Original Article

Fostering a global public sphere in real time: transpacific Skype seminars as a teaching strategy with implications for citizenship and identity

Hans Schattle
Yonsei University, Republic of Korea

Tom Plate
Loyola Marymount University, USA

Abstract

Citizenship and identity can be viewed as dynamic and transformative rather than as fixed or static, especially in an era in which the public sphere for contestation and deliberation has expanded beyond the limits of nation-states and into the global realm. It can be difficult, though, within the confines of conventional classrooms to create an atmosphere that gives students, even in culturally diverse university settings, a sense that they are taking part in a meaningful global conversation. New digital media platforms and videoconferencing technology are rendering this goal less elusive than before, and this article works across the theory and practice of global citizenship education to explain how faculty members in Los Angeles, California, and Seoul, South Korea, have team-taught their respective undergraduate courses via live Skype seminars. We review, in concrete and practical terms, the planning and logistics that went into this teaching strategy, including an extensive discussion on how we evaluated the initiative and how we modified the strategy to add team assignments that brought the students together for collaboration beyond the weekly class meetings. We then reflect upon how our shared endeavor of bringing students together for mutual learning across national borders carries implications for the ways in which our students think about their roles and identities as citizens.

Keywords

citizenship, civic education, globalization, identity, new media, Skype

Introduction: citizenship, identity, and the virtually cosmopolitan classroom

Today's digital media platforms have opened up opportunities for colleges and universities around the world to create new programs with the potential to transform how students think about their

Corresponding author:
Hans Schattle, Department of Political Science, Yonsei University, Seoul 03722, Republic of Korea.
Email: hschattle@yonsei.ac.kr

roles and identities as citizens. Citizenship and identity are multifaceted concepts, and educators interested in creating strategies for global learning need not consign themselves to the aspects of citizenship and identity that are commonly viewed as static or fixed, based mainly on one's national legal residency or birthplace. Of course the institution of national citizenship provides an essential grounding for rights, duties, and allegiances. However, educators can take these aspects of citizenship as given and focus instead on the ways in which citizenship, as a set of mindsets and practices, can extend well beyond the confines of formal membership status within political jurisdictions and adopt a cosmopolitan perspective in which respect for the inherent dignity and well-being of all individual persons takes priority (Banks et al., 2005: 24; Gaudelli, 2016: 50–51; Starkey, 2012: 25).

The authors of this article see citizenship as dynamic and transformative, encompassing multiple ways of thinking and living in the world: as expansive in outlook and hearkening to democratic empowerment and participation as well as a willingness to take on responsibilities that can cut across multiple political communities. Likewise, although it can be taken for granted that the more familiar elements of identity, for most everyday people, are largely set for life, some facets of political and social identity are indeed a matter of choice. For many individuals whose moral horizons gradually expand from local and national to global communities, the accompanying chosen political identities can evolve and expand over time. While theorists, critical of the more individualist strains of liberalism (Miller, 1995; Sandel, 1982; Walzer, 1983), emphasize the aspects of identity that are predetermined—such as being born into a particular ethnic group or a specific religious tradition—we want to acknowledge that many individuals in fact choose to consider themselves as connected in meaningful ways to human beings as well as political communities outside the boundaries of their immediate home countries. Educational programs are crucial in this regard, as they can facilitate enlarged senses of citizenship and identity through readings, conversations, and experiences that reshape the ways in which students think about political and social relationships. Many disparities, however, persist in the educational arena when it comes to both the accessibility of programs that seek to advance global citizenship education as well as the specific content of individual programs, namely, whether programs emphasize the 'humanistic' sides of global ethics or preparation for competing in the global marketplace (Dill, 2013; Goren and Yemini, 2017).

Our chosen approach presented in this article for encouraging students, indirectly, to learn in ways that can transform their perspectives on citizenship and identity centers upon facilitating live transnational conversations among students and faculty based on their respective home campuses. The accessibility of videoconferencing technologies such as Skype and FaceTime renders the ideal of a global public sphere (Castells, 2008; Volkmer, 2003)—comprised of formal as well as informal venues for open discussion on common global issues—within closer reach even for ordinary university instructors who in an earlier time period might have only dreamed of arranging live, face-to-face conversations with students and faculty at partner universities abroad. Bringing together students across continents for live discussions via Skype or FaceTime opens the doors of global education to students who in many cases might not ordinarily have the means to take up more costly forms of international education such as overseas exchange programs.

