EDITORIAL**Citizenship Education in the Era of Globalization: Canadian Perspectives**

Important and challenging theoretical debates and questions arising from considerations of the role of citizenship education in the current “global era” are evident in academic literature. Ultimately, our scholarly work must also engage with what happens in our elementary, secondary, and post-secondary classrooms. Much important scholarly attention is being directed to debates about the nature of globalization, and about national and, increasingly, global concepts of citizenship, multiculturalism, and social movements of global resistance. However, much of this work is done outside of a direct engagement with teachers, students, and classroom practices and is consequently left at a level of abstraction that appears disconnected from the day-to-day work of public schooling. Indeed, when working through significant theoretical interjections and conversations that engage with the complexities and possibilities to which we are drawn, we can never forget that the “what” and “how” of teaching and learning, and the values that circulate within classrooms, reflect the global movements of contemporary history and are shaped by a sense that we must take-up global issues. We must, therefore, recognize what Pashby (this issue) refers to as the *global imperative* that exerts particular pressure on educational theory, practice, policy, and politics. To do this we must struggle with questions of theory that inform our scholarly and our practical work as educators, be that practice in faculties of education or in K to 12 classrooms. This special themed issue presents important questions, concerns, and possibilities that mark both theoretical discourses and classroom practice.

The essays in this collection were inspired by a set of questions that the co-editors feel define democratic theory and practice in contemporary Canada. Within the dynamic between globalization and education, important debates are occurring and new discourses emerging. How are these terms defined in Canadian society today? How do they overlap and interrelate? How do new discourses such as on global citizenship education contribute to the renewal of the field? How do these intersect with new thinking on multiculturalism and multicultural education? How are the promises of new ways of thinking and doing being appropriated for Canada’s increasingly diverse cultural landscape? What is distinctive about them and how applicable are these promises to democratic

citizenship education? Conversely, have global, cultural, and democratic education had their run? While these questions are wide-reaching and intersect with and even challenge the delineation of local, regional, national, and global contexts; the contributors to this issue, writing within and often about the geopolitical context of contemporary Canada, weigh in on these complexities in a range of ways and from a range of perspectives.

Our collection opens with two articles that query the concept of global citizenship. Pashby examines a global orientation to citizenship from a critical engagement with the liberal-democratic notion of citizenship itself and its history of exclusion and inclusion. In this sense, she positions global citizenship as more a metaphor than a viable political institution and as a representation of values which inform the world view and practice of globally-minded individuals who increasingly desire to see the world in terms of community. While recognizing that the precise nature of globalization continues to be contested, Pashby argues that, regardless of the outcome of this debate, there is a global imperative whereby educators feels both pressed and inspired to promote a sense of global responsibility and global consciousnesses. While she argues for more theoretical attention to how this imperative is taken up in scholarly work, she also recognizes the real complexities that face teachers when they attempt to attend to “the global.” Her review of contemporary academic literature reveals particular tensions marking the reinforcing relationships between citizenship diversity and schooling. A main theme of her paper is the increasingly complex notion of *belonging* integral to democratic citizenship and the related questions of inclusion and exclusion inherent to citizenship and schooling. Pashby demonstrates that despite its complex and even contested history, citizenship continues to be called on as an ideal through which to push for social justice from local and global orientations. Consequently, much is demanded of citizenship and citizenship education. She argues for a new, flexible theory of citizenship and for giving consideration to what constitutes the essential elements of a program of global citizenship education as an educational response to the global imperative.

Wood contends that global citizenship can neither be realized literally (citizenship being bound to the nation-state) nor should it were it possible because citizenship is a mode of political domination. Thus while Wood disputes the very possibility of global citizenship based on her critique of the history of the core concept of citizenship, she notes a dialectic between citizenship which serves simultaneously as a means of political control and as a mechanism that accords rights. In support of those social forces organizing to counter the negative effects of neoliberal globalization, the space that this dialectic creates for social action allows her

to conclude that non-scalar thinking about governance, and a broader understanding of being political than is commonly captured by the concept of citizenship, offer strategic possibilities for civil society. In her treatment of and resistance to a notion of “global citizenship,” Wood offers a more politically charged version of the impact of a global imperative on democratic citizenship than does Pashby; however, both pieces reveal that much is at stake in positioning “citizenship” as central within discourses of globalization.

