eCOMMONS

Loyola University Chicago

Loyola eCommons

Education: School of Education Faculty Publications and Other Works

Faculty Publications and Other Works by Department

7-8-2020

Citizenship Education Beyond the Nation State Implications for Teacher Education

Seungho Moon
smoon3@luc.edu

Charlie Tocci
Loyola University Chicago, ctocci@luc.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/education_facpubs

Part of the Education Commons

Author Manuscript

This is a pre-publication author manuscript of the final, published article.

Recommended Citation

Moon, Seungho and Tocci, Charlie. Citizenship Education Beyond the Nation State Implications for Teacher Education. Global Citizenship Education in Teacher Education: Theoretical and Practical Issues, , : 85-101, 2020. Retrieved from Loyola eCommons, Education: School of Education Faculty Publications and Other Works, http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9781351129848

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Publications and Other Works by Department at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Education: School of Education Faculty Publications and Other Works by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License.
© Routledge, 2020.

Citizenship Education beyond the Nation State:

Implications for Teacher Education

Seungho Moon and Charlie Tocci (Loyola University Chicago)

At present, teacher educators around the world are witnessing the emergence of three simultaneous, related trends: a re-emergence of populist ethno-nationalism; the formation of a highly mobile, massively wealthy transnational elite; and the rapid growth of migratory flows, particularly as refugees and indigent labor. These trends threaten the well-being of minority, immigrant, and other marginalized populations and make the concept of global citizenship education (GCE) all the more vital and vexing.

Scholars and teacher educators investigating citizenship education beyond the nation state now require innovative, layered, and generative theoretical frameworks and practices in order to promote conversations concerning equity for students of all backgrounds. There is a consensus that the attention to global citizenship education in teacher education plays a crucial role in fostering new conceptualizations of citizenship in various regions of the world. As we approach issues of teacher education for global citizenship education, we first consider two major open questions:

- How do we understand global citizenship as a general concept?
- How do we understand global citizenship as a distinct concept?

There are multiple, varying responses to these questions. How we respond to these questions has implications for how we frame our work in teacher education. This chapter traces out an array of intersections that mark the relationship between global citizenship and teacher education. As an overarching goal of the present chapter, we explore current approaches to GCE in an effort to broaden our perspectives. A new, varied landscape of citizenship and global

citizenship education provides implications for teacher education. The second part of the chapter outlines four dominant frameworks exploring theoretical and practical components of global citizenship education in teacher education: (a) humanistic approaches, (b) critical theories approaches, (c) phenomenological and autobiographical approaches, and (d) poststructuralist and feminist approaches. We aim to provide multiple notions of global citizenship education with practical, representative samples for teacher educators as a preliminary guide for local implementation.

Global Citizenship, Generally and Distinctly

The very idea of "citizenship" as a kind of national fraternity and comradeship is increasing tested as we move into the future (Anderson, 2016). It is now possible for one to buy citizenship from St. Kitts for $250,000, and it is now possible for a state to purchase citizenship to another nation *en masse* for thousands of its residents, such as the United Arab Emirates did for Bidoon people to become citizens of the Comoros Island (Abrahamian, 2015). And in late-2017, there was a novel development in the notion of citizenship when "Sophia," a humanoid robot with artificial intelligence, was granted citizenship by the kingdom of Saudi Arabia (Wootson, 2017). These events raise a host of profound questions across practical, legal, and conceptual spheres – all spaces in which citizenship operates. For instance, was Sophia a man or a woman, a designation that entails significant attendant restrictions or freedoms in Saudi Arabia? Can the Bidoon people be recognized as citizens of a nation they never sought to become part of? If citizenship can be bought, as it can be in St. Kitts or in many other nations under policies seeking foreign financial investments, then what relationship is operating between a citizen and his/her country? On what basis, with what notion of "global" and of "citizenship" do we begin to educate youth and their teachers?

The ability to consider these dizzying developments relies on the basic questions of how we understand global citizenship as both a general concept and a distinct concept. The difference in the question is one of position. The general concept of global citizenship is a universal rendering in contrast to the distinct conceptualization, which is rooted in the specificities of its realization. Yet each form of citizenship is fundamentally constituent of the other, the general and distinct illuminating each other, while the global operates by simultaneously totalizing and particularizing the world such that the differentiation of position (both location in space and in relation) becomes a shared territory. Our differential access to global citizenship provides us our unique, common grounds.

The general understanding of global citizenship.

The classical roots of citizenship in the Western tradition are traced back to the ancient Greek and Romans (Pocock, 1995). The first clearly developed conceptualization of citizenship was among the Athenians. In Aristotle's (1996) terms, citizens were those who "shares in the administration of justice, and in offices" (p. 62), that is those who directly participated in the political institutions of the state. This republican form of citizenship was highly constricted making a clear distinction between the few Athenian men who were empowered to deliberate and engage in political institutions and the many subjects who had no purchase in these processes.

