ARE TEACHERS READY TO TEACH GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP? INSIGHTS FROM PAKISTANI PRESERVICE TEACHERS ABOUT TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS

Dr. Ghazal Shaikh[1] and Dr. Asadullah Lashari[2]

ABSTRACT

Citizenship education is, arguably, an important part of all education. It is important that the teacher trainees be aware of the concepts involved and be ready to teach them. This study explored how a Masters in Education course prepared trainee teachers to teach citizenship. Perceptions of thirteen trainee teachers enrolled in a Master in Education course were taken through an open-ended questionnaire at the beginning and end of their one year course. The study reveals that the participants' conception of the purpose of education in general broadened over time and they reported to have grown intellectually and psychologically as teachers. However, the respondents were unable to properly define citizenship education and global citizens even after 11 months in the course. On the basis of the findings, we argue that teacher education courses are not well-equipped to prepare trainee teachers to teach global citizenship. It is therefore, recommended that further research be carried out in other contexts to check the generalisability of this study.

Keywords: *global citizenship, teacher training, pre-service teachers.*

1.   INTRODUCTION

The growing internationalization has given rise to the concept of global citizenship. Growing connectivity among countries due to immigration and trade, the scope of global citizenship as an ideology has got immense place in political debates and academia. As, citizenship conforms one's loyalty towards the state s/he lives in, the sense of belonging towards duties, rights and responsibilities for his fellow countrymen, the global citizenship takes the same commitment of an individual to the larger community, the world. It is the sole responsibility of the state to ignite the sense of citizenship among its citizens and it does so through different means. The most effective way is to blend the sense of citizenship within the state curriculum and train teachers to teach this concept. As citizenship education is a relatively new field and not

[1]Associate Professor, Institute of English Language and Literature, University of Sindh, Jamshoro. Email: Ghazal.shaikh@usindh.edu.pk
[2]Assistant Professor, HoD, English Department, University of Sindh, Thatta Campus. Email: Asadullah.lashari@usindh.edu.pk

directly included in the curriculum as a separate subject, there is a need for exploratory research to look into how prepared are our trainee teachers to teach global citizenship education. In this growing time of unrest, terrorism and intolerance, providing a sense of citizenship to the students can be a useful purpose of education. If our teachers are prepared to teach such ideas, it can help foster harmony in these stressful times.

1.1   Research Question

Our main research question was: "How far are trainee teachers prepared to teach global citizenship?"
The sub-research questions included:
1.   What are the perceptions of trainee teachers regarding education and global citizenship education before they study on a teacher training program?
2.   What are the perceptions of trainee teachers regarding education and global citizenship education after they study on a teacher training program?

2.   LITERATURE REVIEW

Various academics have defined citizenship differently. Brett (2005) believed that giving's learners "a set of tools which will enable them to participate effectively, actively and responsibly within their adult life" is citizenship education (p.9). Marshall, a well-known pioneer of citizenship education argues that "citizenship is a status, bestowed on those who are full members of a community. All who possess the status are equal with respect to the rights and duties with which the status is endowed" (Marshall & Bottomore, 1992, p. 18). Osler and Starkey (2002) also define it as a status that comes with rights and duties. In a western context, emphasis has been put on political and civic virtues while designing citizenship education curriculum (for example, Cogan, 1998; Osler and Starkey, 2004). Cogan (1998) defines citizenship in terms of five elements, identity, rights, duties, political involvement and societal values. In a more Asian setting, more emphasis has been put on moral education (see Kennedy and Fairbrother, 2004).