Pike, long known for his work on global education, offers a critique of the plethora of citizenship education models currently in circulation. This includes the difficulty of imagining citizenship as a transnational concept and an examination of the intersecting pedagogical and theoretical terrain marking citizenship education, global education, and global citizenship education. Yet, similar to how Wood recognizes possibilities within the sense of governance and rights inherent to democratic citizenship, Pike finds room for collaboration in the overlapping ideals embodied by both global and global citizenship education. He offers what he refers to as an *ethos* of global citizenship – a set of moral principles and codes of conduct – that is global in scope while recognizing that citizenship will continue, for the foreseeable future, to be national in practice. This observation coincides with Pashby’s critique of the *global* citizenship literature which has not made a significant epistemological break with the traditional *national* citizenship literature. Pike’s observation that we are still working very much within the framework of the national citizenship paradigm (even as the forces of globalization work to weaken the ability of nation-states to preserve their traditional policies) constitutes a call for a dialogue between the advocates of global education and global citizenship education. Pike’s article proposes that potentially contending schools of thought that are engaged in the struggle to implement progressive education from a global perspective find common ground. He calls for an engagement in school based practice that is centered on an ethos shared by both approaches and which demarcates it from neo liberal approaches.

Hébert, Wilkinson and Ali focus our attention within the wider discussions of national and global citizenship on the dynamics of identity formation among second generation youth in Toronto, Winnipeg, and Calgary. They demonstrate the complexity of a process whereby multiple factors contribute to how individual, second generation youth construct a complex self identity which simultaneously includes elements of the cultures of their parents as mediated through each young person’s individual ways of identifying and engaging with their Canadian surroundings. According to

their findings, contrary to traditional assumptions, these young people do not simply accept authorized packages of what it means to be Canadian as defined by their teachers or any other authority. Rather, these second generation young people retain a pride in, and a connection to, the language and culture of their parents. In fact, many have the opportunity to visit their parents' homelands and thereby reinforce the influence of the culture, language, and family ties. Yet, they form their identities on their own terms just as they seem to integrate their understanding of what it means to be a Canadian into their lives in very personal ways. Particularly interesting from the perspective of educators is the absence of the school as prominent within this process. Instead, the school is depicted in this study as simply another site where young people congregate (just like the malls, community centres, or the streets). No mention is made of the influence of teachers or curriculum in this process of identity construction. While the authors do comment near the end of their study on the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum as a potential contributor to this process, in effect, they suggest that further study is required to discover the extent that formal schooling and curriculum does or could impact on the process of second generation youth identity formation.

The next two contributions, by Larsen & Faden and Vetter, bring classroom teachers into the picture. Interestingly, the contributors taking up classroom practice are writing from perspectives outside of the urban-school settings that are so often the center of discussions around diversity, citizenship, and schooling. Larsen and Faden argue that "mainstream," "average" teachers are both interested in and willing to teach global citizenship provided they have the proper professional support and access to the relevant teaching materials. While they distinguish the teachers featured in the study from more highly politicized social activist teachers, they note the openness of these "typical" classroom teachers to tackle topics that, before they entered into a process of professional development and support described in the article, they considered too "political" or controversial. The essential message of this contribution is that the teaching of global citizenship education and of what are considered to be *controversial* topics can be undertaken by regular teachers in schools in small urban and rural areas, and not just by highly motivated, politicized teachers in pluralistic classrooms of large urban centres. In order for this engagement to occur, administrators need to provide the administrative support and professional development that is required to make teachers feel comfortable with the political nature of global issues and make the task feel less onerous.

Vetter provides another model with respect to coming to the conclusion that global issues need to be integrated into the classroom. Unlike the teachers in Larsen and Faden's study who participated in a special board-wide initiative, Vetter seems to be unique in her small town school in practicing critical citizenship education. She situates her own learning about the importance of "global" practice in her rural primary classroom where the interaction with the complex reality of an urban setting such as Toronto occurs in a special field trip, and encounters with "diversity" and "difference" are perceived as rare. Yet, in this reflective piece, she realizes that values and attitudes that will accompany her students for a life time are being established now and that she must enrich her students' learning with critical democratic learning not despite but because the school and community culture sees itself as "outside" questions of diversity. A common theme that arises in both of these articles is the particular way that teachers come to an understanding of the importance of teaching from a global perspective. For the teachers in the Larsen and Faden piece it is the opportunity to participate in a pilot project with the accompanying supports, for Vetter it was the result, metaphorically at least, of an incident with her students on a Toronto street viewed through the particular lens of the strategy of *rich classroom talk*.

In the last article of the issue, O'Sullivan also addresses the multiple ways teachers come to a global perspective in his treatment of the experience of N.C. and her elementary school colleagues who, similar to Vetter and the teachers in Larsen and Faden's study, work in a small-town school. He relays how, first one, then other teachers came in very personal and idiosyncratic ways to understand the importance of teaching their K to 8 elementary students from a global perspective. Before long, there was a critical mass of teachers in a single school doing so throughout the grades and across the curriculum.