This article provides an overview of one such transnational partnership between faculty and students at Yonsei University in Seoul, South Korea, and Loyola Marymount University (LMU) in Los Angeles, California. We begin by explaining how we planned and organized our 'Skype seminars' that have brought together our undergraduate courses on a yearly basis since the spring semester of 2016. We then reflect upon the extent that this shared teaching strategy might have some implications for the ways in which our students think about their roles and identities as citizens as well as the evolution of a global public sphere.

Our partnership brought together two faculty members who have explored the idea of the global public sphere from different vantage points. One instructor is a political scientist based at Yonsei University who works at the nexus of political theory, political sociology and global studies and has published books and articles exploring notions of global political community and global citizenship. The other instructor is a longtime journalist and author now serving as director of the Asia Media Center at LMU; he is a full-time clinical professor at LMU and has long taken initiatives to launch transnational classroom conversations in real time. Since both of us are the initiators of this specific teaching strategy, we do not claim to speak in objective terms but rather from the vantage points of instructors who have positioned themselves at the heart of the endeavor and can share observations, culled from our 3 years of collaboration, on its aims, accomplishments, relevance, and future potential.

The mechanics of the Skype seminars

Our most relevant collaboration, with regard to this article on citizenship and identity, took place in the spring of 2017, when both instructors focused directly on examining the concept of global citizenship in their respective courses—an interdisciplinary seminar in global citizenship at Yonsei and an Asia media practicum at LMU. During this semester, the 4-week sequence of live conversations between the two classes via Skype began with discussion on an edited collection of essays, published in the volume *For Love of Country?* (Cohen, 2002) anchored upon moral philosopher Martha Nussbaum's impassioned case for Americans to teach young people to think about their allegiances and corresponding responsibilities mainly in global rather than in national terms. The classes also read and discussed two chapters from the political science and global studies text *The Practices of Global Citizenship* (Schattle, 2008) illustrating the many ways in which individuals who have chosen to think of themselves as global citizens have reflected upon this concept.

As the two groups of students reviewed the essays by Martha Nussbaum and her critics, the instructors set up a matrix that included four categories or quadrants: patriotism over cosmopolitanism, cosmopolitanism over patriotism, equal weight to patriotism and cosmopolitanism, and neither patriotism nor cosmopolitanism. This matrix allowed the students to find a way to situate the thinking of Nussbaum's various respondents (among them, Kwame Anthony Appiah, Benjamin Barber, Amy Gutmann, Michael Walzer, and Immanuel Wallerstein) and also provided a point of departure for the students, in subsequent weeks, to think about how these contrasting ways of thinking might prompt different kinds of strategies to solve global problems. Accordingly, for the second and third weeks of the Skype seminars, the instructors redeployed the matrix in the context of two major issues that stretch beyond the capabilities of nation-states to resolve on their own: global warming for the second week and the proliferation of nuclear weapons for the third week. Readings on global warming included *Eaarth: Making a Life on a Tough New Planet*, by environmental activist Bill McKibben (2011), and *One World*, by moral and political philosopher Peter Singer (2004), while readings on nuclear proliferation juxtaposed a portion of *The Fate of the Earth*, by the late journalist and peace activist Jonathan Schell (1982), and a short essay, far more favorable on nuclear proliferation than Schell's view, titled 'Why Iran Should Get the Bomb', by the late international relations theorist Kenneth Waltz (2012).

In 2017, the second year of our collaboration, we added into our Skype seminars a new project in which we organized all our students into pairs—one student from LMU and one student from Yonsei—and required each pair to co-author a paper exploring a global issue of their choice and reflecting on how a globally minded perspective could be engaged to address this issue. We assigned partners by lottery at the end of our first joint class session; the students relayed their chosen topics to the larger group at the start of our second session; and we dedicated the majority

of the class period during our fourth and final week to the student presentations. This collaborative assignment became all the more appealing when, by serendipity, our two courses for the spring of 2017 happened to enroll exactly the same number of students—and our enrollments were fairly low, at 11 students, making it manageable to schedule all the joint presentations within the 2-hour window of the final joint class session. (Following the student presentations, the two instructors read the papers and then had a lengthy conversation on Skype to determine the grade for each assignment.)

