

**Cultivating Global Citizens:  
Planting New Seeds or Pruning the Perennials?  
Looking for the citizen-subject in Global Citizenship Education theory**

**Karen Pashby OISE/University of Toronto**

There is a great deal of debate, especially among political theorists, about whether or not there is/can be such a thing as a ‘global citizen’ (e.g. Byers 2005, Wood 2008). Education is one field wherein the notion of global citizenship has been used quite seriously. This may be because while a major challenge to the notion of global citizenship is the question of ‘who is the global citizen if there is no global state/political structure?’<sup>1</sup>, in the case of education, there is a particular structure: state-run schooling, and subject: student, so that the citizen-subject is student. The concept of the student as a ‘citizen in the making’ corresponds with the sense of ‘cultivating’ a new concept of citizenship that is global in orientation. This paper engages with a selection of scholarly writing in English that was published in the last decade and written from particular liberal democratic contexts (predominantly the U.K., the U.S.A., and Canada<sup>2</sup>). The selected literature diagnoses the need for a more complex theory of citizenship education and theorizes schooling for citizenship in a global orientation. I analyze the literature to call for more explicit attention to the assumptions about the citizen subject student, the ‘who’ of global citizenship education.

In the contemporary context of education theory, citizenship education is looked to both as key to improving on the social function of schooling and as implicated in a perceived dissatisfaction with (if not an all-out crisis) in democratic schooling. At the same time, the prevalence of a

---

<sup>1</sup> See for example, Richardson (2008) who identifies a major obstacle to global citizenship education: “the concept of global citizenship education has, as yet, developed neither the political structures that typically ground citizenship in regularized and generally understood civic practices, nor has it, to date, provided a powerful emotive bond comparable to the “imagined nation” (Anderson, 1991) upon which citizenship is based” (Richardson 2008, 56)

<sup>2</sup> Some authors are specific regarding the context about which they are writing (for example, writers such as Nussbaum, Waltzer, and McIntosh are writing about a U.S. context while Golmohamad uses British examples) and Pike refers to examples from Canada, the U. K., Europe and Western democracies more generally. Others write about a more general ‘democratic schooling’ and ‘citizenship education’ (for example Papastephanou draws on Western philosophical traditions and contemporary Western theorists but does not address particular national contexts).

discourse of globalization and of a need to respond educationally to “global problems” has led to a sense of a global imperative in education wherein schooling is being increasingly pressured to respond to and engage ‘the global’. In this sense, the global imperative is associated with a heightened discourse of global responsibility and a heightened call for explicit responses to contemporary globalization in educational theory and practice (Pashby, 2008). Writing as a secondary school teacher, teacher educator, and educational researcher and theorist in Toronto, Canada, who is committed to social justice and equity-based education, I am interested in the growing sense of a need to provide students in the contexts of the global North with an awareness of global interconnectedness and thus to encourage young people to develop a consciousness of themselves as ‘citizens of the world’. I have been drawn to the concept of Global Citizenship Education (GCE), a term that describes a large body of theoretical literature and a wide range of global awareness initiatives, and for the purposes of this paper, it will refer to literature that theorizes citizenship education in a global orientation- that is, citizenship education that seeks to take-up the global imperative<sup>3</sup>. Much is expected of and assumed in what can be described as a politicized framework of citizenship education, and a nuanced view of the theoretical literature on global orientations to citizenship education reveals some underlying paradoxes.

In my reading of the literature on global citizenship education, there is a strong vision that a ‘global’ citizen is one who ‘responsibly’ interacts with and ‘understands’ others while being self-critical of his/her position and who keeps open a dialogical and complex understanding rather than a closed and static notion of identities (Pashby, 2008). However, in investigating the theorization of citizen subjectivity in GCE, I have identified that global citizenship is often conceptualized as an

---

<sup>3</sup> Indeed, not all of the literature engaged in this essay uses the terminology ‘global citizenship education’. Some authors use ‘cosmopolitan citizenship’ or ‘world citizens’, and some authors may contest my grouping of their works within global citizenship literature, but all of the literature theorizes citizenship and schooling within a contemporary global context that recognizes an urgency to address global issues within a framework of democratic schooling and attempt to theorize citizenship education to meet the realities of the current geopolitical context. Therefore, I group the literature analyzed in this essay as ‘in discussion’ because of the interest in global orientations to citizenship education.

expansion of national citizenship, and it is unclear whether or not a revised democratic citizenship education that ‘expands’ to take up a politics of difference in a global orientation or that adds a global orientation to a national model of citizenship actually alters the status quo (Pashby 2008). Does global citizenship education promote a change in the power relations imbedded in the growing inequities associated with trends of globalization, or does GCE represent another superficial gesture of a liberal notion of global relations? The latter suggests that while paying rhetorical attention to improving global power inequities and adding more complex ideas around identity, GCE principles may remain rooted in humanistic discourses that sit unproblematically beside historically embedded colonialist assumptions about difference. Central to this potential contradiction is the question of just who is seen as the subject of global citizenship education. In other words, exactly *for whom* is global citizenship education key to transforming a notion of responsibility and agency, and *by whom* will the framework of such responsibility and agency be determined? Thus, while I draw on and am implicated in the conceptualization of global citizenship education in my own work, in this paper, I take a moment to map out and elicit some of the assumptions around the citizen-subject in the literature and consider how a critique of global citizenship education pushes for a careful theorizing of subjectivities (the ‘who’ of citizenship education or the ‘citizen-subject’).

