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5. TEACHERS, NATIONAL REGULATION AND COSMOPOLITANISM

INTRODUCTION

Teaching and schooling are historical technologies of nation, nationality and nationalism. They are defined, regulated and, literally, fenced in by powerful statutory responsibilities to the local. Teacher education programs are bound by local employing authorities' and state bureaucracies' bids to control and monitor field placements as well as the content of curriculum courses and to ensure that all courses—subject matter preparation included—are aligned with their licensing and accreditation standards. Craft-like apprenticeships are conducted in local sites, allowing a production and reproduction of the parochial, an imperfect initiation into local systems' regulative behaviours, interactional norms, discourses and forms of discipline. In many North American, Asian and European sites, teacher education is increasingly becoming a training in how to deploy a particular local educational jurisdiction's curriculum and how to comply with its particular assessment grids and accountability systems.

Teachers thus are prepared and licensed to profess the "local", the regional, and the national. While critical analyses of teacher education such as those in this volume argue for new forms of discourse, identity and practice, we rarely question the spatial constraints on the epistemological parameters of teachers and teaching; that teachers are trained, however explicitly or implicitly, as advocates and residents of the nation, and to varying degrees, the region, province and local district. Teachers are licensed to practice locally, and the majority of them stay within the territories and adjacent jurisdictions where they were trained. Yet, there is increasing evidence that teaching is amongst the most mobile of professions, with teachers joining a new class of cosmopolitan intellectuals, transnational professionals, highly paid expatriates, and, in instances, exploited guest workers. Within regions and nations, industrial and salary conditions are creating conditions for increased attrition, mobility and career change (Ingersoll, 2001). Teachers are on the move regionally and globally (Larsen & Vincent-Lancrin, 2002).

There are several interesting historical contradictions at work here, particularly as school systems attempt to shift human capital production in response to transnational information/service economies. First, educational systems of the North/West have begun to move to produce "world kids" with GATT-transportable, generic skills, knowledges and competences. As the ongoing EU credentialing negotiations have shown, the transportability of the professional
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degrees, credentials and registration is a substantive free trade/tariff/boundary issue (cf. Marginson & Considine, 2000). With the regional transnational alignment of "professional" qualifications, one response to new conditions is to construct an educated human subject who has transportable and "generic" characteristics, rather than those that solely entitle and enable participation in a local employment market. At the same time, there has been a subordination of teacher education as intellectual, moral and ethical endeavour to the production of locally relevant job skills. With their crowded curricula divided between traditional foundations, methods and practicum subjects, most teacher education programs lag behind in a critical engagement with and analysis of the forces and local impacts of cultural and economic globalisation.

A second, further knowledge effect of the local regulation of teacher education is to delimit the social fields that count as legitimate for teaching practice. Teacher education, practica and local statutory regulations on licensing have the effect of circumscribing the social fields for teacher preparation and thereby limiting the kinds of cultural and social capital that will "count" as entitling one to profess, to teach and to educate. In many teacher education programs, this means that curricular content and field experience are narrowly local or regional in character, with all that this might imply in terms of the setting of epistemological horizons and engagement with other life worlds of teaching and learning. The regionalism and localism, further, is often aided and abetted by pleas for local "relevance" and "connectedness" as motivational tools and curricular goals.

Explanations of the broader dialectics of globalisation are characterised in the literature in terms of local/global, push/pull effects, whereby global flows are remediated and recontextualised by local communities and regions in less than predictable ways (Burbules & Torres, 2000). Our point is that the structural relationships of teacher education and neoliberal educational reform have a contradictory territorialising effect. At once, they push the construction of the generic teacher as accountable and compliant consumer of educational products, methods and curriculum across national and regional boundaries. At the same time, they define the production and disciplining of the teacher as a local and regional activity. This is occurring precisely at a time when both the ethical and moral and the cultural and political demands upon education—as well as the changed conditions of human capital production and modes of information we describe here—are requiring broader critical engagements with globalisation, with borderless technologies and archives, with cross and trans-cultural knowledges and discourses, and with the complex synergies between geopolitical, economic and local events and knowledges. Simply, while new economic and geopolitical conditions are requiring a new teacher with critical capacities for dealing with the transnational and the global, current policies like No Child Left Behind (hereafter, NCLB) and affiliated "standards" statements are turning the teacher into a generic consumer of multinational products with a narrowly local, regional and national epistemic standpoint.

