Global Citizenship Education and Ecopedagogy at the Intersections: Asian Perspectives in Comparison*

Greg William Misiaszek[**]
Lauren Ila Misiaszek[***]

Abstract

This article provides a preliminary comparative analysis of environmental pedagogies in the context of widening spheres of citizenship due to intensifying globalization, with a particular focus on the East Asian context. In it, the authors specifically focus on Global Citizenship Education models and critical, Freirean-based ecopedagogies. The article includes analysis of research with expert scholars of citizenship and/or environmental pedagogies from six continents that focused on the intersectionalities between these two pedagogies and the effects of globalization on this work. The authors further explore the ways self-identified East Asian participants perceive differences in conceptualizations of citizenship between East Asia and the "West."

Key words: Citizenship, Global Citizenship Education (GCE), Ecopedagogy, Environmental Education, Education for Sustainable Development (ESD), Globalization, Comparative Education, East Asian Education

Ⅰ. Introduction

In this article, we explore the broad strokes of the differences and commonalities between constructions of citizenship and citizenship education (henceforth, "citizenship/education") in the "West" and East Asia (henceforth, the "East[1]") particularly how these broad strokes relate to the following three topics: environmental pedagogies (with a special focus on ecopedagogy (critical environmental pedagogies)), the contested terrain of the processes of globalization from above and from below (henceforth denoted in its plural form, "globalizations" (Torres, 2009)), and the similar contested terrain of Global Citizenship Education (GCE) models. Ecopedagogy, which will be described more in the next section, is a critical environmental pedagogy focused on the connections between human acts of environmental harm and social conflict (socio-environmental connections) within socio-environmental justice models.

As well, we discuss some possible dis/connections between the East and the West around the themes of environmental pedagogies and GCE. It goes without saying that the vast diversity of citizenship frameworks in both the East and West makes it impossible in an article's space limitations to analysis these frameworks in adequate depth, as Chang and Turner (2012) discussed in their own works; instead this paper aims to explore these topics in terms of how they are dis/connected with four knowledge sources. First, we analyze them in relationship to other scholars' work on GCE and East/West citizenship frameworks. It is important to state that we are not experts in Eastern citizenship/education. Although we come to this topic from a unique perspective - we are situated as the first full-time foreign professors in a Chinese normal university faculty of education, we are not expert Sinologists, either. Along with drawing on several writings from Eastern citizenship/education scholars, we particularly mediate our non-expert positionalities by grounding our analysis from Wing On Lee's distinguished lecture, "Conceptualising citizenship and citizenship education: A trajectory of exploring Asian perspectives" (2009) as we navigate the complexity of the subject matter. We explore Lee's work through and alongside other lenses that are more familiar to us: ecopedagogies, GCE, Western citizenship models, and critical/Freirean pedagogies.

---

1) "West" and "East" are operationalized in quotations here to denote the dilemmas surrounding these terms; although the quotations will be removed in the text for readability, they are intended to remain conceptually in line with this initial operationalization.

Second, we analyze East/West citizenship frameworks in relationship to findings from our own comparative educational research on the dis/connections between GCE and ecopedagogy. This pilot qualitative, comparative education research involved expert participants from six continents in the fields of globalization, and environmental and/or citizenship pedagogies.

In the analysis of data, we found notable differences in the responses of participants who self-defined as having an Eastern orientation[2]when they discussed how they framed citizenship, especially when analyzing the level(s) of focus in their responses (i.e.,individual, community/local, nation-state, global, and/or planetary (global citizenship constructions with Nature's inclusion). In this article, we will utilize some of the themes that emerged which differentiated participants who self-described as having an "Eastern" orientation to citizenship as compared to another orientation. A quote or two from the participants will be given at the beginning of each section of the analysis to initiate the discussion around their responses, particularly in relationship to the canons of GCE and the tenants of ecopedagogy and how these canons/tenants coincide or conflict with Eastern orientations of citizenship. These quote(s) do not represent all the arguments given in the section, but rather provides a springboard to deconstruct some of the reoccurring East-West citizenship themes that emerged.

Third, we will also draw upon, to a lesser extent, one of the authors' past research projects on analyzing successful ecopedagogical models in Brazil, Argentina, and the Appalachian region of the United States from the perspectives of expert ecopedagogues (Misiaszek, 2011). The themes of successful ecopedagogy which emerged from this research will be utilized throughout this article.

Fourth, we will utilize some of our past publications on these topics. In particular, to guide this paper's discussion on the issues of GCE and ecopedagogy, we draw on one of the authors' previous articles in which he argued that there is an inseparable connection between the two pedagogies (i.e., GCE and ecopedagogy) that emerged from the previous research

_____

2) We recognize that "orientation" itself is a problematic term, as it derives from the Latin oriens ("east").

described (Misiaszek, 2015b). We employ this previous article as both a conceptual and structural guide, to help us select key topics for follow-up as well as consider the logical way in which to present these highly interwoven issues. The article (2015b) can be summarized as follows:

> This article suggests some of the policy and practice changes needed for environmental pedagogies to be more effective and socially just, and how local versus global models of citizenship education are both relevant for effective transformative action in this regard. A core argument put forth is that on the one hand, there is a gap in understanding the rights and responsibilities of citizenship without an understanding of the socio-environmental connections that the ecopedagogy approach has the potential to offer. On the other, without an understanding of how citizenship connects to environmental rights and responsibilities, transformative action is much less effective. In short, the ecopedagogy approach and citizenship education are seen as inseparable. (p. 280)

The reader will find that our exploration of this article's topic has led us to many more questions than answers through Eastern and Western citizenship framings on GCE-ecopedagogy dis/connections. However, we believe that posing these and similar questions is an essential step in teaching global citizenship and socio-environmental issue both separately and together. We argue that environmental pedagogues need to problem-pose the contextual aspects of citizenship (which are often seen as normative and neutral) and the ways in which global citizenship is perceived as positive in some respects and perspectives, and negative in others. In the same respect, the participants from our research stressed the need for much more research to understand such contextualization of citizenship framings and global citizenship models. In an increasingly globalized world, Western framings of citizenship are often normalized in GCE's construction, without the needed contextual analysis citizenship necessary for transformative learning. Thus, context is a main tenet of critical GCE (defined and framed in more detail through this article), since understanding context is an important part of increasing the depth of understanding about and respect of diverse cultures.