The Romans, as purveyors of a vast empire, approached the notion of citizenship as a mode of legal identification (Walzer, 1989). This liberal form of citizenship was assigned to peoples living across Roman-controlled territories, not as a right to political participation, but as a medium through which to interpellate and protect members of the political community. In this move, juridical and social dimensions of citizenship were wedded such that the legal status of

“citizen” formed a political identity not necessarily bound by either physical territory or participation in political processes. One could become citizen by designation.

The Enlightenment restoration and renovation of “citizenship” by theorists such as Rousseau, Locke, and Jefferson sought an integration of the Greek and Roman forms of citizenship, that is the development of concept that entailed both republican participation and political identity. In this formulation, citizens had “political liberty” (Walzer, 1989) comprised of right and responsibilities that undergirded legal status, political agency, and community. Citizenship in this manner was being theorized in conjunction with modern nation-state, thereby creating deep, abiding ties between notions of territorial sovereignty, the state, and nationality, on one hand, and legal status, agency, and community on the other. In contemporary nation-states, this set of core concepts exist in a complex web of tension and relation with each other, which makes the attempt to rethink any one element of the nation-state-citizenship nexus a profound challenge to the entire edifice of political liberty, individual or collective.

Global citizenship, in its general form, presents such a challenge. How can one become a “global citizen” in the absence of a global sovereign state, defined global identity, and adjudicated legal status? That is, many of the vital components of national citizenship that shape the potentials and expressions of political liberty have no parallel in the global. There are limited, proto-elements of a conceptual framework for global citizenship: the United Nations and a wide range of multilateral treaties and agreements that form a system of global governance (Murphy, 2000); the United Nations *Declaration of Human Rights;* the International Court of Justice in the Hague; and other super-national institutions. What these lack are well developed political cultures (Habermas, 1971) as well as the power of direct intervention to assert order. In other words, the world currently lacks the necessary institutions and legal frameworks through which

an individual could identify as a global citizen and express political liberty outside the status provided by national citizenship.

The distinct understanding of global citizenship.

The abstract, idealized form of global citizenship stands in distinction to the specific, particular realities of being "citizen" in various places across the world. Abrahamian (2015) harshly critiques gauzy, optimistic formulations of global citizenship by interrogating what people actually do with such a concept. She asserts "Global citizenship is itself a new form of statelessness" (p.16) and then pointedly asks, "Who among us gets to be 'global'?" (p.17). Abrahamian explores the deep iniquities that exist among those people who live beyond a single nation state. On one side, there is a small cadre of wealthy elites that are able to accumulate multiple national citizenships. While some states, such as St. Kitts, may sell citizenship, numerous others, such as the United States and South Korea, have policies that expedite citizenship for those who make significant business investments. Multiple passports provide legal, financial, and political opportunities unavailable to individuals bound by the institutions of a single state. But rhetorical framing of these privileges often obscures their material benefits, instead focusing on a kind of contemporary cosmopolitanism and "moral superiority of identifying with humanity at large" (Huntington, 2004, p.9).

Found on the other side of statelessness is a severe marginalization, a vulnerability to exploitation and deprivation made possible when people have no access to the political institutions necessary to protect one's rights. The United Nations High Commission on Refugees (2018) currently estimates that there are 65.6 million forcibly displaced people the world, with some 22.5 million refugees among them. The statistics here gloss a staggering array of situations that produce displace people around the globe, such as: people fleeing the Syrian civil war;

Rohingya families seeking refugee from paramilitary forces in Myanmar; unaccompanied minors arriving at United States' southern boarder; and government collapse in South Sudan. Then there are those crossing borders to work either without legal status, such as undocumented immigrants to the United States, or who have their passports confiscated, such as the Nepalese laborers helping build Qatar's World Cup stadiums. All of these people are part of transnational migrations that entail the possibility of cosmopolitanism but are denied access to global citizenship. Instead, their statelessness places them at the bottom, far removed from the multiple passport holding global elite.

The many gaps and discrepancies between global citizenship in its ideal form and its actual form raises a host of difficult questions for educators and teacher educators. What, exactly, do we intend when we seek to educate for global citizenship? How can we productively grapple with stratified access to global citizenship that reinforces both privilege and oppression? What is possible – in the present world and in the future? In the midst of this uncertainty, clear theoretical frameworks provide entry points to begin the work of conceptualizing, critiquing, and educating prospective teachers.

Global Citizenship Education: Four major approaches[i]

Multiple theoretical and practical approaches represent the nexus between global citizenship education and teacher education. Literature shows the complexity of global citizenship education as the result of dynamic exchanges both in a local and global context. Nearly 25 years ago, Johnston and Ochoa (1993) succinctly proposed four research agendas in teacher education to improve global perspectives for teachers, including research on critical perspective, teacher reflection, pedagogical content knowledge and beliefs, and cognitive-developmental studies of teachers. This seminal work has shifted the ways to review research on

global citizenship education, moving beyond providing more content knowledge in education. This section draws upon Johnston and Ochoa's (1993) study to examine the dominant voice in GCE and aims to act as a catalyst for understanding the following relevant approaches to GCE in teacher education programs: (a) liberal, humanistic approaches; (b) critical theories approaches; (c) phenomenological, autobiographical approaches; and (d) poststructural, feminist approaches. As Table 1 indicates, each approach conceptualizes global citizenship differently and thus, translates into a diverse and different set of pedagogical implications for teacher education programs. We will explicate each of the approaches as we move on. Having reviewed each, we introduce teacher education programs or research studies that have built their works upon the philosophical groundings.

