generosity to collaboration, so that those who at first simply collaborate in order to be more effective end up developing more profound emotional linkages. Working side by side to achieve a common objective can contribute to creating a more intense communion...

Even etymologically, there is a differentiation between the verbs collaborate and cooperate. Collaborate comes from the Latin “co-laborara,” “laborare cum,” which means “working together with.” On the other hand, cooperate comes from the Latin “Co-operare,” “operare cum,” the root of which is the noun “opera, -ae,” which means work, but also means help, interest, support. Cooperating, then, means mutual help and support, taking an interest in one another...

(Pujolás, 2009: 232)

This distinction helps us to review (and assess) the CFD that we may be generating in all directions, both in how south-north associates interrelate and vice versa, as well as sector organizations in joint south-south or north-north tasks. In this way the conditions for CL serve to pose a CFD with other elements of analysis:
With this prior explicit development within the process of designing CFD actions (and then incorporating this in following phases), I think that we could experience cooperation in a different way, communicating it under other parameters and working in this way in different social and institutional spaces in an alternative way. So, instead of being a society that carries out CFD (when policy allows), we would be a society that cooperates.

C. Third map

Based on all of this, we can say, considering the two previous missions or maps, that GDE has in its essence the improvement of society or societies. In the two previous points, we have sketched out two potential characteristics: a society that learns continuously and a society that cooperates, which cannot go by unnoticed. The important shade of meaning to be remembered, once again, is the adjective associated with these improvements: improvement in what sense? Because learning can be oriented toward hiding structures of injustice or, on the other hand, evaluating shameful relationships among people and human groups. In the same way, if we think about it a little, we see that cooperation, just like the term solidarity, are neutral terms. We can find a very recent example in the “solidarity” shown by the ‘Ndrangheta Calabrian mafia refusing to attend Sunday services when they found out that Pope Francis had declared them to be outside the Church.9 In this case, there is cooperation among their members, but this is in regard to something like the mafia (with a mixture of fear and surprising cognitive consonances, I suppose). We are surely capable of thinking of negative solidarity and cooperation that, instead of working for justice, happiness, and love for all people, works for

---

9 “The ‘Ndrangheta”, the Pope said, “is the adoration of evil, contempt for the common good. It has to be combated, turned away. And the Church has to help more. Members of the mafia are not in communion with God. They are excommunicated.”


the contrary. And this is because, just as we can speak of positive interdependence, as we have seen with CL, it is also possible to speak of negative interdependence. If in the first there was no personal success without the success of all people, in the second there is no triumph without the failure of others. Perhaps we can find this negative interdependence too often in our society? In the communications and entertainment media (the cinema, TV series and programs, video games...), in social models (sports players...), in professional politics...

It is, without a doubt, something to think about. That’s why, in order to travel through the maps of GDE, we need to use different metaphorical vehicles that will help us to qualify the type of improvement we are seeking:

1. The bus
There is a common fact in any society these days: diversity. Even in the most isolated society anywhere on the planet there is diversity among its members. **GDE aims to make positive diversity visible**, which values unforced mixing, safeguards non-exclusive identities, and eliminates separating borders. We all travel in this bus. It’s a common and shared adventure, although we may not perceive it. This approach proposes a society that learns from its own reality in a complex subject that can only give way to groups that cooperate. We should be clear that this diversity is not only cultural but also that each person is an authentic treasure and an opportunity for this cooperative learning from diversity.

The global vision of GDE is an opportunity to assess the possibilities that exist along these lines. The director Craig Gillespie does this on a small scale in his movie *Lars and the Real Girl* (2007), with a surrealistic and challenging story, where a human group is challenged by one of its members when this person insists that their ideal mate is a life-sized plastic doll. Aside from reflections for psychoanalysis, this story shows a community resistant to diversity that, little by little, finds that same diversity to be a rock of support for getting to know one another better, both individually and in the group. This is how positive diversity works, which today is global in scope, full of opportunities.