Questions of subjectivity and power remain central to a critique of schooling more generally and global citizenship education more specifically especially when considered from within a postcolonial frame. Willinsky (1998) explains how “[w]e are educated in what we take to be the true nature of difference” (1). He also notes an inherent paradox of educating: “if education can turn a studied distance between people into a fact of nature, education can also help us appreciate how that distance has been constructed to the disadvantage of so many people” (1-2). And Mohanty (1990) asserts that the “task at hand is to decolonize our disciplinary and pedagogical practices. The crucial question is how we teach about the West and its Others so that education

becomes the practice of liberation” (191). Therefore, some post-colonially framed questions include: How does the GCE literature conceptualize differences between global citizens? What about those ‘Others’ to whom this ‘global citizen’ needs to ‘imagine’ being responsible<sup>4</sup>? What is the role of those ‘Others’ in determining how responsibility and agency should be articulated and understood within a conceptualization of global citizenship? What about those ‘Others’ in the local/national context who do not identify with or are not identified with the citizen norm? What are the implications for social justice claims of GCE if the concept of global citizenship becomes the purview of the Global North and/or particular subjects in the Global North? In attempting to assess the degree to which these questions are being theorized, I conducted a survey of literature in philosophy of education and educational theory journals as well as in essay compilations written in English to examine the context out of which new and more inclusive and complex approaches to citizenship education, including global citizenship education, are emerging and to look at the ways citizen-subjects are conceptualized.

My research is influenced by the wide-range of teaching experiences I have had. I have taught in a “multicultural” school in Toronto (where over forty first languages are spoken by students); a small school in Northern Quebec with a mix of Cree<sup>5</sup>, French-Canadian and English-speaking students; an elite private school in Brazil; and another large urban school in Toronto which has the largest special education program in the city and deaf and hard of hearing students integrated into mainstream classes. In conducting research and theory work at OISE/University of Toronto into the relationship between discourses of multiculturalism and global citizenship and while encouraging teacher candidates in the initial teacher education program to take-up global issues in their future classrooms, I have been confronting the assumptions I hold around how the concept of citizenship in global citizenship education does or does not take into account the various

---

<sup>4</sup> See Nussbaum’s notion of ‘narrative imagination’.

<sup>5</sup> The Cree is one of the largest First Nations (aboriginal) groups in Canada.

and socially and politically embedded subjectivities of students, teachers, researchers and teacher educators in contemporary contexts. Being white, English-speaking and Protestant-raised, I have generally fit the prescribed norm of national (Canadian) citizenship and have correspondingly benefitted from being unproblematically considered a global citizen by attaining an international teaching position. Considering the concept of GCE from a postcolonial critique has led me to critically self-reflect on and interrogate my good intentions in terms of how I conceptualize GCE from a social-justice lens. In the discussion that follows, I identify that from my perspective here in Toronto, Canada and within the wider-context of the Global North and particular pluralistic Western democracies (such as the USA, the U.K., Australia, New Zealand), global citizenship education is a significant attempt to expand a notion of liberal democratic (national) citizenship to be more complex and to recognize and notice the complicity of nations in global problems so as to promote a sense of participation and responsibility beyond the confines of national borders<sup>6</sup>. However, I argue that while the critical impulse of global citizenship education makes an important move, it may not transform significantly the extant national model of citizenship and therefore may serve to retrench rather than transform power inequities, or it at least it inherits many of the unresolved power dynamics inherent to traditional citizenship education (Pashby 2008). Overall, the assumed subject of GCE pedagogy is the autonomous and European citizen of the liberal nation-state who is seen as normative in a mainstream identification as citizen and who must work to encourage a liberal democratic notion of justice on a global scale by “expanding” or “extending” or “adding” their sense of responsibility and obligation to others through the local to national to global community. I find that theoretical work about the need for an updated view of citizenship education and in promotion of a global orientation to citizenship education contributes a more complex notion

---

<sup>6</sup> As is evident from international conferences and recent attention in anthologies and academic journals (e.g. Banks 2004; Davies 2006; Davies, Evans and Reid 2005; Noddings 2004; Openshaw & White 2005; and O’Sullivan & Pashby, 2008), the concept of GCE is emerging as a particular way to understand cultural conflicts and to promote social justice on a global scale.

of the citizen-subject to accommodate more diversity and to begin to recognize unequal power relations. Ultimately, however, I argue that in this discursive field, the conceptualization of global citizen education assumes a particular normative national citizen and that this assumption must be probed and made more explicit.

### **Troubles in the ‘Garden’: The Malaise of Democratic Schooling**

The notion of ‘cultivating citizenship’ is a common trope in education theory literature and in popular discourse, and serves as an interesting way to look into the context surrounding calls for new approaches to citizenship education<sup>7</sup>. The recent surge in theorizing citizenship education is connected to a deep level of dissatisfaction with the state of democratic schooling in Western democracies<sup>8</sup>. This sense of disillusionment is implicated in theorizing global citizenship education in terms of defining the context out of which calls for new approaches to citizenship education are emerging. Walzer (2002) complains that Americans are currently doing “education on the cheap” (66), and Marginson (2006) asserts that “it must be said that in the garden of democracy in education not all is growing well—if there is no crisis, there is certainly a malaise” (206). The analogy is not lost here, for commonly schooling is seen as the central social institution for the ‘cultivation’ of ‘citizens’. Following this analogy, the garden itself is suffering a “malaise”; the project of cultivating citizens is recognized for certain inherent paradoxes at the same time that it is receiving a particular urgency within the global imperative. The question is whether we need to, a) add new ‘seeds’, use new gardening utensils (by adding to or making slight alterations to citizenship education), and make room for a larger, more diverse garden (by ‘extending’ extant

---

<sup>7</sup> I found the idea of ‘cultivating’ citizenship to be both explicitly and implicitly central to conceptualizing citizenship education in the literature I looked at as well as in popular understandings. A general google search procures 2,470,000 and a google scholar search comes up with over 54, 800 hits for “cultivating citizenship”.

<sup>8</sup> It is significant to note that the bulk of these authors write out of a U.S. context wherein attempts to theorize a changed notion of citizenship education emerge largely out of a dissatisfaction with a more general notion of democratic schooling, but are evoked in particular response to the neoliberal political context of post-9-11, George W. Bush, ‘No Child Left Behind’ America. These discussions around neoliberal policies’ adverse impacts on democratic schooling are also prevalent in Canada (e.g. Joshee 2009), Australia (e.g. Howard & Patten 2006) and the U.K. (e.g. Gillborn 2006).

notions of citizenship education), *or b*) rip-up the garden and significantly re-theorize citizenship and the relationship between schooling and democratic citizenship.