This paper is an attempt to begin to deconstruct these results to better, and more contextually, understand these responses, especially to self-reflexively challenge our own

Western-centric framings of citizenship, criticized by many scholars as lacking diverse citizenship framings. In doing this work, we hope to add to the important literature on the contextual similarities and differences of citizenship within diverse cultures as it relates to the topics of environmental pedagogies and globalizations. The format of this articles will be laid out as follows. In the next three sections we begin by introducing the article's three main topics: (1) ecopedagogy and the contested terrains of (2) citizenship and (3) GCE. Following these sections, we analyze the following key points of dis/connections around ecopedagogy and/or GCE within Western and Eastern models of citizenship: (1) the positioning of the Self, (2) the concept of harmony, (3) constructs of democracy, (4) actions emerging from praxis, and (5) the critical re/questioning of normative ideologies of citizenship.

Ⅱ. Ecopedagogy

Similar to globalizations and models of GCE, environmental pedagogies (e.g. environmental education, education for sustainable development, ecopedagogies) are a contested terrain (Gadotti, 2008a; Jucker, 2004; Kopnina, 2011; Misiaszek, 2015b). This paper will focus on critical theories-based environmental pedagogies, including ecopedagogy, due to the fact that our research participants identified critical pedagogies as a core aspect of their ideal pedagogical models (Misiaszek, 2015b, in revisions (2016)). Rooted in critical theories and originating from popular education models of Latin America, ecopedagogy is centered on understanding struggles of and the connections between acts of environmental ills and social conflict (socio-environmental issues). Ecopedagogical scholars have multiple definitions for ecopedagogy but all are grounded in teaching for critical thinking for socio-environmental praxis within planetary social-environmental justice models (Gadotti, 2000, 2008b; Gadotti & Torres, 2009; Gutiérrez & Prado, 2008; Kahn, 2010). The action-reflection cycle of praxis is essential in processes of transformation (lasting change that is lasting or non-repetitive) (Apple & Au, 2009; Apple, Au, & Gandin, 2009; Gadotti, 1996). Another key aspect of critical pedagogy (as well as ecopedagogies) is that dialogical teaching for transformation is multidisciplinary analysis to determine needed changes, which includes many normative aspects of society that are see as unchangeable. In other words, classroom dialogue focused on questioning the foundational roots of socio-environmental ills is centered in

ecopedagogical teaching to determine solutions – the essence of problem-posing teaching discussed in the next paragraph.

Ecopedagogy is complex and multifaceted, and since there is not space here to focus on all of its tenants, we have chosen to primarily focus on its political essence. The critical pedagogical essence of ecopedagogy is rooted in the Freirean, popular education models from Latin America (Gadotti, 2008a, 2008b; Gadotti & Torres, 2009); teaching is considered "problem-posing," and it is understood that knowledges (socio-environmental in this case) are inherently political and that their effects can be either positive or negative depending on the population in question. The term political here is complex; it goes and beyond the common focus on governments' structures and activities and instead focuses on specific influences on a social phenomena (e.g., education curricula, practice, and structures) that (consciously or unconsciously) promote a particular agenda/goal. Ecopedagogical practice and research focuses on better understanding the politics of the education of environmental issues, specifically, intended goals, who benefits and who are negatively affected by these goals, and how are these goals taught directly, indirectly, or as a hidden curriculum. There are many more aspects of ecopedagogy that we refer in past work (Misiaszek, 2012, 2014, 2015a), in which we will refer to a few throughout the rest of this article.

Ⅲ. Citizenship and the Contested Terrain of Globalizations

1. Globalization and Citizenship

Globalizations, beyond theoretical phenomena of academic study, are a set of worldwide processes that have real affects upon all societies, including to a large extent, how they conceptualize citizenship/education (Beck, 2002, 2009; Choo, 2015; Torres, 2002, 2015). With increasing ease of global mobility and communications, issues such as multiculturalism have pressed countries to "become increasingly dialogic as their public space expands to accommodate multiple voices and forms of representation characteristic of participatory democracy" (Choo, 2015, p. 150). At the Second UNESCO Forum on Global Citizenship

Education (Paris, January 29, 2015), Wing On Lee described how this democratic end goal necessitates complex processes and outcomes of reinventing how citizenship is interpreted from traditional citizenship models that were once based on homogeneity of culture to some global models embrace heterogeneity of cultures. For example, constructions of national citizenship in the East, as well as other parts of the work, often are in conflict with more diverse constructions of citizenship in play because of increased global mobility (Turner, 2012). Critical GCE models do not question or provide migration legality (e.g., visas, immigration laws), but instead focus on teaching for peace through better understanding and through respect for the world's diverse cultures. These educational goals are increasingly needed as global mobility and communication increase in ease and frequency. In the analysis of the effects of these processes and goals on education, we are confronted with very complex contextual aspects of Eastern and Western framing or citizenship.

The contested terrain of Eastern and Western models of citizenship within GCE coincides with many of the similar reasons for GCEs' contested terrain which calls for socio-historical analysis because:

> On the one hand, citizenship can either emerge through social struggles, primarily class conflict, for entitlements or, on the other hand, social and political entitlements can be handed down by the state with the aim of incorporating the working class or marginal social groups into the polity (Turner, 2012, p. 15)

For example, while critical GCE models embrace heterogeneous cultural understanding and respect, neoliberal GCE models center on neoliberal goals; Carnoy (1997, p. 11) notes that the neoliberal endpoint is "a politics reduced to enhancing isolated individuals' solitary competitiveness in a Darwinian struggle" in which monetary profit and unequal power acquisition are the units of measure. However processes of globalization can also be empowering for the local level (bottom-up).

Within the contested terrain of globalization (from above and from below),its phenomena can empower or disempower/oppress the world's populations in very different ways (Arnove, 2007; Kellner, 2002; Stromquist, 2002; Torres, 2009, 2013). One of the main tensions

in the East is the points and degrees of change of the diverse Eastern cultures, customs, traditions, and political systems due to globalizations' modern and foreign influences (Goh, 2012). If globalizations are considered mostly as Western influences, the question of the West's influence upon the East can often emerge from this tension. There are numerous questions about the connections between globalizations and citizenship, including which processes of globalization ultimately bring humans closer together and which processes push individuals further apart and, contextually, in what ways (Capella, 2000). There are many questions here. For example, if a binding aspect of citizenship is cohesion is cohesion being achieved by homogenizing and westernizing cultures or is it achieved by different individuals and societies understanding and respecting one another's cultures?