2. The hot air balloon
The second is an unfinished conquest in our societies: human rights. The best of societies for GDE aims to visibilize where the development of these rights is not occurring, where they are used as an excuse for the interests of the few, and also how we can deepen them. Because their inexhaustible character is found in their implementation but also in their discovery.
Human rights are a proposal of minimums for human dignity but little by little we discover that there is more. The line for the “minimums” is not set. We can find a clear example of this in the phenomenon of slavery: it was considered to be a natural right until practically the XIX century (Vidal, 2007: 51). In these terms, societies learn and cooperate in this unfinished search for human rights. Since their proclamation in 1948, voices have arisen that talk of the importance of including later generations, but also animals and the environment. There are probably even rights that we are currently incapable of imagining (as happened for more than two millenniums with freedom and slavery).

And love has a fundamental role in this, which progressively unveils the extent of justice over the course of history. Only in the understanding of fraternity and sorority do we continue to understand the entire extent of human dignity and even that of other living things and contexts. This is why GDE proposes an ethics of justice complemented by an ethics of care. They are not separate: they are intrinsic and complementary elements. Human rights without tenderness, without context... end up becoming dehumanized, an act of love without justice is a false fraternity.¹⁰ So we are airborne in this balloon, at times without any breeze, at others carried by heat that lets us see what was hidden and other times landing and seeing what crude reality is like. Each flight has its moments and it is good to be prepared for all of them.

In my opinion, cooperation among diversities to comprehend human dignity and human rights is at its highest level when people connect to dream together, to imagine their ideal world in a self-reflective and active way. In this sense, the proposal for reflection by the Japanese director Hirozaku Kore-Eda, in this movie “Miracle” (Kiseki, 2011) is interesting: he puts a group of girls and boys in a Japanese-style Goonies adventure thinking about what they want to improve their lives, if they could ask for a miracle. Each one of them thinks of something different for themselves or their surrounding, but in an exercise of maturity, one of them decides to share his miracle with the entire planet.

¹⁰ “We should dare, in the full sense of the word, to talk about love without fear of being called ridiculous or not very scientific. We should dare, if we want to affirm in a scientific way, and not as simple blah blah blah blah, that we study, that we learn, that we teach, and we know with our whole body. We do all these things with feeling, with emotion, with desires, with fear, and with passion, and also with critical reasoning.” (Freire, 1998: 8). Translation in McLaren and Kincheloe (2008: 414).
3. The parachute

We can jump from our balloon or from a mountain to find others and try to form a coordinated shape, like many coordinated parachute jumps. This is an exercise based on effort, mutual interest and commitment, and a great deal of practice. But... what if the figure or shape created was something more?

The third and fourth element have one of their bases in a dilemma: the danger of manipulation or indoctrination. In the face of this, GDE proposes strategies based on community deliberation and consensus, when the latter is applicable, as well as nonviolent communication practices. Authors like Karl-Otto Apel and Jurgen Habermas have worked deeply on these questions from the perspective of political philosophy. However, it is important to warn that this precaution should not be confused with neutrality. Any kind of education is contextualized and therefore it is absurd to think that neutrality or supposedly pure learning are possible.

As Peter McLaren indicates, “We always run this risk, and we must face it voluntarily, as a necessary act that helps us to cross the dialectical gap and that becomes necessary for any act of knowledge to be able to take place” (McLaren and Kincheloe, 2008: 410). On the other hand, it is possible to think of the other extreme, when the learning proposal becomes sectarian and only offers answers, on whatever side. If we consider that learning is a process of dialectical investigation, we can assume the risk of working from well posed questions. Once more we find that this does not occur naturally—although there are some innate abilities in some cases—and an acquisition and fostering of skills for deliberation is necessary.

The experience of GDE provides a vision of the complex panorama of dialog and conflict in the construction of local and global development. For example, the movie “The Green Bicycle” (Wadja, 2013) from the director Haifa Al Mansour provides us with an interesting tool for considering how these global possibilities are deployed. Taking us to the local surroundings of the suburbs of Riad, this story, about a girl’s decision about her right to have and ride a bicycle, is a stupendous starting point for overall questions about gender, interculturality, rights, education... among many others. This is the potential of global learning placed within the territory of deliberation.

