Dobrawa Aleksiak
Stowarzyszenie “Na Styku”

THE PRESENTATIONS OF POVERTY IN GLOBAL EDUCATION

Keywords: global poverty, poverty, inequalities, global education, global education history, global education approaches

Abstract

This article aims at analyzing the presentations of poverty in global education with a focus on Polish publications. The study demonstrates poverty definitions, categorizations and poverty in the global context – measuring methods and the causes and consequences that sustain global poverty cycles. To achieve the purpose of this article I refer to the history of global education and the comparison of two approaches, soft and critical. These elements outline specific ways of understanding poverty in global education discourse. Along with the historical, political and social context, two visions of poverty are clarified: the one focusing on helplessness of the poor and compassion and the one focusing on injustices of global systems and solidarity. The theoretical content is confronted with the analysis of three Polish global education publications for teachers and educators. The outcome of this article is a vision of poverty that seems to be majorly based on the principles of critical global education.

Introduction

In nowadays world, globalization contributes to increasing interdependencies of states, societies and economies leading to global technological growth, development of science and enrichment of some groups while at the same time to deepening inequalities in and between societies. The asymmetry of the distribution of goods emphasizes global disparities. How in the era of the endless accumulation of capital can teachers explain global poverty to students? How to talk about global poverty to present its multidimensionality and even more, to promote attitudes that can contribute to eliminating poverty? Global education appears to be a significant proposition

– as an educational approach it helps the learners to understand the global interdependencies and phenomena, such as poverty and promotes open-minded and active attitudes as well as necessary skills and competencies needed in complex globalized realities. Global education is a concept that emerged several decades ago, but is still not academically well-recognized in Poland (Gontarska, Kuleta-Hulboj, 2015; Kuleta-Hulboj, 2015; Jasikowska, 2018). Nonetheless, the need of global education and its significant, often critical role in educational discourse is emphasized by international and Polish academics (Hicks 2003; Scheunpflug, Asbrand 2006; Andreotti 2006, 2011; Bourne 2014a, 2016; Jasikowska 2015, 2018; Rudnicki 2015) The purpose of this article is to present

global poverty from the perspective of global education. The first part demonstrates the definitions of poverty, methods to measure it and a short review of the phenomenon in a global context. The second part refers to global education – a brief history and presentation of the soft and critical approaches. The third part is the analysis of Polish textbooks for global education with emphasis on presentations of poverty.

Multidimensional poverty

Poverty can be defined in numerous ways. The two most relevant distinctions that can be found in academic literature are absolute and relative poverty. The first one refers to severe deprivation of basic human needs that can cause health problems or can lead to death. A list of immediate basic needs includes food, water, shelter, education, access to medical care, access to information and communication. The threshold of absolute poverty is deprivation of at least two of above mentioned elements (Gordon, 2005). In contrast, the relative poverty compares the level of satisfying the need of an individual to the general level in given society. The relative deprivation is closely linked to the society that an individual lives in. Ruth Lister, following the thought of Peter Townsend, emphasizes the multidimensionality of relative poverty. Lister mentions that an individual, family or groups live in poverty if they do not have resources to afford food, activities and have the same standard of life as are generally accepted in the society they belong to. Due to the lack of resources they are excluded from average living patterns (Lister, 2007).

Relative poverty poses challenges of measurements. Lister writes about three categories of questions that are used to measure poverty: “why and how”, “what” and “who” (Lister, 2007). The first category provides facts, but is also linked with policy, especially social policy. The second refers to indices as income or poverty line. The third category question determines the poverty standards. Lister points out that none of these categories itself is enough to measure multidimensional phenomenon as poverty. Her proposition is to combine them in order to achieve more accurate results and to present various perspectives. What is important to remember is that the choice of poverty definition influences the latter measurements results, since the definitions specify which individuals and groups can be define as poor (Panek, 2009).

