



JSSE

[Journal of
Social
Science
Education](#)

2021, Vol. 20(2) 05-25

Edited by:
Mehmet Açıklın, Olga
Bombardelli, Gina
Chianese

Article

Global Citizenship Education for Non-Citizens?

Eirik Julius Risberg

Nord University

Keywords: global citizenship education, cosmopolitanism, citizenship, postcolonial theory, human rights

- Global Citizenship Education is one of the fastest-growing educational reform movements in educational research and policy development.
- Recent theoretical development, however, has given rise to a plethora of different conceptions of what Global Citizenship Education is, and to whom it is directed.
- Conceptions of Global Citizenship Education that construe it as an extension of Citizenship Education end up excluding non-citizens, such as migrants and refugees.
- Despite the importance of fostering an awareness of existing social injustice, Global Citizenship Education must therefore take the form of a moral cosmopolitanism.

Purpose: This article seeks to examine whether Global Citizenship Education is able to address non-citizens, such as migrants and refugees. While conceptions of Global Citizenship Education differ, the popular conception of Global Citizenship Education as an extension of Citizenship Education has left the role of non-citizens precarious and in need of explanation.

Approach: Through a theoretical analysis of the dominant approaches to Global Citizenship Education, the article seeks to expose a lacuna in the postcolonial conception of Global Citizenship Education.

Findings: Acknowledging that postcolonial theory has provided a necessary corrective to naïve forms of cosmopolitanism, I argue that a moral or cosmopolitan approach to Global Citizenship Education is more accommodating to non-citizens by allowing them to take part in the conversation. In increasingly diverse societies it is paramount that Global Citizenship Education is able to speak to citizens and non-citizens alike in seeking to foster future global citizens.

Corresponding Author:

Eirik Julius Risberg, Faculty of Education and Arts, Nord University, Box 1490, 8049 Bodø, Norway,
E-Mail: Eirik.j.risberg@nord.no

Suggested citation:

Risberg, E. J. (2021): *Global Citizenship Education for Non-Citizens?*. Journal of Social Science Education 20 (2). <https://doi.org/10.4119/jsse-3912>

Declaration of Conflicts of Interests: none

 **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made.

1 INTRODUCTION

In a world reeling in the grip of a number of interrelated global challenges, frequent high-profile calls are made for the need to foster global citizens (Obama, 2008; Ki-moon, 2012; Guterres, 2019). Facing the highest numbers of refugees ever recorded (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees [UNHCR], 2020), an expected increase in refugees and migrants (International Organization for Migration [IOM], 2019), declining support for democracy (Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance [IDEA], 2019), growing populist tendencies (The Foundation for European Progressive Studies [FEPS], 2020), and impending environmental catastrophe (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [IPCC], 2019), it seems imperative that we adopt a global outlook and encourage cooperation across national borders. The web of interconnected communication and trade relations – as the recent and ongoing Covid-19 pandemic has made evidently clear – has made us all perilously dependent on each other, and only through concerted action do we stand a chance to address the barrage of global challenges confronting us.

The urgency of these problems is evident, but beyond immediate and concerted action a more fundamental change in mindset is thus required. In envisaging a more long-term solution to the glaring demand for action, repeated calls have therefore been made by politicians, researchers and educators alike to implement educational programs to foster global citizens. Education, it is believed, holds a key role in addressing these challenges and has been invoked as instrumental for reaching the UN Sustainable Development Goals (Guterres, 2019). However, while the debate on Global Citizenship Education (GCE) is rich and growing, the place of non-citizens in Global Citizenship Education – most prominently refugees and immigrants – has not been adequately addressed. Lacking citizenship, how do non-citizens fit into the scheme of fostering global citizens? Are non-citizens (potential) global citizens, or is global citizenship for citizens only? And what *kind* of Global Citizenship Education would be best suited to accommodate non-citizens, such as immigrants and refugees, in shaping the global citizen of the 21st Century?

The worry may at first glance seem puzzling, and it is tempting to assume that it relies on a misunderstanding. Talk of ‘global citizenship’, it may be argued, is not meant to imply *political* or *national* citizenship transposed to the global level, and so the purpose of Global Citizenship Education is not to prepare students for social and political participation in a future ‘world state’. Rather, global citizenship, we are told, is set of values, skills, dispositions and attitudes – a global *orientation* – and the task of Global Citizenship Education is to foster what is often referred to as a global *stance* or *mindset* appropriate for inhabitant of an increasingly interconnected and interdependent world, which we may refer to as members of a ‘global community’, or, more metaphorically, as ‘global citizens’. This would be a form of *cultural* (Banks, 2009) or *felt* citizenship (Osler & Starkey, 2005), and given that non-citizens, such as refugees and migrants, are just as much global citizens or potential global citizens in this sense as anyone else, their

existence should not require special explanation or somehow be seen to pose a problem for Global Citizenship Education.

However, while this characterization may seem to be in line with the idea of global citizenship as it is expressed in the policy documents by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2013, 2015, 2018) and to capture the tenor of the many high-profile calls to foster global citizens, the worry arises when we consider the role of *education* in cultivating future global citizens. As theorists in education likes to remind us, education has traditionally taken place within a national context and against a historical and political background; the skills, values and attitudes to be fostered have traditionally been determined by the needs and particular situation of the nation-state, and the role of education has traditionally seen to be to prepare students for future social and political participation in the state (Schugurensky & Myers, 2003; Banks & Nguyen, 2008; Banks, 2009; Starkey, 2017). As we can no longer ignore the global nature of the challenges facing us however, Citizenship Education (CE) cannot be limited to issues pertaining to the nation-state. Our actions have repercussions far beyond our borders and we are so enmeshed technologically, economically and environmentally that a Citizenship Education that is limited to the needs and interest of a single state seems outmoded and must be extended to include global issues and to foster a global perspective. Conceived as an attempt to amend or extend traditional Citizenship Education beyond the boundaries of the nation-state however, Global Citizenship Education remains a form of *Citizenship* Education; a deliberate attempt at crafting or remodelling citizens of a nation-state into globally oriented citizens. Expanding Citizenship Education into Global Citizenship Education thus still takes the *citizen* as its starting-point – leaving it unclear how the educational framework can be said to also pertain to non-citizens.

