

An Analysis of Tangled Rationales for Global Citizenship Education in South Korea^{*}

Cho, Hye Seung^{**}

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to explore how different education stakeholders conceptualize global citizenship education (GCED) in South Korea. This research employed a qualitative research approach relying on the combination of in-depth analysis of interviews and document analysis. I analyzed twenty interviews with education stakeholders in charge of GCED including teachers, NGO workers, IO staff, and a government officer, as well as various forms of documents including teacher's guidebooks and policy papers. The analysis of research is informed by three different ideological perspectives: the neo-liberal, humanistic and critical approaches of GCED. This study reveals that although different actors use the same term of GCED, their intents and understandings of GCED vary depending on their own embedded perspectives. The findings of this research show although educators involved in GCED in South Korea posit the critical approach to some extent, the neoliberal and humanistic approaches of GCED remain and often predominant. I argue that the different ideological perspectives surrounding GCED in South Korea should be clearly addressed and recognized when GCED is discussed and applied. In recognition of its complexity, educators must be able to work with a clear understanding of GCED and reflect on their assumptions and orientation regarding GCED.

Key words : *Global citizenship education, Global citizenship, Global education*

^{*} This research is revised and refined based on the author's larger PhD dissertation.

^{**} Post-doctoral researcher, Chungnam National University, cho.hyeseung05@gmail.com

I . Introduction

In recent years, global citizenship education (GCED) has received great attention in the global society among educators, policy makers, and organizations. GCED has been incorporated into international policy as reflected by the Global Education First Initiative, the post-2015 education agenda, and The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Consistent with this global trend, South Korea joined the Global Education First Initiative (GEFI) as the 15th Champion Country in 2014(Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2014). More notably, the World Education Forum (WEF) 2015, held in South Korea, also facilitated interest and discussions in GCED in South Korea (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2014). Shown increasing interest, GCED has been addressed and undertaken by several stakeholders such as Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), International Organizations (IOs), and schools.

GCED positions itself as transformative education aiming for social justice by offering learners opportunities and competencies to become active contributors to a more just, inclusive, and equitable world(Andreotti, 2006; Davies, 2006; Oxfam, 2015; Shultz, 2007; UNESCO, 2015). However, GCED actually is a contested concept in which there exist competing perspectives and agendas around GCED(Enns, 2015; Evans et al, 2009; Shultz, 2007; Veugelers, 2011). For example, from a post-colonialist lens, GCED is often used to tacitly

propagate Western perspectives over other cultures' views(Mannion et al., 2011). Meanwhile, according to neoliberal discourse that highlights a global community in relation to market rationality, students should be encouraged to equip themselves with certain skills, such as English, to compete in the globalized market through GCED (Camicia & Franklin, 2011). Thus, although GCED is widely mentioned and undertaken, what people/organizations conceptualize GCED differs based on their own perspectives and ideologies.

In this sense, this study aims to explore how different stakeholders including teachers, NGO workers, IO staff, and the government conceptualize GCED in relation to ideological foundations. The analysis of research is informed by three different ideological perspectives drawing on a literature review: the neo-liberal, humanistic and critical approaches of GCED. While there has been increasing attention and discussion about GCED in Korean academia since 2000, research that empirically shows how GCED is conceptualized with particular focus on its different ideologies is scarce(Park & Cho, 2015). Moreover, while most existing studies have examined the curriculum(Camicia & Franklin, 2011) or educational policy(Enns, 2015; Shultz, 2007) to show ideological differences in GCED, this study utilizes not only the documents but also educators' perceptions of GCED. Therefore, by encompassing documents and educators' perceptions, this study attempts to contribute to widening GCED discourse in South Korea by investigating how

different ideologies are imbedded in each stakeholder's rationales with regard to GCED.

II. Conceptual Framework: Competing Ideological Approaches within Global Citizenship Education

GCED suggests “a shift or transformation in the purpose and objective” of education rather than limiting its role to economic growth and development(Enns, 2015, p. 370). However, research points out competing ideological approaches within GCED(Enns, 2015; Evans et al, 2009; Shultz, 2007; Veugelers, 2011). Drawing on a literature review, I propose three main ideological foundations: neoliberal, humanistic, and critical approaches as seen in <Table 1>. An examination of these three competing ideological foundations within GCED will help reveal the extent to which GCED in South Korea advocates the neoliberal, humanistic, or critical approach.

While I propose distinctions between the frameworks of the neoliberal, humanistic, and critical approaches, I acknowledge the complexity among these ideologies derived from “the [varied] needs of individuals, organizations and government”(Evans et al., 2009, p. 23). These approaches could be represented in a blended manner because GCED is imbedded “in a dynamic network of power relations”(Camicia

〈Table 1〉 Ideological approaches within GCED in the literature

	Neoliberal approach	Humanistic approach	Critical approach
Dill (2013)	Global competencies approach	Global consciousness approach	
Camicia and Franklin (2011)	Neoliberal cosmopolitanism		Critical democratic cosmopolitanism
Veugelers (2011)	Open GCE	Moral GCE	Social-political GCE
Evans, Ingram, Macdonald, and Weber (2009)	Instrumentalist orientations		Transformative orientations
Shultz (2007)	Neoliberal approach	Radical approach	Transformative approach
Andreotti (2006)		Soft GCE	Critical GCE

& Franklin, 2011, p. 314). However, I lay out this distinct framework to provide a conceptual lens to understand the notions of GCED that will help my analysis in this research. Thus, I note that this trichotomy does not represent a clear differentiation among the three perspectives; rather, it should be understood as a philosophical orientation that can be found in the concept, discourse, and practice of GCED.