4. The bicycle

And it is also a wager for alternative, critical, and creative thought. These days it is not difficult to find out about practices of deliberation that break with our classical understanding...
of dialog and participation on all their levels, from the most well-known ones of participative assumptions to others through pollination techniques such as the oasis, the world café, or others... Many of them have their origin in popular education, which in some way is a Latin American sister of GDE. And they have in common a prior step related to the type of thought each one of us utilizes.

Learning and applying these techniques in a coherent and committed way requires training for life, just like a bicycle. When you learn not to fall, it becomes subconscious movement. In this way, once again, the level of techniques is surpassed by the emotional appropriation of them. When they enter into the subconscious level of our way of thinking, we go from having to being. It is then when we are profoundly critical and creative subjects and we start up the simple mobile of Graphic 1, that could represent the sprockets of a bicycle. A circle that makes an arrow advance, a person who, by their open and conscious thought, shared and dialogued in diversity, understood as a value... from the human rights approach, causes an advance toward a glocal society in all its dimensions that is ever more inclusive.

The “treed” hat in the illustration in Graphic 1 is an interesting representation of an interrelated and necessarily complex reality. Alternative, critical, and creative thought must move today in the territory of complexity, and that is quite a challenge. We know that a tree has roots, although we may not know their extent. We know how to describe its branches, the fruit it has given and will give... That tree thought exercise returns us to the injustice visibilization exercise and the elements of love that carry us toward an ever more inclusive society. This kind of thought, in its most personal aspect, can be found in the movie Hannah Arendt (“013) by the director Margarethe Von Trotta. It narrates an episode in the life of this German Jewish philosopher in which her critical analysis of the Nazi genocide made her lose friends and be insulted by many people. Her commitment to free and committed thinking made her go through a difficult time that marked her for her entire life.

11 It is enough to cite, for example, the elements that Alfonso Torres describes: “We can distinguish a ‘common nucleus’ of constituent elements—both explicit and implicit—that allow us to conceptualize it. ..
1. A critical reading of the current social order and a questioning of the integrating role that formal education has played there.
2. An emancipatory political intention in the face of the prevailing social order.
3. The proposal to contribute to the strengthening of the dominated sectors as historical subject, capable of bringing about social change.
4. A conviction that education can contribute to this intention over the long run, acting on popular subjectivity.
5. An enthusiasm for generating and employing dialoguing, participative, and active educational methodologies.” (Torres, 2011)
12 Today we talk about the mixing of the local and the global with the term “glocalization,” as a refusal to present a dichotomy. (MORENO, 2009: 512-514).
With the description developed so far, we have configured three maps and four vehicles that GDE contributes with its experience and valuation. The maps speak to us of territory where there is movement, the vehicles express that we do not go in just any way to these destinations. Just like any means of transport, it is necessary to learn how to use them in a diverse way, experimenting, making mistakes, investigating, and discovering.

**A SPECIFIC THOUGHT SCHEME FOR GLOBAL LEARNING**

The description of GDE’s mission that I have developed in the preceding text starts out from the experience and from the ethical anthropology that arise in different generations, which, as we have seen, had a starting point based on an economy that we might call, in philosophical terms, a humanist one. In my opinion, what is involved is a reflection on our comprehension of other people. This is a matter that is very present in the philosophies of the XIX and especially the XX century. Along these lines, Marina Garcés proposes rethinking the individualist protection of post-modernism in the discovery of the “other”, broadening it and redimensioning it.

In order to do so, she differentiates the concept of universalism that we have been using from another that we could utilize and about which GDE has a lot to say: “…The question that divides the universalist philosophy is: How can we be together? What is the broadest horizon of our coexistence? These questions have been the horizon of one of the emancipatory traditions of modernity, the one that has understood the emancipation of man as the emancipation of the individual. But there is another tradition that passes through modernity: the one that associates emancipation with the free and collective transformation of the world that we share. Liberation would not be, from the point of view of this second tradition, a question of removing one’s own assets (one’s liberty, one’s will, one’s reason, one’s intelligence, one’s riches...) from the dominion of the community and its forms of linkage (religion, tradition, birth, etc.). Liberation would consist of being able to collectively create and transform our conditions of existence. Therefore, emancipation does not pass through the conquest of individual sovereignty, but rather the capacity to become mutually involved in a common world.” (Garcés, 2013: 22).