The shared paper assignment in particular gave the students a greater sense of investment in the Skype seminars as well as a greater sense of camaraderie with their counterparts overseas, as each pair of students had to hold several Skype and e-mail conversations of their own to talk through their plans for the paper, divide the research and writing tasks, formulate a mutually agreeable paper, and then plot out the presentations. When we conducted (separate) student evaluations following the completion of our four joint sessions, both of us found a higher level of student satisfaction with the Skype seminars in 2017 than in the previous year, in which our theme for the seminars revolved around US foreign policy in East Asia. We think the collaborative project was one key reason for the improvement: the students liked the extra layer of interaction the assignment brought into the larger endeavor. It also gave them a definitive result that could serve as a capstone for their efforts.

Discussion: broadening the 'global brain'

Citizenship, identity, and the public sphere

Our shared endeavor was not expressly designed to have any specific impacts on how our students conceive of the meaning of citizenship or identity, yet we firmly believe in the power of live, real-time transnational communication in the classroom to transform and enlarge the ways in which our students think about their roles and identities as citizens. Accordingly, three questions flow from our Skype seminars that relate with the theme of this journal's special issue on citizenship, identity, and education:

- To what degree can mutual learning among two distinct yet compatible groups of students—located in two different countries—contribute to the formation of a global identity as well as a global public sphere?
- Are we cultivating (at least tacitly) global citizens through our initiative by virtue of the exchanges of ideas among our students?
- What is the relationship between technology and teaching in facilitating global identity construction?

Much of the scholarship on citizenship and identity has helpfully advanced understandings of these concepts that are ripe for deployment in any endeavor to foster education that can help students develop the capacity to think and live in a more global context. Engin Isin and Patricia Wood (1999), for example, have emphasized that identity is ultimately a plural and relational concept and that each individual is a 'distinct assemblage of identities' (p. 19). This suggests that each individual person, when negotiating identity, can therefore recognize both sources of commonality and difference in each human relationship. Likewise, the late social theorist Charles Tilly (1996) emphasized that 'the phenomenon of identity is not private and individual but public and relational' (p. 7) and that there is room for individuals to hold multiple identities based on the various kinds of ties and roles that they choose to take on throughout their lives; hence Tilly (1996) viewed both

'citizenship and public identities as social relations that remain incessantly open to interpretation and renegotiation' (p. 12). This pliable view of identity has important ramifications for global education, since it holds out the possibility for educational programs to play a part, however modest, in reshaping the thinking of students when it comes to the construction and also the broadening of one's civic identity.

Meanwhile, the recent period of globalization and all the accompanying changes in the economy, technology, communication, and culture that have rendered the world and its peoples far more interconnected than a generation ago have led to a vast expansion in ways in which everyday people can grasp notions of identity and citizenship. The general public is more aware than ever about how their lives are influenced by dynamics that cut across international borders, and this carries over into the feasibility of global citizenship as a complement to national citizenship. As noted by political philosopher Nigel Dower (2005):

> Global citizenship is distinct from earlier forms of world citizenship precisely because contemporary globalization makes possible new forms of identity . . . The kind of global ethic which is now accepted and which accepts a significant dimension of responsibility as global in scope (not just the acceptance of a universal framework) is partly a function of increased transnational knowledge and capacity. (p. 158)

It is the precisely the role of educators to provide students with the kind of knowledge that will strengthen their capacities to think and live in a global context.