There is no unique definition of poverty, neither there are universal tools to measure it. The way an individual perceives and interprets poverty is characterized by the reality he or she lives in, through social and cultural context, economy and history. Poverty can be defined differently within one community, where each one experiences and comprehends poverty in another way. The variety of contexts, forms and experiences cannot be uniformly defined in one community, let alone in a global dimension. Nevertheless, global poverty as one of the biggest global issues, is a concern of many stakeholders, among them intergovernmental organizations like United Nations or non-governmental organizations like Oxfam. Global poverty is also a subject of researches to examine this extremely complex phenomenon in a worldwide dimension.

Global poverty and inequalities

Until recently, the countries with low income and underdevelopment in technological sense were called “third world” in the contrast to “first world” (capitalist economies) and “second world” (centrally planned economies) countries. Nowadays, while referring to development gaps in between countries Global North and the Global South terms are available. These concepts are relatively neutral and do not imply negative associations. To be precise, even though this world division semantically does not evaluate countries, it still sets apart highly developed and well-off North with less developed and poorer South. The division is based on the Brandt Line, proposed as a visual depiction of North-South division of economies in 1980 in Brandt Report (Jasikowska, Klarenbach, Lipska-Badoti, Łuczak, 2015). Global North includes Europe, Russia, Japan, USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Global South includes the rest of the world, over 6 billion people from culturally, socially and economically diverse countries of Central and South America, Africa and South Asia. The terms Global North and Global South, limited and imperfect, but widely accepted in global education, will be used in this article.

Global poverty can be measured with varied methods. The most popular are based on economic indices. The Brandt Line contractually divided the world into rich and poor based on analysis of gross domestic product (GDP). World Bank also adopted economic index to categorize countries. The classification based on

gross national income (GNI) proposes 4 groups: low-income economies with a GNI per capita of \$995 or less in 2017; lower middle-income economies are those with a GNI per capita between \$996 and \$3,895; upper middle-income economies are those with a GNI per capita between \$3,896 and \$12,055; high-income economies are those with a GNI per capita of \$12,056 or more (World Bank, 2019). The group of low-income economies includes 34 countries of which 26 are from Sub-Saharan region. Organizations and institutions that deal with poverty worldwide often develop and try to bring into general use multidimensional poverty measures. One of the widely recognized index is Global Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) developed by Oxford Poverty & Human Development Initiative. MPI is composed of three dimensions: health, education, and living standards, supported by 10 indicators – years of schooling, school attendance, child mortality, nutrition, cooking fuel, sanitation, drinking water, electricity, housing, assets (Global Multidimensional Poverty Index, 2018).

The complexity of global poverty is highlighted not only by indices but also by researches on its causes and effects. For a long time, poverty has been a topic studied by philosophers and sociologists. The research examples are theories of poverty like Social Darwinism, the Culture of Poverty, the Structure of Poverty and the Situation of Poverty (Kostyło 2008). The scope of poverty studies expanded to political studies, economy and other to comprehensively research the causes and effects of global poverty. What adds complexity to the subject is that effects can be simultaneously causes of poverty creating the cycles of poverty on local, national and global levels. The characteristics of poverty areas can be listed as “existence of spreadable diseases; hunger and malnutrition; lack of access to education, inadequate sanitation and water supply; homelessness and endemic violence” (Koktsides, 2016: 63). Malnutrition and hunger, recognized as one of the “traps” of cycle of poverty, does not refer only to death caused by hunger but also the consequences of malnutrition – malnourished people have less strength to work, children without proper diet struggle with studying and malnutrition leads to many diseases. The cycle of poverty creates strong interdependencies that make it difficult or sometimes impossible to break.

