Review Article

International Education and the Crises of Cosmopolitanism and Global Citizenship

Hazzan Moses Kayode[1]

1. University of Ibadan, Nigeria

Globalisation has not only given rise to unprecedented dimensions of mobility of people and ideas across national borders, but it has also enhanced the activities involved in international education (IE) and inevitably drawn attention to the growing levels of cultural diversity and the necessity for cultural exchange among the 'global communities'. Arguably, these phenomena have equally given rise to the possibilities of both cultural exchange and conflicts of interest in what constitutes an effective IE. Besides, recent phenomenal development in digital technologies has enabled people across vast far afield to be in close relations with one another; thus, opening new vistas to an effectively transnational world that could be aptly regarded as a global village. Parts of the fundamental concepts of IE which have agitated the minds of several international scholars are cosmopolitanism and global citizenship (GC). As part of the tenets of GC and cosmopolitanism, it is expected that people are treated equally and that preference should not be given to any particular cultural, political, linguistic, or national group, most especially at the expense of others. Meanwhile, there are scholarly arguments that global education has a fundamental role to play in preparing students for a world that is increasingly interconnected and interdependent. Several advocacies in the light of cosmopolitanism and GC in the context of IE have been principally brought to the fore by several scholars not only as moral frameworks resonant with educators' efforts to cultivate people's openness to new ideas but also as a mutual understanding through respectful dialogue, as well as the awareness of the peculiarities within the cultural values of the others. Meanwhile, there have been stridently diverse arguments from several scholars that the contemporary global practices in IE do not reflect the tenets as well as *modus operandi* as espoused by the concepts of cosmopolitanism and or GC. It was equally argued that there exist varying levels of disequilibria in the contemporary IE, and this has made the cultural realities inherent in the 'others' to be disparagingly relegated. Imperatively, in recent times, there have been several calls from scholars advocating the critical incorporation of cosmopolitan dynamics and realities in approaches to IE (to reflect some of the basic hallmarks and or tenets of GC). Although the positive realisation of these attempts or calls is still at the developing stage in educational practices, recent works in other disciplines promise to forward such a critical agenda. It is, therefore, against this background that both the extant and current literature is critically and scholarly engaged to interrogate the concepts of cosmopolitanism and GC in the context of IE. At the same time, the treatise is principally divided into four (4) sections which include: conceptual clarifications of the terms: international education (IE), global citizenship, and cosmopolitanism; a critical analysis of Western, Asian (Chinese) and African perspectives on cosmopolitanism and global citizenship as well as crises of global citizenship and cosmopolitanism in the light of IE. However, the paper gives a conclusion and puts forth recommendations.

Correspondence: papers@team.qeios.com — Qeios will forward to the authors

Introduction

Globalisation has given impetus to a phenomenal rise in the level of peregrination of not only people but also their ideas from various continents and or across national borders. It has equally increased the crescendo of the levels of cultural diversity in most communities, thereby giving rise to the possibilities of both cultural exchange and conflicts of interest in international education. Similarly, the recent phenomenal development in digital technologies has enabled people across vast far afield to be in propinquities to one another, thereby giving room for an effectively transnational world that could be aptly regarded as a global village. For instance, by the instant exposure of people to the global world as precipitated by spiral development in digital technology and its attendant devices, people from various parts of the globe are exposed to foreign cultures and engage in political issues in places far from their local context of living. Perhaps, one of the pertinent questions that may agitate the mind of any concerned researcher is whether this phenomenon is an express invitation of all and sundry to be global citizens/cosmopolitans or not (Lindell, 2014).

One of the kernels of global citizenship and or cosmopolitanism is that it is deemed to be predicated on equality in the treatment of people while no preference should be given to a particular group based on its cultural, political, linguistic, and national affiliation at the expense of other groups. Meanwhile, there are scholarly arguments that international education has a fundamental role in preparing students for a world that is increasingly interconnected and interdependent (Rizvi and Choo, 2020). Besides, the reanimated focus expresses the energy people are finding in new modes of cooperation made possible by expanding means of mobility, powerful communication technologies, and increasing non-governmental organisations. Such changes render the world's cultural resources more accessible to people everywhere.

As the globalisation process has provided accelerating forces for countries to connect and converge in recent decades, scholars and intellectuals globally have started to seek ways out of cultural clashes and promote inter-civilisational dialogues, international exchanges, and cross-cultural communications. There has been a burgeoning body of literature on multiculturalism, internationalisation and globalisation, along with waves of population flow across the globe and the emergence of various international organisations, all of which have

enhanced cultural contacts to an unprecedented degree and reshaped relations between locals and strangers (Laffey et al., 2012; Nafafé, 2012; Kavas and Thornton 2013; McWilliams 2013).

Cosmopolitanism as a concept has existed from time immemorial. Meanwhile, the modern academics associated with cosmopolitanism include but are not limited to Martha Nussbaum, Kwame Anthony Appiah, Peter Kemp, Daniel Archibugi, and David Held. Other scholars and or thinkers equally incorporate cosmopolitan assumptions into their theories. These thinkers vary in terms of how practical they believe cosmopolitan ideals are; nonetheless, cosmopolitan ideals of human unity remain in the background of many theories and policies. According to cosmopolitan thinkers, global citizenship (GC) and unity are the vehicles for humanity to establish lasting peace, decrease social and economic injustices, and promote environmental sustainability. In the context of a cosmopolitan approach to the study of global interactions among several people in the world, the issue of global citizenship could be aptly described as a means by which cultivating mutual respect across cultures will reinforce the shared right of all humans to the earth and its resources.

Significantly, at the turn of the 21st century, several scholars have written profusely to advocate for global citizenship and cosmopolitanism in the realm of international education (IE). As has been amplified in the foregoing, the eventualities brought about by globalisation informed several theories in teaching and learning in the light of increasing globalised relationships and responsibilities (Stornaiuolo and Nichols, 2019). Having been subjected to extensive interrogations and debates in disciplines such as political science, philosophy, anthropology, sociology, etc., cosmopolitanism and GC, most especially in the realm of IE have been principally explored as moral frameworks resonant with educators' efforts to cultivate people's openness to new ideas, mutual understanding through respectful dialogue and awareness of the peculiarities within the cultural values of the others (Stornaiuolo and Nichols, 2019). In addition to this, in recent times, there have been several calls from scholars advocating the critical incorporation of cosmopolitan dynamics and realities in approaches to education - to reflect some of the basic hallmarks and or tenets of GC (Stornaiuolo and Nichols, 2019).