The public sphere, as conceived by Jürgen Habermas (1991) and his followers, is a flexible and fluid idea that encompasses just about any kind of forum or venue in which groups of individuals—presumably across different territorial spaces and from diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds—are debating important political and social questions. In this regard, any live, face-to-face transnational conversation in real time can be part of a global public sphere—and especially a format in which the same groups of students are conversing with each other on an ongoing basis, even if the time period of this conversation is limited. Mutual learning can emerge even on a temporary basis, if the conversation among the participants is meaningful and even memorable during this limited time period, and one should not discount the potential for this mutual learning within the global public sphere (however tiny its fragments) to carry some impact in how students might eventually adapt and enlarge their senses of civic and political identity. As Audrey Osler and Hugh Starkey (2018) have recently argued, the turn toward right-wing populism across the West has made it more important than ever for educators to provide 'alternative narratives' to nationalism exclusively defined, champion human rights, respond to ever-increasing ethnic and socioeconomic diversity, and 'build solidarities at all scales from the local to the global' (p. 38). In our case, the very purpose of our Skype seminars is to help our students see the world through perspectives other than their own and encourage them to think about the 'big picture' on a myriad of issues related to global policy making. This also reflects how scholars such as Fazal Rizvi and Laura Engel see a key task of cosmopolitan education as helping students develop the capacity to understand how their lives and choices shape and are also shaped by, often in ways not perceived by them, the ongoing transformative processes that accompany globalization (Engel, 2014: 242; Rizvi, 2009: 265–266).

Crucial in this regard is the face-to-face interaction among the students as well as the agenda-setting and guidance from the instructors. Alongside the overall sequencing and direction, what we believe makes our ongoing Skype seminars work each year is that the people are real and that the classroom experiences are grounded; our participants are not hiding behind screen names or avatars but have to project themselves in the same way in which they are fully public and exposed to face-to-face debate in an 'ordinary' or conventional classroom setting. Given that everyday people

who take up global citizen or cosmopolitan identities generally also maintain strong senses of identity and belonging in particular places—what Kwame Anthony Appiah (2006) has called 'rooted cosmopolitanism'—then the personal classroom interaction is essential, as well as the spontaneous prompts and prods from the two instructors to keep the students engaged with their peers and tuned into the flow of the conversation. Rather than holding Skype seminars as some sort of replacement for the physical classroom, we use Skype as a way of augmenting classroom interaction by expanding the boundaries of what counts as a usual classroom.

The editors of this special issue (Yemini and Rapoport, this issue) on citizenship, identity, and education have raised the important question of how the multiple identities of individuals—be they national, ethnic, or racial identities—have an effect on their citizenship and civic practices. In the particular context of our Skype seminars, we can consider this question in an inverted form: the educational practice of being a member, or by extension a citizen in one of our classes at Yonsei or LMU, can lead to an enlarged sense of membership, even within this admittedly transient setting. Just as many contemporary political and social theorists, such as David Held (1999) and Willem Maas (2013), as well as educational studies specialists such as Audrey Osler and Hugh Starkey (2018) have advocated that citizens can think of themselves as having multiple or multilevel citizenships in overlapping political communities, our Skype seminars give our students, at least for a limited time period, an experience of being members of two classrooms separated physically by an ocean but connected through virtual communication.

Surely our students remain firmly planted within the immediate classrooms on their respective campuses—we see absolutely no signs of the Yonsei or LMU students adapting their student identities to take on board the other campus—yet we can see that they at least have a foot in the door of the other campus, figuratively speaking, and often take on at least a partial sense of membership in the larger enterprise and the shared endeavor among the two classes; the collaborative paper assignment has proven very important in advancing this larger sense of common membership or even common ownership. When the students see their counterparts on the other campus projected on the screen each week, they can perceive a closer, direct connection to one of those students by virtue of the individual partnerships. Following the view of Karlberg (2008), then, the educational practice of being a citizen in the Yonsei–LMU Skype seminars—as each student negotiates a pathway of belonging simultaneously within the primary classroom (in which the student is enrolled) as well as the classroom of the partner institution—might well have at least a partial impact on their eventual identity construction as citizens in the political and social communities they inhabit.

On the cultivation of global identities: some caveats for consideration

Several caveats are in order with regard to this discussion on citizenship and identity. For starters, although many scholars and practitioners in educational studies, ourselves included, are interested in the extent to which the formation of a global identity (or at least a measure of heightened global vision) might be an outcome of specific programs, we do not believe that global identities can or should result from top-down curriculum standards or instructional directives. Instead, we believe that the characteristics that can form a global identity—such as the readiness to perceive key global issues from multiple points of view, and not confine one's perspective to the overarching public sentiment in any given country—should emerge naturally through the reflections and choices of students.