While immediately appealing, hinting at a universal ideal, upon further reflection therefore, there seems to be a conundrum at the heart of Global Citizenship Education. Moreover, as all of the component concepts – ‘global’, ‘citizen’, and ‘education’ – are themselves highly contested, and with scholars positioning themselves along multiple axes in these debates, it would be surprising if that complexity did not pass over into the discussion on Global Citizenship Education. As a consequence, scholars have identified multiple diverging conceptions of Global Citizenship Education in the literature, exposing a rich plethora of views on how to understand global citizenship and Global Citizenship Education. However, while a number of lines of contention have been identified (Oxley & Morris, 2013; Veugelers, 2011), the notion of *citizenship* seems to stand out as a particularly important demarcation line in the literature (Wintersteiner *et al.*, 2015; Tarozzi & Torres, 2016). Thus, whereas some see citizenship as a political concept, which, through a critical or postcolonial critique of social injustice and the colonial Western perspective can give rise to a form of *global* citizenship, and thereby conceive of Global Citizenship Education an extension of traditional Citizenship Education, others see citizenship as a moral status, and Global Citizenship Education as

aiming at fostering global citizens through cultivating a set of cosmopolitan skills, attitudes, and values. Either way, it seems one's conception of Global Citizenship Education is inextricably linked to one's notion of a global *citizen*.

In the following, I seek to explore these two main conceptions of Global Citizenship Education in the context of an age of mass migration and the possible implications adopting one or the other may have for fostering global citizens in populations containing a high number of migrants and refugees. I begin, in section one, by tracing the historical roots of the notion of Global Citizenship Education and discuss the two main directions of Global Citizenship Education identified in the literature. In the second section of the paper, I address recent postcolonial criticism of what is arguably the most prevalent conception of global citizenship and Global Citizenship Education: a form of moral cosmopolitanism. While acknowledging some of the important contributions by postcolonial thinkers to the debate, I argue that a critical-political conception of global citizenship risks reifying the distinction between citizens and non-citizens, and thus effectively exclude non-citizens from participating in Global Citizenship Education. Despite the valuable contribution of postcolonial theory to Global Citizenship Education, it does not address itself to non-citizens and has thus little to offer the non-citizen in terms of becoming a global citizen. In the third section, I briefly point towards a moral cosmopolitanism which places human rights at the heart of Global Citizenship Education as the best way to foster global citizens in populations consisting of both citizens and non-citizens. While this is not to deny the importance of a transformative Global Citizenship Education, it seems paramount that a Global Citizenship Education worthy of its name must be able to accommodate citizens and non-citizens alike.

2 THE IDEA OF A GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

While the notion of global citizens or global citizenship boasts an ancient legacy, the related idea of a Global Citizenship Education has emerged gradually in international discourse over the past decades (Schattle, 2008; Wintersteiner *et al.*, 2015; Davies, 2008; Gaudelli & Schmidt, 2018). As a more specific educational framework however, the origin of Global Citizenship Education can be traced to the UN Secretary-General's Global Education First Initiative (GEFI) from 2012 (Tarozzi & Torres, 2016; Wintersteiner *et al.*, 2015). Arguing that "[e]ducation is a major driving force for human development" the then UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon identified fostering global citizenship as one of the three objectives of Global Education (GE), emphasising that "[e]ducation policies should promote peace, mutual respect and environmental care" (Ki-moon, 2012). In the intervening years, similar policy documents have been developed by national and international organizations (Council of Europe, 2012; OECD, 2018; Oxfam, 2015) and the idea of and perceived need for a Global Citizenship Education has steadily gained momentum in educational circles, making it, as Jeffrey Dill (2012, p.541) notes, "one of the fastest growing educational reform movements today."

A concern for a global approach to Citizenship Education however, is of course not new or without precedent in the theory and philosophy of education. On the contrary, global issues, as well as promoting values, skills and a global outlook in future citizens have been a central part of a more general social science education for a long time (Sant *et al.*, 2020), and predecessors to the pedagogical construct that has been labelled Global Citizenship Education can be found in a range of pedagogies, from Human Rights and Peace Education to Intercultural and Multicultural Education (Davies, 2006; Wintersteiner *et al.*, 2015; Tarozzi & Torres, 2016). Many of these implicitly or explicitly invoked the need to foster a global perspective on social or political rights or address the (global) causes of war and conflict (Andreopoulos & Claude, 1997).

However, while seeking to cover much of the same ground the new concept, it is often argued, does not make these older pedagogies superfluous, but “combines them or some of their essential components and thereby gives them a new and unique focus” (Wintersteiner *et al.*, 2015, p.3). At first sight, it might not be evident what constitutes the ‘new and unique focus’ offered by Global Citizenship Education. Global Citizenship Education is roundly said to aim to “instil in learners of all ages a commitment to peace, human rights and sustainable development,” and “to empower learners of all ages to become active promoters of more peaceful, tolerant, inclusive, secure and sustainable societies” (UNESCO, 2015). Whereas the first seems to correspond to the objectives of Human Rights Education and Peace Education, the latter is central in variants of Multicultural and Intercultural Education. Is the concept redundant or, worse, simply vacuous and, as Davies (2006) asks, an abstraction?

Upon closer scrutiny however, the particular addition afforded by Global Citizenship Education to the plethora of kindred concepts seems to be its approach to these issues through a focus on *citizenship*. Global Citizenship Education, Tarozzi and Torres argue, addresses key themes in Global Education, such as peace, a sustainable future and human rights, “by reading them through the meaningful lenses of citizenships as the key educational goal” (2016, p.4). As a consequence, different conceptions of Global Citizenship Education can therefore be distinguished, at least partly, with respect to how they conceive of citizenship. Having grown into a rich and complex field with an array of difference conceptions of Global Citizenship Education, as Winersteiner *et al.* chimes in, “[i]t is always the divergent interpretations of the citizenship term that make up the dividing line between them” (Wintersteiner *et al.*, 2015, p.10).

Approached from the notion of citizenship, Global Citizenship Education can be distinguished into two main strands. On the one hand, there are those conceptions of citizenship that interpret global citizenship as an ideal, construing the notion of global citizenship as a *moral* concept and thus Global Citizenship as a form of moral education. On the other, there are those who take a political or structural approach to global citizenship and see Global Citizenship Education primarily as a form of social justice education. Whereas the first, according to Wintersteiner *et al.* “focuses on the individual, who should develop the human qualities of a cosmopolitan (“individual

cosmopolitanism”)” (Wintersteiner *et al.*, 2015, p.10), the latter, which Wintersteiner *et al.* dubs “structural cosmopolitanism,” focuses on societal structures that need to be changed if global citizenship is to be more than an ideal.

While there are notational differences in how the different contributors to the debate label the two approaches, there seems to be an agreement that the relevant distinction is between these two strands – “the humanitarian and the political approach” (Wintersteiner *et al.* 2015, p.10). Thus, Park, Slobuski, and Durkee (2016) argues that “[t]here are two main frameworks for GCE: liberalist, cosmopolitan, and humanist; and critical and postcolonial”; Oxley and Morris (2013) distinguish broadly between “cosmopolitan” and “advocacy” types of Global Citizenship Education, where the former embrace one or another form of cosmopolitan or world community (political, moral, economic and cultural), while the latter is united by taking an advocacy approach to citizenship along one or another dimension (social, critical, environmental and spiritual); and Vanessa de Oliveira Andreotti distinguish between ‘soft’ and ‘critical’ Global Citizenship Education “in terms of basic assumptions and implications for citizenship education”, where the grounds for action are “Humanitarian/moral (based on normative principles for thought and action), [and] Political/ethical (based normative principles for relationships)” (Andreotti, 2014, p.27-28).