2. Global Citizenship Education (GCE) Models' Contested Terrain

More often then not, many scholars view GCE as framed within Western tenets of citizenship. Just as globalizations that can either center or decenter Westernization (Cudworth, 2003), exploring this dominant view about GCE and the West is essential. Again, forming a similar contested terrain to that of globalizations, GCE is often viewed as having a Western-framed understanding of citizenship with "global" and "universal" end goals. In this article we will utilize the term West-centric GCE for this model of GCE. It is important to note that neoliberal GCE is often interwoven with West-centric GCE; however, West-centric GCE can equally be anti-neoliberal in function. Thirdly, a counter model to these first two forms has been termed "critical GCE", in which we introduced in this paper's introduction.

To conceptualize critical GCE we will first describe how citizenship education expert Lynette Shultz from the University of Alberta (Canada) deconstructs GCE. Shultz (2007) categorizes global citizenship into three of the following frameworks: (1) neoliberal (as described previously), (2) radical: focusing on ceasing all global structures of oppression, and (3) transformationalist: centering on understanding that global citizenship is, similar to the processes of globalization a contested terrain that can be either empowering or oppressive. Critical GCE defined in this paper will be centered upon both the transformationalist and radical models which most coincide with ecopedagogies, as opposed to neoliberal GCE models which ecopedagogies inherently counter. Next we will discuss some of the

commonalities and differences within general Western and Eastern models of citizenship in analyzing the Western-centric-ness and/or diverse inclusion of GCE models.

IV. Citizenship: Eastern and Western Frameworks

1. Citizenship Models of the Eastern and the Western

   ⋯actually citizenship started in Western society so it's a Western concept but now it's transferred to other parts of the world including Asian countries, because if we think about human history, the history of human evolution of citizenship is the history of liberation because it concerns more and more people, you know, then when that started in the ancient Greek, and is only involved [sic] a very small number of privilege citizens which were perfect title men that extorted women from slavery and then women got citizenship, that way I can define citizenship as the urge behind human liberation (Assistant Professor, South Korea, female)

   I know that civil society is quite new for Japanese teachers or school people, that the national or "publicness" of the people is more common for those people; at the same time, this research or people in the multicultural education or multicultural development or society, those people bring the idea of citizenship from Western society (Professor, Japan, female)

The histories of how citizenship was formed in the East and West have greatly influenced their current structures. As previously noted, we want acknowledge that "East Asian" is very diverse and the conceptions of citizenship are, as well, very diverse. In this article we will very broadly analyze Confucius-based citizenship, also recognizing the varied interpretations of Confucianism inside and outside citizenship modeling.

It has been argued by many scholars (Choo, 2015; Heater, 2003; Pocock, 1995) that much of the scholarship on citizenship, including citizenship education, has emerged from the West, centered on ensuring citizens' rights, initially for a selected elite group, of political involvement within the public sphere. Because citizenship in the East has not emerged from these same historical foundations which many argue that it is a relatively modern development, allows citizenship in the East to take quite a different form (Lee, 2009). In

considering Western citizenship, although there are these deeper historical ties, many scholars argue that current conceptualization of all inclusive citizenship (for all individuals , across diverse societies within a civilization) is quite modern and that historically citizenship was only bestowed on a civilization's elite (Capella, 2000; Turner, 2012). Thus, while the historical foundation of citizenship is more Western-centric, Western citizenship has been transformed greatly within the last century.

In the West, citizenship is political and refers to the interactions between the individual and the State, including their rights and responsibilities to each other (Lee, 2009). In the East, citizenship is conceptualized quite differently. Lee (2009) described how citizenship takes on a "relationalistic" focus in which there is not a clear distinction between private and public virtues; citizenship is focused on an individual being a "good person" in her/his relations with the self, others, the State, and Nature. Thus, the goal of citizenship education is the harmonious relationship between students' selves and these other entities (Lee, 2009). It is argued by many that this stems from the Confucian tradition that the public and personal self are "intertwined" (Choo, 2015, p. 149; Lee, 2004, 2009). If morality is the foundation of citizenship education models, one point of inquiry is the following:

> moral development of the individual thought to take place within the public sphere, or is the individual thought to be corrupted by social influences, thereby requiring some protection from the outside world (Turner, 2012, p. 15).

The role of the citizenship educator could then be one of restricting countering knowledges that challenge the current citizenship ideologies, which could position critical GCE as negative.

Contrary to this, Western models of citizenship aren't concerned with the "goodness" of a person; citizenship, in these models, is political and expressed through an individual's and civil societies' rights and responsibilities, and more technical aspects of taxation, governmental representation, voting, welfare, and immigration. There is a sense in the West of the notion of what it means to be a "good" citizen; however, this subjective distinction of "good" does not preclude someone from being a citizen. For example, in the U.S. someone

imprisoned is still considered a citizen of the U.S., although s/he may have lost many rights, such as the right to vote. In many ways, critical models of GCE follow much more of an Eastern version of citizenship because the foundation is how to be a good global citizen - political rights are not as foundational. In many ways this foundation runs counter to these Western notions of a less morally and more politically rights-and-responsibilities oriented understanding of citizenship. Although beyond the more technical aspects, one of rights and responsibilities (e.g., taxation, immigration, military service) there are the rights and responsibilities towards social wellness for all citizens. When there are structural social wellness inequalities between groups in a society, citizenship itself is questioned (Turner, 2012). These issues of social wellness as it is connected with environmental wellness will be the topic of the next section.