What Garcés proposes could also be expressed as the difference between a world built on what separates us and on what unites us. What unites us, more than difference, would be complementariness. More than protecting what is mine, what unites us would be the diversity that helps us to build a society for everyone.
What remains in our scheme of thought from all this is: the visibility of social conquests in search of that complementariness in order to build a common world that our plans specify and with the tools that we have mentioned. How can we develop it from the learning perspective?

In my opinion, what has occurred up until now is that the territory of learning is too uncontrollable, if we take it seriously. Too mysterious for real and effective planning. It is true that formal education makes an important effort in this regard, but if we review our own process of learning, I think that we will be able to recognize that what was really important for our personal discoveries, what marked our lives, what built and builds our cognitive construct is much more located within the unplanned than in what is foreseen.

In addition, I think it is possible to recognize our “learning for life”—that construct that makes us what we are today and that (without closing) is composed of a puzzle of impacts in our education at school but also outside school: at work, from the communications media, family, friends... and our own biology... Perhaps the greatest difficulty lies in recognizing that a large part of these elements, of these key experiences that configure us, is found in our subconscious, well hidden (in general) and very different in each one of us, so this complicates the situation again. As María Acaso comments: “Incorporating the subconscious into learning allows us to displace the idea of the curriculum as object toward the idea of the curriculum as process,

13 In this part, we have the help of the great Chinese illustrator, Jimmy Liao: (2011) El sonido de los colores. Albolote, Granada: Bárbara Fiore.
as something in permanent construction instead of something closed, as something pliant instead of rigid, as something that is built among everyone instead of something that only the teacher builds.” (Acaso, 2013: 38).

In addition, this author proposes a term that is challenging: promoting “active ignorance” (Acaso, 2013: 44). This is about considering ignorance as a goal to be achieved. And this does not refer to the famous “I only know that I know nothing,” attributed to Socrates. Rather, in my opinion, this proposal is about an active resistance to the plasticity of our learning being annulled from both ends: any idea is valid or only one idea is valid, but also in some intermediate spaces. She proposes a metaphor for all of this: that educator groups should understand themselves as DJs, novelists, designers..., definitively, as cultural builders... since global schemes of learning are, definitively, cultural schemes. The fact that they are does not invalidate them if we are aware of this and we do not convert them into absolute answers.

Finally, it seems to me that in all the foregoing considerations, the psychology of education and particularly the evolutionary approach must be taken into account. Because reflecting on learning in the early stages of life is not the same as what takes place at the time of maturity (which does not always occur at the same time of life) or of great experience. Once more, there is a large asymmetry in these processes of individual development and this somewhat complicates the situation. María Acoso also goes into starting to consider the possibility of “pedagogy as fraud” (Acaso, 2013: 52), and although I agree with her explanation, it seems to me she confuses this with current modes of teaching. I say this because I think that real pedagogy, which investigates and reflects on how we learn in an open way is unfortunately somewhat scarce in the panorama of educational spaces, in the broadest sense (with honourable exceptions).

With all of this, we have to think about what is the starting point for a reflection about GDE that takes into account this coherent and risky learning in a shared and complex context in which it may be used as a projectile by some negative solidarities. For this purpose we will go through three levels that configure the scheme of thinking and envisioning that we seek:

**Level 1**

To start with, my proposal is that we place reflective practice in the centre as an unavoidable element of any learning process that has a global learning approach.
Reflective practice may be practice that we identify, at first, with mental thought processes, but I am aiming at much broader reflective practices, involving the mind, yes, but also the heart, the hands, the body, breathing, looking, hugging, listening, participating, dialog, play, debate, aromas...

Many people have investigated and practiced reflective practice, utilizing this term or others, probably since John Dewey (1859-1952) until our times (with the prelude of Socratic maieutics). Today it is very much associated with **investigation-action** from many diverse points of view and with a diversity of terms. If we are to evaluate operational GDE from the learning perspective, I think that the only honest thing to do is to deal with the reflective practices that occur **before, during, and after a development**.