1. Neoliberal Approach of GCED

The neoliberal approach of GCED highlights the global community in relation to market rationality and the development of knowledges and skills required to participate in a competitive global economy. According

to the neoliberal discourse, students should be encouraged to equip themselves with certain skills, such as English, to compete in the globalized market through GCED(Camicia & Franklin, 2011). This perspective views a global citizen is “one who is a successful participant in a liberal economy driven by capitalism and technology”(Shultz, 2007). Neoliberal rationales have an impact on GCED practice. For example, in the Philippines context, the ability to speak English is underlined as an essential global citizen competency to be involved in the global marketplace(Camicia & Franklin, 2011). Marshall(2011) provides another example that Dutch GCED that is perceived from a number of upper-middle class parents as a strategy that provides students with competitive knowledge, skills, and attitude in the globalizing social arenas. These examples show the neoliberal approach has become predominantly embedded in GCED globally.

The neoliberal approach is often criticized in terms of its limitations. By focusing on economic values, a neoliberal approach of GCED rarely tends to consider moral values or social justice. Marshall(2011) argues that GCED should include not only economic values but also other values, as well, such as ecological, aesthetic, or spiritual values. Therefore, several scholars suggest a humanistic approach of GCED, which I now turn to.

2. Humanistic Approach of GCED

The central aspect of the humanistic approach of GCED is moral duty based on cosmopolitanism. Cosmopolitanism believes that there is “legitimacy of the principle of universality” to support human rights and dignity(Tawil, 2013, p. 2). Carter(2001) endorses this idea that “as moral beings individuals have a duty to obey universal imperatives”(p. 155). Reflecting on this, the moral sense of responsibility and obligations to others are essential and distinguishing components of the cosmopolitan perspective of global citizenship. From this philosophical background, the important elements of GCED are moral responsibility and the emphasis of human rights as universal rights.

However, the assumption of humanistic approach of GCED is often criticized in that it perpetuates the First World's discourse of the development and “sanctioned ignorance” about the history of imperialism and continuing unequal power imbalance between the North and the South(Andreotti, 2006, p. 44). Recognizing this critique, scholars propose a more critical approach of GCED.

3. Critical Approach of GCED

A central aspect of GCED from a critical approach is social justice and reducing global (and local) inequalities(Andreotti, 2006; Davies, 2006; Ibrahim, 2005). The critical approach of GCED emphasizes critical reflection on one's own position and situations in relation to

equity and justice in the global and local community(Dill, 2013; Andreotti, 2006; Shultz, 2009). Andreotti(2006) proposes critical GCED as a contrast with soft GCED. Given that globalization is an asymmetrical phenomenon due to the unequal power relations between Northern/Southern elites and others, Andreotti(2006) argues the problems that need to be solved are inequality and injustice, rather than just poverty or lack of development. In this vein, from the critical approach, GCED should encourage students to learn critical literacy and reflexivity so that they can recognize their positions, identities, and power relations in a complex globalized structure(Andreotti, 2006; Mannion et al., 2011; Shultz, 2009).

Accepting this approach, recently several scholars in South Korea address GCED from the critical perspective(Kang, 2014; Kim, 2015; Lee et al., 2015; Sung, 2010). For instance, Kang(2014) argues the decolonialistic viewpoint within GCED is required in order to challenge global inequality. Similarly, Sung(2010) criticizes instrumental and ethnocentric GCED in South Korea, and instead proposes the importance of active participation in global challenges such as global poverty, inequality, and injustice. Thus, GCED in South Korea is defined as “a transformative educational paradigm aimed at learning to live together in a more just and sustainable manner in ... increasingly uncertain and unequal world” as a contrast with traditional educational paradigm that highlights individual or/and national economic

prosperity(Lee et. al, 2015, p. 160).

Thus far, drawing upon a literature review, I presented three competing ideological frameworks within GCED; neoliberal, humanistic, and the critical approach of GCED. Given these different ideological frameworks, I applied the critical approach of GCED as the central conceptual framework of my analysis, as I believe critical GCED expands the scope and orientation from just economic prosperity or moral obligations to more holistic prosperity and political/social obligations, which requires active engagements in our real life to seeking a better world depicted as a more just, equitable, and peaceful world. Literature about the critical approach of GCED informed this study to examine how a critical perspective of GCED is evidenced in documents and the understanding of educators in South Korea.

III. Research Design

My research design for this study entails qualitative methods, relying on the combination of in-depth analysis of interviews and document analysis. I interviewed twenty education stakeholders in charge of GCED. The participants of this study include eight teachers, eight NGO workers, three IO staff, and one government officer, as <Table 2> shows¹⁾. For teachers, I identified six participants from a specific

〈Table 2〉 Brief Details of the Participants

Category	Interviewee	Working experiences
Teachers	Teacher A	5 years
	Teacher B	7 years
	Teacher C	10 years
	Teacher D	6 years
	Teacher E	3 years
	Teacher F	7 years
	Teacher G	15 years
	Teacher H	23 years
NGOs	NGO worker A	9 years
	NGO worker B	15 years
	NGO worker C	8 years
	NGO worker D	4 years
	NGO worker E	2 years
	NGO worker F	5 years
	NGO worker G	—
	NGO worker H	1.5 years
International Organizations	IO staff A	9 years
	IO staff B	20 years
	IO staff C	10 years
The Government	The MoE officer	1 year

1) Although scholars may play an important role in conceptualizing GCED in South Korea, this study did not include scholars considering the scope of my research and time constraints. This research attempts to understand concepts of GCED through interviews with education stakeholders particularly who are in charge or who implement GCED.

elementary school teachers' group interested in GCED and have applied it in their classrooms. Moreover, using purposeful snowball sampling strategy I added additional two teacher participants. To identify interviewees of NGOs and IOs, I contacted each organization that known to be active in engaging in GCED based on a literature review. Through this process, I interviewed eight NGO staff and three IO officers. I also interviewed an official at the Ministry of Education who was involved in organizing the WEF 2015. Each interview was conducted as semi-structured interview according to the predetermined interview proctoral sent to participants prior to the interviews via e-mail. The guiding questions include questions such as: 'What motivates you to implement GCED in your teaching(or program)?' 'What do you think are the rationales of GCED in general in South Korea' and 'How do you describe the concept of a global citizen/GCED?'. All interviews were undertakes between October and December 2015.