Table 1

Four Major theories and practices of global citizenship education

Approaches	Perspectives	Key theoretical terms (Tenets)	Teacher Education practices
Liberal, humanistic approaches	Ways of integration and extension of citizenship	Local citizen to global citizen free will and autonomy	Extending the scope of citizenship through service learning and study abroad Enhancing cultural awareness
Critical theories	Ways of change and resistance Ways of inclusion and recognition	Power issues among nation-states Structural understanding about inequity Inclusion and recognition	Structural analysis of global inequity Inclusion models

Phenomenological approaches	Ways of Being and being-in-the world	Lived experience Interpretation of experience Meaning searching	Writing reflection papers on lived experience
Poststructural, feminist approaches	Ways of unknowingness and interdependency	Power operations Self-reflexivity and ethics Relationship	Challenging existing taken-for-grantedness about self/other Embracing uncertainty in global citizenship

Teacher educators from across the world have employed multidimensional approaches to global citizenship education as a source for educational policy as well as a guide for classroom implementations (Grossman, 2002; Law, 2007). This section helps review existing approaches to global citizenship education, envisage alternative options to advance pre- and in-service teachers' global awareness, and encourage social agency to lay the groundwork for a more just global community.

Humanistic approaches to global citizenship: From local to global. From a humanistic lens, global citizenship education makes it possible for one to acquire a preliminary understanding about self, other, and community beyond a local, nation-state level to a global one. This approach supports the idea that global citizenship is a broader, more inclusive version of regional and national citizenship. Sound and solid knowledge of national citizenship will enable and motivate one to pursue global citizenship more fervently. Banks (2006), for example, identifies "globalism and global competency" as the final stage in developing cultural identity, possible only after "cultural and national identifications" (p. 36) have been achieved. The Enlightenment ideals about autonomous self, trust of human reasoning, and development of human will theoretically influenced the humanistic approach. The bulk of humanistic-focused studies of global citizenship education extend citizens' scope from a local community *within*

national borders to global communities *without* borders. Key discourses in the literature emphasize global citizenship, self-reflection, and free will in order to understand "other" cultures and embrace otherness into the mainstream culture. These studies assume that the capacity of understanding self/other is enhanced if the target of citizen and citizenship is expanded globally (Banks, 2006; Hansen, 2008).

Notably, Nussbaum (2002) highlights global citizens who are compatible with living in "a complex interlocking world" (p. 292). A global citizen has the ability to think as "a citizen of the whole world" (Nussbaum, 2002, p. 289) and cultivate his or her humanity toward the "other." Allegiance to humanity, rather than a loyalty to a nation state, is a major discourse in cosmopolitan education. Cosmopolitan, global citizens practice acting properly to the legitimate claims of the oppressed in global communities. Drawing from the humanities, Nussbaum lays emphasis on "narrative imagination," imagination that incorporates empathy towards the "other." Similarly, Appiah (2006) argues for empathy and mutual understandings among global, cosmopolitan citizens by keeping an individual's cultural heritage as well as respecting the "presence of the other" (p. 21). Two major elements of empathy and mutual respects are prerequisites for proper recognition via dialogues among people from "different" cultural groups. Learning from difference is a key component of Appiah's notion of cosmopolitan, global education because perceiving difference from openness is a starting point to expand a person's paradigm towards self, other, and community. Such discussions in global citizenship education align with Kantian ethics of the universality of rights, obligations, and an autonomous human being. Moral obligations, strengthened by maxims of free will and proper responsibility, are essential to global citizenship education. Therefore, teacher education programs should meaningfully enhance cultural awareness about other global citizens. Consequently, teacher

candidates revisit the notions of liberty and responsibility expanding the boundaries of duties from a local region to global communities.

Practices in teacher education. From the humanistic vantage point, the optimal output for teacher education programs with a global citizenship orientation is an active citizen who has a positive cultural, national, and global identity, as well as the knowledge and propensity required to work collaboratively through their nation and the world. Teacher educators remind teachers of the universal principles of equal human rights and human dignity regardless of national and cultural backgrounds. Teacher education programs encourage teacher candidates to participate in service learning for both local and global community, as well as promoting study-abroad programs. During study-abroad programs, teacher candidates actively participate in teaching in local schools. In promoting internationally minded teachers, experiences such as service learning and study abroad become the centerpiece of global citizenship education (Cushner, 2007). Teacher candidates share their eye-opening experiences during study-abroad programs and claim, "I learned that the United States is not the center of the universe" (Cushner, 2007, p. 27). This awakening about others becomes a launching pad to challenge the border between national citizens and global citizens.