The causes and effects of poverty are inseparable from the causes and consequences of wealth and globalization process that have deepened the inequalities

in between poor and rich. The income disparities have existed in all societies since the dawn of times, but since the end of XX century the inequality gaps between extremely rich and extremely poor have expanded. The socioeconomic polarization is especially visible between citizens of Global North and Global South. Global inequalities have become a more significant element of public debate: “it is often considered that income inequality is created through processes of the global economic system that are not far i.e. that those with the highest income can and do ensure that they continue to prosper. As a result, the problem of income inequality is gaining attention, as more and more organizations are pointing out that the difference of income and wealth of the rich relative to the rest is growing” (Apostolides, 2008: 84). A non-governmental organization Oxfam launches every year a report presenting international statistics on growing gaps between poor and rich. 2019 report reveals i.a. that billionaires’ fortunes increased by 12 percent in 2018, which stands for \$2.5 billion a day, while in the same year the wealth of poorest half of world’s population, 3.4 billion people, decreased by 11 percent (Oxfam, 2019). According to the organization, the global inequalities are a result of i.a. under-taxation of rich individuals and corporations, tax havens for the rich or monopoly of big corporations. A lot of poverty analysts declare that reduction of global poverty is only possible to by reduction of inequalities on state and global level (Lister, 2007).

Global inequalities contribute to intensification of poverty by deepening the division between privileged rich and excluded poor (Lister, 2007). Understanding and analyzing interdependencies between the poor and the rich as well as engaging into taking action against global inequalities are one of main elements of global education. This pedagogical concept, named differently in various countries, i.a. explains the causes and consequences of global phenomena such as poverty, presents Global South perspective and attempts to ensure just and sustainable development. To depict presentations and understating of poverty in global education context, I will introduce a brief history of global education and its essential soft and critical approach.

Poverty in global education

Global education is a broad concept that includes elements of human rights education, multicultural educa-

tion, sustainable development education and civic education. Even though global education has been present in Poland for decades, there are still uncertainties regarding its terminology, theory and didactics (Gontarska, Kuleta-Hulboj, 2015). In Poland, an attempt to unify the concept of global education was a yearlong cooperation between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Education and Grupa Zagranica, a platform of non-governmental organization engaged in development cooperation, humanitarian aid and global education. The cooperation resulted in a report that stated i.a. definition, thematic scopes and vision of global education in Poland. According to this report “global education is a part of civic education and upbringing, which broadens their scope through making a person aware of the existence of global phenomena and interdependencies. Its main objective is to prepare the recipients to face the challenges related to all humankind” (Report on the Multi-Stakeholder Process on Global Education, 2011: 5). Global education should not be considered as another school subject, but as a whole educational concept that can be delivered through formal, non-formal and informal education. What is of great importance is that global education aims to not only pass the knowledge. Its goal is to transform the learners by equipping them with skills like critical thinking and values and attitudes like respect, responsibility and proactivity. Activism is an inseparable element – global education should reflect on everyday social practice and activities (Jasikowska, 2018). In Polish and world publications there are plenty of ways in understanding and defining global education and its goals. The multiplicity of perspectives is a result of different historical experiences, economics, politics and societies of given country or region (Jasikowska, Klarenbach, Lipska-Badoti, Łuczak, 2015). The thematic scope of global education is closely related to variety of contexts, nevertheless poverty is always one of the global issues that is included. To depict the ways of understanding poverty through global education it seems relevant to briefly examine world’s history and evolution of this concept.

While summarizing over 40 years of global education history, Manuela Mesa created a *Model of Five Generations* (Mesa, 2011). Mesa underlines that even though the presented history is evolutionary, it does not have linear nature. According to the author, the history of global education is a cumulative process, where the discourses develop unevenly and some elements of different approaches can be combined. The