According to Dunn (2002), MaIntosh (2005) and Noddings (2005), the term global citizenship is ambiguous and there is no mutual agreement on its definition. Moreover, the changing priorities and roles of Nation-States also change the notion of citizenship education. Furthermore, the cultural and other ideological differences among western and non-western countries have also hindered the mutually constructed meaning of global citizenship (White & Openshsaw 2002). Rapoport (2015) believes, the term global citizenship

education is difficult to comprehend and practice for many teachers and academic practitioners due to many reasons. Since the beginning of the 21st century, a lot of emphasis is being put on globalizing the curriculum and building a sense of global citizenship. There have been many studies carried out in the area of teaching and exploring the idea of global citizenship education. Most of these studies are focused in developed countries.

There have been many studies which have focused on global citizenship education, pre-service/in-service teachers' beliefs about global citizenship education, factors influencing the forming of these beliefs and integrating global citizenship education in teaching practices. Saperstein (2020) argues that citizenship education starts with teacher eduation and teacher training. Lee and Leung (2006), for example, claim based on the findings of their survey that teachers in Shanghai and Hong Kong want to teach global citizenship education but the burden of exam-oriented curriculum, lack of proper training in teaching global citizenship and disinterest of government officials in formulating policies hinder global citizenship education. Moreover, the findings suggest that the topics related to global citizenship were too difficult to comprehend for majority of the teachers from Shanghai and Hong Kong and government paid little attention in developing relevant curriculum and employing pedagogical skills among educators to teach global citizenship education.

Rapoport (2015) conducted a study exploring practitioners' views and rationale for teaching global citizenship. The findings of his study revealed that although all the participants were in favor of teaching global citizenship but ironically, they were unsettled about what global citizenship entails. Moreover, participants made their own rationale of teaching global citizenship based on their own international exposure. Haselkorn (2014) in his PhD dissertation investigated the beliefs of pre-service Social Studies teachers about global citizenship education. The study focused on factors shaping the beliefs of pre-service teachers about teaching global education. The data was collected through a series of semi-structured interviews and a closed-reading of participants' reflection journals. The findings of the study suggested that all three participants of the study believed that teacher education program played an important role in shaping their beliefs about teaching global citizenship. The study concluded that proper awareness of global issues can lead to a better understanding of global citizenship. Patrick, Macqueen & Reynolds (2012) showed that particular courses played an important role in developing the interest of students in global citizenship education. The least interest was seen in the course of English because it had not embedded the global education in its curriculum. On the other hand, pre-service teachers found their

interest in global education in the course of Geography as the curriculum offered more space to explore global issues. The findings are supported by a similar study on pre-service teachers conducted by Robinson et al (2003) in the United Kingdom. Their findings also suggested that teachers having specialization in geography are more inclined towards teaching global citizenship education. While those having specialization in Math are least inclined towards global citizenship education.

Lou (2014) conducted a case study on "Preparing Teachers to Educate for 21st Century Global Citizenship: Envisioning and Enacting". The aim of the study was to get an insight into the candidates' lived experiences in learning to educate global citizenship. The study was conducted on the 45 candidates enrolled in a project Educating for Global Citizenship developed jointly by UPIE and UNICEF Canada. The participants of the study affirmed that before this course they had limited understanding of global citizenship education. After this project the teacher candidates were asked to integrate the Global Citizenship education in their classroom practices. Many of the participants reported that due to embedding global perspective into their classroom practices they were able to get more response and witnessed increased interest of the students in the studies. Although a small number of participants reported that they had trouble in implementing global citizenship education in their classroom practices due to lack of liberty in modifying lesson plans and time constrained syllabus.

Rantakoko (2018) conducted a study as a part of his Master's Thesis on the topic "Teacher Students' Perception on Global Citizenship and Its Role in Education" in Finland. The study was conducted on 34 primary school teachers. The focus of the research was to know the understanding of teacher students about global citizenship education and how would they incorporate the global citizenship education into their teaching. The findings of the study suggested that some of the participants had difficulty in understanding and defining the term "global citizenship". The other participants defined the term "global citizenship" as all the people who live on this globe. In this way all the people are global citizens whether they realize it or not. The findings also suggested that many participants believed global citizenship is travelling and meeting with foreigners. While answering the second part of the research question, the participants believed teaching global citizenship can prove to be a tool to change the world. The participants believed the global citizenship education can be achieved by integrating it with different subjects. Majority of the teachers believed that integrating it with social studies, environmental studies and art and drama could give better results in promoting global citizenship education.