If we think about in, in this way we divert the centre of attention from the learning battle (with the chairs or suitcases of Graphic 2) to place it on a more basic and elemental level of learning. If we look at the illustration on the right, in the background we see a blind girl who is going down the stairs (we can also see her on a chair). The story it illustrates is called “the sound of the colours” and it shows us other ways of thinking, feeling, growing, choosing, walking...

Reflective practice aims to listen to the silent sound of the colours, something very different from what usually makes us look or listen. This girl, absent from learning competition, goes up and down stairs after stairs in search of the “weak blink of the light.”

This search is done in many ways, in many places, and by many means in a reflective practice that is completely different from how we might imagine it: graphic poetry, we might call it. And in spite of everything, within this practical diversity, we have classically called this exercise the process of **inquiry** or **investigation**, and there are some who include it in the metaphor of the **laboratory**. It would be deceptive to think that reflective practice is aseptic, but it is handled within a field more oriented toward when it is done, since **doubt, questions, and plasticity** are an essential element of its constitution.
So then, the initial task is to indicate the area for questions, leaving the door open to others arising in that task. Another condition is the “glocal” approach, in the sense of a coherent connection between the local and the global with positive interdependence as the agent of sense. A final one is studying who asks themselves the questions, in what role, and who will we think can begin to ask themselves questions and take up this reflective and interdependent dynamic.

We could talk a great deal about the possibilities of this reflective practice, but for reasons of space, on this occasion we will stop here. I just want to mention that reflective practice is not the objective but rather the empowerment and the emancipation of people and social groups (and beyond that the cited triad of justice-happiness-love). So it’s not worth much to just reflect in any old way, or produce detailed reflections of a few or many people. It’s about our constitution once more, about being reflective. That process takes time and is also for an entire life.

Level 2
We can see how Jimmy Liao’s graphic poetry becomes reality in an amazing way on the walls of the train station of Nangang,14 in Taiwan. The elements of this level are expressed in part in this example. Once we have initiated reflective processes, we try to situate them in a context of reality in order to experiment and inquire about their development. Once again, this has a thousand possibilities. What is important if for them to be in line with the processes of reflection that we have proposed.

14 http://www.pinterest.com/leesofiahk/jimmy-liao-taiwan/
Classically we identify the concrete initiatives in this level that we believe are going to be coherent with the investigation we propose, as well as the systematization and evaluation of these initiatives in the key of that imaginary laboratory in terms of justice, happiness, and love.

Concrete initiatives + systematization/evaluation is a duo that must be inseparable for many reasons, but perhaps the most important may be in order to deactivate activism and continue remembering that what is central is level 1. In this way, both systematization and evaluation cannot be just about the initiatives developed but fundamentally about the road of reflective practice. Initiatives that do not allow or do not include in the way they function inquiry, questions, and work in regard to them must be modified or, in the end, excluded. As we were saying, initiatives may be of very diverse types, with the roots that we described in level 1 (participation, art...), but we should emphasize the time factor is also a determining element. There are proposals that are doors that open out onto reflective practices (such as communication and awareness raising may be) to others that are integrated into medium and long-term processes whose repercussion in the constitution of the reflective me have a more coherent and profound impact. However, it is true that we must procure passionate, quality time in our practices. If we come upon an initiative that provokes strong conflicts and cognitive ruptures, the time “tastes” different.

In regard to initiative, the only thing left for me to say for now is that it is difficult to differentiate between what we are going to call “mind opening” from others that we might call “hand opening”. In the first group we would find all those proposals that open the door to a new
look at experiences supposedly foreign to our everyday experience. Saying this does not hold up much in the matters that concern us, since we know that almost everything is interrelated. However, we are going to take a step further when initiatives start out by changing our actions, our habits, our routines. For example, one thing is any activity that asks about our ecological footprint and makes us work on data and another thing is one that arises directly out of changing our habits and inquiring about the real consequences that this has for our lives and those of our collectivity. This second type of activity would correspond to the second group. In the same way, it isn’t the same to ask about the democratic model by analyzing the different democracies on the planet throughout history as it is to try to analyze it by incorporating democracy strategies in our educational space (Woods, 2005). The difference is important, because it also speaks to that passionate quality of the initiatives and makes us reflect on their typology, balancing theory and practice. Let’s talk some more about this in level 3.