first generation that Mesa mentions is *The Charitable and Assistance-based Approach*. It was related to non-governmental organizations fundraising and building of social awareness in 1940s and 1950s. The organizations, mostly religious or humanitarian, focused mostly on conflicts and crisis situations and their interventions were not long-term. At that time global issues were not important matter in international relations or public interest. This approach, based on fundraising, often used drastic images to appeal to compassion, mercy and generosity. *The Charitable and Assistance-based Approach* was not closely linked to global education – it lacked informative perspective. The presented information was limited, there was no explanation of the causes and consequences of global issues. As a result of processes like decolonization and independencies of many states in the 1960s *The Development Approach and the Emergence of Development Education* occurred. The problems of the “Third World” countries started to appear in international debates, i.a. low development level, poverty or analphabetism. Global North countries created, called by Mesa, “developmentalism”. It assumed that by having appropriate knowledge, funds and technology, Global South was able to catch up to countries of Global North. In 1960s emerged first development organizations, that along with missionaries and humanitarian organization started to create development projects, which included self-help strategies and cooperation. On one hand, this approach offered more power and dignity to the beneficiaries of aid, while on the other hand, it promoted Western development way as the only acceptable and did not take under consideration history, politics, cultural and social differences. In this context development education was established, based on the idea of cooperation with those who are willing to help themselves. On the grounds of continuing decolonization, raising activism of newly independent states and social transformations in Western countries emerged *A Critical and Solidarity-based Development Education*. Late 1960s and 1970s brought a new perspective that situation in Global South has nothing to do with backwardness, but it is based on dependence of the Global South on economy, politics and societies of dominant Global North. Issues such as global poverty, exclusion in the Global South or environmental degradation gained in importance. In 1969, *Pearson Report* was published, which criticized earlier development strategies, claiming that they contributed to the increase in global poverty, the pauperization of

many social groups and intensification of inequalities between the Global South and the Global North. A new vision of development education emerged, based on a critical approach and an emphasis of the historic responsibility of the Global North. What significantly contributed to it were new pedagogical approaches, emancipatory and critical with Ivan Illich or Paulo Freire at the forefront. Development education spread in countries such as the Netherlands, Germany, France, Great Britain and Italy, and international organizations such as UNESCO started issuing documents recommending development education. *Human and Sustainable Development Education* is the fourth generation. Present in the 1980s, it emerged from several interdependent issues. The world's economy was in a crisis, that was especially severe for countries in the Global South. One of the main reasons for that were regional conflicts in i.a. Afghanistan, Angola, Mozambique, Middle East or countries of Central America. Economists, analysts, ecologists and sociologists discussed the limits of development and the dramatic effects of environmental degradation. Special attention was paid to gender and race in matters of global development as well as to the responsible consumption and fair trade. These issues led to the extension of development education to topics known today in global education: sustainable development, human rights, multi- and interculturalism and peace. In the 1990s, the last generation emerged, called by Mesa *Global Citizenship Education*. It radically criticizes the concept of development, pointing out that it imposes the ideology of the Global North. Global citizenship education emphasizes a critical understanding of the globalization process. According to this approach, political and public institutions, non-governmental organizations, social movements and citizens – as active stakeholders – should aim to eradicate poverty and achieve world justice and equality.

In the *Model of Five Generations* there is a noticeable way of regarding to the poor from the Global South by the Global North. Impoverished people that lived in less developed areas in the first generations were perceived as passive, in need, awaiting compassion and even mercy. With the development of the critical concept, a new approach to the Global South was created: those are victims of colonization and unjust political, economic and social systems. The next generations broadened the scope of global education with topics including feminization of poverty and racial discrimi-

nation. New topics, cultural relativism, emphasis on cooperation between intersectional stakeholders led to emergence of global education as we know today. The *Model of Five Generations* has many similarities with fundamental concept of soft and critical approach toward global education presented by Vanessa Andreotti (Andreotti, 2006). This Brazilian educator, who based her work on postcolonial theory, postmodernism and the work of Paulo Freire, summarized two paths to understanding global education and the problems of the world. Her work is considered to be very influential in theoretical and practical fields (Bourn: 2014b).