Indeed, the ‘garden of democratic schooling’ appears to reproduce itself despite attempts to the contrary. Glass (2000) reminds us how “wittingly or not, schools rank, sort, and merge the masses into an ideological order that unfairly reproduces an unjust status quo” (278). And while Dale (2000) asserts the lack of recognition of the political and economic motivations behind curricular factors and for the involuntary and imposed nature of their reception, McIntosh (2004) laments the neoliberal context within which the education system has settled for solipsism and a narrowly functional definition of citizenship that “produces people who are employable and do not ask broader questions” (30). Walzer (2002) acknowledges how difficult it is to teach the historical knowledge, critical attitudes, political competence, and sense of solidarity required for democratic citizenship and points out that “what is necessary is not only well-funded and imaginatively run public schools but also a body of citizens who are already functioning well” (73).

At the root (pun intended) of these diagnoses lie two key paradoxes. First, as Glass (2000) points out, public education in democracy accentuates inequities among students and citizens so that educational, social, economic, and political power is unfairly distributed along the lines of class, race, gender and ability: “Yet no other institution besides public education endeavours even to begin to address these issues. Schools, with all their faults and despite questions about their own causal role in the injustices, remain crucial to a hope for creating more fair and equitable communities” (279). Secondly, Ladson-Billings (2004) identifies a paradox of method whereby passive, irrelevant and non-controversial curriculum and instruction are employed to prepare students for active citizenship. For example, she notes that in schools, citizenship is defined in a limited sense of ‘service’, and she points to a tendency to focus on local community service:

“Students are recruited to collect canned goods for the hungry without discussion and guidance about why hunger continues to exist in a country with a surplus of food” (78).

Marginson’s (2006) review of five books on contemporary concerns around democracy and education<sup>9</sup> evokes the ‘extension’ metaphor when he addresses the problems with democratic schooling in the current neoliberal context. The books share a common commitment to public schooling as fundamental to the formation of democratic agents and practices but also testify to the dissatisfactions. Based on the different theorization of democratic schooling represented in his review, Marginson calls for further theorizing that moves beyond diagnosis of problems and towards a conceptualization of agency: “Above all, how would [the authors of the books reviewed—and presumably those of us theorizing and researching citizenship education today--] *extend* democracy – that is, how would they augment the formation of individual and collective democratic agency in education, particularly in schooling, which is their site of investigation?” (208, emphasis added). Beyond the familiar critiques of New Right and neoliberal phenomena, he insists on challenging the conditions in which power/ knowledge systems reproduce themselves. This will require a focus on larger democratic questions; thus he urges theorists to emancipate themselves from the ‘there is no alternative’ mentality to do the difficult but possible work of imagining and creating new political alternatives: “When there is an alternative, the political landscape will look very different” (218). Therefore, the literature points to significant dissatisfactions with democratic schooling as a place for the ‘cultivation of citizens’ and probes for an ‘extension’ of democracy through schooling. Yet, while there is a call for extending democratic citizenship, there is also a strong sense of a need to transform and change it. The ‘malaise of democratic education’ acquires a particular urgency within a context of the global imperative.

---

<sup>9</sup> The five books include: Michael Apple’s *Educating the “Right” Way*, Denis Carlson’s *Leaving Safe Harbors*, A. Belden Fields and Walter Feinberg’s *Education and Democratic Theory*, Trevor Gale and Kathleen Densmore’s *Engaging Teachers*, and Klas Roth’s *Democracy, Education and Citizenship*.



## **‘Extending’ Citizenship: Knowing ‘Our Citizen-Self’ and ‘Others’**

In response to the dissatisfaction with democratic schooling that reproduces rather than working to improve social inequities, many theorists call for a revived and critical approach to citizenship education that talks to rather than stepping over conflicts and controversies by incorporating a level of self-critique and critical consciousness-raising. According to my interpretation of the literature, central to this social-justice orientation to global citizenship education is the concept of extending or expanding one’s citizen-identity from local to global. Theorizing a self-critical global citizen calls attention to the conceptualization of citizen subjectivity, or what I call ‘citizen-selves’. Glass (2000) argues that schooling must help students to grasp that human historicity and distanciality mean that everyone is shaped to some degree by the prevailing dominant norms and standards and that these norms are always defined through struggles into which some can and some cannot enter. In the context of global citizenship education, Glass’s theory of schooling represents the structure through which global citizens might be imagined as the global citizen-student. Evoking the extension metaphor, Glass (2000) theorizes the broadening of a polyvocal discourse of citizenship wherein different, multiple, complex and contradictory identities are given voice and boundaries shift and challenge oppressive dominant norms and standards. Such an inclusive view of citizen identity widens the possibilities for who ‘belongs’ as a citizen and how, and Glass’s work in that piece calls for a new view of citizenship that could be expanded by those applying a global orientation to citizenship education. He calls for an extension of democratic citizenship to embrace a more inclusive and complex notion of identity through extant models of schooling. A useful question raised by a consideration of Glass’s suggestion would be what current practices and processes of democratic schooling are compatible with and which ones must be jettisoned or re-worked in order to incorporate such complexity and polyvocality? In other words, how far can the extant notion of citizenship extend? As a concept, is liberal democratic citizenship

flexible enough to include a complex re-theorizing of the citizen-self or is he calling for an entirely new version of citizenship?