Furthermore, document analysis is utilized to complement the understanding of the government perspective on GCED. I explored various forms of documents including policy papers, the presidential speech, and teachers' guidebooks designed for GCED published by government organizations such as the Ministry of Education, the Gyeonggi-do Providential Office of Education.

IV. Findings: Tangled Rationales

In this chapter, I examine how GCED is perceived and reflected by educators and documents. This chapter consists of three sections. First, I discuss the rationale from the government's point of view. Second, NGOs' rationales will be presented. Third, teachers' perception and a broader rationale will be covered.

1. The Government's perspective: Neoliberal and Humanistic Orientation

The South Korean government proposed GCED as one of the key agendas for a post 2015 educational initiative(Choi et al, 2014; interviewee with IO staff A). In other words, GCED is not only the given international agenda, but also the agenda put forward by South Korea itself. In this sense, the South Korean government's interests and involvement in GCED is noticeable as the following presidential speech represents.

Korea has been actively engaging in the Global Education First Initiative as a champion country... In particular, Korea will continue to work with UNESCO to spread global citizenship education (Park, 2015 September)

Given this context, I seek to explore why the South Korean government is interested in GCED. Informed by analyzing documents and interviews with a government officer and IO staff²⁾, this section discusses two main rationales of the government's GCED. First, promoting GCED is necessary in that it would help domestic people work globally. Second, the Korean government seems to desire to play a leading role in promoting GCED in the international community. Through presenting these rationales, I present that the government's approach is situated in a blended orientation of neoliberal and humanistic approaches.

1) Cultivating Global Workers

One of the major rationales is cultivating global workers, which corresponds to the neoliberal approach of GCED. This rationale is mainly identified from the government's perspective throughout documents and interviews with a government officer and IO staff. For example, in teacher's guidebook, students "who have global capabilities and who can work beyond cultural or national boundaries" are described

2) I included UN organizations into the government perspective. Although I admit UN organizations have special functions and identity as international agencies, three UN organizations in my research serve as the Korean National Commission, as the name "Korean National Commission for UNESCO" or "Korean Committee for UNICEF" shows. In the case of APCIEU, established as a UNESCO's Category II institute, it should be strictly categorized into an international organization. Yet given the purpose of the research, I classify it also into the governmental sector.

as future global citizens(Gyeonggi-do Providential Office of Education, 2009, p. 11). Similarly, Another teacher's guidebook, *Early Childhood Global Citizenship Education*(Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, 2009), highlights global workers in the international arena as exhibited by several celebrities working around the world such as Ban Ki-moon, the eighth Secretary-General of the UN, and Kim Yuna, the Olympic figure skating champion. In this sense, documents place a premium on cultivating students to become global workers, prepared to live in a globalized world. Besides documents, several interviews also confirmed the economic rationale as the following two statements present:

Since this country is so small, many people need to go abroad for work. So raising global citizenship is essential. I think this is the reason why the importance of GCED is thought to be so relevant for this country. So South Korea aggressively supported this agenda [in post-2015 Education Agenda Setting]. (IO staff A)

As you may know, South Korean students may try to find jobs abroad since it is hard to break through the job crisis in South Korea. Because Korean students need to have global perspectives, global citizenship education should be strongly considered. (The MoE officer)

Documents as well as interviews show how an understanding of

GCED is particularly framed by an economic rationale. While moral obligations and social responsibilities as features of global leaders are addressed to some extent, global competence in terms of economic values is predominantly emphasized in the South Korean national discourse, as one of the texts produced by the Gyeonggi-do Providential Office of Education(2009) particularly epitomize:

In order to succeed in the globalized world of increasing interdependence, students should be equipped with a high quality of global competences. (p. 17).

Notably, this rationale expressed through documents and interviews was framed by economic values in terms of determining individual and national success in a globalized society. Indeed, market-based conceptions of GCED are often identified in other countries such as in the United Kingdom and the Philippines(Camicia & Franklin, 2011) and the Netherlands (Marshall, 2011). However, this market-based approach reflects the lack of core elements of GCED. Shultz(2007) criticized this neoliberal approach of GCED which does not consider “issues of power and access,” in which global citizens take their privileged positions for granted and consider it “a sign of success”(p. 252). As Shultz(2007) argues, while global citizens in a neoliberal perspective may be involved in supporting intervention such as donations to charities to alleviate the suffering of “those who are not successful”, this approach ignores the

role of GCED in contributing to social or structural change.

One interview with an NGO worker pointed out that this neoliberal ideal of focusing on global leaders is outdated and represents a misunderstanding that many people previously had:

At an earlier stage, no-one, including schools, had any idea about what GCED was, why it was necessary, and worst of all, many had a misunderstanding in which they considered GCED as one way of building up their background to advance themselves globally. As a matter of fact, not only schools, but also many provincial offices of education use 'rearing global leaders' as their motto. So this has led to many misunderstandings about the intent of GCED. (NGO worker A)

However, these neoliberal ideals of GCED still provide a legitimate rationale of the Korean educational practice toward GCED by rationalizing preparing human talents for an economic global society, rather than promoting critical thinking or active engagement for individuals and social change.

2) Positioning South Korea in a Global Society

The (Korean) government wants to demonstrate the excellence of the Korean education system by spreading the Korean educational model to developing countries and desires to spread its successful case.

... Then it (the Korean government) may pursue taking a leading role [in global citizenship education] in the international community.
(The MoE officer)

As noted by this MoE officer, one of the rationales of the Korean government seems to be the desire to taking a leading role in GCED. Indeed, this message is often observed throughout public speeches and documents. For example, at the high-level meeting of the Global Education First Initiative on September 25, 2014 President Park Geun-hye represented the government's strong intention toward GCED, stating that "South Korea will show leadership in placing GCED at the center of the new educational agenda"(Park, 2014, September). In addition, according to the 2016 educational policy, GCED is stated under the title of "leading Global Citizenship Education"(MoE, 2016, p. 27). As illustrated by the frequent references to 'leading,' the Korean government tends to view GCED as one part of a strategy of positioning within the global society.