Andreotti starts by stating main issue of global education: “whether and how to address the economic and cultural roots of the inequalities in power and wealth/ /labor distribution in a global complex and uncertain system” (Andreotti, 2006: 40). It is emphasized that to understand global issues it is necessary to understand and analyze the complexity of local and global processes and contexts on many levels. Soft global education identifies the main problem in the poverty and helplessness of the Global South as a result of a low level of development, education, skills and culture, while the wealth of the Global North is the result of hard work, education and better organization. The Global North, in the name of common humanity and goodwill, is responsible for others. Soft global education proposes imposed changes, campaigns, volunteering and financial materials in order to prevail universal (Western) values and standards. One of frequently used tool to promote this approach is *poverty porn*. These are all kinds of drastic media messages that use poverty to promote compassion and pity, which contributes to the increase of media sales and donations for charity. *Poverty porn* replicates stereotypical images of the poor from the Global South as powerless and weak people waiting for death or help from the Global North (Collin, 2009). Andreotti condemns soft approach by proposing critical global education, which places injustices and inequalities resulting from complex structures and historical, social and political systems that promote the imperialism of the Global North as the source of the problem. In this approach the Global North is responsible towards the other. Critical global education empowers individuals, giving more autonomy to define their own development, but at the same time emphasizing that everyone is both part of the problem and part of the solution, which is why it is important to build critical thinking skills. Moreover, it promotes reflexiv-

ity, dialogue, presentation of all perspectives and the idea of global justice.

The cumulative history and two approaches to global education outlined certain ways of presenting poverty and the Global South: from compassion, charitable donations for helpless poor to solidarity, critical thinking and cooperation. As emphasized by Mesa, different approaches do not exclude each other and we can still meet organizations which through *poverty porn* raise donations, or we can experience stereotypical education, which strengthens the sense of superiority of the rich North over the poor South.

Poverty in Polish global education publications for teachers and educators

In Poland, as in other countries, global education is in the field of interest of academics at universities, non-governmental organizations workers and school teachers. Non-governmental organizations were the first to include global education in their work (Rudnicki, 2015) and are still the most active and engaged when it comes to practice. The employees of non-governmental organizations work in educational projects, distribute information, deliver trainings, create tools while often cooperating with teachers and schools, as well as with academics. The outcomes of their work are often textbooks, manuals or educational packages providing theoretical and methodical content and lessons plans for teachers and educators who wish to include global education in their work. Since existence of global education in Polish curriculum is considered to be minimal (Concord, 2018), these publications are often the only available resources on given topic from global education perspective.

Content about poverty and inequalities regularly appear in those publications, since eradicating poverty is considered to be one of the challenges of global education. How do those contents reflect previously demonstrated ways of presenting poverty in global education? The analysis of three Polish publications aims to depict a vision of global poverty. Only theoretical content was selected for analysis. The key to selecting textbooks was the volume of theoretical part (thirty pages or over) as well as broad and diversified use. These selected publications for teachers and educators contain introduction to the basics of global education, methodologies, lesson plans or example of good practice. The analysis was

based on key words: poverty, poor, presentation Global South.

The first selected publication is an educational package *Edukacja globalna dla najmłodszych. Pakiet edukacyjny dla szkół podstawowych i przedszkoli* published in 2014 by Ośrodek Działań Ekologicznych „Źródła”. It consists of over thirty pages of theory and over one hundred and forty pages of lesson plans and is addressed to early education teachers. In the introduction, the authors emphasize that the package is a response to the lack of focus on the content of global education in early education. In the theoretical part there is a definition, objectives, themes of global education and explanation why it should be a part of curriculum in early stages of teaching. Many references to poverty can be found in a presentation of relations between the Global North and the Global South. The authors explain that the Poles, as part of the Global North, live in privileged conditions. There is a comparison of this position with the situation of the majority of the world who live in poverty. The package contains a few-page explanation of the question “Why are the countries of the South poor?”. It is emphasized that there is no one universal cause of global poverty, and the most common factors that contribute to it are: unfavorable geographical conditions, historical conditions with emphasis on colonization, unfavorable geopolitical situation, lack of competitiveness in international trade and unfair policy of richer countries, paralyzing countries’ debts, lack of efficient state structures and civil society, exploitation of natural resources and labor force of the Global South based on unfair regulations and the effects of climate change, which most often affect the poor because of the sensitivity of agriculture, pastoralism and fisheries – important sectors of the Global South economy. The authors of the package present various indices that can measure global poverty and highlight the wealth of the countries of the South, including respect for traditions and interpersonal relationships, achievements of civilizations, diversity of cultures and religions or natural wonders. It is stated there that richer countries are not “better” than poorer and that early education should build respect despite the race, culture, faith or economic status and should promote positive attitude towards diversity. The development cooperation between the Global North and the Global South is described as a necessity, but only when it takes under consideration the needs and values of the latter. Authors draw attention to the fact that it is not financial assistance that