Critical theories and citizenship education: Social engagement via "critical consciousness." Critical theorists suggest power, recognition, and critical consciousness as major approaches to global citizenship education. They problematize a lack of critical perspectives on global inequity and social injustice in discussing global citizenship. Liberalism in global citizenship education, as explained earlier, is a good starting point. However, critical theorists have voiced concerns that a liberalistic attitude to global citizenship may reproduce a belief "system" or ideology that perpetuates social inequity for the poor and other marginalized,

unprivileged groups (Niens & Reilly, 2012). Habermas (1971), Gramsci (1971), and Freire (1970/2006) articulate the way in which knowledge is constituted and maintained by the dominant group's interests of control and management. Gramsci (1971) coined "cultural hegemony," arguing that hegemonic institutions continue to work to present and sustain dominant ideologies as a set of social norms. In the global context, western values of meritocracy and the ultimate pursuit of individual rights are acknowledged as normal and the other so-called "developing countries" accept this ideology as if it is the only way to consider global equity and fairness. Hence, critical global citizenship education underlines the necessity of political action for equal recognition and education for humanization via critically raising the consciousness of the oppressed and the oppressor (Freire, 1970/2006).

The theory and practice of "recognition" has been an important issue in the political philosophies of Taylor, Habermas, and others. Although political philosophers do not explicitly include global citizenship in discussing proper recognition, their argument is still relevant in global citizenship education in relation to explaining unequal power relationships among nation states and the lack of equal recognition among them. In his book chapter, *Politics of Recognition*, Taylor (1994) underscores how the "equal recognition" imperative in modern democratic societies has influenced current politics (p. 36). Taylor's main argument is whether liberal democratic governments and policies create space for equal recognition for people from different backgrounds, employing *politics of equal dignity* and *politics of difference* to highlight proper recognition. The politics of equal dignity originates in the idea that "all humans are equally worthy of respect" (Taylor, 1994, p. 41). The emphasis on this equal dignity is crucial in the modern global community because withholding a proper recognition of an individual or a cultural group is another hegemonic form of oppression toward any marginalized cultural group

and economically, politically oppressed nation-states. Furthermore, by underscoring the politics of difference, Taylor argues that the uniqueness of an individual group or its distinctiveness should not be covered by a "difference-blind fashion" (p. 43), that is, reproducing inequity by letting one hegemonic culture dominate other cultures under the guise of universal values. That is why critical theorists argue against a humanistic approach to global citizenship education, reasoning that the universalized approach to human dignity perpetuates the Eurocentric values of freedom, autonomy, and choice in considering and defining global citizenship.

Practices in teacher education. Teacher educators advocating critical theories postulate that global citizenship is a framework for action, and therefore, it can be a radical, politicized area in curriculum and teacher education (Davies, 2006). Delineating a globally aligned teacher education for global perspectives, Johnston and Ochoa (1993) made a case for critical perspectives in education. Drawing from critical theorists in education (e.g., Giroux, Apple), the researchers listed at least eight key questions to raise in exploring sociopolitical contexts of schooling and education. Respecting diverse nation-state, cultural subtleties and norms requires teacher candidates to transform their existing values critically. These values include Eurocentric understandings of autonomy, freedom, and choice, to name a few. Teacher educators should be mindful of raising critical consciousness of teacher candidates in understanding unequal sociopolitical interactions among nation-states. Critical theory guides teacher educators to examine the ways ideology functions in discussing civic virtues (e.g., open-minded, industrious, respectful) in global citizenship education. Civic virtues are used to promote competency-based values that advocate global integration of market and thus, stress freedom and choice as universalized moral values (Schattle, 2008).

Advancing social equity in education, Goren and Yemini (2017) support teacher agency and decry its absence in classroom practices. The researchers call for a more active role on the part of teachers to make students aware of opportunity gaps among global citizens. To do this, an interdisciplinary approach is crucial to move beyond a discipline-based articulation of global citizenship. Additionally, teachers' self-efficacy about global citizenship education could be enhanced though teacher education programs and teacher agency should be transferred beyond classroom boundaries.

Within the framework of critical theory, teacher educators envision advancing teacher candidates' and students' critical consciousness and actions with structural analyses of global inequity. The focus of inquiry is to sensitize to diverse needs of fellow citizens, to educate students, to distinguish social injustice and critically inquire about social problems, and to enlighten students to seek social transformation from a structural change. The belief that participatory and justice-oriented actions truly minimize social problems and inequity has motivated efforts (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). Thus, global democratic citizenships are not detached from efforts to improve social justice in teacher education. Carr, Pluim, and Howard (2014) argue that critical global citizenship "provides the necessary analysis of historical, political, and social development of…ever changing globalized world" (p. 6). Thus, critical global citizenship encompasses the examination of neoliberalism, hegemonic structures of global inequity, and power operations and their realizations in global decision-making processes.