Bitna (2017) conducted a research to explore the "Teachers' Perception on Global Citizenship Education in ASEAN Countries" which included Cambodia, Thailand and Singapore. The research involved qualitative research design. The data was collected through country education reports, existing literature on ASEAN countries and semi-structured interviews from selected teachers from Thailand, Cambodia and Singapore. The findings of the research demonstrated that the core concepts of global citizenship are already embedded in basic disciplines such as Social Studies, Geography and History. Nonetheless, except Singapore, teachers in Thailand and Cambodia lacked the basic understanding of global citizenship education. Study found that because the moral values and human rights values in these two countries are deeply rooted in their culture and religion and hence their curricula also exhibit these values in terms of culture and religion. Besides, the government education policies, excessive workload and lack of supporting material also hindered the implementation of global citizenship education in Thailand and Cambodia. On the other hand, teachers in Singapore had better understanding of global citizenship education. Also, the support and facilities in terms of material and information from government made it easier for them to accept and implement global citizenship education. According to the study, except Singapore, low budget in education in ASEAN countries and subsequently low qualified teachers is a big challenge in imparting global citizenship education.

While the studies above show that global citizenship education is still an alien concept to many pre-service teachers in many parts of the world, especially among the less developed countries. The concept of global citizenship education is more dominant in developed countries because of their multicultural population. The literature has found no studies stressing the Investigation of pre-service teachers' perception of global citizenship. The present research aims to fill this gap. Studies on global citizenship education in Pakistani context would open new dimension in the field of teacher education program.

3.   METHODOLOGY

The main focus of the study is to investigate the perceptions of global citizenship education of pre-service and in-service teachers enrolled in M.Ed. (Master in Education) program at a public sector university in Hyderabad, Sindh. The main research question for this study was: "How far are trainee teachers prepared to teach global citizenship?" The study aims to explore the perceptions of global citizenship education of students at the beginning and end of the M.Ed. program. The study uses a qualitative approach as a research design. Bryman and Bell (2007) define qualitative research as a strategy which

emphasizes participants' responses in words in data collection and analysis instead of quantification of data. The research was conducted at a public university in Sindh, Pakistan.

The purposive sampling technique was used as the data was collected from the participants of a specific course and secondly it suited the availability of the participants. The data was collected from 13 enrolled participants in M.Ed. program by distributing open-ended questionnaires. Participants were told about the project in detail, asked to sign a consent form after reading about the project including details on how the data will be used and disseminated. The questionnaires were available in Sindhi, Urdu and English-the regional and national languages- for the convenience of the participants. The participants have a first degree in various subjects ranging from arts to science. Ten of these participants have worked or are working as teachers in schools.

The open-ended questionnaires suited the study as according to Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2013) "it enables the respondents to answer as much as they wish and are suitable for investigating perceptions and opinions". The questionnaires included questions like "What do you think is the purpose of education?" "What does 'educating citizens' means?" among others. The areas that were explored included the participants' perceptions related to the purpose of education, citizenship education and global citizenship education. They were also asked what their definitions of educating citizens, global citizens and community were. Some students were unsure about the concepts in question and left the answer spaces empty. Despite the presence of the researchers in the room and repeated clarifications, it could not be ensured that all participants answer all questions. All the questions asked were in accordance with the main research question that this study set out to explore. The data was collected in two stages. In the first stage, the data was collected from the students in 1st month of their M.Ed. program. In the second stage, the data was collected after a year and at the end of M.Ed. program. The purpose behind collecting data in two stages was to compare the perceptions of participants about global citizenship education before and after acquiring M. Ed. The study aims to investigate how far M.Ed. program influences participants perceptions about global citizenship education.