What is needed is nothing short of the reenvisioning of a transcultural and cosmopolitan teacher: a teacher with the capacity to "shunt" between the local and
the global, to explicate and engage with the broad flows of knowledge and information, technologies and populations, artefacts and practices that characterise this historical moment. What is needed is a new community of teachers that could and would work, communicate and exchange—physically and virtually—across national and regional boundaries with each other, with educational researchers, teacher educators, curriculum developers and, indeed, senior educational bureaucrats. In what follows, we first review the territorialising effects of local standards and regulation, then note the emergence of the generic teacher, branded as a corporate entity and defined in terms of generic competences, skills, interchangeable parts in a global education system with uniform practices involving testing, mandated textbooks, scripted teaching, school based management, marketisation and economic management issues. We then contrast this with the impact of globalisation on cosmopolitan knowledges, institutions and subjects, and argue for a normative educational definition of the teacher as global citizen.

REGULATION AND PROFESSIONALISATION: CONSTRUCTING THE (LOCAL) TEACHER

As we noted above, while the focus internationally has been on developing an educated human subject with transportable and “generic” characteristics, teachers’ work in many North American, Asian and European countries has been increasingly subjected to national and state control. Governments are standardizing and controlling curriculum and pedagogical practices via sanctions and rewards, often relying on a single criterion of effectiveness: improved student scores on standardized achievement tests (Darling-Hammond, 2004). This is increasingly being driven federally, resulting in a tug-of-war between state and national authorities for control of teacher recruitment, preparation, certification and policy around professional development (Bales, 2006). For example, local definitions of student and school success of teacher qualifications and licensure, and of what counts as effective teaching have been impacted by NCLB legislation in the US and the national curriculum in the UK. A similar scenario is likely to unfold in Australia with the federal government considering a national curriculum, one that would protect young Australians from “trendy educational fads” embraced by “ideologues who have hijacked school curriculum and are experimenting with the education of our young people from a comfortable position of unaccountability, safe within education bureaucracies” (Bishop, 2006).

Within this context, teacher education is framed as a public policy problem (Cochran-Smith, 2004), with centralized bids to define and control parameters of teacher preparation most likely to impact on student learning. It is argued that the “right” policies and practices for teacher education are decided according to empirical evidence about their value-addedness in relation to student achievement as measured by standardized tests. The policy debates have become increasingly polarized: posing, on the one hand, the deregulation and marketisation of university-based professional training (often in tandem with calls for increased
centralized control of curriculum and pedagogy), against a defence of professionalism grounded in the academy. Those promoting deregulation argue there is no valid evidence to support the value of teacher education as it is currently practiced, arguing for regulatory standards and performance indicators in lieu of traditional pathways. Those calling for increased professionalisation argue for policies and practices that promote professional self-regulation and semi-autonomy in the face of Neoliberal models of steering via performance indicators. We examine each of these views.

The Deregulation Agenda

In the US, a wave of recent conservative criticism of teachers and their work and of teacher education, driven by powerful right wing public interest groups, has questioned the value of traditional teacher preparation (see, for example, The Abell Foundation, 2001). In addition, NCLB has also fuelled doubts about the value of teacher preparation, foregrounding subject matter knowledge and verbal ability as fundamental determinants of high quality teaching. It is argued that subject matter knowledge is best acquired outside schools of education, while many other things can be learned “on the job” (US Department of Education, 2003, 2004). The US federal government aims to reduce “barriers to becoming a teacher among otherwise highly qualified individuals” (US Department of Education, 2004, p. 2) - the barriers being traditional routes to teacher certification via teacher education programs in schools and colleges of education. Moreover, the federal government has generously funded the American Board for the Certification of Teacher Excellence (ABCTE), an option for prospective teachers to bypass traditional teacher education on route to certification. Those with an undergraduate degree can pay to take an online examination to be “certified” as a teacher. Currently, six states recognise ABCTE’s “Passport to Teaching” as part of their state certification system. It can be said that, in general, US federal government support is strong for alternative pathways, which in the main bypass traditional teacher education, as the following statement from the Department of Education demonstrates:

[T]he Department is committed to continuing is committed to continuing to forge strong partnerships with states, institutions and national organizations, such as the American Board for the Certification of Teacher Excellence, the National Center for Alternative Certification, Teach for America and the New Teacher Project, to help to continue building momentum for change. (US Department of Education, 2004, p.13)

However, there are complex and contradictory forces at work here, with individual states and local jurisdictions actively working to maintain legal regulatory control over the certification of teachers and accreditation of teacher preparation programs. In California, for example, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) is the agency created by the state “to serve as a state standards board for educator preparation for the public schools of California, the licensing and credentialing of professional educators in the State, the enforcement of professional
practices of educators, and the discipline of credential holders in the State of California" (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2004a). State/federal tensions became evident in California in 2004 when the ABCTE sought an audience with the CCTC in order to seek arrangements for ABCTE “certified” teachers to be awarded a California teaching credential. The broader education community mobilised. Following public testimony from universities, county and district offices, schools, unions, parent bodies, research organizations, and professional organizations, the Commission Board moved “that ABCTE will not be recognized in California; that no further action on or consideration of ABCTE will be taken; and that the item is not to be placed on future agendas for Commission consideration” (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2004b). Interestingly, in 2006, the ABCTE again approached individual commissioners asking them to consider ABCTE “certification”.

In the US, other state/federal tensions have emerged. The federal government’s NCLB definition of a highly qualified teacher does did not align with the subject matter knowledge requirements for a teaching credential in some states and, across the US, teachers who have been credentialed by the state in which they work have found themselves “unqualified” in NCLB terms. This has caused funding problems for employers and qualifications dilemmas for the state and the teachers. It is interesting to note that NCLB qualification often aligns with a strict training regime in how to implement specific basal reading programs, with trainers and training certified in relation to industry specifications set by the corporate publishers who produce the programs. NCLB requires that all teachers be officially designed as “highly qualified” by the end of the 2005-06 school year (a deadline that has been extended by a year), and this can be done by varying combinations of points for service, tests and coursework. As a result, a flurry of new programs in universities and colleges has emerged to meet this demand, often offered on-line by for-profit institutions and a growing corps of freelance educational consultants. The Act has also impacted schools and colleges of education. Curricula changes for majors have had to be made and changed accountability mechanisms encourage schools to design data systems for monitoring the impact of programs on (school) student learning.

In Australia, a state/federal tug-of-war over the regulation of teachers’ work and teacher education is gaining momentum. Traditionally, states have controlled and regulated schooling and the requirements for entry into teaching and continued practice. Individual states have licensing boards to regulate the profession, or employers (usually the large state bureaucracies that employ the majority of teachers) take on that role in a form of self-regulation negotiated with the industrial unions. Periodically, the federal government makes moves to gain more control. In light of global economic forces, this activity has recently become more frenzied. In the past year, the federal government has convened commissions on phonics and reading and national curriculum reform; NewsCorp (also the owner of Fox in the US) has waged a systematic attack on schools of education, teacher educators and researchers; and the government, with no direct jurisdictional control over state schooling, has indicated it will tie the disbursement of federal funds to the states in
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compliance with specific curriculum reforms. This is, not surprisingly or coincidentally, very close to the Bush administration's overall approach. It is accompanied by a move to regulate teacher education federally. Teaching Australia was established by the federal government in 2005 to be "a strong unifying body acting in the interests of teachers and school leaders, drawing the profession together to promote quality teaching and school leadership for the good of all Australians" (Teaching Australia, n.d.). In 2006, Teaching Australia announced a proposal for establishing an Australia-wide accreditation of programs for the professional preparation of teachers.