On one side of the pair we find systematization and evaluation, which in turn is another duo. Oscar Jara, in fact, calls them “sisters of the same family,” together with social investigation, considering that all of them provide mutual feedback and all of them are necessary (Jara, 2012: 56-57). In addition, Jara recalls that systematization is visualized from a “new paradigm of knowledge from the South.” The differentiating key that these three elements contribute is the criticism of the “occidental method of knowledge: Cartesian-rational, masculine, and predominantly white, in order to affirm historicized, intersubjective, and feeling-thinking visions and knowledge that link reason and desire, overcoming the positivist conception of social investigation and the abstract universalist notion of so-called scientific knowledge.” (Jara, 2012: 60).

With this perspective and with another to be considered, what is important from the standpoint of this approach is to be attentive to the fundamental characteristic that we are developing in these pages. More than control and monitoring, its important role is to promote reflective learning among people and collectivities. And this can be an important point of encounter among different paradigms (if there are so many differences). It is not in vain that the attempt has been made for a long time in formal education media (with relative success, since precaution usually takes precedence over daring) to incorporate a formative evaluation that, in my opinion, is nothing but another term for reflective evaluation that event is indicated toward learning. For this reason, Shirley Clarke indicates three types of evaluation: evaluation of learning, evaluation for learning, and evaluation as learning. And she recognizes that the ones that are really interesting are the last two, and especially the last one (Clarke, 2010: 9).
The choice between one and another option has consequences in the mental model we utilize. Clarke speaks of the “fixed mindset” and the “growth mindset”, which is just another way of expressing Paulo Freire’s banking thought and generative thought. We can surely find many bridges in the different techniques that are being proposed for this evaluation as reflective learning. For example, Clarke proposes “dialogic conversation,” which she describes as: collective, reciprocal, reinforcing, constructive, and channelling (36).

**Level 3**

We have maintained throughout the preceding text that learning is a much more complex occurrence than what we really usually affirm. For our traveller in search of the light, her adventure on the stairs is a leap into the unknown, not exempt from risk.
It is from this perspective and with the elements from the preceding levels that we pose learning and transformation, on two levels, personal and social, as elements of our trip’s arrival. The difference between the two ideas has to do with the differentiation we made on level 2 in regard to initiatives that we called “mind opening” and “hand opening.” When learning, we appropriate knowledge, experiences, and emotions that together generate a supracognitive equilibrium and, as a practical matter, certain abilities of the development of skills for life. When this is complete, reflective practices are initiated and are partially closed on metacognitive exercises (where each person recognizes their process, at least in part, with permission from the subconscious, and declares that we are in the presence of an unfinished process). This occurs personally but it can also occur in larger or smaller social groups. Social psychology has studied these processes intensely, although new paths are being opened up today that are clarifying much more how this can occur.

But one question is learning: we know how to analyze reality and intervene in it with a conscious model committed to the environment, and another question is undertaking to transform reality, placing one’s own life in play, i.e. with certain levels of risk for vital equilibrium. These risk levels we are talking about have to do with the capacity for decision that each one of us may have and the evolutionary and vital process in which each one of us may intervene. However, all of us have space for the level of transformation, the difference is whether that space is large or small. For example, a third grade child who is capable of reflecting on diversity and acting (for example accepting a classmate with Down’s syndrome) is transforming their current vital space and probably that of the following years. If that appropriation also occurs in the entire classroom or course or in the entire educational centre, that child is navigating on the map of education, working for inclusive education. We can find another example upon reflecting about human development with people with more advanced maturation processes, which come to learning and the appropriation of theories on decrease (Taibo, 2010). A classic example would have to do with political incidence actions. The approximation between theory and practice will mark the difference between learning and transformation.