is the key to getting out of poverty, but the individual attitudes of the citizens: consumer awareness, care for the natural environment, responsible tourism, learning about diversity in the and avoiding stereotypes. The educational package of *Źródła* emphasizes the need for solidarity, as well as individual work to reduce inequality and the level of global poverty.

The guidebook *Edukacja globalna. Poradnik metodyczny dla nauczyciel II, III i IV etapu edukacyjnego* written by Katarzyna Jasikowska, Magdalena Klarenbach, Gabriela Lipska-Badoti and Robert Łuczak, published by Ośrodek Rozwoju Edukacji in 2015 is another selected educational resource. It is an effect of cooperation of non-governmental organizations workers and academics and it is intended for teachers of students aged 10–19. The guidebook is divided in three parts: theoretical, methodical and practical. The authors emphasize that the theoretical part is the basis for work with the guidebook, and that it is essential in better understanding of the modern world. Six texts on over thirty pages present the topic of global education considering the historical, social and economic context. The division of the world is discussed – initially on the first, second and third, and now on the Global North and the Global South, emphasizing the controversy of it and that it further separates the rich from the poor, not taking into account the huge diversity of the Global South. The short analysis of colonization and neo-colonization processes is summarized as it provided Europe with economic and cultural domination as well as narrative domination. The dichotomy between civilized, rational, righteous white and others (depending on the narrative of history) – barbarians, slaves or the poor from the Global South is repeatedly mentioned. The authors emphasize that Western domination is “neither a consequence of God’s judgment nor an objectively existing historical process” (Jasikowska, Klarenbach, Lipska-Badoti, Łuczak, 2015: 31). According to the guidebook, global education is needed for learners not only to expand knowledge, but also to show and enable understanding of other, not Western narrations. It is stated that global education emerged as an attempt to rationalize complicated relations with former colonies and in decades evolved from charitable activities and curiosities on exotic lands to cooperation and open-mindedness to other perspectives. The content presented in this guidebook provides the idea of dominant narration of the Global North, constructed through ages, that does not give the voice to the Global

South, maintaining its superior position. The guidebook states that global education, through its content and methods, should equip people with skills, attitudes and knowledge that can facilitate understanding other perspectives and narratives in order to build global co-operation and fair relationships.

The last selected publication is *Jak mówić o wielkości świata? Jak rzetelnie informować o krajach globalnego Południa?* published by Instytut Globalnej Odpowiedzialności in 2015. It is the fourth edition of the guidebook that presents and promotes *Code of Conduct on Images and Messages* released by European confederation of Relief and Development Non-Governmental Organizations Concord (Concord, 2006). The publication is intended for all practitioners who work within global education: teachers, educators, workers of non-governmental organizations. It presents the principles and rules of communications about the Global South, so that the information is reliable and respects the dignity of the people concerned. In the introduction to the *Code of Conduct on Images and Messages* itself, discussed in *Jak mówić...* publication, it is stated: “Signatories to this Code are acutely aware of the many challenges and difficulties entailed in conveying the scandal and injustice of poverty while striving to meet the ideals of the Code. It is a reality of our world today that many of the images of extreme poverty and humanitarian distress are negative and cannot be ignored. [...] The values of human dignity, respect and truthfulness as outlined in the Code, must underlie all communications” (Concord, 2006: 1). The authors of the guidebook explain that the Concord code was a breakthrough text for practitioners of global education. It promoted the status of equality of stories and people from the Global South towards the Global North. The Code stressed the value of diversity and dignity of all people in the world and outlined the way of understanding global education as an educational concept. According to the *Jak mówić...* authors, the introduction of such rules and regulations has finally removed global education from the charitable nature of activities towards partnership and solidarity activities. The present, constantly evolving global education is supposed to pass reliable knowledge and shape attitudes of empathy, solidarity or respect, as well as to teach critical thinking and promote individual engagement in global situation like poverty. The postcolonial perspectives are essential in the guidebook as the ones that undermine the dominant narration of the Global