More specifically, the Korean government appears to attempt to show leadership in contributing to international development by making a link to GCED. In fact, "strengthening international cooperation for promotion of GCED" is one of the main foundations of GCED policy(MoE, 2016, p. 27). According to the 2016 Education Policy plans(2016), the MoE aims to strengthen international cooperation by providing a GCED curriculum, teaching materials, and training to

Official Development Assistance (ODA) recipient countries. The Korean government identified GCED as fields in which Korea can contribute to international development, integrating its competitiveness and the needs of developing countries(Choi et al., 2013). In other words, GCED can be an instrumental strategy for the Korean government to position itself in the global society modeled on its humanistic approach by providing implicit messages to boost its national image as a global helper (or donor) especially with regard to Korean education.

At first glance, Korea's intention to contribute to developing countries through the channel of GCED may look unproblematic. However, upon closer examination, it may be questionable. Some anonymous interviews have observed that the Korean government proposed GCED according to political motivations caused by global trends and agenda setting, but not drawing from a sufficiently GCED-centered discussion. It can be argued that GCED has been rationalized by the Korean government in an effort to obtain global recognition as a developed and committed nation-state of the global community. While it may not be possible to entirely separate GCED from national interests, Parmenter(2011) argues "when national concerns come to dominate global research production... there is a danger of distortion of the research agenda, and significant danger of distortion of the academic discourse of global citizenship education"(p. 371). Thus, the priority of national concerns over educational concerns regarding GCED needs to be carefully considered.

2. NGOs' Rationale: A Means to Reduce Global Poverty

NGOs have played an important role in GCED in recent years (KoFID, 2015; Shultz, 2007). The majority of NGOs involved in GCED in South Korea are development NGOs, "committed to working toward economic, social or political development in developing countries" (Ulleberg, 2009, p. 12). Given that development NGOs' main concern is global poverty, the dominant rationale from NGOs' perspective is related to reduction of global poverty, especially in developing countries. NGOs' rationale is closely related to the alleviation of poverty in mainly two ways. The first rationale is a need for alternative messages about the role of poverty in the world, especially the under-developed world. The second rationale involves an alternative way to raising public engagement, which is derived from a critical reflection on NGOs' charity-driven approach.

1) Need for an Alternative Narrative about Poverty

NGO interviewees noted that GCED could play a role in challenging this limited message by offering alternative messages about the world which could shape the students' view on the world in a critical and holistic way. NGO staff often encountered uncomfortable perceptions about poverty or the world of developing countries expressed by media, students, or public. For example, "We (in this case Koreans) live well and others live comparably difficult lives, so we can do something to

help them” or “African countries or children are frequently described as poor and passive, which leads to the message they are powerless and we can help them” (interview with NGO worker D). This incomplete perception about the world is perceived as a rationale for NGOs to be involved in GCED. GCED is considered as a way of creating and delivering an alternative message to challenge these limited perceptions about poverty or the world.

This rationale was facilitated from NGOs’ firsthand experiences with students or volunteers. For example, one NGO member shared her experience in an elementary school class:

It was shocking to see this. One student said ‘one child dies from hunger every 4 seconds’ then another student said ‘No, it is every 5 seconds!’ They said they watched a TV commercial created by a relief organization. Actually, because of MDGs, a child’s death from starvation every 4 seconds became 5 seconds. Students were arguing between 4 second and 5 seconds. At that moment, I thought ‘Ok, they are discussing these details, but they don’t even know how many countries are in the African continent. But their first impression about the whole African continent is only child hunger? When they were asked to say something to African friends, students said ‘I’m sorry that I can’t help you more.’ (NGO worker D)

Another NGO worker shared:

Volunteers who visited African countries saw that most African

people use cellphones. So they said to us that 'people here live better than we expected!' but the reality was that due to the lack of electronic cables buried underground, using a cellphone is necessary in many cases. Thus, we thought it seems crucial to provide them (volunteers) with appropriate education to deepen their understandings about the contexts where they serve. (NGO worker F)

As these examples show, students or volunteers tend to have fragmentary and partial messages about poverty and African children. This statement is supported by recent research about Korean's perceptions of Africa (Kim, Chae, & Jung, 2014). This research demonstrates that Korean tend to have limited perceptions about Africa predominantly in relation to "famine, poverty, disease, war, death, environment, and danger" (Kim et al., 2014, p. 138). Some interviewees point out that it is because students seem to be rarely introduced to underrepresented countries within a national education curriculum. In addition, these fragmentary messages about the world that students frequently receive are also attributed to the message created by NGOs themselves (interview with NGO worker A). To rectify this, GCED is viewed as a channel to produce an alternative narrative about poverty. Particularly, in recognition of the current development discourse that poverty eradication is not about the provision of resources, but ultimately about structural and historical issues (Andreotti, 2006), many Korean NGOs want to address this perspective through GCED, as

exemplified by the following statements from two NGO workers:

Poverty [eradication]? It's not simply a one-sided relationship in which one side just gives help, and the other one gets it. There should be another approach. Then what can be our alternative message? In trying to answer this question, we came to think about global citizenship education last year and this year. (NGO worker D)

If you probe into that [poverty], it is the problem of the system after all. It is the problem of the structure. So in order to change the structure and the system, citizens must become more powerful. I think the citizens need to become more powerful and exercise this power to change the people who design the structure and the system. (NGO worker A)

These commentaries show that NGO workers focus on the transformative message of GCED in what Andreotti(2006) calls 'critical' GCED. NGO staffs view GCED as a channel to address that poverty is embedded in a complex structure and unequal power relations. In this sense, creating a new way of narrative or "new ways of negotiating global relations"(Shultz, 2007, p. 257) is identified as the rationale for GCED from NGOs' perspectives.