2. Ecopedagogy Frameworks within Eastern Citizenship Frameworks

⋯include the publicity, how to make the public aware of the importance of the environmental pollution, not just allow the students, but the general public, I think the whole society should have the same awareness, that we should protect our planet, and we should, everybody must do their job to protect the environment. (Associate Professor, China, female)

Ecopedagogy is concerned with reflection on morals and the environment and how this reflection can lead to action. From this perspective, environmental morality is also social morality since it is impossible to separate social and environmental issues – they become socio-environmental. There are two ways to conceptualize this connection in which we highlighted in some of our previous research projects as cited. First, morality includes environmental morality because of this social connection in which individuals are included; this is an anthropocentric understanding of morality. Second, morality can be understood through a biocentric (non-anthropocentric) lens in which an inherent need exists to not harm nature; harming nature is immoral. Although this latter, biocentric view is very important, and worthy of deep exploration within ecopedagogical learning spaces and research, in the space of this article, we focus on the former, anthropocentric viewpoint. We have chosen to do so, since, as humans, we are the only beings on the planet that are reflective and historical and capable of transforming the world (as opposed to non-human beings that are only

capable of reacting to the world) (Dewey, 1963; Freire, 2005).

3. The Self within Society: Eastern and Western Citizenship Frameworks

⋯in the Asian notion, it's more about social relationship and not so much about the individual contract between the state and the individual for example. So when you say that citizenship is a matter of the role of citizens in the society, it sounds different than my version of understanding - it's not so much an individualistic concept for us. (Professor, Japan, female)

An individual's civic duty to (what the West would call) self-cultivate her/his own morality, and to do so within a collective sense, is central to the East's citizenship frameworks (Lee, 2009). Lee (2009) has argued that the self should not be interpreted as non-collective, read, selfish, within such frameworks, but rather as within a relationalistic perspective. This relationalistic perspective between an individual and society(ies) is an active, interdependent praxis. This praxis runs counter to neoliberal frameworks that value the (individual) private sphere – in which the self is trying to gain more at an individual level (Postma, 2006) - above collective good and severely devaluing the public sphere.

It should be noted that although we mainly discuss the East's citizenship models within Confucian traditions, Confucianism "represents only one alternative among others, congenial to some social and political interests, but not to others" in the East (Dirlik, 2012, p. 51). Lee has stated that these relationalistic perspectives are exemplified by the Confucian tradition in which "the spheres beyond the self within and the self without refer to the social and national context in respect to humanity, and Nature in respect to metaphysics" (Lee, 2009, p. 7). Thus, the idea of the "individual" transcends the traditional, "national" sphere of citizenship to also include all of "humanity" and "Nature." We argue that this "humanity" sphere could easily coincide with concepts of critical GCE-ecopedagogy. From a non-Eastern perspective, we view this humanity in education as humanizing education which counters what Freire described as dehumanizing education that begin with "egoistic interests of the oppressors (an egoism cloaked in the false generosity of the paternalism) and makes the oppressed the objects of its humanitarianism, itself maintains and embodies oppression" (2005, p. 54). As discussed previously with the all-inclusiveness of citizenship (critical side of

its contested terrain), within GCE this means inclusion of all humans. Also we would call for further explanation of "metaphysics" to consider how this connects to the relationship between ecopedagogy and citizenship, and how it connects to ideas of planetary citizenship (defined by Moacir Gadotti (2008a) as "an expression that was adopted to express a group of principles, values, attitudes and habits that reveal a new perception of the Earth as a single community" (p. 23)).

However, Lee (2009) has also expressed that this collective nature within Chinese societies, noting that "Chinese can become 'surprisingly individualistic' once they leave their self-determined society or their 'relational circle'" (p. 7). The question of one's multiple citizenship spheres is, does this progressive sense of individualism relate back to one's sense of citizenship? Furthermore, if this sense of connectivity weakens outside of these defined circles, what happens within a global sphere of citizenship? Does this relationalistic position weaken the potential for individuals to take actions considered to be collectively good? And since whether an individual will act towards end environmental ills seen as harmful to others outside of her/himself is often dependent on the connections that she/he has to "others," how does this relationalistic position affect possibilities for collective decision-making about environmental issues? In other work (Misiaszek, 2011), one of us has argued that the concept of being a fellow citizen has been an important factor in determining whether an individual will make environmentally good decisions through learned reflection of socio-environmental knowledges (from all levels of education: formal, non-formal, and informal (i.e., public pedagogy)). However, the bonds between an individual's various citizenship spheres are not all equal but instead vary in "strength" (Misiaszek, in revisions (2016)). In other words, the local citizenship bonds (e.g., between persons in a particular town) may not be as strong as global citizenship bonds (e.g. between persons in opposite parts of the world). In the next section we will deconstruct the concept of harmony as possibly coinciding with GCE-ecopedagogy.

4. Harmony Within Citizenship and Environmental Pedagogies

Environmentally good actions are] also the responsibility of all citizens, because we all are connected and we live in the same planet, so no one can escape if the planet is polluted. I think

that is the important part of citizenship education now, how to be a responsible citizen. That can protect our environment, because of the economic development, the pollution is more and more serious, that's a very urgent issue, I think especially in China (Associate Professor, China, female)

It can be citizenship but it's a bit different than citizenship itself, because we use two words, one's meaning is very close to citizenship, the other which can be used in the Japanese school education which means the public people (Professor, Japan, female)

Lee (2009) drew upon the following Chinese cultural theorist's analogy of the idea of harmony to illustrate how Eastern societies often do not challenge soft authoritarianism and soft democracy as compared to their more "non-harmonious" combative Western counterparts:

···facing a dilapidated house, the Westerners would change [their] house, but the Easterners would learn to live in it or ignore the problem. Learning how to live in a condition less favourable is a means of maintaining harmony, which is a very significant goal or philosophy of life. (Liang, 1930, p. 9)

If we translate the concept of "learning to live in" or "ignore" a "dilapidated house" (read, biocentric needs) to the larger context, read, the environment, the sense of harmony could be viewed as anti-environmental. The prioritizing of social harmony over biocentric needs as an educational point could be against environmental pedagogues' goal to help understand the importance of environmental wellbeing. In other words, a question might be, should we adjust to a ruined state of the environment/nature? Yet the anthropocentric aspects of ecopedagogy can counter this possibility through its focus on socio-environmental connections - which promote environmental wellbeing in conjunction with individual-social harmony. In ecopedagogy, problem-posing the inseparability of social conflict and environmental devastation is key; thus, returning to this analogy, ecopedagogues would teach that the house is closely tied to both the well being of those who live within the house and to the society, or spheres of societies, in which the house is built upon.