To be sure, the historical roots of inclusion and exclusion that Glass prioritizes are integral to theorizing citizen-subjectivity in a global orientation that works to promote social justice. This is especially the case when read through Mohanty's (1990) view that "[the] issue of subjectivity represents a realization of the fact that who we are, how we act, what we think, and what stories we tell become more intelligible within an epistemological framework that begins by recognizing existing hegemonic histories" (185). And Pike (2008) raises the importance of an explicit treatment of how the "extension" of citizenship is conceptualized. He identifies that a fundamental principle of global citizenship is that "an individual's awareness, loyalty, and allegiance can and should extend beyond the borders of a nation to encompass the whole of humankind" (Pike 2008, 225). This idea of extending awareness and loyalty, he argues, is the "bedrock" for the other dimensions of global citizenship including rights, responsibility, and participation. Pike calls attention to the importance of the way that global citizens narrate an understanding of this extension. He unpacks how certain legends of "the global" blend fact and myths into powerful stories that shape culture and lives. These legends are often "stepped in morality" as citizens make sense of who "we" are and how "we" fit in: "Just as legends about heroes and villains helped us understand our developing selves in childhood, so legends about the world assist in our understanding of where we fit in the global system: rich or poor, free or fettered, powerful or weak, fortunate or disadvantaged" (Pike 2008, 226). He points out that these legends become rooted in culture and become normative within the dominant culture to the point that any attempt to change how 'the global' is conceptualized is highly resisted. He recognizes that global educators are trying to suggest revisions to the prevailing post industrial and scientific revolution legend of "the world", a legend that is shaped by patriarchy and colonialism and is driven by free market forces of capitalism. He laments the fact that

prevailing narrative accounts of global relations leave out accounts of poverty and oppression as well as the perseverance of traditional subsistence living and that instead, the lives of billions of people are portrayed in a way that enables “feelgood” measures through developmental aid and humanitarian assistance: “From a position of power, it is safer to tinker with a few minor details than to radically alter the plot” (Pike 2008, 226). Pike’s work highlights the importance of being explicit about who controls and is included and normalized and who is excluded and marginalized in the concept of how one *expands* citizenship to become aware of and loyal to global ‘Others’.

In a similar move to Glass and relating to Pike’s call for new legends of global citizenship, Golmohamad (2004) looks to citizenship education as a site of possibilities for an expanded, more complex notion of citizen-subjectivity. In theorizing a concept of a “world citizen” who serves a global community, she favours a “thick” notion of identity over a “thin” one where thin is constituted by status and thick refers to a state of being in which citizenship has self-knowledge and is embedded in social practices. By drawing on Nussbaum’s notion of narrative imagination within this context, Golmohamad promotes that a thick notion of identity is an appropriate model for educating for world citizenship because a thick citizen is conceptualized through the notion of an integrated self and engages at various levels including local, national, and international. Her thick concept of the citizen-self is integral to and *extendable* to various levels of community:

The concept of service to the community may well be considered as a voluntary act that can be perceived as an extension of oneself if one can accept the notion of the integrated self. The self becomes perceived as an integral aspect of the community. The community can then begin with the self and extend to the family, local, national and trans-national community. (145)

Her theory relies on the assumption that a change in consciousness of the self can “enable active, responsible citizens...of the local community, the State, the world” (134). The concept of

“extending oneself” invokes a notion of extension through discrete communities (family, region, nation, world). Through a framework for change in consciousnesses, Golmohamad—like Glass—makes a move away from the homogenous and static citizen and emphasizes the significance of a complex concept of subjectivity in relation to the notions of responsibility and community.

Theories of “an integrated self” (*à la* Golmohamad) or a notion of “polyvocality” (*à la* Glass) are attractive when posited against a static and homogenizing tradition of citizenship education and the prevailing “legend” of the global that Pike laments, and they open up a space for negotiating different identities within the concept of citizenship. However, in terms of an engagement with difference, some questions arise. In what ways might adding to citizenship education a more polyvocal discourse or a notion of an integrated self extending through communities rely on a discourse of diversity that serves to reify what Glass and Golmohamad seek to resist? As Fitzsimons (2000) states, “When there is talk in education about ‘difference,’ ‘culture,’ ‘identity,’ and so on, the tendency is to try to pin down a unity that is supposedly signified by these terms” (518). Can we still desire and work towards unity, community, and solidarity without falling back on a static notion of universality<sup>10</sup> or on a hegemonic Western notion of citizen-subjectivity? While looking at a polyvocal, inclusive, and integrated conceptualization of citizen identity, to what degree does there remain a dominant assumption about how citizens conceive of themselves as individuals and as members of a global community? Do all citizens-subjects’/students’ integrated and complex identities extend in a linear extension through the local-national-global communities in the same way? What assumptions about the identities of students are unchallenged in this view of self and community and to what extent is there a potential contradiction between the complex and

---

<sup>10</sup> Discussions of global citizenship education appeal strongly to a discourse of Human Rights as a basis for unity; yet, certain critiques raise problematics around the conflation of human rights and citizenship. This is significant area for further consideration (see Covalleski 2003, Noddings, Kiwan 2005, Isin & Turner 2007).

polyvocal concept of citizen identity that troubles a homogenizing view and the notion of citizenship identity extending from local to national to global communities?

Related to the theorizing of the citizen-self, a redefinition of knowing the self and others responds to dissatisfactions with the project of schooling for democratic citizenship. Importantly, Glass places a great deal of significance on a notion of “knowing” identity within power structures in order to promote agency: “Without a grasp of the cultural and historical formation of their identities within unequal and unjust power relationships, students cannot know who they are and who they might become” (297). The student-citizen-self is defined and even redefined through knowing “who s/he is” and through knowing others. Thus, an explicit engagement with difference is central to the theorizing of citizenship identity in the global imperative. Papastephanou (2003) draws on the notion of the intersubjective dimensions of schooling as reflexive in that the interpersonal aspect of education is rooted in how one’s identity conditions and is conditioned by that of the ‘Other’ and group of ‘Others’. The link between knowing self and Other is transformatory: “[W]hat changes in our philosophical understanding of the self and its relation to the Other and the community can radicalize our constructions of school models and orient them to more humane and less antagonistic educational policy and planning” (395). However, echoing Fitzsimons (2000), she insists that “an actual engagement with and care for the Other” cannot be achieved by a pedagogical ideal based solely on an emphasis on difference because while a discourse of diversity can improve existing ideals, it cannot achieve more than a “radicalisation of liberalist tolerance” (401). She conceptualizes a self-in-process who is not “blind to the Other within” and who is always “displaced and ‘reshuffled’”; thus she recognizes the forces that disrupt the unity of the subject (401). Her vision of “democratic symmetrical reciprocity” redefines the self in order to re-direct the notion of ‘the Other’ with whom the self is in a community. In this sense,

Papastephanou's theory of citizen subjectivity would problematize a conceptualization of extending—local to national to global—citizenship because it suggests this process is not so linear.