Phenomenological, autobiographical approach: Teachers and students' lived experience and reflection. Phenomenology is the study of consciousness, experience, and the meaning/interpretation of such experience within a historical context. It focuses on the ways in which lived experience receives meanings through interpretation and on the search for meanings.

Gallagher (2012) explain phenomenology as the "first-person point of view," referring to the study on a person's own experience from the point of view of living through such lived experience (p. 7). Husserlian phenomenology introduces a process of *epoché*, which suspends all judgment or bias required to discover the essence of existence and experience. "Bracketing" is a process that reviews and returns to one's personal experience. By suspending and "bracketing" the doctrines, theories, and biases imposed on us, human beings attend to consciousness and the "experienced" world drawing from the subjectivity (Gallagher, 2012).

Depending on which philosophical tradition a person follows, multiple versions of phenomenology exist. Macann (1993) introduces phenomenology drawing from four major philosophers in Western tradition: Husserl, Heidegger, Sartre, and Merleau-Ponty. In the field of global teacher education, leading scholars adopt and explicate their own version of phenomenology and highlight lived experience, interpretation, and consciousness in education. Van Manen's (1990) phenomenology has been highly regarded for its description and analysis of lived experience. Heideggerian hermeneutics influenced van Manen's (1990) conceptualization of seeing lived experience as "text" for interpretation. The recovery of Being, *Dasein*, is possible by interpreting situated experience, that is, our experience of being in the world. A Human being's freedom and choice, then, becomes center stage in this meaning-making process. Phenomenologically speaking, global citizenship education concentrates on depicting and interpreting "meanings in the ways that they emerge and are shaped by consciousness" (van Manen & Adams, 2010, p. 644).

On the other hand, Greene (1995) articulates key themes for global teacher education, prioritizing *releasing the imagination.* Having reviewed the existential, phenomenology tradition, Greene defined imagination as "the one that permits us to give credence to alternative

realities. It allows us to break with the taken for granted, to set aside familiar distinctions and definitions" (p. 3). Artistic and aesthetic experiences take a crucial role to be wide-awake in social, global injustice. They release educators' imagination towards different, alternative realities. Encompassing social, ethical, political, and narrative imagination is a place to transform lived experience into "narrative to be a source of meaning making" (Greene, 1995, p. 3). Greene encourages teacher educators to find meanings driven from their lived experience of the past while interacting with present-day experiences with self and others. Critical reflection of subjectivity and lived experience aided by art and aesthetic experience opens up possibilities to imagine alternative realities and take actions for social change. Phenomenological traditions in global citizenship education, accordingly, focus on the descriptions and interpretations of students and teachers' educational experiences and their meanings. The method allows for an inclusive, wide-ranging insight into the subject's lived experience within a given social and educational context.

Practices in teacher education. Phenomenology has brought to the fore the importance of teacher candidates' lived experience and self-reflection in teacher education. Teacher educators following Heideggerian phenomenology make a case for lived experience of teacher candidates as Beings-in-the-world. Wang and Hoffman (2016) use the phrase "the ironic emphasis on 'self' within ostensibly 'global issues'" (p. 8) to review and challenge personal positionality and the construction of otherness in a global sociopolitical context. They argue that such a self-critical, reflective practice becomes the foundations of civic engagement and activism. The contextual scrutiny of their lived experience becomes a focal inquiry concern and teacher candidates are encouraged to interpret meaning out of their experience in a given sociopolitical context. Deliberation and self-reflection operate as pedagogical tools to advance

teacher candidates' ability to decipher complex, diverse culturally laden meanings. Having explored Maxine Greene's (1989) existential phenomenology, Johnston and Ochoa (1993) emphasized reflective teaching and action in teacher education, inviting teachers for self-reflection about their beliefs and teaching practices about global perspectives. As a teaching artist, Gaines (2016) extends Greene's phenomenology to encourage students and teachers into "more engaged and better-informed citizens" through aesthetic experience.

In promoting global, cosmopolitan competency informed by phenomenology, Englund (2011) coined "deliberative democracy," according to which students develop moral and intellectual capacities of cosmopolitans and global citizens via reflection on global issues. A sense of responsibility to the other is a prerequisite for deliberative democratic practices as a responsive action to build trust and facilitate deliberative communication. Roth (2011) moved beyond Englund's deliberative democracy, underscoring global citizenship education as a Habermasian deliberation site—that is, nurturing a teacher candidate's reflective structure of mind. This approach involves aiming at educating an empathetic person who is deliberate and responsive in dealing with global issues. Another interesting approach to global citizenship education originates from the phenomenological attempt to examine the teacher candidate's subjectivity. In his book, *The Worldliness of a Cosmopolitan Education*, Pinar (2009) shifted the focus of cosmopolitanism from political-geographical approaches to the cultivation of subjectivity through education. He explored subjectivity's passionate engagement with *alterity* in the public space by introducing Jane Addams (1860-1935), Laura Bragg (1881-1978), and Paolo Pasolini (1922-1975) as three public, cosmopolitan intellectuals. This autobiographical approach to global citizenship education adds up to our understanding of how to examine and interpret global citizen subjectivity in the public space. Similar to Pinar, Andreotti, Biesta, and Ahenakew

(2015) re-conceptualize global mindedness as a mode of being, which concentrates on existence and exposure about self and other by moving beyond a cognitive, empathetic approach to the other. In practicing global citizenship education, Appleyard and McLean (2011) emphasized experiential learning, reflection, and explicit modelling that provides specific instruction to address all intellectual, affective, and action domains of global citizenship education. This approach refers to active collaboration with like-minded professionals in school, involving reflection on the actual implementations of global citizenship education.