Exploring this analogy at a more macro level, a house could also represent a society within a nation-state. In such an analogy, the "dilapidation" of the house - processes of globalization which intensify and spread environmentally devastative actions, which ignore the "property

lines" of the house - geo-political borders, of the house would run contrary to global harmony. In shallow models of environmental pedagogies such connections are not taught the focus on harmony minimizes environmental problems; however, within ecopedagogical models, harmony is directly linked to environmental wellbeing. When we discuss modernization and development today in the East it needs to rigorously contextual because "no other region in the world seems to have entered modernity in a more diverse way than East Asia" (Chang, 2012, p. 62); however some might also argue that "perhaps the differences between Europe and Asia are becoming increasingly less important as globalization has common effects on the economies and societies of global capitalism" (Turner, 2012, p. 35). We argue that there is not one correct perspective on this but rather essential to critically research and problem-pose in learning spaces.

5. Democracy within Citizenship/Education

The need to deepen democracy in both critical GCE models and in all aspects of ecopedagogy emerged in the research we conducted (Misiaszek, 2015b, in revisions (2016)); departing from that we ask now how this idea of "deepening democracy" connects to Eastern understandings of citizenship. Lee (2009) has discussed how for in many East Asia countries that there is a "relaxed way [of thinking] that 'as far as the government is a good government, it is democratic'" (p. 8). This section of the paper is the only one without a quote from East Asian participant because there were no participant quotes relating democratic essence or actions when describing citizenship. This does not necessarily mean that democratic actions are not considered within the participants' framing of citizenship and there are some indirect references to democracy when discussing Western conceptions of citizenship; however, the lack of reference of democracy within government, governance, and education is also telling in terms of prioritizing aspects of citizenship/education.

Turner (2012) has described how Confucius traditions have helped to develop passive citizen-subject relations and helped to "preserve and defend a status hierarchy based on the ideal of the educated gentleman, filial piety, and civilized behavior as conservative life orientations" (p. 31). This progression of logic, in what could be seen as a soft type of democracy doesn't align with the belief in critical pedagogy, and thus critical GCE or

ecopedagogy, that subjectively "good education" can not necessarily be equated with democratic education. While what is "democratic educational pedagogy" may be subjective, the foundational tenets of defining a democratic learning space are much less subjective. For example, (critical) ecopedagogical spaces must be characterized by a deep democracy that allows for authentic dialogue and collective knowledge construction by all teachers and students.

6. Praxis and Citizenship Models

⋯we clarify what is a unique contribution of a the Asian way of framing education and GCE and ESD seems to be a very good platform to demonstrate that uniqueness because both ESD and GCE are concepts which are not specifically about certain skills or specific subject, it's more about attitude and behavior. [The] Asian notion is so much linked with the morality, behavior and communal act, so I think it is time for us not only Asians scholars but also for global scholars to think from different perspective, not only from the specialized kind of educational pedagogical or subject or cognitive but also something more fundamental. (Professor, Japan, female)

Lee (2009) ranks (highest to lowest) the following four values as outcomes of education in the East: (1) provide a foundation for spiritual development, (2) increase the sense of individual responsibility, and (3) develop reflective and autonomous personality. He defines spiritual development in the East as education for wise decisions-making that emerges from reflective thinking and a developed autonomous personality (Lee, 2009). This definition differs from what many in the West would define as spiritual development. As well, initially, in this ranking, there appears to be no linkages to Western tenets of citizenship, Lee (2009) has stated that autonomy is defined within a neo-Confucian framework in the East that includes educational cultivation of the following traits of one's Self: self consciousness, critical awareness, creative thought, independent effort, and judgment. This concept of self-reflection can be seen as similar to the concept of praxis in ecopedagogies and in other critical pedagogies, as essential for transformative change towards a better socio-environmental world.

Yet other aspects in this conceptualization of Eastern citizenship run counter to other tenets

of critical pedagogy. For example, many Eastern citizenship education scholars such as Lee (2009) had stressed that the political aspect of citizenship in Western frameworks is greatly de-emphasized in Eastern frameworks in comparison to the fulfillment of individuality. Because of this emphasis on the latter, Eastern ecopedagogy might similarly place a higher emphasis on how environmental devastation negatively affects individuality.

Since ecopedagogy is a Freirean-based pedagogy - which emphasizes the importance of teaching that is meaningful and contextual to students (Freire, 1998, 2005), its incorporation into citizenship education must be done in ways that are likewise meaningful to students (Freire, 2004). This means that its educational constructions must be a democratic, bottom-up approach. Thus, the question becomes, how do students in Eastern contexts make meaning in citizenship education classrooms, and how ecopedagogy can be meaningfully incorporated into these classrooms? If, as many scholars have argued, GCE is molded from a Western citizenship framework, this would be a futile challenge; but if GCE is critically constructed in an Eastern context, this would cultivate contextually sound potentialities. We argue that the latter is essential within critical GCE.

The idea of transformative action is a central goal for critical pedagogies, including ecopedagogy. Transforming oppressive realities requires praxis, as described above, and this transformation emerges through bottom-up solutions in which critical analysis of education centers on what causes oppressions. (Gadotti, 1996). This often requires change to normative structures and ideologies (Apple, 2004; Freire, 2005), and such foundational changes may require radical actions as catalysts for this change to occur (Morrow & Torres, 2007).

Do such pedagogies directly oppose foundational tenets of Eastern citizenship? It is important to note here that the disconnections between critical pedagogy and Eastern citizenship models are likely not as pronounced as those between critical pedagogy and Western neoliberal citizenship models (Misiaszek, 2015b, in revisions (2016)). If critical pedagogues argue for the need to "critically examine current realities with a conceptual/political framework that emphasizes the spaces in which counter-hegemonic actions can be or are now going on" (Apple & Au, 2009, p. 992), what does this mean for Eastern notions of harmony? The question of how aspects of ecopedagogy coincide and

counter aspects of harmony and to what extent politics are absent in citizenship/education in the East is important. What are the breaking points of continuous harmony – what happens when need for change emerges? How can appropriate actions towards that change be critically determined?