The Professionalisation Agenda

Many within the academy and the teaching profession are alarmed at what they see as the deskilling and deprofessionalisation of teachers by current legal and bureaucratic accountability frameworks and the threat of pulling teacher education away from schools of education. Coming from the standpoint that licensed teachers are more effective than unlicensed teachers in terms of student achievement, it is argued that the basis for reform should be policy investment in the quality of teachers through teacher education, licensing and hiring arrangements, and professional development (e.g., Darling-Hammond, 2000). This position draws heavily from the evidence on school reform and the emergent evidence on the limits of marketisation and curriculum enforcement; that pedagogical effectiveness, improved student outcomes, and closure of the equity gap require something more than a compliant workforce and scripted pedagogy. That is, teaching is intellectual work that flourishes through the establishment of sustainable and flexible professional learning communities (e.g., Newmann, 1996).

Agreeing on the need for the profession to be accountable, it is argued that "professional accountability" creates a more effective teaching workforce. A self-regulated teaching profession would take collective responsibility for ensuring that all those permitted to teach are well prepared, have and use all available knowledge to inform professional practice and maintain a primary commitment to clients (i.e., students and the public). Such a professional accountability model represents a "policy bargain" the profession makes with society, whereby greater (self) regulation of teachers is guaranteed in exchange for deregulation of teaching (Darling-Hammond, 1989, 2004; Mayer, 2005).

In the US, the profession has sought to regulate the preparation of teachers and entry into the profession and to recognize highly accomplished teachers. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the (also national) Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) probably represent the profession's best attempts to self-regulate entry into teaching. NCATE accredits institutional units that offer teacher preparation programs, while the more recently established TEAC accredits individual programs. However, fewer than 40% of existing teacher preparation programs and/or the institutions that offer them are accredited nationally (Wilson & Youngs, 2005), even though some states use NCATE accreditation for all or part of their state accreditation requirements.
In addition, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), an independent, non-profit, non-partisan and nongovernmental organization formed in 1987 to advance the quality of teaching and learning by developing professional standards for accomplished teaching, has created a voluntary system to certify more experienced teachers. Some employers recognise National Board Certification through salary compensation.

In Australia, the profession's attempts to regulate itself has been through efforts of the Australia College of Educators and various subject associations like the Australian Association of Mathematics Teachers (AAMT), which awards Highly Accomplished Teacher of Mathematics status to those teachers who choose to undergo assessment of their knowledge, capabilities and achievements against the AAMT Standards. The Australian Deans of Education have also made consistent calls for self-regulation (e.g., Australian Council of Deans of Education, 1998; Lovat, 2003).

Thus, we see a matrix of regulations and controlling mechanisms with various constituencies struggling for control of teachers' work and teacher education. Increasingly, federal bureaucracies and national groups, often fuelled by powerful interest groups and the business community, have taken control in the construction of more generic practices for teachers and student learning outcomes in response to the pressures that we now identify with rapid cultural and economic globalisation—linguistic and cultural diversification of student populations, new knowledge, technological and skill demands, increased numbers of poor and "at-risk" students, and school governance, funding and infrastructure that is struggling to adapt to these new contexts. Whether the agenda involves calls for deregulation and professionalisation, state and federal struggles for control, or for government, business and profession control, teachers' work is increasingly being constructed in generic terms. The debates within nations and across regions over what will count as the "new teacher" for this millennium are striking in their similarity of terms, definitions and "standards". Ironically, whether the practices for preparing teachers and the procedures for regulating their entry into the profession are determined and enacted at the national or local level, a de facto model of the teacher is emerging. In the main, these efforts converge on a generic teacher defined through professional standards and teacher assessments.

The US has seen steady increase in the use of various forms of teacher assessment for teacher licensing decisions, usually in the form of tests. In 2004, all 50 US states and the District of Columbia reported having a written test policy for teacher licensure, an increase from 43 states in 2002 (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2005). Thirty states used three forms of teacher assessment (basic skills, portfolio, subject matter knowledge), while 12 used two of these assessment methods. The 1998 reauthorisation of Title II of the Higher Education Act, which mandated that each state report annually the percentage of teaching candidates who
passed state certification tests, has served to further legitimate bureaucratic models of teacher testing. While there has been public outrage in some states about teacher failure in these tests (e.g., Cochran-Smith & Dudley-Marling, 2001) and despite the fact that research on teacher testing has called into question their predictive validity and their capacity to actually measure a teacher’s ability to teach (Wilson & Youngs, 2005), the movement continues. At the same time, given the ambivalence about the value of teacher preparation offered in universities and colleges that we referred to earlier, there is concern that teacher tests may provide inappropriate short-cut routes into teaching (Youngs et al., 2003).