North. The authors call for presenting dramatic phenomena, such as poverty or war, in the most objective way possible. The issues of language, emotions and power relations have to be taken under consideration so as not to allow the above-mentioned *poverty porn*. If subjective treatment is applied in presentation of each person or story, it can “effectively provide new knowledge, deepen understanding of global interdependencies and encourage reflection on stereotypes” (Gontarska, Kielak, Huminiak, Kucińska, Qandil, 2015: 42). The lack of a solidarity, equality and subjective treatment strengthens stereotypical and simplified image of the Global South. The guide provides and explains the principles and rules of reliable information about the poorer, living in the Global South. By opting for solidarity and postcolonial perspectives on the understanding of global problems such as poverty, it promotes the principles of equality of narration, partnership and dignity of every human being.

Poverty presented in these Polish publications is linked with inequality and injustice, multiple perspectives, awareness and respect. There is a distinct emphasis on solidarity and individual responsibility towards global poverty. The contents of these educational resources coincide with the model of *Education for Global Citizenship* and critical global education.

Conclusion

As a result of the development of civil societies and raising awareness of the causes and consequences of global interdependence, new perspectives for presenting global poverty emerged. Global education is one of the educational proposals that addresses global poverty. The vision of poverty in global education evolved from post-war charitable activities creating an image of helpless and passive poor, through solidarity trends on injustice and exploitation of the Global South to nowadays partnership, personal engagement and multidimensional understanding of this global phenomenon. Poverty presented in available educational resources is a multi-faceted phenomenon, that is a result of the historical, cultural, political and economic domination of the Global North as well as the present global interdependencies and inequalities. Teachers and educators facing the challenge of explaining the learners global poverty can employ critical global education as a concept that proposes non-stereotypical knowledge, multiple perspectives and

at the same time promotes values of respect and cooperation and aims to shape personal engagement to contribute to elimination of global poverty.