Papastephanou's theory is ambitious in its re-working of a notion of the citizen-self; yet, despite aiming to trouble “the bipole of subject vs community” around which pedagogical ideals have revolved, Papastephanou—like Golmohamad and Glass—does not explicitly determine whether this citizen-self is any person belonging to any political (state) community (to USA *or* Somalia *or* Taiwan, for example) or any community at all (neighbourhood, religious community, sub-culture), nor is a distinction made between being a citizen and being a member of a family. There is no overt discussion of whether these notions of self and citizen are universal and can be applied globally and across contexts, or whether the type of political work desired by these projects of citizen-self theorizing are directed specifically at Western, Northern, liberal democratic subjects/students/citizens, or particular citizen-subjects within those societies (those students whose are identified with the norm). The focus appears to be on linking to ‘the Other’, but it is not clear whether this ‘other’ is any other person, or is a particularly ‘different’ person from the citizen-subject. Also, there appears to be a need for a spatial discourse here. Is the same process of ‘self-Other’ suitable for ‘understanding Others’ in one’s immediate environment, or is it a particular process of subjectivity and relating with and ‘knowing’ ‘Others’ who are ‘far away’? It may be useful to specifically attend to and explicitly focus on the need for certain citizens in Northern-Western contexts to be more aware of and responsible to both local and global ‘Others’, to those members of the ‘global community’ who are often tokenized or ignored. Indeed, from a post-colonial perspective, a hegemonic citizen is normalized as a particular Northern/Western citizen and the status of this concept of citizenship as an unmarked term reinforces colonialism. It is therefore very important to distinguish an agenda to name and interrogate privileged citizen-positions from one where global citizens are homogenized as those who fit a ‘Northern-Western’ norm.

The distinction between interrogating privilege and assuming a normalized citizen-subject is relevant when considering Nussbaum's (2002) work on educating for citizenship in an era of global connection. Central to her understanding of a global orientation to citizenship education is a re-imagining of the citizen-self and its relations to 'others' which again raises the question of who 'needs' to 'know' others. Nussbaum (2002) promotes three capacities as central to equipping students for the challenges of global citizenship education. She argues that the required portion of the liberal arts education in American universities can be reformed so as to promote three key capacities for global citizenship: a) a critical view of self and one's traditions, b) a recognition of one's self as tied to all humans, and c) a capacity for "narrative imagination" which is a synthesis of first two. She evokes the cultivation narrative as well as a vision metaphor: "[W]e need to educate the eyes of our students, by cultivating their ability to see complex humanity in places where they are most accustomed to deny it. Defeating these refusals of vision requires not only a general literary education, but also one that focuses on groups with which our citizens' eyes have particular difficulty" (301). Therefore, the traditional view of citizenship education is extended and adapted to include self-criticality. The overt conceptualization of the context of one's own citizen identity is an important move because it opens a critical space a) for understanding that citizenship traditions are not neutral but are framed by social positions and power dynamics, b) for recognizing the complexity inherent to global relations, and c) for promoting an engagement with 'Others' and with difference. However, there is a potential irony in this theory of *global* citizenship in the focus on "our citizens"—who are particularly 'blind' or 'unable to see' certain groups—because it suggests that a *global* orientation to citizenship education is actually an adjustment to *national* citizenship education. The assumed citizen-subject is a particular college student with particular traditions to acknowledge and critique; it is a normative view of a national citizen reaching out to and recognizing the 'global Other'. A recognition of the specific position of Northern subjects globally,

and those attending Liberal Arts Colleges in the United States in particular, is extremely important within a post-colonial move if it includes a recognition of privilege and a complicity within global inequalities<sup>11</sup>. Furthermore, in “viewing” global ‘Others’, there is an important epistemological point to be made in terms of acknowledging the limitations of the gaze and the complicity of the gaze within global power relations. It is important to make an explicit distinction because, as Boman insists in an interview with Nussbaum (2002), there is an ethical responsibility inherent to letting someone else exist beyond one person’s understanding of him or her. In a project for solidarity and tolerance, Boman suggests, we must face a difficult question of power: “Could we ask citizens of the world, of a multicultural society, to feel trust without taking possession of the other?” (308)<sup>12</sup>.

Also responding to Nussbaum’s notion of narrative imagination for global citizenship, von Wright (2002) poses an important question around how concepts of space and distance affect a transformative notion of diversity in the global imperative:

Can we actually ‘go visiting’ others in a way that would expand and change our selves and our actions, and not only our arguments? Confronting difference is easier when it happens in a remote place: it is easier when you travel to Kenya and spend some weeks with the Samburu people, then when it happens in your own home. It seems easier to understand and include somebody who is different elsewhere, than to recognize differences in our own context and accept the otherness of one’s neighbor.... Visiting other people does not necessarily confront your values and make you a citizen of the world unless you are willing to make changes in your own life as

---

<sup>11</sup> Andreotti’s (2006) work is very useful in this context when she advocates for the inclusion of a notion of complicity within global citizenship in order to avoid a ‘soft’, liberalist approach in favour of a ‘critical’ post-colonial approach rooted in critical literacy practices.