The cosmopolitan conception of citizenship – that we are all citizens of the world, or ‘*kosmopolitēs*’ – which is often understood as the idea that all human beings belong to a “*single moral community* based on the idea of freedom” (Peters *et al.* 2008, p.3) can be traced back to antiquity. Both Socrates and Diogenes of Sinope are said to have proclaimed themselves to be citizens of the world (Schattle, 2009; Gaudelli, 2016). The latter, when asked where he was from, is famously reported to have replied that he was “a citizen of the world” and thus, “by identifying himself not as a citizen of Sinope but as a citizen of the world, Diogenes apparently refused to agree that he owed special service to Sinope and the Sinopeans” (Kleingeld & Brown 2019). In drawing the moral boundary wider than the nation-state, cosmopolitanism champions the idea that “the inherent dignity and well-being of each human person warrants equal respect and concern” (Schattle, 2009, p.3).

The cosmopolitan approach to Global Citizenship Education reverberates through the UNESCO formulations. It is emphasised that global citizenship is not a political citizenship, but a global ‘gaze’ or ‘mindset’ (UNESCO, 2015). The objective of Global Citizenship Education, as stated in the first UNESCO document on the topic, is to foster “knowledge, skills, values and attitudes learners need for securing a world which is more just, peaceful, tolerant, inclusive, secure and sustainable” (UNESCO, 2015, p.9). Although the conference leading up to the formulation of the founding document on Global Citizenship Education revealed significant disagreement on the notion of a Global Citizenship Education (UNESCO 2013), the final conception of Global Citizenship Education in the UNESCO documents seems clearly to be moral rather than political.

Despite the strong cosmopolitan current in Global Citizenship Education, there is also a notable political or critical streak to more recent contributions to the literature on Global Citizenship Education. Drawing on critical or social justice pedagogy, a number of scholars have understood Global Citizenship Education to be a branch of transformative pedagogy whose primary aim it is to educate citizens to become globally aware, impressing upon them “a duty to consider the global dimension in all their decisions” (Wintersteiner *et al.*, 2015, p.12). The grounding idea seems to be that Global Citizenship Education is an expansion of traditional Citizenship Education, by which national citizenship is extended or broadened into *global* citizenship (Pashby, 2011, 2012). Tapping into a rich source of critical pedagogy, these scholars thus connect the new pedagogical construct to older pedagogies of global justice, arguing that “justice is a better ground for thinking as it is political and prompts fairer and more equal relations” (Andreotti, 2014 p.23) than soft and squishy cosmopolitan values, and that the global citizen comes about by “‘expanding’ or ‘extending’ or ‘adding’ [learners’] sense of responsibility and obligation to others through the local to national to global community” (Pashby, 2011, p.430).

The political or critical conception of Global Citizenship Education has been taken up and furthered by a number of postcolonial theorists, which sees Global Citizenship Education as an opportunity to “move beyond an exclusively national perspective of world affairs and seek to avoid a social-studies approach that tends to tokenize and exoticize foreign places and peoples” (Pashby, 2012, p.9). However, while acknowledging an indebtedness to critical pedagogy, postcolonial theorists have at times been less impressed with how the former has applied its own main insights, finding shortcomings in many of the classic texts and approaches of critical pedagogy. Thus, “[a]lthough Freirean theory and critical pedagogy foreground social inequalities, oppression, and reflection and action as pathways to social change,” as Michael Zembylas notes, “it is argued that they have ignored the White settler colonial imperatives behind the use and performance of the language and tools of critical pedagogy” (Zembylas, 2018, p.404). By pointing out colonial biases in traditional Global Citizenship Education and by broadening the range of questions and issues under discussion, postcolonial theory has enriched the literature on Global Citizenship Education, revealing the complexity of educating global citizens and the range of issues and perspectives that needs to be taken into account in a Global Citizenship Education.

3 CRITICISM OF GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION FROM POSTCOLONIAL THEORY

While Global Citizenship Education, as noted, has become something of a buzzword in educational circles, the richness and ambiguity of the concept has also laid it open to considerable debate. Multiple and competing conceptions of ‘globalization’ and the ‘global’, a renewed interest in the notion of ‘citizenship’ and the need for new

pedagogies to address the problems of the 21st Century have contributed to generating a fertile and vibrant scholarly interest in Global Education, and Global Citizenship Education in particular (Tarozzi & Torres, 2016; Burbules & Torres, 2000; Kymlicka, 2005). As the debate has begun to mature however, different approaches, theoretical assumptions and concerns have been identified, giving rise to some in-house criticism between proponents identifying with one or the other conception of Global Citizenship Education. Fissures have begun to appear, in particular between those who take a moral-cosmopolitan approach and those who take a critical-political approach to Global Citizenship Education. While on the face of it running the same errand (of fostering global citizenship), the two approaches to Global Citizenship Education seem at times fundamentally opposed.

A particularly pungent criticism of moral-cosmopolitan versions of Global Citizenship Education has come from postcolonial theory. Drawing on the work of political scientist Andrew Dobson and cultural theorist Gayatri Spivak, Andreotti (2011, 2014) has attacked what she sees as the perils of a complacent cosmopolitanism. Distinguishing, as we have seen, between what she dubs a ‘soft’ and a ‘critical’ version of Global Citizenship Education, Andreotti notes that “[i]n order to understand global issues, a complex web of cultural and material local/global processes and contexts needs to be examined and unpacked” (2014, p.22). It is not simply enough to cultivate liberal values if we remain blind to our own hand in perpetuating power-relations that keep people in poverty. If we fail to inculcate a critical reflection in our ‘global gaze’ “we may end up promoting a new ‘civilising mission’ as the slogan for a generation who take up the ‘burden’ of saving/educating/civilising the world” (Andreotti 2014, p.22). In a more recent book, Andreotti and de Sousa (2012, p.1) elaborate on this claim, arguing that:

“despite claims of globality and inclusion, the lack of analyses of power relations and knowledge construction in this area often results in educational practices that unintentionally reproduce ethnocentric, ahistorical, depoliticized, paternalistic, salvationist and triumphalist approaches that tend to deficit theorize, pathologize or trivialize difference.”