In response to the identified shortcomings of teacher tests and in an attempt to acknowledge the contextualised nature of teaching and learning, many US states have moved to include teacher performance assessments in licensing decisions. In 2002, nine US states employed some form of performance assessment when making licensing decisions, and most used classroom-based observations and interviews. Only two states, Connecticut and North Carolina, used portfolios (Youngs et al., 2003). In 2006, the state of California mandated a teacher performance assessment for a teaching credential to take effect in 2008. In anticipation of this, a consortium of teacher preparation programs at a number of California universities has been working for a number of years as PACT (Performance Assessment for California Teachers) to develop a teacher performance assessment comprising Embedded Signature Assignments and a capstone Teaching Event (Pecheone & Chung, 2006). It is anticipated that PACT will become an option for satisfying the teacher performance assessment requirement for a teaching credential in California. The California Teacher Performance Assessment (CA TPA), the state funded option, was developed by Educational Testing Service (ETS) under the direction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Integral to these teacher performance assessments are statements of professional standards designed to describe effective professional practices for beginning and accomplished levels of teaching and to capture the nuances associated with teaching in different subject areas and grade levels. In the main across many countries, there has been rampant growth in the development and implementation of professional standards for teaching. This usually reflects a goal to standardize and control teachers’ work on the world stage so that comparisons and judgments can be made across states and nations in relation to questions about “transportability” and “quality assurance” (with standards constituting the equivalent to an industry “ISO 2005” benchmark). Yet the related regulatory mechanisms for using the standards often construct teachers’ work in local and regional ways.

In the US, professional standards and assessments are structured for reciprocity in the certification of new teachers across states (Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium [INTASC]), for the recognition of accomplished teachers (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards [NBPTS]), and for reviewing and accrediting teacher education programs (e.g., NCATE, TEAC). But a local/national tussle is again evident. In 2004, 50 states—including the District of Columbia—licensed their teachers based on state-approved teacher standards, an increase from 34 states with such practices in 1998.
(Council of Chief State School Officers, 2005). This has created an almost impossible situation for teachers, beholden as they are to a multiplicity of standards and to the “masters” of each standards framework.

In Australia, a professional standards quagmire is also developing, with debates across a number of dimensions: Should standards be constructed and implemented in generic or subject specific ways? Should standards be national providing an overarching framework or local allowing focus on local conditions? How should standards be used—personally managed professional growth, or employer tool? Interest groups have responded in various ways, often in tactical (rather than strategic) ways. State education systems have created generic teaching standards (e.g., The State of Queensland, 2005), while the federal government has created a national standards framework (Ministerial Council on Education Employment Training and Youth Affairs, 2003). Teaching Australia has created standards for school leadership and advanced teaching, while subject associations have created subject specific standards for accomplished practice (e.g., Australian Association of Mathematics Teachers, Australian Science Teachers Association, Standards for Teachers of English Language and Literacy in Australia). In addition, teacher-licensing boards have developed their version of professional standards for graduates from teacher education programs and for more accomplished practice linked to ongoing registration (e.g., Queensland College of Teachers, Victorian Institute of Teaching).

While many of these standards aim to construct a generic teacher able to be compared across state, nation, and subject boundaries, the procedures for using them mean that, in reality, teachers are constructed in local and specific ways. Not surprisingly, as the products of trade-offs in the search for policy consensus, the actual content of standards comes to ground in sets of generic statements about the need for, inter alia, threshold levels of literacy, numeracy, content-knowledge, knowledge of curriculum and syllabus materials, flexible face-to-face instructional skills, behaviour management strategies, knowledge of general and field-specific educational development and learning, understandings of student diversity, familiarity with assessment procedures, diagnostic capabilities and so forth. Ironically, the standards return us almost full circle to the core content and form of almost all existing teacher education programs—the very phenomenon that the deregulation via standards movements aim to supplant. What is missing—not coincidentally in a standards-based focus on “minima”—is a broad commitment to liberal arts education, to critical intellectual engagement and work, to breadth of understanding and capacity to engage with the new economic, cultural and social realities of geopolitical, local and national change.