It is important to note that the modern concept of citizenship, which is a recent concept historically – is ineluctably connected with the existence of a civil or political community; a set of rights and obligations ascribed to citizens under their membership in that community as well as an ethic of participation and solidarity needed to sustain it. Most traditional accounts of citizenship begin with the assertion of individuals' basic civil, political, and social rights (Peters, 2010). Thus, most of the educational scholarship and works to date have in one way or another delved into cosmopolitanism as a process of recognising or cultivating cosmopolitan dispositions in individual educators and learners (Hull, Stornaiuolo, and Sahni, 2010; DeCosta, 2014; Juzwik and McKenzie, 2015; Choo, 2016; O'Connor, 2018).

It could be extrapolated from the foregoing that cosmopolitanism in the realm of international education offers a potentially generative direction for educators, underscoring the active ingredients required to construct common worlds across differences (Watson, 2014; Saito, 2015). Therefore, it may be plausible to argue that a critical interrogation of the systems and histories that work against a vision of diverse shared humanity and to create contexts in which the labour of negotiating cosmopolitan world-building activity can thrive (Stornaiuolo and Nichols, 2019). However, with few exceptions, scholars across the disciplines who have examined cosmopolitanism and citizenship are yet to come to terms with its educational significance. Moreover, many studies of the cosmopolitan and GC ideas perceive them primarily as reactions to political, socioeconomic, environmental, and other crises, so that the idea becomes, in effect, parasitic upon perceived rupture, strife, and fragmentation. However, some of the historical analyses and critical evaluations of cosmopolitanism have

been vigorously argued based on new forms of mobility and globalisation. Indeed, scholars' description of cosmopolitanism in this contemporary period is principally characterised by the elements of pluralism that recognise the manners and ways through which people from different cultural backgrounds negotiate multiple and overlapping commitments, loyalties, and identities (Robbins and Horta, 2017).

Expanding one's loyalty beyond one's community, region, or country was included by Pike (2008) in his list of critical dimensions of an ethos of GC. This consists of the acceptance and valuing of multiple identities and loyalties, including, among others, family, community, region, country, species, and planet. The need to expand one's identity and loyalty beyond one's borders is characterized by Nussbaum (1997), as well as other scholars (e.g., Dower and Williams, 2002), as the prerequisite of membership in the broader community of humanity beyond the nation-state, and is a basic characteristic of a global citizen. It is therefore against this background that both the extant and current literature is critically interrogated while the treatise is divided into several sections, which include: conceptual clarifications of the terms: IE, GC, and cosmopolitanism; a critical analysis of Western, Asian and African perspectives as well as crises of GC and cosmopolitanism in the light of IE. However, the paper gives a conclusion and puts forth the recommendations.

International Education, Global Citizenship and Cosmopolitanism: Nominal or Realistic Phenomena?

There is a medley of arguments concerning the perspectives of scholars on the concepts that underpin this study. It is significant at this threshold to critically look at the concepts of IE, GC, and cosmopolitanism. Education, globally, is conceived as a principal instrument that could be used in preparing people to be ethically responsible and appreciate the human community.

International Education (IE)

Education which is essentially predicated on liberalism could be used to nurture and develop three capacities in human beings: identification of an individual with the global community, a critical evaluation of oneself as well as sharpened objectivity in imagination across cultural differences that characterise humanity in general (Nussbaum, 1997). Besides, the views of several scholars are that IE could be structured to reflect Nussbaum's concept of the narrative imagination by critically examining how arts and literature can aid people's comprehension of other realities through a multiplicity of perspectives, cultivation, and development of empathy and greater knowledge of one's position to others in the world (Campano and Ghiso, 2011; Choo, 2016).

The rise in International Educational Exchange (IEE) is not surprising since it naturally seems like a positive practice to engage in. Aside from the obvious economic interests that are met by such exchanges, more noble goals appear achievable as well. Intuitively, it seems logical that educational exchanges will increase participants' knowledge and understanding of others' practices and beliefs, and this will, in turn, contribute to better, friendlier relations between the participants and the others. This broad intuition is based on the concept of intercultural understanding and two follow-up assumptions: first, that such understanding can be improved via some forms of contact encouraged by educational exchanges and second that the more we know about those who are different from us, the better we will get along with them (Peters, 2010).

Notably, the IE sector is a Western product exported across the globe to a range of developed and developing countries. Just as with any other product, it has a price. By purchasing an international education, consumers are promised an internationally recognised qualification, a

global and social mobility ticket. However, as a service of education, it is not just a product; but equally a philosophy. Hence, IE is not only based simply on free markets. It is also rooted in an ideology of cosmopolitanism. Those dedicated to IE are committed to creating and cultivating an aura of GC that would not exist without some elements of nurturing (Hawkins, 2018).

An effective IE, as described by Nussbaum cultivates a global identity, inspires cross-cultural sympathies, and prompts self-examination in the local, national and global domains (Nussbaum, 2002: 295-299). Perhaps, part of the defects of Nussbaum as encapsulated in other nationalists' critiques is her failure to recognise how an individual's cultures and communities deeply shape her moral life, priorities, and motivations. She hopes that people in the world could eventually supplant identity politics and cultural relativism with a global view of morality, bearing in mind that shared worlds are never found but always built.

A critical look at world institutions of higher learning as microcosms of global migration and school classes that represent the normality of the cultural, linguistic, religious, and social diversity of the global society show that IE can be aptly regarded as the main melting pot for not only for the interaction of different students of diverse origins but also as a pedestal for the exchange of cultural values whether consciously or unconsciously. In this environment, it is possible to collectively develop social rules of coexistence, recognise and negotiate diverse interests, acknowledge differing perspectives, and practice a way of living together with respect and mutual appreciation.

However, for all its potential, IE has its flaws. If it is understood that education, no matter what perspective one holds of its primary purpose, is a socialising tool, then who is it that wields it? If education in its international form seizes to be a nationalist agent, then whose values does it truly represent and propagate? International education has, rightly or wrongly, inherited the controversies that continue to surround globalisation and capitalism. The contemporary nature of international education has come to represent: privatisation, westernisation, and service traditionally dominated by the transient, transnational capitalist elite.