Both approaches are important. In fact, not all learning has to lead to transformation, but it can’t be the case that none of the learning experiences in global key that we carry out are not accompanied by any transformation. That is an alarm sign about apparent and superficial learning, even in people and social groups who are at the head of reforms and innovation. And this is so for two reasons that are easy to deduce: the first is because reflective practice has innovation and transformation in its very essence; the task is always considered to be incomplete, without, for that reason, failing to celebrate and value advances. The second is
because the journey toward justice, happiness, and love is a long road. The large number of examples of people, ideas, and spaces in exclusion are a bell that does not stop ringing when we visibilize and listen to the real world. It is the sound of colours view, lyrically proposed by Jimmy Liao.

With everything said and situated on this level 3, such learning and transformations as may occur are a great conquest, if we can detect them clearly and concretely. Although this is difficult, it is not impossible. What occurs in reality is that the attention to these phenomena should not be sought in the moment of the practical initiative but rather some time after. In the language of cooperative learning, this is called fermentation time\(^{15}\) (Torrego and Negro, 2012: 136). It is also important that the search for such learning and transformations be carried out among all the people and collectives who are directly or indirectly involved. If we really make a discovery in this sense, reflective practice will take us toward an explanation of the success achieved and even to taking learning completely out of the box.\(^{16}\)

Finally, although learning and transformations may be a complex search, we can take notice of the models of learning that we are utilizing (Joyce, Weil, and Calhoun, 2012). Although there is a great deal of variety, not everyone is aligned with a global learning model. Experimenting with and reflecting on them is also part of the process, returning us to level 2 of palpable elements. Among them we can find cooperative learning, as already mentioned, problem and project-based learning, democratic school management, the participative techniques of popular education, the skills of critical and creative thought... and many others... However, these strategies are appropriate for specific aims for the education improvement map. It is necessary to go more deeply into these and others in other spheres of cooperation and society. An exciting task, without a doubt.

CONCLUSIONS: A “GLOBAL LEARNING APPROACH”

With everything said thus far, we have an approach to thinking based on global learning. Through this we incorporate learning in the key of diversity for an entire life and all people and contexts.

---

15 In general, it corresponds to “abilities of formulation and fermentation.”
16 As when, in my opinion, work is done based on basic educational abilities (Ardanaz and García-Rincon, 2013), when the model is properly developed.
We find that basic learning consists of reflective practice understood broadly, not just as mental activity, as a fundamental exercise of empowerment and emancipation (Level 1). It is important to differentiate between content and learning. In the first we contemplate an appropriation of knowledge without personal involvement. Real learning, however, breaks through our cognitive equilibrium and obliges us to create a new equilibrium that is stable at times and fragile at others. This approach affirms that solid learning is scarce and difficult to measure. And therefore, difficult to plan. It corresponds to an extra (and extraordinary) level to which a great deal of attention should be paid (Level 3).

In order to pay attention to it, we propose a way of functioning with this approach that facilitates its occurrence. That’s why, an additional level is channelled in reflective practice through real initiatives and systematization and evaluation processes (Level 2).

Graphic 6: A look at the set of levels envisioned by the global learning approach (My own development).
We have before us an approach, because it incorporates education improvement functions transversally (which would seem to be more obvious), but also functions of cooperation and of society in general. It is a specific view because it goes beyond the GDE generations model without excluding it and tries to extend and give coherence to a diffuse myriad of elements in regard to learning on the part of the model (and that has had consequences in the role of GDE throughout its history).

In spite of everything, we can say that some elements of the approach can be identified in generations and especially in some practices. However, the coherence and the integration between the different parts are not clear at all and cause problems. One example are the famous DE dimensions: awareness raising-training-investigation-incidence-policy (AECID, 2007: 21), which, although they have played a notable role in the sector, have not been able to contribute much clarity to it. With this, we could make an analysis of the different generations with the expanded levels that we have presented above, the 5 elements that operate in an interwoven fashion and that we have tended to separate even in habitual practice:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Learning</th>
<th>Transformation</th>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Investigation</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social service</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Survival</td>
<td>Humanitarian</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>R. accounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Generation</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Rights</td>
<td>A processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Togetherness</td>
<td>I-action</td>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>T processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic</td>
<td>Interdependence</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Networks</td>
<td>Share</td>
<td>Systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: GDE generations vs. separated elements of the global learning approach.