TEACHER EDUCATION, GLOBALISATION AND COSMOPOLITANISM

Teacher education is being reshaped in the context of economic and cultural globalisation. We have described two contradictory push/pull factors. On the one hand, teacher education remains vested in the hands of the local political economies that govern certification. These range from employing educational
authorities (state and non-state), the increasing private sector of schools that employ teachers, their governing bodies, and corporate sponsors, producers and trainers. As a result, teacher education has remained resolutely parochial, locked into training and regulation for the “local” curriculum for the state teacher to be accredited and legally admitted into the profession within specific state regulatory boundaries. The teacher is still defined in terms of a “Queensland teacher” or a “California teacher”, without portability of habitus across different legally defined and recognised social and cultural fields of exchange. The teacher’s expertise is not automatically taken as transportable across space and bordered educational jurisdictions.

On the other hand, an emergent trend has been towards the defacto synthesis of standards across jurisdictions, with pushes towards national curricula, national professional standards for teaching, and elsewhere, Bologna accords, with a legal push through Neoliberal governance. This is an ideological push around the new corporatist order of educational outcomes with discourses of flexibility, transformation, collaboration, higher order thinking, and so on. Competence and statement standards tend to plot individuals against neo-behaviourist descriptions and grids of specification.

Standards-based reform both results from and feeds into Neoliberal educational policy responses to economic globalisation. The aim to define fixed and uniform national or even transnational standards is consistent with the desire for a more objective, standardized and quantifiable commodity which can be understood, judged and even transported/exported across national boundaries, bypassing the localized knowledge of the states, schools and universities who, it seems, cannot be trusted to organize and monitor the education of teachers and school students (cf. Delandshere & Petrosky, 2004). At the same time, the perceived threat to the autonomy of the regions/states mobilizes them into tightening their control and regulation and even developing their own standards, purportedly to represent local needs and contexts. In reality, these standards look very much like national ones with the insertion of localized wording like “in California” and “in Queensland” to a stem that defines uniform teaching behaviour. It is the regulatory procedures for enforcing them that defines, constrains and enables the local teacher to realise professional practice and identity.

The policy package of standards-based reform, test-based accreditation and deregulated provision has the effect of narrowing the parameters of teachers’ work, exacerbating disparities in educational achievement, and promoting simplistic notions of equity. The notion that the standardization of education—providing all students with teachers certified by the same standards of professional knowledge and practice working toward fixed and common student learning outcomes—will in some way equalize educational opportunity and outcomes, is naïve at best. Moreover, even though a standards-based reform movement could be thought of as providing some organization and certainty in the face of changing student and community demographics, teaching standards attempt to deal with diversity generally by specifying some diagnostic and pedagogical sensitivity to multicultural and multilingual backgrounds, students with special needs, and so forth (e.g.,
Delandshere & Petrosky, 2004). Further, the neglect of attention to local cultures, identities and political/economic realities sits in tension to the idea of teacher as intellectual, as reflective practitioner, and teacher as social agent and community activist. Simply, standards statements as they are interpreted by accrediting and employing bodies by definition drift towards the minima and tend to emphasise verifiable teaching behaviours and practices—not the accompanying forms of consciousness, cultural identity, commitment and belief that we affiliate with teacher activism.

In so doing, the reform debates sidestep questions about the construction and regulation of teachers’ work and teacher education in the context of cultural and economic globalisation: the making of a “world teacher” who can teach in and about the complex dynamic socio-demographic and industrial conditions, knowledge and technological relations. We view the standards movement as the creation of a global, transnational teacher by default, without a strong normative view of what teaching can and should entail in relation to globalisation. For that, we turn to the concept of cosmopolitanism, a vision of teaching as cosmopolitan work and profession in critical and contingent relation to the flows, contexts and consequences of cultural and economic globalisation.

The term “cosmopolitan” is attributed to Immanuel Kant’s essay “To Perpetual Peace” (2001/1795). Like most of his 18th century contemporaries, Kant would rarely have travelled beyond his village, much less national and regional boundaries. Writing at the point of the emergence of the European nation state and empire when Prussia and France were concluding the Peace of Basel, Kant attempted to define a transnational, worldly citizenry. In his “third definitive article of the eternal peace” he talks about the necessity of “Cosmopolitan or World law” which would depend upon a “universal hospitality” (p. 448). At the same time, he critiques colonialism, describing the “inhospitable conduct of the civilized, especially of the trading nations of our continent, the injustice which they display... to foreign countries goes terribly far” (p. 449).