2) A Way of Promoting Public Engagement

NGO staff also highlighted the rationale for GCED in terms of an

alternative way of public engagement in international development. While NGOs used to focus more on fundraising to promote public engagement in poverty issues, the current tendency of Korean NGOs values increasing public awareness about global issues especially poverty. One NGO comment summed up this point nicely:

When we first used GCED as the term for sharing education, our ultimate purpose was fundraising to expose the public to the needs of the world. I mean, our original focus was on searching for potential sponsors. The students who received our education were considered as potential sponsors. This was the general approach of NGOs. However, at some point, this perception evolved toward a discourse focusing on educational values. [That is,] it is raising awareness about inequity in society by providing appropriate information and encouraging people to find their own practical actions. (NGO worker B)

Indeed, many interviewees of NGO staff confirmed that to implement their projects they used to emphasize fundraising to obtain financial or material support from the public. However, because fundraising has traditionally focused on merely raising funds rather than also including education about global poverty or poverty-related issues, there has been a paradigm shift in NGOs' approach from soliciting donations to raising public awareness through GCED. This tactic has become the rationale for GCED, as one NGO staff stated:

There has been self-reflection on the charity-driven approach. We did many charity events such as a 24 hours fasting to experience hunger, so that regular citizens can participate in sharing. However, we thought there is a lack of motivation. To spread the value of sharing, something was lacking. We became increasingly aware of problems with the status quo. (NGO worker A)

As this statement indicates, GCED is adopted as a way of encouraging the public including students to be engaged in poverty issues and philanthropy through GCED and not merely focusing on fund-raising activities. Furthermore, although many NGO interviewees recognized that their previous forms of GCED tended to focus on fundraising rather than on the educational purpose itself, it is argued that their focus has evolved from fundraising toward the intrinsic value of education. This rationale is also confirmed by KoFID's research(2015) that the reason why many NGOs started GCED in late 2000 was to increase public awareness about poverty issues and to encourage individuals' participation in combating poverty. That is, GCED is perceived as an important channel to increase public perception of global poverty and the reasons behind it and therefore promote public engagement.

However, despite this paradigm shift within NGOs, the rationale of NGOs for increased public awareness tends to be criticized by other actors as being a means to solicit donations in schools, as articulated by

two interviewees.

There are some NGOs which link GCED to fundraising. ... I was often told that some NGOs dispatch their staff on condition of a fund-raising campaign. (IO staff C)

Many NGOs are very involved in public elementary, middle and high schools under the banner of GCED in an attempt to raise money. (IO staff A)

Although NGOs staff acknowledged this criticism and admitted that GCED can be a good vehicle for fundraising especially in schools, some NGO workers disputed this, saying “this is a misunderstanding about NGOs’ GCED without closely examining their actions” (NGO worker A). There is an apparent gap in understanding between NGOs and other stakeholders including teachers and IO staff about GCED fundraising issues.

This perception gap between NGOs and others about NGOs’ fundraising issues can be attributed mainly to three reasons. First, most NGOs staff commented that the change in focus from fund-raising to intrinsic education values is a recently observed trend. For example, one interviewee specifically stated that this trend has begun in just the past three years. Thus, this change may be still in an initial stage, and other stakeholders may not yet recognize this trend. Second, according

to NGOs, fundraising is understood not as a fundamental goal of GCED, but should be understood as a beneficial by-product of GCED. GCED entails not only cognitive improvement but also behavioral engagement which in many cases then results in donations. In this way, donations are suggested by NGOs as a form of active participation for people who want to become global citizens:

We are not saying please support us first; we serve [schools'] needs first and provide a practical way of engagement (which means donation in this context). (NGO worker B)

Third, while NGOs try to avoid using GCED as instrumental to fund-raising, it is impossible to clearly separate GCED from charitable donations since most NGOs depend primarily on individual donations. Current research shows that Korean NGOs' major source of income has been individual charity despite increased government attention and support placed on ODA and development of cooperation (Park et al., 2015). Also, due to their having little opportunity to receive government support for GCED, many NGOs have difficulty in maintaining their programs with limited fiscal resources. For example, several NGO workers criticized that most of the budget for GCED from the government was set aside only for specific International Organization without considering the needs of other GCED actors such as NGOs' need. In this sense, NGO staff argue that fund-raising is not

the ultimate goal of GCE,D but rather a necessary aspect of it.

Therefore, in response to their critical reflection on the charity-driven approach, NGOs seek the critical approach of GCED focusing on public awareness and producing an alternative narrative about global poverty. However, their limited financial interdependence has led NGOs to embrace a market-driven approach to solicit donations to some extent. This point is voiced from Camicia & Franklin(2001) that different ideologies of GCED would necessarily be presented in a mixed manner due to dynamic power relations among stakeholders, in this case between the government/IOs and NGOs. In this sense, NGOs' rationale for GCED is situated in a complex and blended way.

3. Teachers: Transformative and with a Broader Sense of Rationale

While teachers are influenced by the government's policy and curriculum, they may possess different rationales which may also differ from the government's approach based on their unique intent and approach. This section presents that teachers view GCED as an alternative way to deal with exam-focused competitive education system in an effort to promoting students' well-being and happiness. Next, I will present that each teachers' individual philosophy on education plays a pivotal role as they uphold elements of GCED and implement it in their practice.

1) Students' Well-being and Happiness

Korean teachers tend to identify students' well-being and happiness as the rationale for pursuing and implementing GCED in their classrooms. The phrases of 'well-being' and 'happiness' were frequently used by teachers in relation to GCED, such as two teachers expressed:

Our students look soulless. They look like they live unwillingly. They are just busy coming and going to school and to private education. I hope students do not suspend their happiness and enjoy their life now. I think this can be related to global citizenship. That's why I do global citizenship education. (Teacher E)

The purpose of global citizenship education? I think it is for well-being. Living as a human being. When I think about what living as human being... Well, I don't know what President's Park's Happy Education policy means, but I think it is happiness anyway. Happiness can be different depending on people of course, but happiness and well-being seems the key to global citizenship education. (Teacher F)

Most Korean educators mentioned Korean education is problematic in that it is mainly directed toward achieving high performance in competitive university entrance examinations. Indeed, Korean education is often referred to as examination hell(Lee & Larson, 2000), which represents the high pressure that Korean students experience to get into

the best university. Recognizing this, teachers have perceived GCED as a “creative alternative” to deal with this problem in a Korean educational context. The following two comments show this concern:

[The importance of Global Citizenship Education] In Korean educational practice? Entrance-exam-oriented education and character education are emphasized. Also the law (the Character Education promotion law) came into force. Then I thought it (GCED) can be a distinctive and creative approach to Korean education in contrast to the traditional approach. When I do global citizenship education, I include debates and activities, and it becomes a student-centered classroom. In this way, I think global citizenship education can be an alternative to the current exam-centered education in Korea. (Teacher E)

The only way to make well-being is through changing perception. And changing perception requires education. But the current [Korean] education focuses too much on grades and class rank. Only care about them. I think global citizenship education is an alternative way of education to change our perception. I hope global citizenship education will enable students to think about themselves, not about only their grades. I hope this paradigm shift comes true with global citizenship education. (Teacher F)

Thus, Korean teachers perceive GCED as an alternative approach that can challenge the exam-focused Korean education by encouraging

students to think critically about themselves rather than what a society or school wants. In this sense, they emphasized critical thinking as a core component of GCED, which enables students to analyze their positions and society through a critical lens. Teachers interviewed in my research pay attention to GCED as empowering students to question their assumptions about themselves and society, thereby actively challenging inequality and unjust social structures. This teachers' rationale of GCED generally falls within the 'critical' form of GCED that Andreotti(2006) describes.

Moreover, teachers' rationale of GCED is linked to students' individual well-being and happiness, rather than social or world change. While a few teachers do address concerns about global issues such as environmental problems as the contents of GCED, this is not the teachers' rationale of GCED. In other words, Korean teachers focused more on individual transformation rather than global or social transformation. This point can be understood through the work of Parmenter(2011), who argues the interpretation of global citizenship varies according to culture. In European, North American and Australian culture, global citizenship is understood as global or social transformation such as social justice, or global equality. On the other hand, in areas of Asia, the idea of self-transformation is more evident. While deserving of further exploring this with empirical data, the argument of Parmenter(2011) gives an interesting insight into a

potential explanation for understanding the rationale of GCED in Korean educational practice focused on students' well-being and happiness.

2) Teachers' Own Educational Philosophy

Teachers interviewed in this research responded that the reason why they implement GCED is that their educational philosophy conforms to core values of GCED such as equity and respect for diversity. This indicates that teachers view GCED in a broad sense, which does not necessarily fit into the three ideological frameworks of GCED. Most teachers represented that GCED reflects teachers' own educational views, perspectives, or instructional values which guide their overall educational activities and instruction, as the following quotes articulated:

Global citizenship education is just a teacher's own educational philosophy. And it could be reflected into all the educational activities the teacher provides. (Teacher E)

I think GCED is a philosophical base. In teaching the Korean language, for instance, this philosophy, global citizenship education, can be based upon this subjects. It's the same with other subjects as well such as math and science. Global citizenship education is not some sort of a coursework or instructional method but it is more of a mind set or an attitude that should be shared philosophically. (Teacher A)

I think that GCED itself is similar to a big bowl which cannot be seen. It's like a complete gift set. My perception is that it is a bowl filled with every single element of conflict that most people encounter as they live their lives. I think it is a little inappropriate to call it certain knowledge, a skill, or an attitude. (Teacher C)

According to these teachers' views, GCED is not some special content, educational method, or a subject. Rather, it is a lens or paradigm that influences teacher's overall educational activities. In this understanding of GCED, teachers implement GCED not only during class hours in certain subjects but also in their comprehensive behaviors and attitudes such as the manner of talking to students as well as the relationship between students and teacher.

In this vein, some teachers seemed quite uncomfortable in defining global citizenship or global citizenship education. One teacher explained:

Almost every institute tries to define global citizenship. But I think GCED should not be defined, rather it is a movement. ... Have we not had a global citizenship education? We have had it. If we define global citizenship education, it might constrain us from doing that we've been already doing. I am strongly against that. I believe everything we teach involves global citizenship education, therefore, it doesn't need to be any fancier (Teacher F)

As noted by this teacher, with recent increasing attention to GCED in South Korea, many stakeholders try to define GCED and regard as a

special item. However, teachers argue that GCED is not anything special, but something which is already contained in their educational practice. The efforts to define GCED seem to limit the meaning of GCED by drawing a line between GCED and the non-GCED, as one teacher put it:

I once said that I feel wary and uncomfortable when such a topic (global citizenship education) is brought up. This makes more people aware of it and they'll pay more attention and interest to it. This is of course a good thing and a positive phenomenon. But, I feel like meaning of the global citizenship education is being narrowed down, limited, and standardized. (Teacher E)

This perspective is related to Tawil's(2013) comment that GCED is "a framing concept or paradigm that expresses a collective purpose of education" rather than a distinct domain of learning and teaching (p. 4). Teachers' concepts of GCED seem to encompass a broad span depending on one's own philosophy of education. Consequently, the analysis of teachers' rationale shows that teachers have wide-ranging and blurred boundaries of understanding of GCED.

V. Conclusion: Divergence in Rationalizing GCED

The purpose of this study is to explore how different stakeholders conceptualize GCED in South Korea. By exploring diverse stakeholders and documents, The findings of this study show that different actors related to GCED in South Korea possess variation in rationales, which demonstrate competing ideological foundations.

To sum up, the Korean government's intention can be understood mainly as coming from a neoliberal perspective focusing on preparing individuals to be able to participate in the global marketplace. The Korean government is also working to position itself as a global leader in GCED. Making a link to international development, the government seems to share its experience of Korean education with developing countries, which also reflects a humanistic perspective regarding its commitment as a global donor. This shows that GCED has been rationalized in a mix of neoliberal and humanistic ideology by the government. In contrast, the rationales of NGOs and teachers tend to focus more on humanistic and critical approaches. NGOs view GCED as a way of providing alternative messages about the world and global poverty, so that it can attract public engagement. While NGOs tend toward an approach of helping others based on humanistic principles, they also intend through critical GCED to challenge hegemonic messages of global poverty described as passive and inferior. Teachers'

perceptions can be explained from the critical approach of GCED in that they view GCED as an alternative way of empowering students to critically reflect on socially imposed norms and on what they want. However, teachers' motivations about GCED are based mainly on their various educational philosophies, which are not fully mapped onto the three ideological frameworks. In this sense, this study reveals that although different actors use the same term of GCED, their intents and understandings of GCED vary depending on their own embedded perspectives.