Unarguably, the aspirations of IE are great; however, it has not been met with as much cynicism and suspicion as one might initially expect (Cambridge, 2010). In spite that IE is typically a Western-oriented initiative (Bates, 2011), it (higher level of education) has been proven as an expansive and popular form of education globally (Cambridge, 2010). Therefore, the term 'IE' can be somewhat misleading. This is because the international sector itself faces an ongoing challenge of the absence of uniformity, and this is very much based on the plurality of different types of GCs. Therefore the diverse interpretations of global citizenship education (GCE) could aptly be referred to as one of the complex areas when studying IE. Thus, there is great disparity within the IE sector worldwide due to the absence of consensus over GC education and its purpose.

Global Citizenship

The problematic nature of citizenship has created an avenue for various scholars' literature on several global themes relating to the concept, mostly from the past two decades. Scholars have written from a variety of viewpoints in economics, politics, ethics and cultural studies, and education and have provided various definitions and typologies. However, there has not been a systematic theory or consensus on GC, but rather various and even polarised understandings have arisen (Wang, 2021).

In a traditional sense, citizenship could be conceptualised as a political and geographical community member. This could be viewed from three dimensions (Cohen 1999; O'Byrne 2004; Osler and Starkey 2005): citizenship about the legal status which involves civil, political, and social rights; citizenship that is defined by the active participation of

citizens in political life and in realising the common good of societies (Honohan, 2002) as well as citizenship, that is predicated on equal membership in one's community and the context of a global community. Changes in the present societies ---international migration, increased global mobility, more frequent transnational economic and social exchange, common global problems faced by humanity, etc. have significantly changed the conceptualisation of citizenship to reflect globalism instead of its parochial understanding within the context of a sovereign state (Marchetti, 2014).

The frontiers of the global community have been stretched from "city-states" in ancient Greece to "nation-states" at the end of feudalism and again to "the world" at the dawn of 21stcentury (Xiaoyong, 2021); hence, there emerges an intense interrogation of the term' global citizenship. Global citizenship as defined by UNESCO (2014) echoes the cosmopolitan perspective and gives recognition to the moral obligations owed to all human beings based solely on (their) humanity without making references to several peculiarities (e.g., racial, gender, cultural, political, religious, ethnic and other differences) that could distinguish them from one another or other communal particularities. One might ask if all these lofty characteristics are practicable in this contemporary era where egoistic, racist, parochial, and different self-centred ideologies have invariably become the order of the day. Meanwhile, normatively, cosmopolitanism embraces the hallmarks of individuals' capacities to form overlapping affiliations, attachments, and consciousness (Banks, 2009) that underpin an ability to approach ideas from multiple perspectives (Hanvey, 1976) and approach the dynamics of culture of every society from the pluralistic and accommodating points of view bearing in mind no culture and civilisation could be classified as superior or inferior.

One of the pertinent issues that could agitate the mind of every critical scholar is the characteristics that an individual could possess before he or she becomes a global citizen. Taking this into consideration through a thorough evaluation to ensure the presence of these critical ingredients of GC will go a long way to guide against the mere glorification of rhetorics of global citizenship which has become the buzzword for most of the globetrotters. Another pertinent question to ask at this threshold is whether it is possible to be referred to as (in the real sense of the word) a global citizen without amplifying being a world state (Sen, 2006). For Sen (2006), a legal form of language excludes this possibility. In other words, Sen (2006), though cautious about embracing the term wholeheartedly, sees that citizenship can exist in the absence of institutions that govern it.

Parts of the outcomes of the critical evaluations of cosmopolitanism by several scholars remain germane at this juncture. For instance, it has been observed that cosmopolitanism is not the main kernel of the GCE ideological landscape (Oxley & Morris, 2013); its discourses are somewhat centred on nationalism and neoliberalism (Gaudelli, 2009; Myers, 2016). A foundational belief of cosmopolitan ideology is that to make global governance work, the state needs to mould individuals to have globalized values through education. Derek Heater theorises that education can mould people's values, creating civic virtues that match the governmentality of the state, whether it be democratic, totalitarian, or dictatorial (Heater, 2004: 110-115).

Cosmopolitanism

A critical look at most of the hallmarks of cosmopolitanism through different phases of historical trajectories from the Stoics to Enlightenment philosophers and thinkers to contemporary scholars revolves around the central belief that all people belong to a single and shared human community, irrespective of their other multiple affiliations and commitments (Kleingeld and Brown, 2013). From such a threshold, cosmopolitanism involves developing mutual understanding and cooperation between peoples from different cultures and geographies, indicating a model of governance that goes

beyond the nation-state in which multiple global and local allegiances and identities are taken into account (Stornaiuolo and Nichols, 2019).

The term 'cosmopolitanism' originated in antiquity when Diogenes the Cynic coined it, referring to himself as a global citizen. The idea of world citizenship was then discussed by Roman Stoic philosophers who promoted the importance of pursuing one's city's common good and the common good of humanity. In the Modern period, philosophers and legal scholars theorized the legal and political dimensions of cosmopolitanism at a time when the term was also often used to refer to a certain lifestyle based on openness and travel. The term 'cosmopolitanism' comes from ancient Greek. A few centuries later, Stoic philosophers such as Epictetus, Cicero, Seneca, and Marcus Aurelius followed in the footsteps of Diogenes the Cynic (Stanton 1968; Nussbaum, 1997; Kleingeld and Brown 2014). They all asserted that human beings were part of two communities: a local community of birth and a universal human community. They all highlighted the utmost importance of belonging to this second community by the sheer virtue of being rational creatures. Because of this universal membership, all humans ought to care for one another, not only for their siblings but also for their neighbours and those who share the same culture. For the Stoics, this universal expansion of our moral aspirations directly follows our shared membership in a community of reason.

Stressing the significance of cosmopolitanism, Immanuel Kant (1975) plausible argued that civilisation had reached such a level that the violation of laws in one part of the world could have ripple effects that could be felt everywhere" (Kant in Nussbaum, 1997: 1). Today, over two hundred years after Kant's writings, social scientists deploy the term "cosmopolitanisation" to describe a transformation of our "inner grammar of cultural and national identifications" stemming from the increasingly interconnected nature of everyday life (Delanty, 2000). Contemporary scholars often frame the dynamics associated with cosmopolitanism as a response to increasing globalisation and as an important means of recognizing mobility and multiplicity (Robbins and Horta, 2017).