As a second caveat, we would note that it is tricky, in general, for instructors at selective universities to assess any kind of cause-and-effect relationships of teaching strategies when it comes to the formation of students' civic identities. Our students at Yonsei and LMU appear to us as already more predisposed than most of their generational cohort to think from a global perspective and

perhaps even see themselves as global citizens, as both of our classrooms were quite diverse and indeed cosmopolitan on their own terms. When we bring our students together, it isn't as if we have a World Cup–style Team America and Team Korea—the ethnic diversity within each individual class underscores our respective cosmopolitan student populations: our Yonsei cohorts have included many students from Europe and the Americas, while our LMU cohorts have included numerous students from across Asia and the Middle East. In addition, many of our students hail from wealthier segments of the population and have already traveled more extensively than their peers, two factors that render our students more predisposed to cosmopolitan identities. Taking this into account, we could argue that Skype seminars might well have a greater transformative impact, when it comes to how students view their roles and identities as citizens, on segments of the population that are less affluent and advantaged than ours and have had fewer 'global' experiences, and any steps taken in this direction would serve to advance equity in globally minded educational initiatives.

Next, we would note that examining the idea of 'global citizenship' head-on also does not necessarily lead students to embrace a primarily cosmopolitan identity, as in thinking of humanity itself as one's main source of political membership, belonging, and responsibility. When we discussed in class the short essays by Martha Nussbaum and her critics within the framework of the aforementioned matrix, several of our students seemed to think that they could attain an ideal balance between patriotism and cosmopolitanism, while other students saw themselves as giving priority to national patriotism, as in regarding one's home country as the primary if not exclusive source of political membership, belonging, and responsibility. (We organized the class discussion by outlining the matrix with its four choices, explaining the ways that Nussbaum and her critics think about patriotism and cosmopolitanism both on their own terms and in relation to each other, and then asking the students to tell the group in which quadrant they would choose to situate themselves.) Nussbaum's primarily cosmopolitan position did not attract a majority of our students, thereby suggesting skeptics (see Sant et al., 2016) are right to point out that a specific 'global citizen' identity seems far from prevalent in the next generation.

Nor was it our purpose, as instructors, to steer students into any kind of predefined global identity. Our job, as we continue to see it, is to play 'devil's advocate' and challenge the thinking of our students in whatever quadrant of the matrix in which they might find themselves: not try to push them into the cosmopolitan-over-patriotism quadrant. We have, however, asked our students to think about how a 'global citizen' approach to certain global issues might lead to more imaginative and effective strategies for addressing enduring problems such as global warming and nuclear proliferation that stretch well beyond the capacities of individual nation-states to address on their own. Whether or not students choose to think of themselves as global citizens, they can engage the concept of global citizenship in thinking about how to respond to a range of policy issues—and this applies not only to international relations and global governance but also to key questions in domestic politics and society, namely, today's contentious debates on immigration and multiculturalism.

Concluding observations: making the most of the experiment

Technology can drag us into directions undesirable as well as meritorious. Artificial intelligence, for example, can demonstrate how to win a chess or even a 'Go' game but it is a deceit to credit it with the power of human and humane imagination. To encourage young students, at the start of their professional careers, to engage in problem-solving across boundaries—and in the absence of artificial unintelligent barriers such as the protocols of international institutions—is powerful intellectual seeding for the next generation. Our view is that an international relations course or foreign affairs course taught within the national silo is inherently intellectually claustrophobic. In addition,

we believe that the failure to leverage information technology capabilities to the fullest is to parallel the closed mentality of an earlier epoch's insistence that the sun revolves around the earth. In 10 years' time (or something like that), the live Skype seminar might well prove as viable and common an option for faculty as the uses of PowerPoint and 'smart boards' are today. This observation assumes, of course, that information technology will continue to be refined and made increasingly accessible worldwide.