An even more important, problem-posing question is if the ideology of harmony in question is reflective to who benefits and who are negatively affected by sustaining current socio-environmental systems. This is a central and very complex question which many Western citizenship and non-critical GCE pedagogies ignore; it is often ignored or superficial in teaching. Similarly, in Eastern contexts, such problem posing might be also suppressed for the sake of harmony. As a central research-education connection within ecopedagogy (Misiaszek, 2015b), such re/questioning the relationship between and socio-environmental issues is necessary but probably also difficult as the process might bring up counterarguments to dominant constructs of "harmony."

V. Questioning and Re-Questioning Ideologies within Citizenship Frameworks

⋯teachers or students have to consider more about the whole picture of society or the community which they belong to, otherwise school education is finished for children, they will never come back to learn, which doesn't always mean sustainable development because when they grow up they have to be citizens of certain groups then they have to think about the whole picture, not the community they belong to but some countries and some locations which can relate with their own lives because Japan is a huge important country, and we are depending on the resources outside of Japan, that's one of the things or characteristics of ESD, at the same time (Professor, Japan, female)

As with all regions of the world grappling with citizenship/education issues, Asian educational systems are finding it difficult to maintain cultural traditions within pedagogies, as well as to determine how best to educate "global" student-citizens (Goh, 2012; Lee, 2012). As discussed previously, there are various dilemmas of what should be included in citizenship education. Goh (2012) presented the following three often contradictory aspects of

citizenship: ideology versus cohesion, tradition versus modernity, and sectarian versus non-sectarian. In this section we will attempt to explain some key ecopedagogical issues around these contradictions of citizenship. Ecopedagogues question how does each of these contradictions affect the environmental understanding and valuing- with these contradictions excellent problem-posting arguments within ecopedagogical learning spaces and research.

Michael Apple has pointed to several essential questions to pose in learning spaces (2004): "What do ideologies actually do for the people who 'have' them? What are the histories of ideologies (p. 18)?" When adapted to ecopedagogy, a very appropriate next question would be, how do ideologies promote or counter cohesion by reducing or reproducing socio-environmental oppressions? For example, this might take the form of cultivating students' critical literacies of technology and traditions so that they can problematize the tensions between modernity and tradition. Both of these can be environmentally beneficial but also environmentally harmful. Related to this, not all that is connected to globalization from below (e.g., traditions) is environmentally good; not all that is connected to globalization from above (e.g., modern technologies) is environmentally bad – both demand critical teaching. Some scholars, such as Bowers and Apffel-Marglin (2005), have argued that some that critical pedagogies, with their foundations in notions of transformation and the inherent "unfinishedness" of humans and society (Freire, 2005), inherently destroy traditions. However, many others (Au & Apple, 2007; McLaren, 2007; Misiaszek, 2011, 2015b), have argued that these are shallow readings on critical pedagogies in that the goal of critical pedagogy is not to end traditions but instead engage in critical praxis to reinvent societies – indeed, this reinvention might include both traditions and modern processes.

Finally, the question of who is included as a citizen, who is included as a participant, within societies is a central question of GCE. Within global citizenship there are complex relationships between spheres of citizenship and with planetary citizenship there is the inclusion of the biocentric aspects. There are also questions of how we separate each other into groupings within citizenship spheres through persons' –this separation may range from oppressive othering all the way to GCE's goal of respect through better understanding each others' similarities and differences, and their multiple identities. GCE, and ecopedagogy, does not seek to homogenize notions of culture within citizenship but rather to embrace

heterogeneity of the World's cultures. Without need to be stated, neoliberal global citizenship/GCE would be opposite to this with the goal of Westernization as the endpoint (Cudworth, 2003). Due to the inseparable connection between GCE and ecopedagogy (Misiaszek, 2015b), this is also true as an inherent goal of ecopedagogy.

Although there are foundational differences between traditional nation-state citizenship and critical global citizenship, this does not mean that the two must be in opposition. Because it is within sovereign nation-states that rights and responsibilities are delivered and carried out, globalization does not make national citizenship "redundant and obsolete" as some scholars have theorized (Cohen, 2009; Ong, 2013), but rather "defend[s] the relevance of the concept of [nation-state] citizenship in contemporary theory (Isin, Nyers, & Turner, 2013; Turner, 2012, p. 19). For education/research (including citizenship education/research) the nation-state is also important, even with intensifying globalization, because "educational systems and practices are sponsored, mandated, organized and certified by the state" (Olmos & Torres, 2009, p. 77). During his keynote speech at the Second UNESCO Forum on Global Citizenship Education (Paris, January 29, 2015), Carlos Alberto Torres stressed that for critical GCE to be successful, it must add value to national citizenship with "global common goods." Torres has given the following as common global goods: (1) sustainable development education, moving from diagnosis and denunciation into action and policy implementation; (2) global peace is an intangible cultural good of humanity; and (3) live together democratically in an ever growing diverse world, seeking to fulfill their individual and cultural interest (Misiaszek, 2015b). Since being morally "good" is central in Eastern citizenship frameworks, these "global common goods" would need to coincide with Eastern notions of this term.

Lee (2009) has argued that there is a hybridization of citizenship pedagogies in the East in which there are "always in-betweens in the way that citizenship pedagogies are developed that would cater for the various concerns, purposes and features of various types of pedagogies" (p. 19). Lee (2009), as well as Torres (2002), have discussed that citizenship has the following three pedagogical oriented approaches: nation, person (or personhood), and global. Torres (2002) has stated that because most nation-states do not have the capacity to compete in economics which has became increasingly global, a main focus of their education

should be on personhood which "supersedes the logic of national citizenship," for critical understanding and respect of citizens' multiple identities and their goals of increasing their livelihood. This loss of control is also described by Turner in East Asia, as in the rest of the world, as the "weakening of national power over TNCs [transnational corporations]: more global, states can no longer exercise effective control over international corporations..." (2012, p. 38). He posed that focusing on personhood helps a State towards the second of the following two often-contradictory roles of the State: (1) generating economic activity and (2) social cohesion. In this way, this is a similar critical global citizenship role within both Western and Eastern models of citizenship with the indication that humans have multiple citizenship spheres to the largest of planetary citizenship (Misiaszek, in revisions (2016)). Although this article does not allow for the space to further discuss planetary citizenship sphere, the main ideas is that the planet is a holistic entity with Earth being a citizenship, along with the other complex connections with future citizens (e.g., citizens of future generations) (Misiaszek, in revisions (2016)).