Indeed, cosmopolitanism could be seen as a form of neo-humanism that looks at the world as it might be, not just in advocating for the universal idea that people are not only connected in shared humanity but also in recognising how the vision of shared humanity in practice has more often been denied or destroyed than respected and celebrated. Perhaps, a serious recognition of the historical trajectories of colonialism, racism, and the like could be strategically placed at the centre of critical approaches to the study of cosmopolitanism. For instance, critical scholars have suggested that an analysis of prognosis concerning not only just what society or the world might normatively be but also how the world has been and the current state of affairs would represent parts of what should be incorporated into the critical study of the contemporary issues relating to cosmopolitanism (Gandhi 2017). Such realistically-critical analysis of these past historical phenomena of oppression and inequity opens those historically rooted practices to critical interrogation (Stornaiuolo and Nichols, 2019).

Cosmopolitanism received renewed academic consideration due to Nussbaum's essay on "Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism," written in response to Richard Rorty's New York Times article. In "Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism," Nussbaum theorises that through cosmopolitan education, the world can become borderless with a system of global governance, thus solving environmental degradation, reducing inequalities, and establishing world peace. (Nussbaum, 1994:155-162). Similarly, Walzer (2010) and Himmelfarb (2010) have criticized Nussbaum for framing the issue of cosmopolitanism in the context of world citizenship. Their main claim is that the idea of citizenship makes sense only against the background of a state, and since there is no world-state, the notion of world citizenship is unintelligible. It is important to note that while both critical and non-critical scholars have profoundly interrogated the pros and cons of contemporary cosmopolitanism, we, in this treatise, focus on a critical x-ray of the concepts of cosmopolitanism and global citizenship in the light of Western, Asian and African perspectives; discuss the crises of cosmopolitanism and global citizenship in the realm of the global higher education and how these have seriously engaged the discussions of the scholars from various fields and or walks of life.

Global Citizenship and Cosmopolitanism: a critical analysis of Western, Asian and African Perspectives

Theorists of global citizenship encourage an understanding of how citizenship occurs on multiple levels, including, for example, the state or national level, the sub-state or local level, and world citizenship at the supra-state and transnational level (Osler and Starkey, 2003). Events of the 20th century, notably the First and Second World Wars and the founding of the United Nations caused many to think about the world in new ways, often in international and transnational directions. Throughout the 20th century, supra-national institutional bodies continued to broaden. Indeed, a myriad of international organisations emerged, including transnational corporations, civil society organisations, women's and anti-racist movements, The World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, UNESCO, and the International Bureau of Education (Mundy et al., 2007).

Significantly, events after the Second World War brought about initiatives of international cooperation that had hitherto led to the creation of key conventions and treaties that strengthened legal frameworks for "global values," including, of course, the UN Declaration of Human Rights (1948). Taken as a whole, the emergence of these organisations and legal frameworks partly represents a response to greater recognition that individuals held multiple and simultaneous identity affiliations, allegiances, and loyalties. One of the fundamental and extensive critiques of a contemporary brand of cosmopolitanism is its Western characterisation and orientation coupled with its Eurocentric and Enlightenment foundations. Pieces of evidence from the literature have shown that the genealogies of cosmopolitan thought cut across different cultures and philosophies of Asian, European, African, and other continents of the world (Haiping, 2017; Harris, 2017). For instance, most of the macro-narratives about cosmopolitanism often trace its historical trajectory to ancient Greece through the Enlightenment (Calhoun, 2017).

Some scholars had looked at this concept (cosmopolitanism) from the lens of post-colonialism rooted in Western foundations of cosmopolitanism; argued that it is not impossible to transcend its Eurocentric tendencies by understanding the last centuries as a history of empire (Alavi, 2015; Lavan, Payne, and Weisweiler, 2016). Another dimension of critique of the Western-oriented form of cosmopolitanism involves precisely the inquiry about what constitutes universal principles around which everyone can agree. Indeed, several scholars have rejected the theory or model of 'universalism' rooted in Western, elitist, and colonial moral subjectivities (Appiah, 2006; Hollinger, 2017).

Western Perspective

Among the scholars who suggest constructing individuals' membership and affinity beyond national borders, the most influential group is that of globalists or cosmopolitans, which call for a form of GC (Osler and Starkey, 2003; Appiah, 2006, 2008; Myers, 2010). From a Western perspective, global citizenship as a philosophical idea is dated back to the era of the Greek's notion of 'cosmopolitan' (Hartung, 2017), meaning "citizens of the cosmos" (Appiah, 2005, p.217). The Stoic tradition of the world of citizenship and Kant's cosmopolitan citizen also provide a solid foundation for developing this concept in modern times (Osler, 2011; Zahabioun et al., 2013).

Global citizenship (although not a novel concept) has garnered much attention since the turn of the 21st century. Martha Nussbaum, an American philosopher, wrote an essay in 1994. In her argument, she underscored the possibility of liberal education opening a new vista to cultivate cosmopolitan capacities, which will enable an individual citizen of a state to appreciate and embrace GC by amplifying collective similarities and thereby collectively bridging not only cultural but also cosmological differences. Decades after her espousal of this theory, several debates ensued to either support or challenged Nussbaum's proposed vision of cosmopolitan education (Naseem, and Hyslop-Margison, 2006; Papastephanou, 2013).

Asian: a reflection on the Chinese Perspective

Cosmopolitan sentiments have been embraced by most national systems of education around the world and Asia is not left out in this trend (Rizvi and Choo, 2020). For instance, the idea of tianxiacan (rooted in Chinese history), could be translated as cosmopolitanism. In another example, the concept of datong, or the greater unity, in Confucianism refers to "the world commonwealth in which all men once strove for general welfare and harmony" (Heater, 2004, p. 9), and it is quite similar to the allegiance of cosmopolitans to humankind. The emphasis on love, empathy, ethics and the human community in cosmopolitanism is similar to the core values of Confucianism.