<sup>12</sup> In her reply to Boman, Nussbaum does acknowledge that there is always a limit to our ability to understand others but warns we should not *assume* that people distant to ourselves are not possible to understand. It is also significant that Boman equates a multicultural society to world citizenship which begs the question of whether or not global citizenship can be conflated with multiculturalism (see Pashby 2006).



well. (414)<sup>13</sup>

The question “global citizenship education *by whom, for whom?*” is pertinent in this context, and von Wright highlights the importance of recognizing the dynamic (inter)connections between ‘local’, ‘national’, and ‘global’ subjectivities. She also positions self-criticality as a necessary precursor to action and as a frame for agency.

McIntosh (2004) also looks to a sense of ‘knowing’ ‘the Other’ in her pedagogical theory of expanding citizenship. She argues that the very definition of citizenship must be changed before the globe itself can be a political and social united. For this to happen, she determines that the political definition of citizenship must be augmented to include more affective definitions:

[The] ideas of loyalty, protection, duties, rights, responsibilities, and privileges would need to be expanded and multiplied to the point where one’s loyalty and expectation of protection come not only from such units as the living place, province or nation, but also from a sense of belonging to the whole world. Within this vast world, the marks of citizenship would need to include affection, respect, care, curiosity, and concern for the well-being of all living beings. (McIntosh 2004, 23)

It is interesting that McIntosh adds a notion of multiplying citizenship dimensions to the expansion concept. She uses a “five phases” framework for “knowing others” through GCE, based on her work developing teacher-led workshops as part of the Seeking Educational Equity and Diversity (or SEED) program. The five stages include: a) acknowledging the absent, b) admitting the need to include the absent, c) recognizing that the absence of the absent is a dynamic that raises questions about power relations, d) internalizing nonbinary thinking by seeing every person as a knower and each person’s knowledge production as worthy of study, and e) redefining the world of

---

<sup>13</sup> See also Kymlicka (2003) when he argues that by glorifying and privileging global connections while avoiding confrontations with intercultural relations at the domestic level, a concept of intercultural citizens can work against the ideals of a multicultural state.

knowledge to be inclusive (McIntosh 2004, Ibrahim 2007). This approach takes up power relations in a way that is not explicit in Nussbaum's "narrative imagination". Like Golmohamad's integrated self, or Glass's polyvocality, McIntosh is interested in conceiving of citizen relations as marked by complexity and movement: "I feel that we desperately need thinking that goes back and forth across the interface between Phases III issues and Phase IV experience, that is, in the actual poignant stories of human beings' textured, relational, and interdependent lives as makers and menders of the fabric of life" (33). McIntosh's framework gives much currency to a notion of 'knowing' and 'including'. The assumption is that 'knowing' oneself and others in terms of 'knowing' power relations will lead to the 'inclusion' of different epistemologies into an understanding of citizenship. Importantly, McIntosh recognizes the gendering of citizenship and this explicit attention to difference within a normalized version of citizenship is important to a critical theory of global citizen-subjectivity "insofar as the public world has been assigned to men, as men's definitions of what citizenship is about have prevailed in its definitions. Within patriarchy, male definitions of reality trump female experience" (25). Thus, she acknowledges that a privileged view controls the concept of citizenship and also suggests that citizens who identify with female experiences of community may not conform to the hegemonic norm of the democratic citizen. From her feminist perspective, there are multiple ways of expanding one's sense of citizenship. McIntosh's work contributes to the complexity of theorizing a global-citizen subject.

I have identified that in many of the conceptualizations of global citizenship, much attention has been paid to recognizing that the global citizen has a complex and pluralistic identity. However, given that GCE is most often theorized as part of the pedagogy for state-run schooling, that citizen is generally understood as a national citizen first. Therefore, there is an underlying sense of a particular citizen-self, whose responsibility it is to 'know' and 'include' those 'Others' who are excluded and thus marginalized. There seems to be a particular 'citizen-self' who is targeted, and

this could be for good strategic and critical reasons, but it seems to be most-often a ‘citizen-self’ who is not ‘Other’. It is not every ‘citizen’ in the world. Given that much of the work seems to assume that a particular national citizen needs global citizenship education, those of us theorizing and researching in this area must work towards including models of global citizenship that account for those not subsumed within the targeted Western, national citizen-subject.

### ***Global Citizenship? Expanding, Extending, Re-Conceiving or Re-trenching (National) Citizenship?***

Global orientations to citizenship education move a notion of citizenship and of schooling into conversations with complex notions of identities and problems of power relations. The conceptualization of citizenship in contemporary Northern/Western democratic contexts is both contentious in that it is associated with an ailing project of democratic education and popular as a central framework for democratic education in the global imperative. An important question has emerged in this analysis: for whom and by whom is global citizenship education being developed? It appears that within a sense of a global imperative, there is a significant need to promote global connectivity, to combat ignorance of global ‘Others’, and to engage students as political agents in global processes. However, at the same time, it is very difficult to describe and imagine a notion of global citizenship that is not merely an extension of and thus rooted in national citizenship and that does not imagine a normative citizen-subject whose identities move naturally and neutrally from a Northern/Western context of family to nation to global community.

An example of the tendency for GCE to equate advocacy for global issues with international visits and local community service is Tanner’s (2007) broad version of what ‘counts’ as GCE in the U. K. context: “Education for global citizenship offers many opportunities for community involvement at local, national and international levels. Children and young people in school can participate in practical projects such as tree-planting or energy conservation; in intercultural

exchange through school twinning or international visits; or through campaigning on global issues” (155). While such an array of activities may encourage GCE principles, the focus is on extant and traditional citizenship activities that could preclude any transformative potential and may remain “soft” GCE (Andreotti 2006). There is also an inherent assumption that citizen identities are neutral and transferable to any local, national, or global context. Such an approach does not revise the prevailing legend of ‘the global’ that Pike (2008) interrogates. He recognizes that the task of “spreading global consciousness, or the promotion of an ethos of global citizenship within our educational institutions” has been attempted for a while (Pike 2008, 226-227). And he cites activities similar to those Tanner outlines when describing what global educators have been trying to do. He notes that the current generation of youth have an increased environmental awareness among students and more exposure to “what’s going on in the world” through media exposure. He also concurs that they have more opportunities for cross-cultural dialogue. However, he argues that “the collective impact of such developments is as yet insufficient in strength and focus to make the breakthrough required to reconstruct the prevailing legend” (Pike 2008, 227).