Informed consent was taken from all participants through consent forms which was on the first page of the questionnaire in both cycles. The participants were assured that all information would be published under pseudonyms. Participation was voluntary and the respondents could withdraw at any stage.

For data analysis, the study followed the six-step thematic analysis framework proposed by Braun and Clarke (2006). Since the data was collected through open-ended questions and it allowed the participants to express their perceptions and opinions, it required to be divided into codes, categories and themes. Braun and Clarke's (2006) framework includes six steps: 1. familiarizing yourself with data 2. generating initial codes 3. searching for themes 4. reviewing themes, 5. defining and naming themes 6. producing the report. Following these steps, we familiarised ourselves with the data during translation and transcription of data. Once the data was collected, it was translated into English as some of the questionnaires were filled in Sindhi and Urdu. After translating the data, it was divided into codes. The coding process started with topical codes and moved on to more analytical codes which required decision making (Richards, 2012). After reviewing the codes, categories were established from these codes. The categories helped formulate the themes that helped discuss the research question in the light of the data. The themes brought forth from the coding process are presented and discussed in the following sections.

4. FINDINGS

The data received from 13 participants before and after their M.Ed course was coded. Round 1 and Round 2 data had a number of codes. The codes were divided into six categories, each of which is explained below:

4.1 Purpose of Education

When asked what they thought was the purpose of education, participants at the beginning of the course talked about morality, citizenship, bringing change and awareness as the major purposes of education. Seven of the participants said *the purpose of education was to make learners better people i.e. to "make them understand the difference between good and bad", "to be a good human being", "to make humans humane"*. Five of the participants considered citizenship education as a purpose of education, as one wrote, "*make them good citizens*". Even though they did not always mention citizenship education directly, they said things like "*education means taking care of other people's rights", "the purpose of education is that people can talk about their rights*". Some participants also talked about education as a means to bring change in society and their behaviour while others talked about it as a means to bring awareness.

The questionnaires from the second round of data also talked about similar themes. However, bringing change was talked about by seven participants now as compared to just three before. When asked to write what

education's purpose was, one of the participants responded, "*to bring a positive change in a person*". Another participant wrote, "*to bring the change in an individual's behaviour*". Six of the participants talked about moral purpose while four others thought education was meant to make good citizens aware of their rights and duties. During the second round, the participants commented that the teacher education course had influenced their understanding of the purpose of education. They talked about an intellectual and psychological influence saying, for example, *"It helped to understand child psychology, testing and evaluation, and teaching techniques."*

4.2   Educating Citizens

While writing about what educating citizen mean, these trainee teachers talked about the purpose and suggested teaching methods. Within the code of purpose, there were, morality, patriotism, awareness and changing society. Four of the participants thought educating citizens meant making them "a good person", "harmonious" and "responsible." Four of them talked about "loving Pakistan", "being patriotic" as the main goal of educating citizens. The participants also suggested teaching methods where most of them talked about teachers leading by example, "*we should make ourselves role models, students copy our behaviour*". Three of the participants connected it with their own subject. Couple of participants talked about teaching through innovative activities, and one mentioned using current, published research.

Similar responses were received in Round 2 as well. Participants talked about the same four reasons of educating citizens- morality, awareness, patriotism and changing society. However, by this time in their courses, an equal number of participants, four each talked about morality, awareness and bringing change in society as a purpose of citizens' education while only two discussed patriotism. Teaching methods suggested were also the same. Five of the participants suggested that teachers teach through example: "*if a teacher is a good citizen himself, he can make entire society better.*" They also talked about teaching through activities. Four of the participants said *they could teach by connecting with their subject*, however, three others thought that *citizens' education could not be connected with their subjects of specialization.*

4.3   Global Citizens

The student teachers were asked to define global citizens in the questionnaires. In round one only eight of thirteen participants answered this questionnaire item. Five of these said anybody who is part of the world is a global citizen. For example, one participant said, "*I live in this world so I am a global citizen*". Two of the participants seemed to think only those with

education are global citizens as one of them said, "*Being a global citizen means being an educated person*". One participant gave it a moral dimension, saying "*a good and moral person*" is a global citizen.