Cosmopolitan principles are evident in the cultural and religious traditions of Asian societies (Sen, 2010). Also, the literature is replete with examples of how critical pedagogy and curriculum could be tailored in such an imaginative way that others could be well accommodated (Choo, 2016). However, a typical example of this could be seen in the work of Lee (2009) which had hitherto indicated that there are cosmopolitan principles inherent in some of the educational reform intentions across Asia. In addition, President Xi Jinping's recent establishment of a 'Community of Shared Future for Mankind' through the instrumentality of the BRI Initiative as long-term national policies has resulted in increased attention to and a call for the importance of promoting globality in education (Liu and Zhang, 2018).

Hence, along with the continuing mission of strengthening international education, it is significant to involve global or international perspectives in IE to prepare the coming generations with adequate information on issues relating to global awareness and competence needed for the contemporary period (Feng, 2014; Liu and Zhang, 2018). Therefore, the notion of global citizenship in Chinese cosmology could be looked into from three dimensions - an awareness of nationalism and practical knowledge of traditional culture; adequate comprehension of global cultural diversity and the development of a global vision and a combination of the Western idea of 'citizen' with a cultural perspective that is rooted in Chinese traditional (Peng, 2009).

African Perspective

As far as Africa is concerned, cosmopolitanism could not be said to be necessarily malignant to the fabric of the African setting as a whole (Chan, 2018). One of the critical issues that may agitate the minds of wary scholars is the intricacies that underline the 'global' aspects of cosmopolitanism and its counterpart – GC. Realistically, there seems to be a surreptitious danger for the so-called 'global' is never global at all. For instance, in as much as the 'tenets' that essentially characterised the 'global' practices of cosmopolitanism are presumed to be connected with the Western universalistic perspective anchored on the Enlightenment thought, its globalism and its applicability in Africa would be susceptible to contestation and a barrage of criticisms.

A critical observation of the extant literature has shown that Africa has been underrepresented in the analysis of different versions and functions of cosmopolitanism (Van Assche and Teampau, 2015). So, through critical interrogation, the contemporary patterns of cosmopolitanism could better be described as Western metropolitan cosmopolitanism because it does not reflect the main characteristics of global cosmopolitanism. Therefore, talking about cosmopolitanism in a global context requires a complete understanding of all the continents, including Africa.

From the critical analysis of the treatise and rigorous study of Bowden (2003:350), it could be extrapolated that the modus operandi and practices that underpin cosmopolitanism are deemed to be essentially and ineluctably characterised 'the ideal GC rooted in the Western cosmology and the civilizing-cum-universalising missions of the non-western world'. Similarly, from the critical evaluation of Noyes (2006: 444), it could be practically deduced that his conviction dovetails with that of Bowden. Significantly, none of the elements of GC and cosmopolitanism had hitherto sought to impose 'global' upon 'local' without considering the peculiarities of the former but sought to interpret and inflect the local with elements of the global. Therefore, the local remained a subsidiary without the power or capacity to change in any decisive manner the global system (Chan, 2018).

The modern framework HE in Africa essentially refers to the colonial era. The colonial experience was grounded in Kantian rationality of the impartial objective versus the particularistic subjective, resulting in "the metaphysical denial of African existence and, therefore, on the myth of emptiness" (Mungwini, 2017, 8). There is thus in African HE a Kantian "knowledge hegemony" that does not allow for the diversification of the curriculum in respect of valid alternative knowledge paradigms and systems (Etieyibo, 2016, 404). Be that as it may, education for cosmopolitanism and GC in Africa today sustains a context that generally assigns an inferior estimation of African experiences as another culture (Etieyibo, 2016, 411). A panoramic look at the previous analyses will reveal that Africa is under neoliberal pressure of globality to "become part of a global 'knowledge society'" (Blunt 2005, 1370). A significant characteristic of such knowledge that ostensibly aspires to global universalism lies in its nature to "tyrannically suppress difference" (Blunt, 2005, 1369). Like the essentialist Kantianism that inhered colonialism, globality also establishes hierarchies and validity of knowledge production that privilege egocentrism while simultaneously unduly dismissing objects and aspects of local knowledge (Elliott-Cooper, 2017).

International Education: the Crises of Global Citizenship and Cosmopolitanism

The focus on international-mindedness and intercultural understanding has resulted in numerous schools in the United Kingdom, United States (US), Canada, Australia, and Singapore citing the use of GC and cosmopolitanism within their mission and vision statements. Such schools have also moved towards adopting a more internationally-minded curriculum (Schattle, 2009). The focus on cosmopolitanism and GC has resulted in IE, predominantly universities, focusing on the development of intercultural and global competence, cross-cultural communication skills, global knowledge and so forth (Leask, 2013).

A critical look at various perspectives, definitions, and standpoints of IE indicates some areas of consensus regarding the general objectives of IE. The concepts of 'cosmopolitanism' and 'GC' are central to the discourse of IE, regardless of which perspective one chooses to adopt (Cambridge, 2010). The very notions surrounding the two concepts suggest a world community to which all of humankind belongs, with mutual interests and consciousness of human rights as universal entitlements (Cambridge, 2010). A study of international education cannot be separated from the discussion of globalisation and neoliberal free markets. It has come to be synonymous with ideas of education for GC or international mindedness, both of which are adaptations and innovations of its sister term, cosmopolitanism.

However, such qualifications also suggest that graduates are educated in an exclusive philosophy that sees the world as interconnected,

interdependent, and continually merging - economically, politically and culturally. Through Western-conceived teaching strategies, students are guided to maximise their intercultural literacy in preparation for an increasingly globalised world (El-Badawy, 2017). It might be pertinent to ask whether indigenous students would become beacons of post-national, cosmopolitan values in otherwise closed, insular societies simply because of their education.

In the meantime, scholars within the postcolonial tradition vary greatly in the flaws they find in the cosmopolitan approach to GC, to some, the ills of a cosmopolitan conception of GCE are virtually limitless, making the notion of a global citizen and GCE dubious or even incoherent. In their book, Andreotti and de Sousa (2012, p.1) elaborate on this claim, arguing that: "despite claims of globality and inclusion, the lack of analyses of power relations and knowledge construction in this area could result in educational practices that deliberately reproduce knowledge rooted approaches that are ethnocentric, ahistorical, depoliticised, paternalistic, and tend to theorise, pathologise or trivialize difference (Andreotti and de Sousa, 2012, p.1)."