The postcolonial reception of a the idea to educate ‘global citizens’ – or at least to how it is currently practised – is scathing. As illustrated by the quote above, postcolonial theory seems to offer a comprehensive and near wholesale criticism of ‘soft’ Global Citizenship Education; from the unwarranted and self-acclaimed monopoly on ‘knowledge’ and ‘truth’ down to a lack of historical awareness. While scholars within the postcolonial tradition vary greatly in the flaws they find in the cosmopolitan approach to global citizenship, to some the ills of a cosmopolitan conception of Global Citizenship Education are virtually limitless, making the notion of a global citizen and Global Citizenship Education dubious or even incoherent. Thus, Dalene Swanton argues that “global citizenship is contradictory and less than innocent, and can be said to be at least partially caught up in the globalization project of neoliberal spread and capitalist

imperialism” (Swanton 2015, p.28). Taking a similar view, Colin Wright argues that, “[b]eing extremely polemical, then, one could argue that global citizenship education is the smiling face of human capital theory” (Wright 2012, p.50) – the view, roughly, that conceives of education as an ‘investment’ which will lead to a higher ‘return’ (Eide and Showalter, 2010). While sometimes deliberately polemical, the most critical of postcolonial theorists seem not only against a cosmopolitan conception of Global Citizenship Education therefore, but against the notion of a global citizen and Global Citizenship Education *tout court*.

A recurring and (slightly) less dismissive postcolonial critique of a cosmopolitan Global Citizenship Education however, emphasises the utter inadequacy of the well-meaning and naïve attempts to understand the ‘Other’; the paternalistic, ethnocentric and self-gratifying gaze that sees needy victims everywhere. At presently, this gaze is experiencing a hey-day: We can hardly avoid the bombardment of images and newsflashes of suffering and poverty impinging on us in a constant and what seems like a never-ending cycle. While it is undoubtedly true that much of the emotional imagery surrounding us is more or less intentionally designed to trigger our emotional responses and thus of limited value in creating an understanding of complex geo-political issues without a good deal of historical and political contextualization, this kind of emotional engagement has also been interpreted as a necessary starting point for further action. As a consequence, repeated and influential calls for the need to empathize with those worse off have been made, and empathy has been construed as a fundamental skill for fostering future global citizens (UNESCO, 2015; Obama, 2006; Slote, 2013). Educationalists, similarly, have argued that empathy is a “necessary building block for multicultural and global consciousness” (Dolby, 2012, p.5), or more generally, that it constitutes “the building block of social life” (Demetriou, 2018) and that it is fundamental for the pursuit of social justice (Dolby, 2012) and the development of values (Cooper, 2011). This seemingly unimpeachable call to empathise with the less fortunate however, has not evaded the scorching criticism of postcolonial theory. As Carolyn Pedwell argues, the “act of ‘choosing’ to extend empathy can itself be a way to assert power” (Pedwell 2016, p.14) and thus, that “empathy may involve forms of projection and appropriation on the part of ‘privileged subjects’ which can reify existing social hierarchies and silence ‘marginal subjects’” (Pedwell 2012, p.283).

These objections against the cosmopolitan conception of the global citizen may have significant implications for how we come to think of Global Citizenship Education. At its extreme, the sweeping criticism from postcolonial theory seems to kick the legs from underneath the cosmopolitan ambition of fostering global citizens through cultivating some kind of ‘global mindset’ or ‘gaze’. Educating for global citizenship, on this conception, is more a matter of *unlearning* old ways of thinking than acquiring new skills, attitudes and values. “[A]pproaches to difference,” as Karen Pashby warns, “must recognize the extent to which those educational initiatives seeking to raise awareness about and learn about ‘others’ are implicated in power relations and colonial ways of

knowing” (2012, p.15). But is the only viable conception of Global Citizenship Education defined negatively, by the exposure of cultural biases and the critique of political and economic hegemonies? And *to whom* does such a Global Citizenship Education really apply?

4 GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION FOR WHOM?

It is hard to deny the validity of some of the objections offered by postcolonial theory. If Global Citizenship Education is to foster anything resembling a truly global citizenship – global citizens that can live up to the high hopes envisaged in the aspirational language of the international policy documents on Global Citizenship Education (UNESCO, 2013, 2015, 2018) – it needs to steer clear of a simplistic Western ethnocentrism. It needs to be historically informed and provide an awareness and understanding of the political and economic structures operating in international politics; it needs to be self-conscious, reflective and mindful of not perpetuating power-relations through well-intended but misguided acts of charity or failed attempts to empathize; and it needs to avoid blatant Eurocentric biases and triumphalism. To achieve this, it seems imperative that we work to unearth remnants of “neocolonial and imperialistic frameworks that are still prevalent in global citizenship education” (Andreotti & de Sousa, 2012, p.2), for despite its good intentions, it seems clear that a ‘cosmopolitan missionizing’ can be an obstacle to understanding, and thus an impediment to fostering the ‘global gaze’ needed to address the barrage of problems and challenges facing the world.

Pointing this out, postcolonial theory has clearly provide an important corrective and service to much naïve or ‘soft’ Global Citizenship Education. The resulting ‘critical’ Global Citizen Education, as Karen Pashby notes, “aims to empower individuals to think differently and to reflect critically on the legacies and processes of their own cultures and contexts so that they can imagine different futures and take responsibility for their actions and decisions” (Pashby, 2012, p.11). But herein however, lies also a problem for a postcolonial conception of Global Citizenship Education. These caveats and warnings, as well as the call to foster a more self-reflective and critical stance in Global Citizenship Education, are particularly apposite as a corrective to traditional Citizenship Education in the West ‘gone global’; i.e. as warnings of facile attempts to move smoothly from a discussion of citizens’ rights and responsibility, to a discussion of the legitimate rights claims of distant others and the responsibilities that we bear to those that fall outside our close circle of friends, family, and fellow compatriots. This, postcolonial theory objects, cannot be done without simultaneously scrutinizing one’s own colonial perspective. However, in imploring the potential global citizen to confront her prejudices and colonial past as part of becoming a global citizen, the critical or political conception of Global Citizenship Education promoted by postcolonial theory seems to addresses itself exclusively to the citizen of the Global North. Built around labouring to overcome the

parochialism and Eurocentrism of the West, what can this conception of Global Citizenship Education offer to non-Westerner – and does it speak at all to non-citizens?

These objections are only gradually beginning to draw the attention they deserve, but have not yet been fully acknowledged and articulated in the literature. However, while scholars are hard at work trying to define and describe Global Citizenship Education, the relevant questions about global citizenship and Global Citizenship Education, it has come to seem, is not only *what* Global Citizenship Education is or how it should be understood, but *who* the global citizen is or *for whom* Global Citizenship Education is. As Karen Pashby notes, “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?’” (Pashby, 2011, p.427). In lieu of a global state, ‘global citizen’ has often been considered a problematic concept in political science, but, as Pashby goes on to argue, the concept is more widely embraced in education, where “there is a particular structure: state-run schooling, and subject: student, so that the citizen-subject is student” (Pashby, 2011, p.427, my emphasis).