This is what the collaboration-promoting assistance generation is like, viewed from the best of perspectives (and often not even that, since collaboration requires a certain horizontality and we have before us a very vertical generation by definition). Transformation is for survival and humanitarian initiatives: necessary in some cases by without a doubt of a short-term nature due to not attending to the causes of the situation. If we want to save some element of this generation, we would have to have gone through investigation (by means of reflective practice) on empathy (Hoffman, 1992) and go beyond an evaluation based on rendering accounts (although this may be necessary).

In the technical generation, cooperation as a concept begins to make headway, although with some approaches still too foreign, too vertical. Over time it will be perceived that the perspective utilized generates dependence and that is reflected in the fact that GDE initiatives
have to do exclusively with communication and information. In this way, investigation and evaluation can only be on the efficacy of technology transfer, the infrastructures established, and how it is communicated.

In the critical generation there begins to be a different comprehension of cooperation, criticizing leaning that provokes dependence through training processes that aim for one’s own construction of emancipating thought. Popular education will occupy an important role in going more deeply into human rights and how they are appropriated in learning processes.

In the diverse generation, what is usually called “education for,” the underlying learning is one of complexity, although, in my opinion, in a somewhat fractionated way. We are going to call the transformation it promotes, for the sake of convenience, as still on the border to reaching the complementariness that we mentioned with Marina Garcés. We might well be able to situate the initiatives in investigation-action, but in a fractionated way, searching for their own pedagogy, their way of accessing social transformation processes that seek a healthy common coexistence for everyone.

The current generation takes some elements from the previous ones and groups them in the idea of citizenship, with the learning of interdependence and overcoming geographical barriers in favour of transformation toward inclusion. Its initiatives have to do with networks and especially with participative and joint learning. This orients reflective practice and seeks a global view of learning and transformation processes, understanding them from a systemic perspective, i.e. in their contexts, taking into account all the actors and attending to the interrelations existing among all of them.

And although we may include elements in all the generations, I think that it is important to emphasize those that do (in orange in Table 6) and those that do not have to do with a global learning approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Learning</th>
<th>Transformation</th>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Investigation</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social service</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Survival</td>
<td>Humanitarian</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>R. accounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Generation</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Rights</td>
<td>A processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Togetherness</td>
<td>I-action</td>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>T processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic</td>
<td>Interdependence</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Networks</td>
<td>Share</td>
<td>Systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: GDE generations vs. Separate elements with real coincidences
However, reality is much more complex. We should understand Tables 5 and 6 as a provocation to reflection in a didactic key. The fact that some elements may fall outside the area of our action does not mean that they are unnecessary, but rather that they need something more. An example is our commentary on the possibilities of empathy as a sphere of investigation. Another similar case would be the case of human rights as an element to be deepened, as the subject of study for specialists. These, as concepts from a formative perspective, are easy to get to know with a brief search in Google (Gilbert, 2011). However, if included in a pedagogy that takes the system of development into account, as in Paulo Freire’s style, they may go over to the orange area.

In the same way, learning and transformation processes are part of a systemic understanding of what happens during educational moments. We can assimilate them in the orange part in the same way that we understand that the branches and their ramifications are part of the tree. In this way, we will have to come to envision, through the Global Learning Approach, this tree that represents people and collectivities and that is situated on the terrain of justice, happiness, and love. If these are the ingredients with which we create our reality. Do we reflect on this?

Graphic 7: The “global learning approach at a glance” (My own elaboration).
I have walked that long road to freedom. I have tried not to falter; I have made missteps along the way. But I have discovered the secret that after climbing a great hill, one only finds that there are many more hills to climb. I have taken a moment here to rest, to steal a view of the glorious vista that surrounds me, to look back on the distance I have come. But I can rest only for a moment, for with freedom comes responsibilities, and I dare not linger, for my long walk is not yet ended.
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