Bibliography

- Andreotti V. (2006), Soft versus critical global citizenship education, *Development Education: Policy & Practice*, 3, 40–51.
- Andreotti V. (2011), “Global Education, Social Change and Teacher Education: The importance of Theory”, *Becoming a Global Citizen*, 16–30, Espoo: GENE.
- Apostolides A. (2016), Global Inequality: Drivers and Challenges, in *Development Education in Theory and Practice*, Unidev, 81–94.
- Bourn D. (2014a), *The theory and practice of development education: a pedagogy for global social justice*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Bourn D. (2014b), What is meant by Development Education?, *Sinergias*, 1, 7–23.
- Bourn D. (2016), Global learning and the school curriculum, *Management in Education*, 3 (30).
- Collin M. (2009), *What is ‘poverty porn’ and why does it matter for development*, *Aid Thoughts*, Retrieved from <http://aidthoughts.org/?p=69>.
- Concord (2006), *Code of conduct*, Retrieved from <https://concordeurope.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/DEEEP-BOOK-2014-113.pdf>.
- Concord (2018), *Global Citizenship Education in Europe: How Much Do We Care?*, Brussels: CONCORD Europe, Retrieved from https://concordeurope.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/CONCORD_GCE_FundingReport_2018_online.pdf.
- Gontarska M., Kielak E., Huminiak A., Kucińska A., Qandil M. (2015), *Jak mówić o większości świata? Jak rzetelnie informować o krajach globalnego Południa?*, Warsaw: Instytut Globalnej Odpowiedzialności.
- Gontarska, M., Kuleta-Hulboj, M. (2015), Wprowadzenie: Edukacja globalna. Polskie konteksty i inspiracje, in M. Kuleta-Hulboj i M. Gontarska (Eds.), *Edukacja globalna. Polskie konteksty i inspiracje*, 4–15, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Dolnośląskiej Szkoły Wyższej.
- Gordon D. (2005), *Indicators of Poverty and Hunger*, New York: Youth Development Indicators, Retrieved from http://www.poverty.ac.uk/sites/default/files/indicators-of-poverty-and-hunger_UNpoverty.pdf
- Grupa Zagranica (2011), *Report on the Multi-Stakeholder Process on Global Education*, Warsaw: Grupa Zagranica, Retrieved from http://zagranica.org.pl/sites/zagranica.org.pl/files/attachments/Dokumenty/Ministerialne/raport_z_procesu_miedzysektorowego_eg.pdf.
- Hicks D. (2003), Re-Examining the Future: The Challenge for Citizenship Education, *Educational Review*, 3 (55).
- Jasikowska K., Klarenbach M., Lipska-Badoti G., Łuczak R. (2015), *Edukacja globalna. Poradnik metodyczny dla nauczycieli II, III i IV etapu edukacyjnego*, Warsaw: Ośrodek Rozwoju Edukacji.
- Jasikowska, K. (2015), Po co nam edukacja globalna?, in: M. Kuleta-Hulboj i M. Gontarska (Eds.), *Edukacja globalna. Polskie konteksty i inspiracje*, 16–38, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Dolnośląskiej Szkoły Wyższej.
- Jasikowska K., (2018), *Zmieniając świat! Edukacja globalna między zyskiem a zbawieniem*, Kraków, Impuls.
- Koktsides P. (2016), Poverty: Who, Where and Why?, w: *Development Education in Theory and Practice*, Unidev, 59–80.

- Kostyło Piotr (2008), *Teorie ubóstwa i pomoc społeczna*, Teraźniejszość, Człowiek, Edukacja, 4, 47–65.
- Kuleta-Hulboj M. (2015), *Kilka uwag o heterogeniczności edukacji globalnej*, Teraźniejszość – Człowiek – Edukacja, 1, 67–80.
- Lister R. (2007), *Bieda*, Warsaw: Sic!
- Mesa M. (2011), Evolution and Future Challenges of Development Education, *Global Education Research*, 0, 141–160.
- Nowaczyk M., Świderek G., Karbowski M., (2014) *Edukacja globalna dla najmłodszych. Pakiet edukacyjny dla szkół podstawowych i przedszkoli*, Łódź: Ośrodek Działań Ekologicznych „Źródła”.
- Oxfam (2019), *Public good or private wealth?*, Oxford: Oxfam GB, Retrieved from <https://www.oxfam.org.nz/sites/default/files/reports/Public%20Good%20or%20Private%20Wealth%20-%20Oxfam%202019%20-%20Full%20Report.pdf>.
- Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (2018), *Global Multidimensional Poverty Index 2018: The Most Detailed Picture To Date of the World's Poorest People*, Oxford: University of Oxford, Retrieved from https://ophi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/G-MPI_2018_2ed_web.pdf.
- Panek T. (2009), Ubóstwo i nierówności: dylematy pomiaru, in: J. Czapiński i T. Panek (Eds), *Warunki i jakość życia Polaków*, Warsaw: Rada Monitoringu Społecznego, 310–319.
- Rudnicki P. (2015), Edukacja globalna w polskich szkołach, czyli refleksje nad pozaformalną zmianą w oświacie w trzech ujęciach, in: M. Kuleta-Hulboj i M. Gontarska (Eds), *Edukacja globalna. Polskie konteksty i inspiracje*, 60–90, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Dolnośląskiej Szkoły Wyższej.
- Scheunpflug A., Asbrand B. (2006), Global Education and Education for Sustainability, *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 3 (53).
- World Bank (2019), *Country and Lending Groups*, Retrieved from <https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519>.