Seeking to explore these further questions about Global Citizenship Education, Pashby sets herself the task to “map out and elicit some of the assumptions around the citizen-subject in the literature and consider how a critique of GCE pushes for a careful theorising of subjectivities (the ‘who’ of citizenship education or the ‘citizen-subject’)” (Pashby, 2011, p.428). At first glance, this may seem like a deflection of the issue in question. Presumably, we are all *potential* global citizens, and so we are all fitting citizen-subjects of Global Citizen Education whose aim it is to transform us into global citizens. What we ought to be discussing, it seems, is what Global Citizenship Education is or ought to be, and how it can best serve the aim of educating us to become global citizens.

On a postcolonial conception of global citizenship and Global Citizenship Education however, things are less straight-forward and the question appears pertinent. For on a critical or postcolonial conception, a global citizen is quintessentially one who is able to adopt a critical or postcolonial perspective on his/her own past and current standing in the world – which obviously presumes *having* a certain status and colonial past to revisit. “The assumed citizen-subject, “as Pashby notes, “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 recognising the ‘global Other’” (Pashby, 2011, p.435). Or, as she says earlier in the same article:

“Overall, the assumed subject of GCE pedagogy is the autonomous and European citizen of the liberal nation-state 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” (Pashby 2011: 430).

A consequence of this conception of Global Citizenship Education is that Global Citizenship Education is primarily or even exclusively directed at a privileged class of

members of the global community, that of *citizens*, or more specifically; citizens of the Global North. A further consequence however, is that only tangentially does the question of how non-Westerners and non-citizens fit into the scheme appear on the radar. Thus, while imploring the need for a postcolonial reformulation of global citizenship, traditionally understood as “starting from a critical national and extending to a notion of global citizenship”, we find her wondering “[t]o what extent is it also appropriate as a pedagogical theory in schools in non-Western contexts and/or in the Global South?” (Pashby, 2012, p.19). And, in the midst of a series of exploring questions about the ‘Other’, we find her alluding briefly to non-citizens, asking: “What about those ‘Others’ in the local/national context who do not identify with or are not identified with the citizen norm?” (Pashby, 2012, p.19).

At least dimly perceptive of the need to accommodate these ‘Others’ therefore, Pashby argues that there is a need to “work towards including models of global citizenship that account for those not subsumed within the targeted Western, national citizen-subject” (2011, p.437). Seeking to explore the prevalent conception of the ‘citizen-subject’ of Global Citizenship Education, Pashby thus questions whether citizenship can be “re-conceptualised or [whether] it is 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’” (2011, p.439). However, apart from raising a number of questions that goes unanswered and a warning not to remain bound by the former, “so that an ‘add-on’, expansion style of citizenship education does not serve to retrench the very model of citizenship it aims to change” (Pashby, 2011, p.439), she does not explain *how* we can move beyond this conception of citizenship rooted in the nation-state in re-conceptualising a notion of citizenship more adequate to Global Citizenship Education.

This is hardly surprising however, given the starting-point of the postcolonial conception of global citizenship. In fact, the problem for a postcolonial conception of Global Citizenship Education to move beyond the Western national citizen-subject is self-inflicted and appears unavoidable on the ‘expansion-model’ of global citizenship invoked by Pashby, i.e. the conception of global citizenship as the final ‘layer’ added to national citizenship. While the cosmopolitan conception of the global citizen and of a Global Citizenship Education is grounded in the belief that all humans belong to a global moral community, in which we are all, in a sense, *already* global citizens and the ‘for whom’ of Global Citizenship Education is thus given, the postcolonial starting-point is the Western citizen whose conception of him/herself as a citizen (with rights and responsibilities) must be shed of its colonial biases and expanded or broadened into a global citizenship. The consequences of this for non-westerners and non-citizens, as pointed out, is that it is difficult to see how a Global Citizenship Education pertains to them; in what sense can this conception of Global Citizenship Education accommodate non-westerners and non-citizens in any meaningful way? In what sense does it speak to or address *them*?

Postcolonial scholars may attempt to respond to this objection by arguing that their conception of global citizenship explicitly seeks to avoid the Western universalism that “denies and denigrates differences” (Abdi, Shultz, & Pillay, 2015, p.1), and thus that we may and should insist on developing regional or local Global Citizenship *Educations*. However, while there is a sense in which we could conceive of a *plurality* of Global Citizenship Educations, thus making the notion able to accommodate non-Westerners, each of these would in fact be more adequately describes as local or regional Citizenship Educations adapted to different contexts. However, even closing our eyes to the oxymoron which the notion of a ‘local’ or ‘regional’ Global Citizenship Education seems to be, the failure to accommodate *non-citizens* however, cannot be done away with in the same way. The problem for the non-citizen on the postcolonial ‘expansion-model’ of global citizenship is precisely that there is nothing to expand; no citizenship on which to add another ‘global layer’.

5 TOWARDS A RECONCEPTUALIZATION OF GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

On a postcolonial conception, whose primary emphasis is on a critique of colonial and Eurocentric biases in traditional Western cosmopolitanism, Global Citizenship Education appears to be a project that is directed exclusively at citizens of the Global North; a corrective to simplistic conceptions of the ‘Other’ designed specifically to root out prejudices and misconceptions among affluent citizens in the West. While this task is certainly pertinent in the current day and age, and a Global Citizenship Education that contributed to perpetuating global injustice by upholding stale and derisive imagery from a colonial past would hardly be worth its name, a Global Citizenship Education seeking to foster global citizens for the 21st Century would have to offer more than criticism, and would have to be directed at and relevant to more than a small and exclusive global elite. Essentially, it seems, it would have to offer a program or route to *becoming a global citizen* that included non-westerners and non-citizens. But can we conceive of an alternative to, on the one hand, a critique of one’s historically blinkered conception of the ‘Other’, accompanied by a gradual expansion of citizenship beyond the confines of the nation-state, and, on the other, a peddling of a ‘soft’ or charitable cosmopolitanism to the world’s poor?

The need to reconceive Global Citizenship Education in a way which steers clear of both of these horns of the dilemma is gradually gaining traction among scholars, due, in no small part, to the rapid increase in global migration (Kymlicka, 2005, 2017; Banks, 2017; Osler & Starkey, 2005). While migration has always been a feature of human societies, never before in human history, as James Banks notes, “has the movement of diverse racial, cultural, ethnic, religious, and linguistic groups within and across nation-states been as large-scale and rapid or raised such complex and difficult questions about citizenship, human rights, democracy, and education” (Banks, 2017, p.xxvii). As the number of people migrating has increased dramatically, so it seems, has the way we

have come to think of migration and its impact on our societies. On the one hand, societies have become ‘superdiverse’ (Vertovec, 2007) through a proliferation of variables beyond that of ethnicity, while the distinction between clear-cut types of migrants are being challenged through improvements in transport and communication, leading some scholars to favour the term ‘mobility’ over ‘migration’ (Castles, 2017). On the other hand, the unprecedented scale of migration has provided an impetus to nationalistic and populist tendencies, which have grown stronger and bolder over the past decade, hurling the multicultural society into a crisis.