Through analysis of different actors' rationale of GCED, this study presents that ideological struggles about GCED exist in a complicated way. Although educators involved in GCED in South Korea posit the critical approach to some extent, the neoliberal and humanistic approaches of GCED remain and often predominant. As Camicia and Franklin (2011) recognize that the meaning of GCED is complex by "a tension and blending between neoliberal and critical democratic discourses" (p. 321), stakeholders represent different rationales according to their different degrees of emphasis between neoliberal and critical or transformative values. This analysis of rationale of GCED confirms that the tri-factor framework among neoliberal, humanistic, and critical GCED is not distinct, but rather is "blended, complex and embedded in a dynamic network of power relations"(Camicia and Franklin, 2011p. 314).

Furthermore, there seems to be a significant difference between government perspective and practice. While the Korean government's rationale predominantly represents neoliberal discourse, educators in practice notably identify their rationales related in a transformative or critical approach. In other words, despite the prevailing perception of critical approach of GCED in practice, the government's approach does not correspond to educators' understanding of GCED. This gap may be attributed to the government's lack of consideration of perceptions and expectations for GCED in educational practice. Thus, although GCED is defined in Korea as a transformative educational paradigm, educators in practice often recognize inconsistency between their understandings and the government's approach which still uphold a traditional educational paradigm designed for equipping students to be successful in a competitive society in South Korea as well as in a global society.

Considering the results, there is a need for space to develop and reflect on educators' educational philosophies regarding GCED. Given that educators' own philosophies on education play a critical role in implementing GCED, it is important to provide opportunities where teachers can learn and explore the values of GCED through training or individual research. Reilly and Niens(2014) argue that in order to develop critical dialogic discourse in GCED, "teachers need more than subject knowledge and methodological expertise—they must develop a clear political understanding of the issues explored, which necessitates

time for critical reflection and opportunities for discourse amongst teachers themselves”(p. 69). As this argument indicates, I believe not only teacher training that provides knowledge and methodological implications but also provision of time/resources to critically reflect on their own educational philosophy and values should be expanded.

This research makes a contribution to a theoretical discussion of GCED. Confirming that GCED is “a complex and contested concept”(Shultz, 2007, p. 248), the results of my study extend the existing literature by providing a detailed understanding of how different ideologies regarding GCED exist in a complex manner within a South Korean context. Moreover, this analysis echoes Enns’s(2015) research that demonstrates how the struggle between neoliberal (hegemonic) and human rights-based (counter-hegemonic) ideals shaped the post-2015 global education agenda by analyzing post-2015 development agenda discussions. Enns(2015) argues that although discourse about post-2015 education has placed greater emphasis on a human rights-based approach than previous global agendas such as Education for All (EFA) and Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), neoliberal ideals that view education as a tool for employability and economic growth still remain visible on the post-2015 global education agenda. The analysis of my research extends Enns’s(2015) study by revealing a detailed example of ideological struggles over the rationale and direction of GCED in South Korea. In conclusion, I argue that the different ideological perspectives

surrounding GCED in South Korea should be clearly addressed and recognized when GCED is discussed and applied. In recognition of its complexity, educators must be able to work with a clear understanding of GCED and reflect on their assumptions and orientation regarding GCED.

As an extension to my research, there is a need for investigating varied voices and stances about GCED *within* each stakeholders. Given the major purpose or scope of this research, I focused on addressing various stakeholders' main rationales of GCED. Although this research tried to understand varied stakeholders' rationales for GCED including the government, the NGOs, and teachers, I acknowledge that this study may not fully capture different opinions that may exist within each stakeholders. For example, with regard to NGOs, each NGOs may have unique emphasis or interest embedded in their GCED programs such as human rights and environmental substantiality. Thus, it could be meaningful to distinguish their various voices to highlight potentially different positions within each stakeholders in future research.

Bibliography

- Andreotti, V.(2006). Soft versus critical global citizenship education. *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review*, 3, 40-51.
- Byeon, J.(2012). Global Citizenship and the Task of Elementary Moral Education *Journal of Korean Elementary Moral Education*, 38, 177-203.

- Camicia, S. & Franklin, B.(2011) What type of global community and citizenship? Tangled discourses of neoliberalism and critical in curriculum and its reform. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9(3-4), 311-322.
- Carter, A.(2001). *The Political Theory of Global Citizenship*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Choi, J., Kim, J., Park, H., Park, J., Lee, S., Kim, S., Moon, M., Cho, J., Seo, J, Park, H., & Cho, J.(2014). 2015 세계교육회의를 위한 한국의 교육경험 의제 발굴 및 확산 지원 사업. (TR 2014-34) [A projects of Korean education's agenda excavation and dissemination for 2015 World Education Forum (TR 2014-34)]. 한국교육개발원[Korean Educational Development Institute].
- Davies, L.(2006). Global citizenship: abstraction or framework for action? *Educational Review*, 58(1), 5-25.
- Dill, J. S.(2013). *The longings and limits of global citizenship education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Enns, C.(2015). Transformation or continuation? A critical analysis of the making of the post-2015 education agenda, *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 13(3).
- Evans, M., Ingram, L. A., Macdonald, A., & Weber, N.(2009). Mapping the “global dimension” of citizenship education in Canada: The complex interplay of theory, practice and context. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 5(2), 17-34.
- Gyeonggi-do Providential Office of Education(2009). **더불어 살아가는 국제시민교육: 국제이해교육 프로그램 가이드북** [Global citizenship Education: International Understanding Education Program Guidebook]. (주)서울멀티넷.
- Ibrahim, T.(2005). Global citizenship education: mainstreaming the curriculum? *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 35(2), 177-194.
- Kang, S.W.(2014). Tasks of Korean Global Citizenship Education(GCED) in the context of Education for International Understanding(EIU). *Journal of education for international understanding*, 9(2), 1-31.
- Kim, C. Chae, Y., & Jung, N.(2014). **한국 미디어의 아프리카 재현방식과 수용자 인식 조사** (세이브터칠드런 연구보고서) [Research of Korean

media's way of representation of Africa and consumers' perception (Save the Children Research Paper)]. Seoul: Save the Korean.