VI. Conclusion

In this article we have discussed some key, but broad, concepts of Eastern and Western frameworks of citizenship and their possible intersections with citizenship/education and globalizations. As stated previously, the contextual re-/reading (a la Paulo Freire) of citizenship frameworks within the diverse societies that make up, the often problematic, terminology of the East and the West is essential to give meaning to give meaning and understanding to these societies' differences and similarities. We have highlighted the contested terrains of globalizations and models of GCE, presenting the need criticality of these contextual contested terrains in teaching and in educational research. Specifically, we have focused on environmental pedagogies and the research on how these pedagogies can lead to the emergence of transformative socio-environmental actions by students. We have tried to present some initial arguments in hopes that that it will initiate and continue such dialectic dialogue and analysis. To paraphrase the words of Carlos Alberto Torres, for GCE to be successful there need to be "global common goods" along with respect and understanding of the World's diversity. Because of the connective, dependent need for critical

GCE and ecopedagogical for their success (Misiaszek, 2015a), the focus of this conclusion and overall article are essential educational issues of socio-environmental wellbeing and peace. Thus, the ultimate focus of critical GCE together with ecopedagogy must be global, all-inclusive socio-environmental wellbeing and peace – two key global common goods.

References

Apple, M. W. (2004). *Ideology and curriculum (3rd ed.).* New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. W., & Au, W. (2009). Politics, theory, and reality in critical pedagogy. In R. Cowen & A. M. Kazamias (Eds.), *International Handbook of Comparative Education (Vol. 22,* pp. 991-1007): Springer Netherlands.

Apple, M. W., Au, W., & Gandin, L. s. A. (2009). Mapping Critical Education. In M. W. Apple, W. Au, & L. s. A. Gandin (Eds.), *The Routledge International Handbook of Critical Education* (pp. 3-20). New York, NY: Routledge.

Arnove, R. F. (2007). Introduction: Reframing comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local. In R. F. Arnove & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local (3rd ed,* pp. 1-20). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Au, W. W., & Apple, M. W. (2007). Reviewing policy: Freire, critical education, and the environmental crisis. *Educational Policy, 21*(3), 457-470.

Beck, U. (2002). The cosmopolitan society and its enemies. *Theory, Culture & Society, 19*(1-2), 17-44.

Beck, U. (2009). *World at risk.* Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Bowers, C. A., & Apffel-Marglin, F. d. r. (2005). *Rethinking Freire : globalization and the environmental crisis.* Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Capella, J.-R. (2000). *Globalization, a fading citizenship.* In N. C. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds.), Globalization and education: Critical perspectives (pp. 227-252). New York: Routledge.

Carnoy, M. (1997). Foreword. In P. Freire & A. M. A. Freire (Eds.), *Pedagogy of the heart* (pp. 141 p.). New York: Continuum.

Chang, K.-S. (2012). Different beds, one dream?: State-society relationships and citizenship regimes in East Asia. In K.-S. Chang & B. S. Turner (Eds.), *Contested citizenship in East Asia: Developmental Politics, National Unity, and Globalization* (pp. 62-87). Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon ; New York: Routledge.

Chang, K.-S., & Turner, B. S. (2012). *Contested citizenship in East Asia: Developmental Politics, National Unity, and Globalization.* Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon ; New York:

Routledge.

Choo, S. S. (2015). Citizenship education in Asia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 35*(2), 149-152. doi:10.1080/02188791.2015.1048764

Cohen, E. F. (2009). *Semi-citizenship in democratic politics*: Cambridge University Press.

Cudworth, E. (2003). *Environment and society.* New York: Routledge.

Dewey, J. (1963). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education.* New York: Macmillan.

Dirlik, A. (2012). Colonialism, revolution, development: A historical perspective on citizenship in political struggles in Eastern Asia. In K.-S. Chang & B. S. Turner (Eds.), *Contested citizenship in East Asia: Developmental Politics, National Unity, and Globalization* (pp. 43-61). Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon ; New York: Routledge.

Freire, P. (1998). Cultural action and conscientization. *Harvard Educational Review, 68(4, Winter).* Retrieved from http://www.edreview.org/harvard98/1998/wi98/w98frei2.htm

Freire, P. (2004). *Pedagogy of indignation.* Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York, NY: Continuum.

Gadotti, M. (1996). *Pedagogy of praxis: A dialectical philosophy of education.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Gadotti, M. (2000). *Pedagogia da terra. São Paulo,* SP: Editora Fundação Peirópolis.

Gadotti, M. (2008a). Education for sustainability: A critical contribution to the Decade of Education for Sustainable development. Green Theory and Praxis: *The Journal of Ecopedagogy, 4*(1), 50. Retrieved from http://greentheoryandpraxis.org/journal/index.php/journal/article/viewFile/38/32

Gadotti, M. (2008b). What we need to learn to save the planet. *Journal of Education for Sustainable Development, 2*(1), 21-30. Retrieved from http://jsd.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/2/1/21

Gadotti, M., & Torres, C. A. (2009). Paulo Freire: Education for development. *Development and Change, 40*(6), 1255-1267. doi:10.1111/j.1467-7660.2009.01606.x

Goh, M. (2012). Teaching with cultural intelligence: developing multiculturally educated and globally engaged citizens. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 32*(4), 395-415. doi:10.1080/02188791.2012.738679

Gutiérrez, F., & Prado, C. (2008). *Ecopedagogia e cidadania planetária.* San Paulo: Instituto Paulo Freire.

Heater, D. (2003). *A history of education for citizenship.* London: Routledge.

Isin, E. F., Nyers, P., & Turner, B. S. (2013). *Citizenship between past and future*. London: Routledge.

Jucker, R. (2004). Have the cake and eat it: Ecojustice versus development? Is it possible to reconcile social and economic equity, ecological sustainability, and human development? Some implications for ecojustice education. *Educational Studies, 36*(1), 10-26. Retrieved from http://www.informaworld.com/10.1207/s15326993es3601_3

Kahn, R. (2010). Critical pedagogy, ecoliteracy, and planetary crisis: *The ecopedagogy movement (Vol. 359)*. New York: Peter Lang.