Poststructuralist, feminist approaches: Interrelationality and openness toward the unknown. Global citizenship education is boundless in scope as suggested by enriched recent literature on poststructural, feminist discourses in education. Poststructuralists review and analyze discourses of identity, self/other, and culture as an effect of transnational flows and mobilities, where everyone and everything is in a flux of change in the global scene (Miller, 2006). Global citizenship is continuously restructured by defying standardized, fixed understandings, such as "First world male," or "Third world female." Openness towards the self-other duality and the global community becomes a jumping board for imagining unexplored possibilities. The subject is socio-politically constructed by the interactions with others. In his book, *Cosmopolitanism and the Age of School Reform: Science, Education, and Making Society by Making the Child*, Popkewitz (2008) addressed cosmopolitanism and governmentality. The ideology of reason/unreason binary is implemented in school reform and global citizenship, which creates a duality in approaching to global citizenship education. According to Popkewitz, a major focus of cosmopolitanism is on Enlightenment's dream of creating idealized, universalized values of humanity, which transcend any local/provincial concerns.

Practitioners of cosmopolitanism and global teacher education are hopeful to set free the individual from any local and national attachment to universalized values of humanity, agency, and rationality. However, the promise to educate cosmopolitan citizens ironically has "differentiated, divided, and abjected" individuals into a citizen/non-citizen dichotomy, and normalization is used to exclude a certain group from the mainstream discourse (Popkewitz, 2008, p. xiv).

Poststructural, feminist theorists avoid a static notion of global citizenship or multiculturalism. Notably, Butler (2009) proposed to look at multiculturalism or global citizenship through a different lens when people take for granted the "already constituted communities, already established subjects" who are not recognized as lives (p. 31). Rather Butler encourages educators to investigate the interdependency among nation states and their interwoven networks of power in ongoing lives. In doing so, global citizenship education shifts its mission from an obsession with the sameness/difference discourse grounded in the pre-determined to inquiries about power functions, in a bid to understand the root cause of recurring local and global massacres. That is, it seeks to move away from examining "how to include more people within existing norms," to considering "how existing norms allocate recognizability differently" (Butler, 2009, p. 6). Teacher educators have sought to explore new possible norms and lexicon to value living as recognizable lives. Rather than try to figure out where one stands, for example, "in" or "outside" the frame, the main goal is to explore "what vacillates between those two locations, and what, foreclosed, becomes encrypted in the frame itself" (Butler, 2009, p. 75).

Practices in teacher education. Transnational identity discourses are more than just "discovering" one's own identities and "understanding" cultural differences between teachers

and immigrant students. Teacher educators avoid to write a reflection paper as if teacher candidates assume their existing, stable identities in understanding global citizenship (e.g., I am a White, middle class female teacher candidate who grew up in suburb...). Self-reflexivity is a crucial pedagogical practice to get an insight into the "unknowingness" of the self-other and ambiguous realities. Notably, Pillow's (2003) self-reflexivity built her argument upon a "discomfort" about self/other, truth, and reality. Teacher educators, through a concentration on discourse, subjectivity, and interrelationality of self-other, come to hearten teacher candidates to launch an in-depth analysis about global conflicts of historical, socio-political, and economic nature.

Teacher candidates scrutinize power-knowledge and power operations (Foucault, 1980) embedded in local and global massacres, and they cast doubt on habitual ways of looking at cultural difference/sameness as being pre-determined. The examination of cultural norms to assign differential recognition to global citizens introduces more complexity into global citizenship education (Moon, 2017). Teacher candidates interrogate the biased legitimization of a certain group or behavior, and rather than including more "marginalized" groups into the existing norms or advancing cultural awareness, strive to read discursive practices of inclusion and exclusion analytically.

Poststructural, feminist scholars also highlight the interrelationality of self/other, rejecting the idea that subjectivity is an independent entity. Instead, they argue that subjectivity arises discursively and materially from interactions with others. Moreover, from poststructural, feminist perspectives, subjectivity is not a function of cultural categories of race, nationality, or gender, and the self-other relation is linguistically constructed within the proximity of self and other (Todd, 2009). Driven by this ontological understanding of self/other, the poststructural,

feminist approach requires global citizenship education programs to educate teachers on raising questions about the socio-political interrelationality existing between self and other. A major question is how racial/ethnic, gender and class identities are constructed in actual interactions with others. That is, the identities should not be based on assumptions driven from the subject's collective identity. Teacher candidates explore their narratives with the help of their subjectivity, which is always constructed by interacting with the other. Subjectivity is not a pre-fixed entity; it is a consequence of a complicated intersection of race, class, gender, and more (Santoro, 2009). Overall, this approach challenges "already inscribed entitlements and obligations" (Todd, 2009, p. 156) in global affairs and thus, envisages different approaches to addressing the complexity of subjectivity discursively and materially constructed by interacting with the alterity in a global context.