These developments have obvious and clear implications for Citizenship Education. For “[w]hile global migration has increased diversity in nations across the world,” as Hugh Starkey has noted, “the school curriculum has often ignored or marginalized the perceptions and experiences of minoritized groups, who have to struggle for recognition as equal citizens” (Starkey, 2017, p.41). As our societies are rapidly becoming more multicultural, in the current political climate the “central task of citizenship education,” Kymlicka has argued, is therefore “to replace older, exclusionary ideas of nationhood with a more inclusive or multicultural conception of citizenship, which challenges inherited hierarchies of belonging and insists that society belongs to all its members, minority as much as majority” (Kymlicka, 2017, p.xix). A political minefield, the failure to adapt the notion of citizenship to the realities of an increasingly diverse and multicultural societies may have grave consequences. “[W]hen individuals who are born within the nation or who migrate to it and live within it for an extended period of time do not internalize the values and ethos of the nation-state, feel structurally excluded within it, and who have highly ambivalent [feelings] towards it” (Banks, 2017: 370) the result may be what Banks labels ‘failed citizenship’ (Banks 2017: 367).

Responding to this challenge, the emerging push to reconceptualize Citizenship Education seems to have taken one of two forms: While some have argued that we need to conceive citizenship more broadly than as a narrow political concept delimiting one’s relation to the nation-state, others have sought to circumvent the issue by avoiding or replacing the contested notion with an emphasis on human rights instead. According to Kymlicka, a combination of both of these approaches – of multicultural citizenship *and* cosmopolitan human rights – represent a “compelling ideal” (Kymlicka, 2017, p.xx) to many scholars. However, he notes that while the support for a cosmopolitan human rights education is, as he says, “virtually unanimous” (Kymlicka, 2017, p.xxi), there has been a growing scepticism against the possibility of broadening out the citizenship-term; a doubt about “whether national narratives of membership and belonging can ever be truly transformed in a multicultural direction” (Kymlicka, 2017, p.xix). Addressing the urgent need for a reconceptualization of *Citizenship* Education, whose primary aim may be said to be to foster inclusive and well-functioning societies however, can either or both of these suggestions also point us in the direction of a reconceptualization of a *Global* Citizenship Education?

Comparable to the first of these suggestions, the concept of citizenship, as a number of scholars have argued (Veugelers, 2011; Osler & Starkey, 2005; Banks, 2009, 2017), is currently both deepened, through connecting citizenship and identity, and broadened, through characterising it as “a way of being in the world” (Veugelers, 2011, p.473). Note however, that broadening or deepening the notion of citizenship in this way, is not the same as *extending* it. While expanding or extending the notion of citizenship, as the idea is invoked on the postcolonial conception of Global Citizenship Education, is to ‘add layers’ to an already existing political citizenship, broadening it seems to be a move in the opposite direction: Rather than extending the obligations and responsibility inherent in citizenship beyond its traditional political confines, broadening the citizenship-term seeks to loosen it from its national or political anchorage. Deepening and/or broadening the concept of citizenship therefore, may provide the way for more inclusive multicultural societies, which extending citizenship does not. This approach may be – and is – applied in cosmopolitan variants of Global Citizenship Education, through the notion of a global citizen: one whose citizenship is *not* political, but felt (Osler & Starkey, 2005) or lived, as a way of being in the world; the global mindset or gaze invoked by the UNESCO framework on Global Citizenship Education. The worry as we have seen, is that the cosmopolitan global gaze is not in fact a global gaze, but rather a Eurocentric navel-gazing.

While I believe this parochialism may be overcome, the scepticism against the idea of broadening out the citizenship term, as noted by Kymlicka, has led some to embrace an alternative that seeks to do without the problematic concept in the first place. Arguing that traditional forms of Citizenship Education based on a conception of political or national citizenship have become obsolete, Osler and Starkey argues that:

“In responding to super-diversity, teachers are increasingly recognising that traditional forms of citizenship learning which emphasise and privilege the nation-state and national citizenship are inappropriate and outdated (Osler 2011). Citizenship education founded in human rights offers an alternative approach, since all students, regardless of their nationality and migration status, are holders of human rights” (Osler & Starkey, 2018, p.35).

Seeking to move beyond citizenship by reverting to the idea of universal and inalienable human rights as the core of Citizenship Education, the second suggestion therefore attempts to approach the question from a less contentious angle. This suggestion is clearly compatible with and transferrable to a cosmopolitan conception of Global Citizenship Education. At the heart of a moral cosmopolitanism, as we saw, lies the idea that we all belong to the same moral community, one not delimited by the nation-state. This however, Osler and Starkey argue, does not make the approach ‘soft’:

“At their core, human rights can be understood as “an expression of the human urge to resist oppression” (Osler 2016, 119). When human rights and human rights education is seen through this lens its universal power and relevance

becomes apparent. It is necessarily about supporting students to name inequality, challenge injustice, make a difference and develop solidarities at local, national and global levels” (Osler & Starkey, 2018, p.38).

By effectively liberating the notion of Global Citizenship Education from, on the one hand, a metaphorical, and on the other, a constrained and conservative notion of citizenship, Global Citizenship Education is relieved of a concept which is chosen for its suggestive meaning, but which remains a stumbling block in the humanities and social sciences. Instead of placing the concept of citizenship at the core of the debate on Global Citizenship Education, thus making it the defining concept in the debate on Global Citizenship Education (Wintersteiner *et al.*, 2015; Torres & Tarozzi, 2016), it is circumvented or replaced by a set of values and rights we take to be defining of global citizenship, thus offering up an alternative suggestion for how to give content to the idea of global citizenship.