Despite the existence of success stories of individual teachers, small groups, and school-wide groups of teachers learning to teach from a global perspective, O'Sullivan raises a basic question: to what extent can the average teacher be an agent of change in the tradition of Dewey, Freire, and Giroux? His questioning of this role which is so frequently assigned to educators by critical pedagogues arises from his observation that the large majority of teachers are high achieving graduates of the very school system to which they have returned; and, as a result of spending their formative years in largely untroubled middle-class circumstances, they are steeped in the dominant neoliberal ideology and consumer-orientation of the global market society. O'Sullivan implicitly raises the issue, especially given his concerns about the power of the dominant ideology, as to just how critical

and how transformative the actual classroom practice of global education and global citizenship education is or has the potential of being. In posing the question, O'Sullivan turns our attention back to the Pashby, Wood, and Pike articles that deal explicitly with the theoretical work of engaging with and responding to the global imperative; to Hébert et al whose work can be interpreted, because of the silence surrounding the role of teachers, as questioning the extent to which young people rely on teachers at all as they construct their world views; and to Larsen & Faden and Vetter's account of successful classroom interventions from a global perspective.

This collection is entitled *Citizenship Education in the Era of Globalization: Canadian Perspectives*. As a group, the proceeding papers represent significant desire for democratic education in Canada to respond to and even interject into the way that contemporary globalization is taken-up in classrooms. At the centre of this challenge, and at the heart of all of these papers, is the significance of citizenship as the corner stone of democratic life and schooling. According to the contributors, citizenship continues to be firmly national in orientation and practice even as the duties associated with it with respect to our sense of responsibilities to others increasingly have a global pull. Pashby, Wood, and Pike are explicit in asserting this; Hébert, Wilkinson, and Ali imply it strongly in their notion of what it means for the second generation youth they studied to be Canadian through a process of identity formation mediated by their Canadian surroundings; Larsen and Faden employ the term global citizenship education (GCE) in order to talk about bringing global awareness and a sense of global responsibility to quintessentially Canadian young people; while Vetter does not explicitly mention this term, her piece espouses a sense of GCE being a duty of citizenship to encourage a respect for diversity; and O'Sullivan writes about critical/transformational pedagogies from a global perspective.

Pike's suggestion that we consider "an *ethos* of global citizenship" which, while global in scope, recognizes "that citizenship will continue, for the foreseeable future, to be national in practice" articulates a fundamental dualism of our time: the national versus the global. The tensions inherent to any treatment of this dynamic can be couched as mutually exclusive, mutually inclusive, or dialogical. When taken-up within a conversation that takes classroom practice and the lives and identities of young people in Canada as central, this special issue highlights the importance of a dialogical approach, for the papers all see the possibilities inherent to opening the idea of citizenship to a consideration of the connections between people all over the world. Thus, Pike's call for "an *ethos* of global

citizenship” constitutes a guide to classroom practice that can occur even as the debates about global and national citizenship, critical and transformative pedagogies, and global impulses continue. Teachers can and must respond to the global imperative, and the concept of citizenship is a place from which to begin to conceive of an approach to global issues from the confines of provincial curricula and national institutions and discourses. This collection of papers is significant in reminding us that theoretical debates on the subject will benefit from the reflections of those classroom teachers and students who endeavor to contribute to democracy in these complex times.

Advisory Board

Sandra Acker Ontario Institute for Studies in Education	Normand Labrie Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
Helen Amoriggi McGill University	Linda LaRocque Simon Fraser University
Carol Beynon University of Western Ontario	Daniel Lechner University of Gronigen, Netherlands
Ann Marie Brimsmead University of Toronto	Benjamin Levin University of Manitoba
Stacy Churchill Ontario Institute for Studies in Education	Hanne Mawhinney University of Ottawa
Mary Clare Courtland Lakehead University	Margie Mayfield University of Victoria
Marion Crowhurst University of British Columbia	Peter L. McLaren University of California at Los Angeles
Sandra Bowman Damico Emory University	Robert C. Morris West Georgia College
Ruth Dempsey University of Ottawa	Margaret Olson St. Francis Xavier University
Don Dworet Brock University	William W. Purkey University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Juanita Ross Epp Lakehead University	Jacques Rebuffot McGill University
William T. Fagan Memorial University	Michael J. Rockler National-Louis University
Diane Gérin-Lajoie Ontario Institute for Studies in Education	Deanna J. Sands University of Colorado at Denver
Linda Goulet University of Regina	Doreen Shantz University of Windsor
Robert John Henderson McMaster University	Annabelle Slocum University of Western Ontario
Mary Hookey Nipissing University	Paula Helen Stanley Radford University
Christine Horne Brock University	Adele Thomas Brock University
Caroline Krentz University of Regina	Jane Wardle McGill University