Kellner, D. (2002). Theorizing globalization. *Sociological Theory, 20*(3), 285-305. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3108613
http://0-www.jstor.org.ignacio.usfca.edu/stable/3108613

Kopnina, H. (2011). Revisiting education for sustainable development (ESD): Examining anthropocentric bias through the transition of environmental education to ESD. *Sustainable Development,* n/a-n/a. doi:10.1002/sd.529

Lee, W. O. (2004). Emerging concepts of citizenship in the Asian context In W. O. Lee, D. L. Grossman, K. J. Kennedy, & G. P. Fairbrother (Eds.), *Citizenship education in Asia and the Pacific: Concepts and issues* (pp. 25-35). Hong Kong: Kluwer Academic.

Lee, W. O. (2009). Conceptualising citizenship and citizenship education: A trajectory of exploring Asian perspectives. Paper presented at the Chair Professors Public Lecture Series, The Hong Kong Institute of Education: HKIEd Tai Po Campus.

Lee, W. O. (2012). Education for future-oriented citizenship: implications for the education of twenty-first century competencies. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 32*(4), 498-517. doi:10.1080/02188791.2012.741057

Liang, S. M. (1930). *Zhong Xi Wenhua Ji Qi Shehui [The Cultures of the East and the West and their philosophies]*. Hong Kong: Longman Press.

McLaren, P. (2007). Conservation, class struggle, or both: A response to C.A. Bowers. *Capitalism, Nature, and Socialism, 18*(1), 99-108.

Misiaszek, G. W. (2011). Ecopedagogy in the age of globalization: Educators' perspectives of environmental education programs in the Americas which incorporate social justice models. (Ph.D.), University of California, Los Angeles, Dissertations & Theses: Full Text. (Publication No. AAT 3483199)

Misiaszek, G. W. (2012). Transformative environmental education within social justice models: Lessons from comparing adult ecopedagogy within North and South America. In D.

N. Aspin, J. Chapman, K. Evans, & R. Bagnall (Eds.), *Second International Handbook of Lifelong Learning (Vol. 26,* pp. 423-440). London: Springer.

Misiaszek, G. W. (2014). Environmental education through global and local lenses: Ecopedagogy and globalizations in Appalachia, Argentina, and Brazil. In D. A. Turner & H. Yolcu (Eds.), *Neoliberal educational reforms: A Critical Analysis* (pp. 184-203). New York: Taylor & Francis/Routledge.

Misiaszek, G. W. (2015a). Ecopedagogy and Citizenship in the Age of Globalisation: connections between environmental and global citizenship education to save the planet. *European Journal of Education, 50*(3), 280-292. doi:10.1111/ejed.12138

Misiaszek, G. W. (2015b). Ecopedagogy and citizenship in the age of globalization: Essential connections between environmental and global citizenship education to save the Planet. *European Journal of Education: Research, Development, and Policies, 50*(3), 280-292.

Misiaszek, G. W. (in revisions (2016)). Ecopedagogy as an element of citizenship education: The dialectic of global/local spheres of citizenship and critical environmental pedagogies in the Americas. *International Review of Education (UNESCO).*

Morrow, R. A., & Torres, C. A. (2007). The state, social movements, and educational reform. In R. F. Arnove & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local (3rd ed,* pp. 79-100). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Olmos, L., & Torres, C. A. (2009). Theories of the state, educational expansion, development, and globalizations: Marxian and critical approaches. *International Handbook of Comparative Education, 73.*

Ong, A. (2013). Please Stay: Pied-a-Terre Subjects in the Megacity. In E. F. Isin, P. Nyers, & B. S. Turner (Eds.), *Citizenship between past and future.* London: Routledge.

Pocock, J. G. (1995). The ideal of citizenship since classical times. In R. Beiner (Ed.), *Theorizing citizenship.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Postma, D. W. (2006). *Why care for nature?: In search of an ethical framework for environmental responsibility and education.* New York: Springer.

Shultz, L. (2007). Educating for global citizenship: Conflicting agendas and understandings. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 53*(3), 248-258. Retrieved from http://ajer.synergiesprairies.ca/ajer/index.php/ajer/article/view/698

Stromquist, N. P. (2002). Education in a globalized world: The connectivity of economic power, technology, and knowledge: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Torres, C. A. (2002). Globalization, education, and citizenship: Solidarity versus markets? *American Educational Research Journal, 39*(2), 363-378. Retrieved from http://0-www.jstor.org.ignacio.usfca.edu/stable/3202526

Torres, C. A. (2009). *Globalizations and education: Collected essays on class, race, gender, and the state*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Torres, C. A. (2013). Afterword: Another Globalization is Possible. In R. F. Arnove, C. A. Torres, & Franz (Eds.), *Comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local (4th ed.)*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Torres, C. A. (2015). Global citizenship education: A new educational, pedagogical and political narrative in the world system? Retrieved from http://mgiep.unesco.org/bluedot/global-citizenship-education-a-new-educational-pedagogical-and-political-narrative-in-the-world-system/

Turner, B. S. (2012). National and social citizenship: Some structural and cultural problems with modern citizenship. In K. n.-s. p. Chang & B. S. Turner (Eds.), *Contested citizenship in East Asia* (pp. 15-42). Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon ; New York: Routledge.

* Greg Misiaszek, Ph.D. is an Assistant Professor at the Faculty of Education, Beijing Normal University. He is the Director of Communications and an Executive Editorial Board member of the Publications Committee of the World Council of Comparative Education Societies (WCCES); and Assistant Director of the Paulo Freire Institute, UCLA. Dr. Misiaszek serves on the International Advisory Committee of the UNESCO Chair of Global Learning and Global Citizenship Education (GCE).
* E-mail: gmisiaszek@gmail.com,

* Lauren Ila Misiaszek, Ph.D. is an Associate Professor at the Institute of International and Comparative Education, Faculty of Education, Beijing Normal University. She is the Assistant Secretary General of the World Council of the Comparative Education Societies (WCCES) and Assistant Director of the Paulo Freire Institute, UCLA. Dr. Misiaszek serves on the International Advisory Committee of the UNESCO Chair of Global Learning and Global Citizenship Education (GCE).
* E-mail: limisiaszek@gmail.com