This however, does not mean that we need to give up the idea of a ‘global citizen’ or that the aspiration of Global Citizenship Education can simply be replaced by Human Rights Education. The backlash against the multicultural society has been staunch, but while currently experiencing considerable resistance, the multicultural society and a broader, more inclusive notion of citizenship is certainly worth fighting for. In addition to seeking to broaden this politically grounded term however, it may be worth considering how global citizenship can be more fruitfully understood and encouraged through a cosmopolitan conception; as the cultivation of values, skills, and attitudes befitting a cosmopolite or world-citizen. This, of course, cannot be done ahistorically, or without a critical understanding of global power-relations propping up status *quo*, but needs to remain critical and transformative, forcefully asserting the rights of exposed groups and individuals wherever they are being contested. Postcolonial theories seems to hold the edge in exposing colonial and parochial practices, but the inability to cater to the large and growing number of non-citizens in liberal democratic societies however, makes a postcolonial conception of Global Citizenship Education poorly adept at fostering global citizens. While it is beyond the scope of the present paper to provide a full-fledged alternative to a postcolonial conception of Global Citizenship Education, I believe therefore, that grounding a Global Citizenship Education in a human rights approach may set us down a path to developing a Global Citizenship Education that speaks to citizens and non-citizens alike, without compromising the critical or transformative dimension required of a Global Citizenship Education in the 21st Century.

6 CONCLUDING REMARKS

As an outgrowth of Citizenship Education seeking to ‘expand’ or ‘extend’ citizenship beyond the confines of the national, postcolonial conceptions of Global Citizenship Education seem incapable of addressing non-citizens in any substantial sense. Despite talking frequently *of* migrants and refugees, the approach seems curiously deaf to the

need to include these groups into the conversation – other than as exemplars of the ‘Other’. The perspective assumed in postcolonial conceptions of Global Citizenship Education is consistently from the Global North and from one whose current privileges and entitlements as a citizen, and whose implication in a colonial and oppressive history, mandates a reflection upon his/her own entitlements in order to become a global citizen. While exposing the colonial conception of the ‘Other’ is, as noted, an important corrective to the parochialism and Eurocentrism of the West, the consequences of this way of conceiving of global citizenship is that the global ‘gaze’ is not one that everyone *can* adopt. Paradoxically therefore, the political or critical conception of citizenship at the root of a postcolonial conception of Global Citizenship Education leaves it mysterious how large swaths of the world’s population can ever *become* global citizens. One is left wondering whether, in order to become a *global* citizen, one must not already be a *citizen*.

A critical and transformative dimension to Global Citizenship Education is certainly needed in our day and age. The West is complicit in maintaining power-relations globally, and not only politically and economically, but through a narrow Eurocentric conception of the ‘Other’. However, while criticism is a necessary supplement, it cannot be the heart of Global Citizenship Education. What is the substantial content of Global Citizenship Education which will allow non-Westerners, and non-citizens to take part in the conversation, providing them with a route to becoming global citizens? Warning against the dangers of a soft citizenship education, Andreotti ends her seminal essay by a concession. She argues that “it is important to recognise that ‘soft’ global citizenship education is appropriate to certain contexts – and can already represent a major step” (Andreotti, 2014, p.30). Rather than an afterthought however, values and attitudes, I argue, ought to play a central role in fostering global citizens. Without an inclusionary approach based on human rights, non-citizens, such as migrants and refugees will remain global non-citizens.

REFERENCES

- Abdi, A. A., Shultz, L., & Pillay, T. (2015). Decolonizing global citizenship education: An Introduction. In A. A. Abdi, L. Shultz, & T. Pillay (Eds.), *Decolonizing Global Citizenship Education* (pp. 1-9). Sense Publishers.
- Andreopoulos, G. J. & Claude, R. P. (1997). Editors’ introduction. In G. J. Andreopoulos & R. P. Claude (Eds.), *Human Rights Education for the Twenty-First Century* (pp. 3-9). University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Andreotti, V. (2014). Soft versus Critical Global Citizenship Education. In S. McCloskey (Ed.), *Development Education in Policy and Practice* (pp. 21-32). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Andreotti, V. (2011). (Towards) decoloniality and diversity in global citizenship education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9 (3-4), 381-397.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2011.605323>

- Andreotti, V. & de Souza, L. (2012). Introduction: (Towards) Global Citizenship Education 'Otherwise'. In V. de Oliveira Andreotti & L. de Souza (Eds.), *Postcolonial Perspectives on Global Citizenship Education* (pp. 1-9). Routledge.
- Banks, J. A. (2017). Failed Citizenship and Transformative Civic Education. *Educational Researcher*, 46(7), 366-377.
- Banks, J. A. (2009). Diversity and Citizenship Education in Multicultural Nations. *Multicultural Education Review*, 1(1), 1-28.
- Banks, J. A. & Nguyen, D. (2008). Diversity and citizenship education. Historical, theoretical, and philosophical issues. In L. S. Levstik and C. A. Tyson (Eds.), *Handbook of research in social science studies education* (pp. 137-155). Routledge.
- Barton, G. & Garvis, S. (2019). *Compassion and Empathy in Educational Contexts*. Springer International Publishing.
- Burbules, N. C. & Torres, C. A. (2000). *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives*. Routledge.
- Castles, S. (2017). The Challenges of International Migration in the 21st Century. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Citizenship Education and Global Migration: Implications for Theory, Research, and Teaching* (pp. 3-23). American Educational Research Association.
- Cooper, B. (2011). *Empathy in Education: Engagement, Values and Achievement*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Council of Europe. (2019). *Global Education Guidelines. Concepts and methodologies on global education for educators and policy makers*. <https://rm.coe.int/prems-089719-global-education-guide-a4/1680973101>
- Davies, L. (2008). Global Citizenship Education. In M. Bajaj (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Peace Education* (pp. 109-115). Information Age Publishing
- Davies, L. (2006). Global citizenship: abstraction or framework for action? *Educational Review*, 58(1), 5-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131910500352523>
- Demetriou, H. (2018). *Empathy, Emotion and Education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dill, J. S. (2012). The Moral Education of Global Citizens. *Global Society*, 49, 541-546. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12115-012-9599-8>
- Dill, J. S. (2013). *The longings and limits of global citizenship education: the moral pedagogy of schooling in a cosmopolitan age*. Routledge.
- Dolby, N. (2012). *Rethinking Multicultural Education for the Next Generation*. Routledge.
- Eide, E. R. & Showalter, M. H. (2010). *Human Capital Theory*. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/economics-econometrics-and-finance/human-capital-theory>
- The Foundation for European Progressive Studies. (2020). *State of Populism in Europe 2020*. https://euagenda.eu/upload/publications/state_of_populism_in_europe_2020_final.pdf
- Gaudelli, W. & S. J. Schmidt. (2018). Global Citizenship Education and Geography. In I. Davies, L. Ho, D. Kiwan, C. L. Peck, A. Peterson, E. Sant, & Y. Waghid (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Citizenship and Education* (pp. 473-489). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gaudelli, W. (2016). *Global Citizenship Education. Everyday transcendence*. Routledge.
- Guterres, A. (2019). *Remarks to High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development*. <https://www.un.org/sg/en/content/sg/speeches/2019-09-24/remarks-high-level-political-sustainable-development-forum>

- Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. (2019). *The Global State of Democracy 2019. Addressing the Ills, Reviving the Promise*.
<https://www.idea.int/sites/default/files/publications/the-global-state-of-democracy-2019.pdf>
- International Organization for Migration. (2019). *World Migration Report 2020*.
https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/wmr_2020.pdf
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2019). *An IPCC Special Report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change, sustainable development, and efforts to eradicate poverty*.
https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/sites/2/2019/06/SR15_Full_Report_High_Res.pdf
- Ki-Moon, B. (2012). *Statement from the Secretary-General*.
<http://www.unesco.org/new/en/gefi/about/an-initiative-of-the-sg/>
- Kleingeld, P. & Brown, E. (2019). Cosmopolitanism. In Edward N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/cosmopolitanism/>
- Kymlicka, W. (2017). Foreword. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Citizenship education and global migration: Implications for theory, research, and teaching* (pp. xix–xxv). American Educational Research Association.
- Kymlicka, W. (2005). Citizenship in an Era of Globalization. In S. P. Hier (Ed.), *Contemporary Sociological Thought: Themes and Theories*. Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Obama, B. (2008). *Speech in Tiergarten, Berlin, Germany on July 24, 2008*.
<https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/Vote2008/story?id=5442292&page=1>
- Obama, B. (2006). *Northwestern Commencement Speech*.
<https://www.northwestern.edu/newscenter/stories/2006/06/barack.html>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2018). *Preparing our youth for an inclusive and sustainable world. The OECD PISA global competence framework*.
<http://www.oecd.org/pisa/Handbook-PISA-2018-Global-Competence.pdf>
- Osler, A. & Starkey, H. (2005). *Changing Citizenship. Democracy and Inclusion in Education*. Open University Press.
- Osler, A. & Starkey, H. (2018). Extending the theory and practice of education for cosmopolitan citizenship. *Educational Review*, 70(1), 31-40.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2018.1388616>
- Oxfam. (2015). *Global Citizenship in the Classroom. A Guide for Teachers*.
<https://oxfamilibrary.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/10546/620105/edu-global-citizenship-teacher-guide-091115-en.pdf?sequence=9&isAllowed=y>
- Oxley, L. & Morris, P. (2013). Global Citizenship: A Typology for Distinguishing its Multiple Conceptions. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 61(3), 301-325.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2013.798393>
- Park, H., Slobuski, T. & Durkee, C. (2016). Global Mindedness and Global Citizenship Education. In Anne Hynds (Ed.), *Oxford Bibliographies*.
<https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199756810/obo-9780199756810-0161.xml>
- Pashby, K. (2011). Cultivating global citizens: planting new seeds or pruning the perennials? Looking for the citizen-subject in global citizenship education theory. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9(3-4), 427-442.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2011.605326>

- Pashby, K. (2012). Questions for Global Citizenship Education in the Context of the 'New Imperialism': For Whom, by Whom? In V. Andreotti and L. de Souza (Eds.), *Postcolonial Perspectives on Global Citizenship Education* (pp. 9-27), Routledge.
- Pedwell, C. (2016). De-Colonizing Empath: Thinking affect transnationally. *Samyukta: A Journal of Womens Studies*, XVI (1), 27-49. Retrieved on 26th October 2020 from <https://kar.kent.ac.uk/54869/>
- Pedwell, C. (2012). Economies of empathy: Obama, neoliberalism, and social justice. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 2012, 30(2), 280-297. <https://doi.org/10.1068%2Fd22710>
- Peters, M., Britton, A., & Blee, H. (2008). Introduction. In Peters, M., Britton, A., & Blee, H. (Eds.), *Global Citizenship Education: Philosophy, Theory and Pedagogy*. Sense publishers.
- Schattle, H. (2009). Global Citizenship in Theory and Practice. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad: Higher Education and the Quest for Global Citizenship* (pp. 3-21). Routledge.
- Schugurensky, D. & Myers, J. P. (2003). Citizenship education: Theory, research and practice. *Encounters on Education*, 4, 1 – 10.
- Slote, M. (2013). *From Enlightenment to Receptivity. Rethinking our Values*. Oxford University Press.
- Starkey, H. (2017). Globalization and Education for Cosmopolitan Citizenship. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Citizenship education and global migration: Implications for theory, research, and teaching* (pp. 41-62). American Educational Research Association.
- Swanton, D. M. (2015). Ubuntu, Indiginty, and an Ethic for Decolonizing Global Citizenship. In A. A. Abdi, L. Shultz, and T. Pillay (Eds.), *Decolonizing Global Citizenship Education* (pp. 27-38). Brill.
- Tarozzi, M. & Torres, C. A. (2016). *Global Education and the Crisis of Multicultural Education. Comparative Perspectives*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (2020). *Global trends. Forced Displacement in 2019*. <https://www.unhcr.org/5ee200e37.pdf>
- UNESCO. (2013). *Outcome document of the Technical Consultation on Global Citizenship Education*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000224115>
- UNESCO. (2015). *Global Citizenship Education. Topics and Learning Objectives*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000232993?posInSet=1&queryId=2be7f6d1-6f3d-4396-bd77-5d6a6aac641a>
- UNESCO. (2018). *Preparing Teachers for Global Citizenship Education. A Template*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000265452?posInSet=1&queryId=15405ca6-0026-4bea-9e34-7d9fb41893ee>
- Vertovec, S. (2007.) Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 1024-1054. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870701599465>
- Veugelers, W. (2011). The moral and the political in global citizenship: appreciating differences in education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9(3-4), 473-485. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2011.605329>
- Wright, C. (2012). Postcolonial Cosmopolitanisms Towards a Global Citizenship Education Based on 'Divisive Universalism'. In V. Andreotti, and L. de Souza (Eds.), *Postcolonial Perspectives on Global Citizenship Education* (pp. 47-68). Routledge.
- Wintersteiner, W., Grobbauer, H., Diendorfer, G. & Reitmair-Juárez, S. (2015). *Global Citizenship Education. Citizenship Education for Globalizing Societies*. In cooperation

with the Austrian Commission for UNESCO.

http://www.unesco.at/fileadmin/Redaktion/Publikationen/Publikations-Dokumente/2014_GCED_Poltische_Bidlung_fuer_die_Weltgesellschaft_en.pdf

Zembylas, M. (2018). Reinventing critical pedagogy as decolonizing pedagogy: The education of empathy. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 40(5), 404-421. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10714413.2019.1570794>

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY

Eirik Julius Risberg, PhD, is Postdoctoral researcher at the Faculty of Education and Arts, Nord University, Norway. His main interests are in global citizenship education, environmental and global ethics, and human rights. Beginning October 2021, Risberg will be a Visiting Fellow at Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities at Cambridge University, where he will be is doing research on the role of empathy in global citizenship education.