In Round 2, nine participants chose to write a response to this questionnaire item. Six of them believed all people in the world were global citizens. As one of them wrote, "*Everyone who lives on Earth is a global citizen.*" However, two people still gave importance to education as a prerequisite while one seemed to think that people with more than one nationality are global citizens.

4.4   Global Citizenship Education

In response to the questionnaire item, "What is global citizenship education?", only three participants responded in Round 1. As one of them wrote, "*all education is global citizenship education*". One other participant wrote, "*It is the ability to travel internationally.*"

In Round 2, six of the participants wrote a response. However, some of the responses were vague. One participant talked about it as education necessary for the ability to travel. Another one said, "*it means educating students about Islam*", while one other talked about all education being global citizenship education. Only one of the respondents talked about being a good student, saying, "*we should also make them good citizens so they can be helpful for the entire world.*"

4.5   Teaching Global Citizenship

Three participants commented on how to teach global citizenship in Round 1. As one participant wrote, "*Global citizenship education can only be given if we have the right equipment like internet access, multimedia, mic, laptops or tablets in the classroom*". One other participant said, "*it is the responsibility of all teachers teaching different subjects, cannot be done by one or two*". During Round 2, only two participants talked about teaching global citizenship mentioning the same things as in Round 1 questionnaires.

4.6   Role of Teacher Education Course

In Round 1, as the participants were at the beginning of their course, they were only asked about their expectations of the course preparing them for global citizenship education. Five of the participants responded that they did not know while others thought the course should prepare them for teaching global citizenship. When the same participants were asked after almost a year if the course actually prepared them to teach global citizenship, three of them said they did not know, while three said it did not prepare them

at all. As one of them wrote explaining their answer, "*there is a lack of such teacher education that prepares for global citizenship.*" Another respondent wrote, "*Our faculty's teachers are also unaware about that." Seven others however believed that the course did prepare them to teach citizenship*". One of them said, "*The course has affected us indirectly but if we do proper teaching then obviously these things will get better in our students*."

5. DISCUSSION

In light of the findings, we argue that the trainee teachers had a moralistic view of the purpose of education. The involved participants seem to believe that the purpose of education was to make humans humane and be good. In Asian contexts, morality and moral education is considered very important (e.g. Kennedy and Fairbrother, 2004). The participants in this study, therefore, behaved as expected by connecting education to its character-building and moral aspects. This is similar to what other researchers have reported in Asian settings.

The participants of this study were asked to identify the purpose of education in this study to see if they connected it to citizenship education in any way. As it is believed that citizenship education is the education of all citizens to enable them to live with rights and duties in society (Osler and Starkey, 2002; Marshall and Bottomore, 1992; Cogan, 1998), it was hoped that the teacher trainees might connect it with the purpose of all education. Five of the participants did talk about citizenship education, one directly while the other four implicitly. Therefore, some of the participants did think of citizenship education as one purpose of education.

Even though the concept of citizenship education and global citizenship are recorded in literature (e.g. Noddings, 2015; McIntosh, 2015; Cogan, 1998), there are still many possible ways to define citizenship. The trainee teachers participating in this study were asked to define their understanding of educating citizens. They talked about four purposes of educating citizens- morality, awareness, patriotism and changing society. These four purposes that they stated were the same before and after the Masters course. The focus on patriotism can be connected with many theorists of citizenship education who talk about citizenship education being a means to strengthen national identity, citizenship being a status etc (e.g. Marshall and Bottomore, 1992; Osler and Starkey, 2002). The attempt at connecting citizenship with bringing change in society could be somewhat connected to the idea of political and public involvement through performing duties and getting rights as suggested by Cogan (1998). The focus on morality being an important element of citizens' education can also be connected to Kennedy

and Fairbrother's (2004) emphasis on morality in an Asian setting. Therefore, the elements that these trainee teachers discussed as being the purposes of citizens' education are those discussed in literature and assigned as elements of citizenship education by many theorists.