Although we have expressed caution regarding the hazards of steering students specifically toward a global identity, in many ways, the more fundamental problem in education is the possibility of programs that constrict, either actively or passively, the political and moral horizons of students to their immediate countries. National identity can constrict the student imagination to the lowest common geopolitical denominator (the nation-state) and diffuse the direct consequences of the realities of our oft-borderless world. Skype seminar education can lift the lid from the eyes by allowing the students, through the tools of information technology, to transcend borders and cultures in real time. Hearkening to William Gaudelli's (2016) conception of global citizenship education as 'everyday transcendance', it is a continuous educational process of national transcendence without demeaning patriotism in any serious respect; it raises consciousness about international commonalities, genuine national differences, and pressing global crises. Future leaders must have a dimension of rigorous cosmopolitan education in order to be prepared for the world in which they and their children will live. A measure of global citizenship is not a barrier to national development but a driver of rational, sustainable development in the broader international community. Education cannot afford to be alienated and asymmetrical from this increasingly complex global age if it is to avoid marginality.

In this spirit, we would like to share the following practical observations on what works (and what doesn't) when embarking on Skype seminars as a strategy for global learning:

- *Give the students a sense of shared ownership in the enterprise* and require them to show up for the Skype conversations prepared to discuss the key themes in the reading. The Yonsei instructor requires his students to write short journal entries on the assigned reading each week, as a way of ensuring that the students will enter the classroom with observations to share. When the Skype seminars go well, it's a credit to everyone.
- *Keep the readings highly engaging and fairly short*. Select readings that can easily catch the interest of both groups of students as points of departure for conversation. We were too ambitious in our first semester in 2016 and assigned readings that were too lengthy, occasionally leaving students lost in the details of particular chapters rather than ready for conversation on overarching themes. Since the Yonsei courses are three-credit courses meeting twice weekly, the Yonsei instructor assigns his students additional readings for background each week alongside the required readings for the Skype seminars.
- *Strike the right kind of balance* during the live Skype conversations: one of our biggest challenges from week to week is to set the tone at the outset and generate common themes and questions for discussion, yet also 'hang back' and let the students talk spontaneously among themselves. Both of us have often had to restrain ourselves from jumping into student conversations for the sake of allowing the students to engage each other instead. At the same time, we also see the need to inject comments into the discussion to keep the students on track and respond to specific points raised by students.
- *Get to know the students in both classes by name*. It makes a big difference when the students know they could be called on to speak by either professor—it's a good motivation for the students to be twice as prepared! Both of us are comfortable allowing the other instructor

to ask questions directly to our students, often following up their specific comments or challenging points of view they convey. A sense of 'shared turf' is necessary to have a natural flow of conversation and begin to think of themselves as members of the larger enterprise, not only their immediate class.

- *Draw out students who might be hiding in the background*. Just as in ordinary classes, some students with meaningful observations to share are reticent or shy and need to be encouraged to speak. We try to generate a good balance of involvement across each room and prevent the most outgoing students from dominating the conversations. It's also important to make sure that all the participants are visible on each webcam.
- *Humor is essential*. Instructors need to be extroverted and resilient; we often have to pick ourselves up (but not apart) when things go wrong—missed connections, dropped Skype calls, late students, seemingly off-base comments, and so forth.
- *Time management is essential.* Two hours in this format can fly by.
- *Alternate roles as lead instructor for each section.* This can help with time management as well as classroom efficiency during the Skype sessions. If each session is under the baton of orchestration of one instructor for one week, and the other instructor for the next week, this helps bring out maximum benefits from the limited number of sessions as well as the limited time available within each session. Generally students are inexperienced with having two professors in their classroom; this simple change in classroom dynamics can leave some of the students feeling disoriented, at least initially. Accordingly they can feel more comfortable 'facing' mainly one of the two professors during each Skype meeting, and discussion can often move more smoothly if one instructor is taking the lead in moderating the discussion.
- *Reckon with asymmetries in advance.* As noted above, we have worked for convergence across our two courses: The Yonsei courses are three-credit political science courses that meet twice weekly for a total of 3 hours, while the LMU course was for two credits meeting once a week for 2 hours. Such asymmetries are not necessarily a problem as long as instructors recognize them in advance and compensate for them accordingly.
- *Look for opportunities to gain support from colleagues and campus leadership.* Any kind of innovative teaching strategy, especially one that involves overseas collaboration and live transnational Skype conversations, carries risks of logistical glitches as well as student frustration and disappointment. Faculty members interested in this kind of initiative will benefit when their deans reward new kinds of collaborations and realize that not every initiative will go entirely smoothly the first time around. It is easier to gain support from deans once they see the technology costs are very low, as long as there is faculty backing. This can only happen when those in the faculty who try this method of transnational teaching share their experiences in detail. Revolutions, including educational ones, perhaps settle in best when they occur in carefully structured stages.