Correspondingly, the IE, most especially in the contemporary era, has given impetus to the ideas that make 'new cosmopolitanism' challenging conventional conceptions, which are considered to be driven by global capitalism and Euro-American elitist ideologies (Werbner, 2020). The main complication in the idea of what constitutes GC and or cosmopolitanism has hitherto been beclouded by the egocentric, jingoistic, as well as inherent selfishness on the part of the community of people in the global village. This has made GC and cosmopolitanism vague and given the multiplicity of interpretations globally. And while the term cosmopolitanism is not always used, the sentiments it expresses can be found in such concepts as "global citizenship", "international mindedness," and "intercultural understanding" (Rizvi and Choo, 2020).

There is an immediate danger herein that the 'global' is hardly global at all as the concept is somewhat predicated on the norms regarded as universal in the West. With new realities such as the advent of the novel dynamics in the global world and competitive globalisations; navigating all the in local terms may be desirable but not fully possible; inflecting the global/s with the local, setting terms, may be possible if understanding the global other/s is accomplished (Chan, 2018).

The models of cosmopolitanism are grounded only in commonalities that the people of the world share and, hence, necessarily normatively outlaw difference, ignore and undermine the sources of individual and collectivity concreteness. Being part of humanity, in general, cannot be detached from one's situatedness. Transcendent selves that extinguish the particularities of social embeddedness, which are the sources of being a concrete human being and community, are not exhaustive of the actual individuated being. Respecting human dignity requires respecting the subjectivities resulting from and supporting the exercise of both individual and collective agency (Manthalu and Waghid, 2019). Suppose the world higher education must cultivate attitudes, knowledge, and skills for respectful global cooperation. In that case, the cosmopolitanism configuration must centre other than divorce differences across the world's peoples. Without necessarily outlawing the normative value of commonalities inherent in humanity, individual and collectivity differences are indispensable cardinal elements of concrete beings. Such differences must be engaged, interrogated, and embraced as part of respecting the dignity of humanity (Manthalu and Waghid, 2019).

Conclusion and Recommendations

If there is going to be one, a common world requires concerted efforts to be built by dint of hard work and collective commitment. The use of "collective commitment" here suggests a central challenge to this work: we will not always agree on the common world we desire. We

hope to avoid this trajectory in education. We, therefore, underline that a structurally-cosmopolitan education can aid people in retaining their cultural and individual peculiarities and integrity while also supporting peace, social justice, and other globally lauded goods. Claiming and believing that individuals are capable of cosmopolitan devotion while prioritizing local, regional and national interests tends to justify invasive international policies that promote Western interests and disadvantage non-Westerners due to the global power structure.

Evaluating the realities of the contemporary world by looking at the effects of modern institutions, which are supported by a cosmopolitan ideology, demonstrates that the teleologic end of cosmopolitanism is a monolithic, Western-led culture. Recognizing the agency of non-Westerners is an important step towards global cooperation; For instance, a nation's unwillingness to conform to Western values like democracy does not mean that its leaders are incapable of implementing successful social and political policy. The problems that cosmopolitanism seeks to address are alive and escalating daily. Thus, instead of motivating students to shed national attachments favouring large-scale, global undertakings, educational reforms should aim to promote the projects of peace, environmental sustainability, and a commitment to reducing economic inequalities while promoting respective cultural sentiments.

Introducing curricula topics that convince students of the economic and social utility of peace and outline the realities of climate change mobilizes them to fight for international peace and environmentalism, respectively. Sometimes, space' does not need to be physical. It can be abstractedly applied or imagined. This has some relevance to understanding the logic behind IE and those of its proponents. Therefore, globalism and the cosmopolitanism of higher education should incorporate the series of experiences from various countries and continents as legitimate and valid objects of academic inquiry without jettisoning the contributions and or 'injections' from all and sundry to the peculiarities of different countries in the world. Unless such endeavours are undertaken, higher education in the 'others' (continents such as Africa, Asia, etc.) will remain alienated due to their being grounded in normatively problematic cosmopolitanism framework– cosmopolitanism exclusiveness or exclusive commonalities.

References

- Alavi, S. (2015). *Muslim Cosmopolitanism in the Age of Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Andreotti, V., & de Souza, L. (2012). Introduction: (Towards) Global Citizenship Education 'Otherwise'. In V. de Oliveira Andreotti & L. de Souza (Eds.), *Postcolonial Perspectives on Global Citizenship Education* (pp. 1-9). Routledge.
- Appiah, K. A. (2005). *The Ethics of Identity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Appiah, K. A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Appiah, K. A. (2008). Education for Global Citizenship. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, 107(1), 83-99. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-7984.2008.00133.x.
- Banks, J. A. (2001). Citizenship Education and Diversity: Implications for Teacher Education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(1), 5-16. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487101052001002.
- Bates, R. (2011). *Schooling Internationally: Globalisation, Internationalisation and the Future for International Schools*. New York: Routledge.
- Blunt, S. V. (2005). Critical Thinking Education. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 19, 1368–1378.
- Bowden, B. (2003). The Perils of Global Citizenship. *Citizenship Studies*, 7(3), 349–362. https://doi.org/10.1080/13621020302213.
- Calhoun, C. (2017). A Cosmopolitanism of Connections. In B. Robbins & P. L. Horta (Eds.), *The Cosmopolitan Ideal: Challenges and*

Opportunities (pp. 51-73). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Cambridge, J. (2010). The International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme and the Construction of Pedagogic Identity: A Preliminary Study. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 9(3), 199-213.

- Campano, G., & Ghiso, M. P. (2011). Immigrant Students as Cosmopolitan Intellectuals. In S. A. Wolf, K. Coats, P. Enciso, & C. A. Jenkins (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Children's and Young Adult Literature* (pp. 164–176). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Chan, S. (2018). The Problematic Non-Western Cosmopolitanism in Africa Today: Grappling with Modernity outside History. *Human Affairs*, 28, 351–366. https://doi.org/10.1515/humaff-2018-0029.

- Choo, S. S. (2016). *Fostering the Hospitable Imagination through Cosmopolitan Pedagogies: Envisioning Literature Education in Singapore*. Research in the Teaching of English, 50(4), 400–422.