The participants' understanding of global citizenship education was tested with basic concepts which they were asked to define such as, global citizens and global citizenship education. As Sant (2018) argues global citizenship seemed a rather elite concept to the undergraduate students. They believed it was for those who travelled and transcended beyond national citizenship. Earlier studies such as Patrick et al. (2012) and Robinson et al (2003) have shown that teacher trainees have some knowledge of, though to a varying degree according to the subject of their specialization, in global citizenship education. In our study, however, the participants seemed to have very little knowledge and interest in global citizenship education. Concepts as simple as global citizens, for which the term is self-explanatory, were not clearly defined by all participants. Even in the second round of questionnaires, some of the participants thought only educated people can be considered global citizens. When asked to define global citizenship education, the participants were unaware of the concept. Even after their Masters course, only six participants ventured to define, the rest left the answer empty. This is similar to what Bitna (2017) reports regarding teachers in Thailand and Cambodia being unaware of the basic concepts related to global citizenship and what Lee and Leung (2006) report regarding the situation in Hong Kong and Shanghai. Though it can be argued that not answering does not mean that they did not know, it is important that these participants volunteered to participate and there is no other apparent reason why they should not answer. Therefore, it can be concluded that this teacher education course did not help these participants in understanding what global citizenship education entailed.

The questionnaires included a question about how to teach global citizenship. As is evident from the discussion in the previous paragraphs, these Pakistani trainee teachers did not understand the concepts of global citizenship education very well like the teachers in Thailand and Cambodia (Bitna, 2017). It can therefore, be expected that they would not, by consequence, know how to teach global citizenship. The question was responded to by only three participants in the pre-questionnaire and two in the post-questionnaire. This was the only questionnaire item where the number of responses had decreased after their training. The lack of response to the questionnaire items can be explained by other factors such as their lack of interest in the topic as they were specialising in other subjects, their lack of interest in filling the questionnaire as they didn't know the researchers and had

nothing to gain. However, they do respond to questions not related to global citizenship, even the question about educating citizens has been answered by all participants. So, it was not an issue of lack of interest but rather them not knowing the answers.

It can, therefore, be concluded that the teacher education course does not prepare the trainee teachers to teach global citizenship.

The participants were asked at the beginning of the course whether they thought the course would prepare them to teach global citizenship. A majority of them (eight of thirteen) thought that it should while others did not know. When posed the same question at the end of the course, the participants had varied opinions. While some of them said they did not know, others did understand that the course had not prepared them. However, somewhat unexpectedly, some participants believed that the course had prepared them to teach global citizenship. In the light of above discussion, it can only be interpreted as their lack of awareness as to what citizenship and global citizenship education entailed. The extent of the trainee teachers' unawareness can be seen from this statement by one of the participants who believed that the course had prepared them to teach global citizenship, "The course has affected us indirectly but if we do proper teaching then obviously these things will get better in our students." Most citizenship educators will agree that citizenship cannot be taught implicitly without the teacher mentioning it or intending to teach it. It is not a by-product of all teaching. Thus, it can be concluded that despite some students thinking so, the teacher education course did not prepare the trainee teachers for global citizenship education.