Directions of Global Citizenship in Teacher Education

A global citizenship provides social space to self-define and reform in relationship to the constraints and opportunities of life in situations. Global citizenship is not to be without national citizenship; those who have had their national citizenship stripped away or held in suspension are deeply vulnerable and readily exploitable (e.g., undocumented, refugees, or the indentured laborers of the Middle East). Similarly, to rack up multiple national citizenship, as the wealthy often do these days as a way to maintain political and financial dominance, is not global citizenship. Rather, this is a kind of subscription privilege afforded to global elites. The transnational circuits created through the exertion of this influence do not make the global; it inscribes an international hegemony that gleefully, determinedly mocks the old Communist Internationals and religious calls for the universal brotherhood of all peoples. Given these complicated situations related to promoting global citizenship, there exists a consensus about a

need of developing a vision of global citizenship. This chapter provides at least four major theoretical frameworks and implementation of them in teacher education. Thus, teacher educators encourage preservice and in-service teachers to advance their critical understanding of and respect for human rights and due responsibilities. Teacher education is the process of empowering students to work for creating a more just and sustainable world through democratic processes (Ibrahim, 2005).

Global citizenship, thus, is multidimensional with multiple approaches to it, including a political status, cultural heritage and identity, democratic ideals, actual public practice, and social actions (Mutch, 2004). Teacher educators have addressed these multiplicities of global citizenship applying diverse pedagogical strategies as articulated in the previous section. We highlight the value of global *citizenship from bottom up,* as an intellectual, political, and practical suggestion. In her article, "Education and the Contested Meanings of 'Global Citizenship,'" Roman (2003) analyzed the meaning of global citizenship "from below" (p. 269). She argued for leaving space to decolonize curriculum by analyzing what such curriculum looks like and how it is taught. Her suggestion of working *from below* is a concrete political action minimizing any essentialized slogan system related to global citizenship. She argues that global citizenship is not an abstract, essentialized concept from top-down; rather, global citizenship is actual local and global interactions embodied in particular policies, curricula, and education. We support Roman's notion of *from below* in order to avoid the reinforcement of classed, gendered, and racialized nationalism. Teacher educators desire to invent and update new pedagogical and research methods advancing global citizenship. Open-ended inquiry on global citizenship, particularly grounded in this *from below* leaves hope to develop and implement multiple, alternative methods to global citizenship education.

References

Abrahamian, A. (2015). *The cosmopolites: The coming of the global citizen.* New York, NY: Columbia Global Reports.

Anderson, B. (2016). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origins and spread of nationalism* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Verso.

Andreotti, V., Biesta, G., & Ahenakew, G. (2015). Between the nation and the globe: Education for global mindedness in Finland. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 13*(2), 246–259. doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2014.934073

Appiah, K. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.

Appleyard, N., & McLean, L. R. (2011). Expecting the exceptional: Pre-service professional development in global citizenship education. *International Journal of Progressive Education, 7*(2), 6–32.

Aristotle. (1996). The politics: Book III, S. Everson (Ed.). *Aristotle: The politics of Aristotle and the constitution of Athens* (pp. 61-90). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Banks, J. A. (2006). *Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, curriculum, and teaching* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Butler, J. (2009). *Frames of war: When is life grievable?* Brooklyn, NY: Verso.

Carr, P. R., Pluim, G., & Howard, L. (2014). Linking global citizenship education and education for democracy through social justice: What can we learn from the perspectives of teacher-education candidates? *Journal of Global Citizenship & Equity Education, 4*(1), 1–21.

Cushner, K. (2007). The role of experience in the making of internationally-minded teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 34*(1), 27–39.

Davies, L. (2006). Global citizenship: Abstraction or framework for action? *Educational Review, 58* (1), 5–25.

Englund, T. (2011). The potential of education for creating mutual trust: Schools as sites for deliberation. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 43*(3), 236–248.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977* (C. Gordon, L. Marshall, J. Mepham, & K. Soper, Trans.). New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Freire, P. (1970/2006). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Gaines, A. M. (2016). Ambassadors of aesthetic experience: The healing legacy of Maxine Greene. *Teaching Artist Journal, 14*(1), 24–29.

Goren, H., & Yemini, M. (2016). Global citizenship education in context: Teacher perceptions at an international school and a local Israeli school. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 46* (5), 832–853.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks.* New York, NY: International Publishers.

Greene, M. (1989). Reflection and passion in teaching. In C. Eisele (Ed.), *Reflective teaching*. Normal, IL: Illinois State University for the John Dewey Society for the Study of Education and Culture.

Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination: Essay on education, the arts, and social change.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Grossman, D. (2002). Multidimensional citizenship and teacher education. *Pacific Asian Education, 14*(2), 36–45.

Habermas, J. (1971). *Knowledge and human interests.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Hansen, D. T. (2008). Curriculum and the idea of a cosmopolitan inheritance. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 40*(3), 289–312.

Huntington, S. P. (2004). Dead souls: The denationalization of the American elite. *National Interest, 75,* 5-18.

Ibrahim, T. (2005). Global citizenship education: Mainstreaming the curriculum? *Cambridge Journal of Education, 35*(2), 177–194.

Johnston, M. & Ochoa, A. (1993). Teacher education for global perspectives: A research agenda. *Theory into Practice, 32*(1), 64–68.

Law, W. (2007). Globalisation, city development and citizenship education in China's Shanghai. *International Journal of Educational Development, 27*(1), 18–38. doi: 10.1016/j.ijedudev.2006.04.017

Macann, C. (1993). *Four phenomenological philosophers: Husserl, Heidegger, Sartre, Merleau-Ponty.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Miller, J. L. (2006). Curriculum studies and transnational flows and mobilities: Feminist autobiographical perspectives. *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry, 3*(2), 31–50. Retrieved from http://nitinat.library.ubc.ca/ojs/index.php/tci

Moon, S. (2017). Reframing learning to teach diversity: Multicultural curriculum within a cosmopolitan context. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education. 45*(5), 469–486.

Moon, S. (2019). Three approaches to qualitative research through the ARtS: Narratives of teaching for social justice and community. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Brill|Sense

Murphy, C. (2000). Global governance: Poorly done and poorly understood. *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-), 76*(4), 789-803.

Mutch, C. (2004). Teacher education for global citizenship: An example from New Zealand. *Pacific Asian Education, 16*(1), 42–55.

Niens, U., & Reilly, J. (2012). Education for global citizenship in a divided society? Young people's views and experiences. *Comparative Education, 48*(1), 103–118.

Nussbaum, M. (2002). Education for citizenship in an era of global connection. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 21*(4), 289–303.

Parker, W. (2017). Towards a powerful human rights curriculum in schools: Problems and possibilities. In J. Banks (ed.), *Citizenship education and global migration: Implications for theory, research, and teaching*. New York: AERA.

Pillow, W. S. (2003). Confession, catharsis, or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*(2), 175–196.

Pinar. W. F. (2009). *The worldliness of a cosmopolitan education: Passionate lives in public service*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Pocock, J. (1995). The ideal of citizenship since classical times. In R. Beiner (Ed.), *Theorizing citizenship* (pp. 29-53). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Popkewitz, T. (2008). *Cosmopolitanism and the age of school reform: Science, education and making society by making the child.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Roman, L. G. (2003). Education and the contested meanings of ‘global citizenship.’ *Journal of Educational Change, 4*(3), 269–293.

Roth, K. (2011). Good will: Cosmopolitan education as a site for deliberation. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 43*(3), 300–312.

Santoro, N. (2009). Teaching in culturally diverse contexts: What knowledge about “self” and “others” do teachers need? *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *35*(1), 33–45. Retrieved from http://doi.org/10.1080/02607470802587111

Schattle, H. (2008). Education for global citizenship: Illustrations of ideological pluralism and adaptation. *Journal of Political Ideologies, 13*(1), 73–94. doi: 10.1080/13569310701822263

Taylor, C. (1994). Politics of recognition. In C. Taylor, K. A. Appiah, J. Habermas, S. C. Rockefeller, M. Walzer, S. Wolf, & A. Gutman (Eds.), *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition* (pp. 25–73). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.

Todd, S. (2009). *Toward an imperfect education: Facing humanity, rethinking cosmopolitanism.* Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

UNHRC. (2018). *Facts at a glance*. Retrieved from: http://www.unhcr.org/en-us/figures-at-a-glance.html

van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. Albany, NY: SUNY.

van Manen, M. & Adams, C. A. (2010). Phenomenological research. In C. Kridel (Ed.), *The Sage encyclopedia of curriculum studies* (pp. 641–645). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Walzer, M. (1989). Citizenship. In T. Ball, J. Farr, R. L. Hanson (eds.), *Political Innovation and Conceptual Change*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp.211–220.

Wang, Ch., & Hoffman, D. M. (2016). Are WE the world? A critical reflection on selfhood in U.S. global citizenship education. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 24*(56), 1–18.

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal, 41*(2), 237–269.

Wootson, C. (October 29, 2017). Saudi Arabia, which denies women equal rights, makes a robot a citizen. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from: https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/innovations/wp/2017/10/29/saudi-arabia-which-denies-women-equal-rights-makes-a-robot-a-citizen/?utm_term=.d6c8adcbdaca

---

[i] With a minor revision, conceptual definitions of phenomenology, critical theory, and poststructuralist approaches appear in a book entitled, Moon, S. (2019). *Three approaches to qualitative research through the ARtS: Narratives of teaching for social justice and community*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Brill|Sense