- Cohen, J. L. (1999). *Changing Paradigms of Citizenship and the Exclusiveness of the Demos*. International Sociology, 14(3), 245–268. https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580999014003002.

- De Costa, P. (2014). *Reconceptualizing Cosmopolitanism in Language and Literacy Education: Insights from a Singapore School*. Research in the Teaching of English, 49(1), 9–30.

- Delanty, G. (2006). *The Cosmopolitan Imagination: Critical Cosmopolitanism and Social Theory*. Buckingham, United Kingdom: Open University Press.

- Dower, N., & Williams, J. (Eds.). (2002). *Global Citizenship: A Critical Introduction* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315023595.

- El-Badawy, E. S. (2017). Educating for Global Citizenship in Egypt's Private Sector: A Critical Study of Cosmopolitanism among the Egyptian Student Elite. PhD Thesis, Arab and Islamic Studies, the University of Exeter. Available at: https://ore.exeter.ac.uk/repository/handle (Accessed: 05 January 2022).

- Elliott-Cooper, A. (2017). 'Free, Decolonised Education': A Lesson from the South African Student Struggle. *Area*, 49(3), 332–334.

- Etieyibo, E. (2016). *Why Ought the Philosophy Curriculum in Universities in Africa be Africanised?* South African Journal of Philosophy, 35(4), 404–417.

- Feng, J. (2014). *Quanqiugongminshehuiyuquanqiugongminjiaoyu [The Global Civil Society and the Global Citizenship Education]*. Journal of Higher Education, 35(2), 6–14.

- Gandhi, L. (2017). *Utopian Life: A Genealogy for Global Ethics*. In B. Robbins & P. L. Horta (Eds.), *The Cosmopolitan Ideal: Challenges and Opportunities* (pp. 3–20). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Gaudelli, W. (2009). *Heuristics of Global Citizenship Discourses towards Curriculum Enhancement*. Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 25(1), 68–85.

- Haiping, Y. (2017). *Other Cosmopolitans*. In B. Robbins & P. L. Horta (Eds.), *The Cosmopolitan Ideal: Challenges and Opportunities* (pp. 1–38). Harvard University Press.

- Hanvey, R. (1976). *An Attainable Global Perspective*. New York: The War/Peace Centre.

- Harris, A. (2017). *Afropolitan Style and Unusable Global Spaces*. In B. Robbins & P. L. Horta (Eds.), *The Cosmopolitan Ideal: Challenges and Opportunities* (pp. 1–20). Harvard University Press.

- Hartung, C. (2017). *Global Citizenship Incorporated: Competing Responsibilities in the Education of Global Citizens*. Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 38(1), 16-29.

- Hawkins, M. R. (2018). *Trans-Modalities and Transnational Encounters: Fostering Critical Cosmopolitan Relations*. Applied Linguistics, 39(1), 55–77.

- Heater, D. B. (2004). *Citizenship: The Civic Ideal in World History, Politics and Education* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Palgrave.

- Himmelfarb, G. (2010). *The Illusion of Cosmopolitanism*. In M. Nussbaum (Ed.), *For Love of Country? A New Democracy Forum on the Limits of Patriotism* (pp. 72-77). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

- Hollinger, D. A. (2017). *Cosmopolitanism and the Problem of Solidarity*. In B. Robbins & P. Horta (Eds.), *Cosmopolitanisms* (pp. 240–253). New York, NY: New York University Press.

- Honohan, I. (2002). *Civic Republicanism*. London: Routledge.

- Hull, G. A., Stornaiuolo, A., & Sahni, U. (2010). *Cultural Citizenship and Cosmopolitan Practice: Global Youth Communicate Online*. English Education, 42(4), 331–367.

- Juzwik, M. M., & McKenzie, C. (2015). *Writing, Religious Faith, and Rooted Cosmopolitan Dialogue: Portraits of Two American Evangelical Men in a Public School English Classroom*. Written Communication, 32(2), 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088315576480.

- Kavas, S., & Thornton, A. (2013). "Adjustment and Hybridity in Turkish Family Change: Perspectives from Developmental Idealism." *Journal of Family History*, 38(2), 223–241.

- Kleingeld, P., & Brown, E. (2013). *Cosmopolitanism*. In The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2014).

- Kleingeld, P., & Brown, E. (2014). "Cosmopolitanism." In Edward N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.

- Laffey, M., & Nadarajah, S. (2012). "The Hybridity of Liberal Space: States, Diasporas and Insecurity." *Security Dialogue*, 43(5), 403–420.

- Lavan, M., Payne, R. E., & Weisweiler, J. (Eds.). (2016). *Cosmopolitanism and Empire*.

- Leask, B. (2013). *Internationalizing the Curriculum in the Disciplines— Imagining New Possibilities*. Available at: https://www.journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1028315312475090 (Accessed: 20 April 2023).

- Lee, W. O. (2009). *Conceptualising Citizenship and Citizenship Education: A Trajectory of Exploring Asian Perspectives*. Hong Kong Institute of Education Chair Professors Public Lecture Series, 1 (pp. 1–52). Available at: http://libdr1.ied.edu.hk/pubdata/img00/arch00/link/archive/1/instarh/ (Accessed: 18 April 2023).

- Lindell, J. (2014). *Cosmopolitanism in a Mediatised World: The Social Stratification of Global Orientations*. Dissertation | Karlstad University Studies | 2014:23 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Department of Geography, Media and Communication, SE-651 88 Karlstad, Sweden.

- Liu, B., & Zhang, W. (2018). *Cultural Conflict and Ideas Bridging — New World Citizenship Education under the Background of "One Belt, One Road". Tsinghua Journal of Education*, 39(4), 56–63.

- Manthalu, C. H., & Waghid, Y. (2019). *Interrogating a Cosmopolitanism of African Higher Education. South African Journal of Higher Education*, 33(2), 1–15.

- Marchetti, M. C. (2014). *Citizenship beyond the Nation-State: New Perspectives in the Citizenship Debate. European Journal of Research on Education*, 2, 122–128. https://doi.org/10.15527/ejre.201426567.

- McWilliams, S. (2013). "Hybridity in Herodotus." *Political Research Quarterly*, 20(10), 1–11.