6.   CONCLUSION

In the light of the findings and discussion, we argue that the teacher training course at a public-sector university in Sindh, Pakistan fails to prepare trainee teachers to teach global citizenship. It is obvious that the students are not aware of any concepts related to citizenship education and are not ready to teach global citizenship. As our states have various issues related to identity, rights and duties and global citizenship education can help teachers and students gain perspectives on these issues, it is the need of the time to include this important component into all teaching and learning. It is therefore, recommended in the light of this study that teacher education courses should be designed with a global citizenship education component within them. As this is a qualitative, exploratory study conducted at one university, it is also recommended that such and more expanded studies be conducted throughout the country to understand the situation in its full capacity and take measures accordingly.

REFERENCES

Anni, R. (2018). Teacher Students' Perceptions of Global Citizenship and Its Role in Education. University of Oulu.

Bitna. J. (2017). Teachers' Perception on Global Citizenship Education in ASEAN Countries. Seoul National University.

Braun, V & Clarke, V. (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77-101

Brett, P. (2005). Citizenship through history, what is good practice? International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research, 5(2). Retrieved February 15, 2019 from http://www. citized.info/pdf/ commarticles/PB_citizenship_through_History.pdf

Bryman, A., Bell, E. (2007). Business Research Methods (second ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Cogan, J. (1998). Citizenship for the 21st century. In J. Cogan & R. Derricott (Eds.), Citizenship for the 21st century: An international perspective on education. London: Kogan Page Limited.

Cohen, L. Manion, L. Morrison. K. (2013). Research Methods in Education 7th Edition. Routledge.

Dunn RE (2002). Growing good citizens with a world-centered curriculum. Educational Leadership, 60(2), 10–13.

Ferguson-Patrick, K., Macqueen, S., Reynolds, R. (2002). Global education in teacher education programs: views from pre-service teachers. Joint AARE APERA International Conference, Sydney.

Guo, L. (2014). Preparing Teachers to Educate for 21st Century Global Citizenship: Envisioning and Enacting. Journal of Global Citizenship & Equity Education, 4(1), 1-23.

Haselkorn, J. (2014). An Investigation of pre-service social studies teacher's beliefs about global education: Evidence from personal narratives of learning and teaching. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh.

Kennedy, K and Fairbrother, G. (2004). Asian Perspectives on Citizenship Education. In W. O. Lee, D.L. Grossman, K, J. Kennedy and G. P. Fairbrother (Eds.), Citizenship education in Asia and the Pacific: concepts and issues (pp. 289-301). Hong Kong: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Lee, W. and Leung, S. (2006). Global citizenship education in Hong Kong and Shanghai secondary schools: ideals, realities and expectations. Citizenship Teaching and Learning, 2(2), 68–84.

Marshall, T.H. & Bottomore, T.B. (1992). Citizenship and Social Class (Vol. 2). London: Pluto Press.

McIntosh, P. (2005). Gender perspectives on educating for global citizenship. In: Nodding N (ed.) Educating Citizens for Global Awareness (pp.22-39). New York: Teachers College Press.

Noddings N (2005) Global citizenship: promises and problems. In N. Noddings (ed.) Educating Citizens for Global Awareness (pp. 1-21). New York: Teachers College Press.

Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2002). Education for Citizenship: mainstreaming the fight against racism? European Journal of Education, 37(2), 143-159.

Rapoport, A. (2015). Global citizenship education: Classroom teachers' perspectives and approaches. In M. M. Merryfeld, T. Augustine & J. Harshman (Eds.), Research in global citizenship education (pp. 119–135). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Robbins, M., Francis, L., & Elliott, E. (2003). Attitudes toward education for global citizenship among trainee teachers. Research in Education, 69, 93-98.

Sant, E. (2018). We, the non-global citizens: Reflections on the possibilities and challenges of democratic global citizenship education in higher education contexts. Citizenship Teaching & Learning, 13(3), 273-292.

Saperstein, E. (2020). Global Citizenship Education Starts with Teacher Training and Professional Development. Journal of Global Education and Research, 4(2), 125-139.

White, C., & Openshaw, R. (Eds.). (2005). Democracy at the crossroads: International
perspectives on critical global citizenship education. USA: Lexington Books.