It is significant that when McIntosh (2004) discusses global citizenship, she defends the extension move as working against a general ignorance of global concerns in the U.S.—thus interrogating a prevailing legend—wherein other peoples and nations are “mostly seen as competitors, threats, or unknowns, none of them measuring up to the United States” (26). Noddings (2004) also insists that “American students will have to accept some hard facts about their own nation in order to become global citizens” (12). In this context, McIntosh (2004) envisions global citizenship as a widening of loyalty: “Can U.S. educators muster the character needed to widen the sense of loyalty and care in themselves and in students beyond the units of family, team, class, school, town, city, state, and nation?” (26). Is this *global* citizenship education, or is it an improved version of *American* citizenship education? Perhaps traditional American (or Canadian or British)

citizenship education is in fact in need of a global approach that will assist in self-critique and will contribute a language of privilege and complicity in order to interrogate American (or North-Western) hegemony. Furthermore, global citizenship might indeed require specific critical foci for certain national contexts. However, such an approach will have to be careful about the way it frames the concept of *global* citizenship. While it is important to work against ignorance—as Nussbaum insists—and to include historical and contemporary analyses of global relations as central to democratic education—as Glass points out—it is not clear whether or not in a specifically imagined national citizenship context, a global citizenship education approach will succeed in making a major shift in how community is understood and practiced within a global imperative if the global citizen imagined is assumed to be an extension of a hegemonic and particularly positioned Northern/Western national citizen. Again, no matter which angle is prioritized, it is evident that a clearer and more explicit conceptualization of citizen-subjectivity needs to be theorized. Further, it is also important not to fall prey to a binary vision of either global *or* national citizenship. As Ghosh (2008) reminds us: “Factors that affect citizenship exist at many levels of society, from the most local through the most global; and it is increasingly necessary to examine how different forces of identity and experience are related. Citizenship has multiple layers and world citizenship is one layer added to local and national citizenship, not replacing them” (89). Ghosh’s statement raises the importance of multiple levels of citizenship co-existing and thus connects to theories of poly-vocal and thick concepts of identity discussed in this paper, yet it also reifies the extension concept where “the global” is the last level to be “added”. Many students in the contexts from which the scholars referred to here are writing (including Canada, the U.K., the U.S., Australia, and New Zealand—as in many other national contexts) may identify more strongly with a home and family elsewhere in a global location or with a transnational community, and the *national* or *local* community may be “added” last in their sense of connection with communities.

There appears to be much assumed about and much desired from a notion of global responsibility through a citizenship education model. This discussion has provided some important critical questions required for further theorizing around a global citizenship agenda rooted in a key concern: is global citizenship education actually national citizenship for ‘global awareness’? And if so, how can educators harnesses this conceptualization in a critical way so as to promote the recognition of the privileging of certain citizen-subjectivities? Can citizenship be re-conceptualized or is it so entrenched in a nation-state framework that it can only be imagined in terms of extending towards “the global” rather than being constituted within a notion of “the global”? Or, can some global citizens understand themselves as “global” first and then as extending to “national” and “local”? Ultimately then, the citizen-student can be taught about “global citizenship” as a pedagogical concept, and citizenship education theorists have taken-on the concept in important ways, but in terms of political agency, the state structure remains essential to the concept of citizenship.

This critique highlights the importance of including a range of epistemologies and ontological traditions so that multiple “global citizen selves” are conceptualized not solely through the Western norm, but also through diverse perspectives that challenge Western humanism and that employ non-Western ontologies to define global citizenship (Andreotti & Souza, 2006). This paper has attempted to present a nuanced sense of the need to do critical work in global orientations to citizenship education. Further projects must work to carefully interrogate the intentions of this agenda and to be explicit about the questions of ‘for whom’ is global citizenship education and ‘by whom’ is it being promoted, so that an ‘add-on’, expansion style of citizenship education does not serve to retrench the very model of citizenship it aims to change. As Marginson points out, the possibility for an alternative form of citizenship is significant and can be viewed as a political imperative in the current global context.

This paper has raised two issues: a) to what extent is the ‘expansion’ model of ‘cultivating citizenship’ a useful way or a limited model through which to theorize global consciousness, responsibility and agency via schooling, particularly given the ‘malaise’ of democratic schooling, and b) how ‘global’ is the global citizen-student? As I continue to probe my own assumptions about the ‘who’ of GCE in my teaching practice with secondary students and teacher candidates and in my work in research and theory in education, I have begun to reflect on the trope of ‘the garden of democracy’: Is GCE a matter of pruning the perennials, fixing up national citizenship education, or can it plant ‘new seeds’ for cultivating global citizens?