- Mundy, K., Manion, C., Masseman, V., & Haggerty, M. (2007). *Charting Global Education in Canada's Elementary Schools: Provincial, District and School Level Perspectives*. Available at: http://globalclassroom.unicef.ca/pdf/ChartingGlobalEducationinEleme (Accessed: 26 April 2023).

- Mungwini, P. (2017). "'African Know Thyself': Epistemic Injustice and the Quest for Liberative Knowledge." *International Journal of African Renaissance Studies — Multi-, Inter- and Transdisciplinarity*, 12(2), 5–18.

- Myers, J. P. (2010). "'To Benefit the World by Whatever Means Possible': Adolescents' Constructed Meanings for Global Citizenship." *British Educational Research Journal*, 36(3), 483–502.

- Myers, J. P. (2016). *Charting a Democratic Course for Global Citizenship Education: Research Directions and Current Challenges. Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 24(55), 1–16.

- Nafafé, J. L. (2012). "Europe in Africa and Africa in Europe: Rethinking Postcolonial Space, Cultural Encounters and Hybridity." *European Journal of Social Theory*, 16(1), 51–68.

- Naseem, M. A., & Hyslop-Margison, E. J. (2006). *Nussbaum's Concept of Cosmopolitanism: Nation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Noyes, J. K. (2006). "Goethe on Cosmopolitanism and Colonialism: Bildung and the Dialectic of Critical Mobility." *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 39(4), 443-462.
- Nussbaum, M. (1994). *Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism*. In *The Cosmopolitan Reader* (pp. 155-162).
- Nussbaum, M. (1997). *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (2002). *Education for Citizenship in an Era of Global Connection. Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 21(4-5), 295-299.
- O'Byrne, D. (2004). *The Dimensions of Global Citizenship: Political Identity Beyond the Nation-State*. Available at: https://books.google.com/books?hl=zhCN&lr=&id=okyRAgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=The+Dimensions+of+Global+Citizen (Accessed: 24 April 2023).
- O'Connor, B. H. (2018). *Cross-Border Mobility and Critical Cosmopolitanism among South*.
- Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2003). *Learning for Cosmopolitan Citizenship: Theoretical Debates and Young People's Experiences. Educational Review*, 55(3), 243-254. https://doi.org/10.1080/0013191032000118901.
- Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2005). *Changing Citizenship: Democracy and Inclusion in Education*. Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.
- Osler, A. (2011). *Teacher Interpretations of Citizenship Education: National Identity, Cosmopolitan Ideals, and Political Realities. Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 43(1), 1–24.
- Oxley, L., & Morris, P. (2013). *Global Citizenship: A Typology for Distinguishing its Multiple Conceptions. British Journal of Educational Studies*, 61(3), 301–325. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2013.798393 (Accessed: 27 April 2023).
- Papastephanou, M. (2013). *Cosmopolitanism Discarded: Martha Nussbaum's Patriotic Education and the Inward–Outward DISTINCTION. Ethics and Education*, 8(2), vii–viii. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Peng, J. (2009). *Zouyizhongguodaxuepeiyangshijiegongminzhineihan [Discussion about Cosmopolite Cultivation by China's Colleges]. Journal of Sichuan Normal University (Social Science)*, (3), 4–9.
- Peters, M. A. (2010). *Global Citizenship Education: Politics, Problems and Prospects. Citizenship, Social and Economic Education*, 9(1). Available at: http://www.wwwords.co.uk/CSEE (Accessed: 25 April 2023).
- Pike, G. (2008). *Citizenship Education in Global Context. Brock Education Journal*, 17(1), 38-49. Available at: http://brock.scholarsportal.info/journals/brocked/home/ (Accessed: 07 April 2023).
- Rizvi, F., & Choo, S. S. (2020). *Education and Cosmopolitanism in Asia: An Introduction. Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 40(1), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2020.1725282.
- Robbins, B., & Horta, P. L. (2017). *Cosmopolitanisms*. In B. Robbins & P. L. Horta (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Cosmopolitanism Studies* (pp. 38–46). London, U.K.: Routledge.
- Saito, H. (2015). *Cosmopolitics: Towards a New Articulation of Politics, Science and Critique. The British Journal of Sociology*, 66(3), 441–459.
- Schattle, H. (2009). *Global Citizenship in Theory and Practice*. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad: Higher Education and the Quest for Global Citizenship* (pp. 3-21). Routledge.
- Sen, A. (2006). *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny*. London: Allen Lane.
- Sen, A. (2010). *The Idea of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Stanton, G. R. (1968). "The Cosmopolitan Ideas of Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius." *Phronesis*, 13(2), 183-186.
- Stornaiuolo, A., & Nichols, T. P. (2019). *Educational Purposes and Ideals, Educational Theories and Philosophies, Education and Society*. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education: Cosmopolitanism and Education*. Online Publication. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.252.
- UNESCO (2014). *Global Citizenship Education: Preparing Learners for the Challenges of the Twenty-First Century*. Paris.
- United Nations (2018). "Universal Declaration of Human Rights." *Documents*. Available at: http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/. (Accessed: 24 April 2023)
- Van Assche, K., & Teampau, P. (2015). *Local Cosmopolitanism: Imagining and Re-Making Privileged Places*. New York: Springer.
- Walzer, M. (2010). *Spheres of Affection*. In M. Nussbaum (Ed.), *For Love of Country? A New Democracy Forum on the Limits of Patriotism* (pp. 125-127). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Wang, L. (2021). *Global Citizenship Education in Chinese Secondary Schools: Intentions and Practices from a Curriculum Perspective*. A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Education), Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, The University of Sydney.
- Watson, M. C. (2014). "Derrida, Stengers, Latour, and Subalternist Cosmopolitics." *Theory, Culture & Society*, 31(1), 75–98.
- Werbner, P. (2020). *Anthropology and the New Cosmopolitanism: Rooted, Feminist and Vernacular Perspectives*. Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Xiaoyong, Z. (2021). *Global Citizenship Education in School Curricula: A Chinese Perspective. International Journal of Liberal Arts and Social Science*, 9(4), 40-60.
- Zahabioun, S., Yousefy, A., Yarmohammadian, M. H., & Keshtiaray, N. (2013). "Global Citizenship Education and its Implications for Curriculum Goals at the Age of Globalisation." *International Education Studies*, 6(1), 195-206.

Declarations