Kim, J. H., Cha, Y. K., Park, S. Y. & Lee, J. Y.(2014). **평화와 협력을 위한 세계시민교육: 2015 세계교육회의(WEF 2015) 의제 형성 연구** [Global Citizenship Education for Peace and Cooperation: Research for agenda formation for 2015 World Education Forum]. Korean National Commission for UNESCO.

Kim, J.(2015). Critical Understanding on Global Citizenship Education in Post 2015 Context. *Theory and Research in Citizenship Education*, 47(1), 59-88.

KoFID(2015). 국내외 시민사회 교육개발협력의 동향과 과제 -2015 세계교육 포럼 및 국제교육개발협력 증진을 위한 시민사회 역량강화 연구- 최종보고서 [Trends and tasks on national and international civic society's education development cooperation (Research for capacity building of civic society for 2015 World Education Forum and promotion of international educational development cooperation)]. 국제개발협력시민사회포럼 [Korea Civil Society Forum on International Development Cooperation (KoFID)].

Koo, S(2014, August 1). An assault Upon Our Children: South Korea's Education System Hurts Students. The New York Times.

Lee M. & Larson, R.(2000). The Korean 'Examination Hell': Long Hours of Studying, Distress, and Depression. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 29(2), 249-271.

Lee, S., Kim, M., Chung, B., Park, Y., Jo, Y., Song, S., & Lee, S.(2015). The practices and challenges of global citizenship education in South Korean schools. Seoul: Korean Educational Development Institute.

Mannion, G., Biesta, G., Priestley, M. & Ross, H.(2011). The global dimension in education and education for global citizenship: genealogy and critique. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9(3-4), 443-456.

Marshall, H.(2011). Instrumentalism, ideals and imaginaries: theorising the contested space of global citizenship education in schools. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9(3-4). 411- 426.

- Ministry of Education, Science and Technology(2009). 유아 세계시민교육 활동자료 Early Childhood global citizenship education]. Ministry of Education, Science and Technology.
- MoE(2016). 2016 Education Policy Plans: Happy Education for All, Creative Talents Shapes the Future. Ministry of Education Republic of Korea
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs(2014). ROK Becomes the 15th Champion Country of the Global Education First Initiative (2014. 8. 28).외교부 보도자료.
- Oxfam(2015). Education for Global Citizenship: A guide for schools. U.K: Oxfam.
- Parmenter, L.(2011). Power and place in the discourse of global citizenship education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9:3-4, 367-380.
- Park, G.(2014 September). Remarks by President Park Geun-hye at the High-level Meeting of the Global Education First Initiative. The Republic of Korea Cheong Wa Dae.
- Park, H. Lee, H., & Cho, H.(2015). Perceptions of Korean NGOs for education and educational development projects. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 45, 31-41.
- Reilly, J. & Niens, U.(2014). Global citizenship as education for peacebuilding in a divided society: structural and contextual constraints on the development of critical dialogic discourse in schools. *Compare*, 44(1), 53-76.
- Shultz, L.(2007). Educating for global citizenship: Conflicting agendas and understandings. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 53(3), 248-258.
- Sung, Y. K.(2010). A Theoretical Discussion on Universal Core Elements and Korean Distinctiveness in Global Citizenship Education. *Journal of Korean Education*, 37(2), 109-130.
- Tawil, S.(2013). Education for 'Global Citizenship': A framework for discussion (Education Research and Foresight Working Papers Series, No. 7). Paris: UNESCO.
- Ulleberg, I.(2009). The Role and Impact of NGOs in Capacity Development: From Replacing the State to Reinvigorating Education. International Institute for Education Planning.

UNESCO(2015). Global Citizenship Education: Topics and learning objectives. Paris: UNESCO.

Veugelaers, W.(2011). The moral and the political in global citizenship: appreciating differences in education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9(3-4), 473-485.

요 약

한국의 세계시민교육에 대한 다양한 이해 분석

조혜승

(충남대학교 박사후 연구원)

이 연구의 목적은 한국의 다양한 교육 관계자들이 어떻게 세계시민교육을 인식하는지 알아보기 위함이다. 이를 위해 인터뷰와 문헌분석을 포함한 질적 연구를 실시하였다. 인터뷰에는 교사, NGO 종사자, 국제기구 종사자, 정부관료 등 세계시민교육을 담당하거나 관계된 교육가 20명이 포함되었으며, 문헌분석을 위해서는 정부관련 기관에서 발간된 교사지침서, 정책 문헌 등이 사용되었다. 분석 틀로는 세계시민교육의 내용이 그 기저에 있는 이데올로기에 따라 다르게 나타난다는 이론적 배경을 토대로 '신자유주의적, 인류애적, 비판적 세계시민교육'의 세 가지 관점을 설정하여 분석을 진행하였다. 분석결과, 다양한 이해관계자가 '세계시민교육'의 동일한 용어를 사용하고 있지만 그 안에 담긴 의미는 각각의 관점에 따라 복잡하게 얽혀져 나타났다. 또한 한국의 세계시민교육이 비판적 관점도 추구하고 있음에도 불구하고 신자유주의적, 인류애적 관점에서의 세계시민교육이 강조되고 있음을 지적하였다. 이러한 연구 결과를 바탕으로, 세계시민교육에 대한 분명한 이해를 갖기 위해서는 세계시민교육의 개념적 복잡성과 그 안의 상이한 관점들을 인식하고 드러낼 필요가 있음을 주장하였다.

주제어 : 세계시민교육, 세계시민성, 국제교육

투고신청일: 2016.10.30

심사수정일: 2016.12.03.

게재확정일: 2016.12.26