In conclusion, we strongly recommend this experimental strategy given its effort to transcend an exclusive focus on national perspectives when approaching international relations; for its intense (and even suitably prideful) involvement of students; for its potential as the interactive technology continues to improve; and—last but perhaps not least—for its economic efficiency and sustainability. Yes, the time it takes to establish and maintain partnerships for Skype seminars across borders translates into more work for the faculty, if not necessarily the students. In our rapidly changing world, though, educational innovation carries great potential for students to transform their perspectives in ways that can enlarge their horizons as citizens as well as their capacities for democratic empowerment and community participation. In this vision, transnational educational

technology can become as essential and perhaps someday even as commonplace as the blackboard and whiteboard.

References

Appiah KA (2006) *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Banks JA, McGee Banks CA, Cortes CE, et al. (2015) *Democracy and Diversity: Principles and Concepts for Educating Citizens in a Global Age*. Seattle, WA: Center for Multicultural Education, University of Washington.

Castells M (2008) The new public sphere: global civil society, communication networks, and global governance. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 616(1): 78–93.

Cohen J (ed.) (2002) *For Love of Country?* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Dill JS (2013) *The Longings and Limits of Global Citizenship Education: The Moral Pedagogy of Schooling in a Cosmopolitan Age*. New York: Routledge.

Dower N (2005) Global citizenship, globalization and citizenship—an unholy trio? In: Eade J and O'Byrne D (eds) *Global Ethics and Civil Society*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 154–165.

Engel L (2014) Global citizenship and national (re)formations: analysis of citizenship education reform in Spain. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice* 9(3): 239–254.

Gaudelli W (2016) *Global Citizenship Education: Everyday Transcendance*. New York: Routledge.

Goren H and Yemini M (2017) The global citizenship education gap: teacher perceptions of the relationship between global citizenship education and students' socio-economic status. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 67: 9–22.

Habermas J (1991) *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (trans. T Burger and F Lawrence). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Held D (1999) The transformation of political community: rethinking democracy in the context of globalization. In: Shapiro I and Hacker-Cordón C (eds) *Democracy's Edges*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 84–111.

Isin E and Wood P (1999) *Citizenship & Identity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Karlberg M (2008) Discourse, identity, and global citizenship. *Peace Review* 20(3): 310–320.

Maas W (ed) (2013) *Multilevel Citizenship*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

McKibben B (2011) *Eaarth: Making a Life on a Tough New Planet*. New York: St. Martin's Griffin.

Miller D (1995) *On Nationality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Osler A and Starkey H (2018) Extending the theory and practice of education for cosmopolitan citizenship. *Educational Review* 70(1): 31–40.

Rizvi F (2009) Towards cosmopolitan learning. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 30(3): 253–268.

Sandel M (1982) *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sant E, Davies I and Santisteban A (2016) Citizenship and identity: the self-image of secondary school students in England and Catalonia. *British Journal of Educational Studies* 64(2): 235–260.

Schattle H (2008) *The Practices of Global Citizenship*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Schell J (1982) *The Fate of the Earth*. New York: Knopf.

Singer P (2004) *One World: The Ethics of Globalization*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Starkey H (2012) Human rights, cosmopolitanism and utopias: implications for citizenship education. *Cambridge Journal of Education* 42(1): 21–35.

Tilly C (ed) (1996) *Citizenship, Identity and Social History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Volkmer I (2003) The global network society and the global public sphere. *Development* 46(1): 9–16.

Waltz K (2012) Why Iran should get the bomb: nuclear balancing would mean stability. *Foreign Affairs* 91(4): 2–5.

Walzer M (1983) *Spheres of Justice: A Defense of Pluralism and Equality*. New York: Basic Books.

Yemini M and Rapoport A (this issue) Citizenship, identity and education. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*.