## References:

- Andreotti, V. 2006. "Soft versus critical global citizenship education", *Development Education Policy and Practice*, Issue 3, Autumn, 83-98.
- Andreotti, V., and Souza, L. 2008. "Translating theory into practice and walking minefields: lessons from the project 'Through Other Eyes'". *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 1(1), pp. 23-36
- Banks, J. (Ed.). 2004. *Diversity and citizenship education: global perspectives*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc, (3-15).
- Boman, Y; Gustavsson, B; and Nussbaum, M. 2002. "A Discussion With Martha Nussbaum on 'Education for Citizenship in an Era of Global Connection'", *Studies in Philosophy and Education*. 21, pp. 305-311.
- Byers, M. 2005. "Are You a Global Citizen? Really, What Does That Mean?" *The Tyee*, October 05, 2005. <http://www.thetyee.ca/Views/2005/10/05/globalcitizen/>. Accessed 11/05/2008
- Covaleski, J. 2003. "Paley's Paradox: Educating for Democratic Life", *Philosophy of Education Yearbook*, pp. 330-337.
- Dale, R. 2000. "Globalization and Education: Demonstrating a 'Common World Educational Culture' or Locating a 'Globally Structured Educational Agenda'" *Educational Theory* 50(4), pp. 427-448.
- Davies, Ian; Evans, Mark; and Reid, Alan. 2005. "Globalizing Citizenship Education? A Critique of 'Global Education' and 'Citizenship Education'" *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 53(1), pp. 66-89.
- Davies, Lynn. 2006. "Global citizenship: abstraction or framework for action?" *Educational Review*, 58(1), pp. 5-25.
- Fitzsimons, P. 2000. "Changing Conceptions of Globalization: Changing Conceptions of Education" *Educational Theory*. 50(4), pp. 505-520.
- Gillborn, D. 2006. "Citizenship education as placebo: 'standards', institutional racism and education policy". *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 1 (1), pp. 83-104
- Glass, R. 2000. "Education and the Ethics of Democratic Citizenship" *Studies in Philosophy of Education*, 19, pp. 275-296.
- Golmohamad, M. 2004. "World Citizenship, Identity and the Notion of an Integrated Self" *Studies in Philosophy and Education*. 23, pp. 131-148.
- Ghosh, R. 2008. "The Short History of Women, Human Rights, and Global Citizenship" in Ali A.



- Abdi and Lynette Shultz (Eds.) *Educating for Human Rights and Global Citizenship*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, pp. 81-95.
- Howard, C., & Patten, S. 2006. "Valuing Civics: Political Commitment and the New Citizenship Education in Australia." *Canadian Journal of Education*, 29(2), pp. 454-476.
- Ibrahim, A. 2007. "Linking Marxism, Globalization, and Citizenship Education: Toward a Comparative and Critical Pedagogy Post 9/11" *Educational Theory*. 57(1), pp. 89-103.
- Isin, E. and Turner, B. 2007. "Investigating Citizenship: An Agenda for Citizenship Studies" *Citizenship Studies* 11(1), pp. 5-17.
- Joshee, R. 2009. "Multicultural education policy in Canada: Competing ideologies, interconnected discourses" in James A. Banks (Ed.) *The Routledge International Companion to Multicultural Education*. New York: Routledge, pp. 96-108.
- Kiwan, D. 2005. "Human Rights and Citizenship: an Unjustifiable Conflation?" *The Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 39(1), pp. 37-50.
- Kymlicka, W. 2003. "Multicultural states and intercultural citizens", *Theory and Research in Education*. 1(2), 147-169.
- Ladson-Billings, G. 2004. "Differing Concepts of Citizenship: Schools and Communities as Sites of Civic Development" in Nel Noddings (Ed.) *Educating Citizens for Global Awareness*. New York: Teachers College Press, pp. 69-80.
- Marginson, S. 2006. "Engaging Democratic Education in the Neoliberal Age" *Educational Theory* 56(2), pp. 205-219.
- McIntosh, P. 2004. "Gender Perspectives on Educating for Global Citizenship" in Nel Noddings (Ed.) *Educating Citizens for Global Awareness*, pp. 22-39.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. 1990. "On Race and Voice: Challenges for Liberal Education in the 1990s", *Cultural Critique*, Winter, pp. 179-208.
- Noddings, N. 2004. "Global Citizenship: Promises and Problems" and "Conclusion: What Have We Learned?" in Nel Noddings (Ed.) *Educating Citizens for Global Awareness*. New York: Teachers College Press., pp. 1-21 and 122-135.
- Nussbaum, M. 2002. "Education for Citizenship in an Era of Global Connection" *Studies in Philosophy and Education*. 21, pp. 289-303
- Openshaw, R and White, C. 2005. "Democracy at the Crossroads" in Cameron White and Roger Openshaw (Eds). *Democracy at the crossroads: international perspectives on critical global citizenship education*. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, pp. 3-11.

- O'Sullivan, M and Pashby, K. (Eds). 2008. *Citizenship education in the era of globalization: Canadian perspectives*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Pashby, K. 2006. *Citizenship and Diversity in the Global Imperative: What Does Global Citizenship Education Mean for Multiculturalism?* Master's Thesis, York University.
- Pashby, K. 2008. "Demands on and of citizenship and schooling: 'Belonging' and 'diversity' in the global imperative". In M. O'Sullivan & K. Pashby (Eds.) *Citizenship education in the era of globalization: Canadian perspectives*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, pp. 9-26.
- Papastephanou, M. 2003. "Education, Subjectivity and Community: Towards a democratic pedagogical ideal of symmetrical reciprocity", *Educational Philosophy and Theory*. 35(4), pp. 395-406.
- Pike, G. 2008. "Reconstructing the Legend: Educating for Global Citizenship" in Ali A. Abdi and Lynette Shultz (Eds.) *Educating for Human Rights and Global Citizenship*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, pp 223-237
- Richardson, G. 2008. "Caught Between Imaginaries: Global Citizenship Education and the Persistence of the Nation", in Ali Abdi and Lynette Shultz (Eds.) *Educating for Human Rights and Global Citizenship*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, pp. 55-64.
- Tanner, J. 2007. "Global Citizenship" in David Hicks and Cathie Holden (Eds.) *Teaching the Global Dimension: Key principles and effective practice*. New York: Routledge, pp. 150-160.
- von Wright, M. 2002. "Narrative Imagination and Taking the Perspective of Others" *Studies in Philosophy and Education*. 21, pp. 407-416.
- Walzer, M., Shaughnessy, M. and Sardoc, M. 2002. "An Interview with Michael Walzer" *Studies in Philosophy and Education*. 21, pp. 65-75.
- Willinsky, John. 1998. *Learning to Divide the World: Education at Empire's End*. Minnesota: Minnesota Press.
- Wood, P. 2008. "The Impossibility of Global Citizenship". In M. O'Sullivan & K. Pashby (Eds.) *Citizenship education in the era of globalization: Canadian perspectives*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, pp. 27-40.