In the 18th and 19th centuries, travellers across national borders were a curious mix of active agents of empire and its discontents (e.g., soldiers, bureaucrats, but equally priests and missionaries, scientists and teachers), and those who were its unwilling diasporic victims, slaves, guest workers, scientific objects, and refugees. In transnational, late capitalism, that mix has become a more complex blend, with an increasing proportion of the world’s population on the move at any given time (whether willingly or not) in search of work, better forms of life, more stable and safer political conditions, and so forth.

Travelling cultures and the weakening of the boundaries of the nation-state are two relatively recent developments that have generated new debates about the constitution of the social subject in “new times”. Advocates and detractors of globalisation have suggested, at least since the 1980s, that new information and communication technologies, economic restructuring, easier and cheaper access to air travel (pre-9/11), and the disorderly flow of people, information, ideas and commodities between spaces and places has compressed space and time, and effectively eroded the post-war liberal welfare nation-state in the West. No longer
capable of regulating capital nor providing its citizens with the requisite welfare safety net, the nation-state is said to be a redundant concept. At the same time, the rise of religion and ethno-nationalism in particular regions of the world has levelled an even more serious threat to the coherence and power of the nation-state.

The roll back of the state has been accompanied by powerful corporate forces of marketisation and privatisation of what were previously seen as responsibilities of the state. This includes not only education but also powerful pushes towards corporate and private funding of universities, corporate sponsorship of schools, expansion of non-government schooling, the supplanting of state-developed curriculum by multinational educational materials, and indeed the privatisation of childcare, day-care and preschool. All this sits within a new political economy of information, where the converging multinational ownership of information, intellectual property and modes of information is a new battleground for control (C. Luke, 2005). These moves have aided the growth and spread of the transnational business of English language instruction and translation (Pennycook, 1994). ESL teachers are part of the educational mobile global workforce not that dissimilar from the medieval itinerant scholar-teacher.

Globalisation is not exclusively an external force with a top-down modus operandi. Rather, it is a process with variable effects that national policies can promote and guide. The strategies used by individual states vary depending on local/national factors such as the ideology of their governing elites, national histories, extant human and natural resources, and their economic and political situatedness vis-à-vis the global capitalist system. Nation-states retain the ability to attract, threaten, co-opt international capital and ameliorate or mediate the effects of its stratified distribution. The development of highly literate, educated and/or mobile workforces is a key strategy for states can market their human resources in order to attract foreign investment and to export labour.

Governing elites the world over may also involve the appropriation of ethnocultural “myths” to present a favourable face to investors. Recall the raft of writings in the 1980s that sought to explain Japan’s economic success by attributing to it unique forms of capital-labour relations based on a Japanese style of management by consensus (Nemawashi) which generated high yields. In the 1990s, the success of the Asian Tigers (Singapore, Korea, Hong Kong) was attributed to “Confucian values”, which can be broadly translated to mean a diligent and docile workforce capable of collective “sacrifice”. In other words, governments stressed the need to defer material gratification and immediate needs and demands for high wages for long-term economic and social benefits. Therefore, ethnocultural and civic nationalism, when combined with state corporatism, can provide the conditions that support economic globalisation which, in turn, both depends upon and creates a global workforce—a “universal” community of a fixed and mobile elite, and relatively cheap agricultural, industrial and service labour which transcends the strictures, boundaries, and particularities of nations and states. Yet while states retain jurisdiction over the management of domestic flows (i.e., the in- and outflows of people, goods and services), the
movement of capital and information is driven by companies and corporations, not nations or countries.

Clearly, the extent to which any nation state can successfully tap into global economic exchange is to manage and market its most crucial resource—its human resource pool. This requires a fine balance between first, a highly educated, preferably English and/or Mandarin speaking elite; second, literate and cheap, increasingly non-unionised, service workers; third, a mobile labour force that can follow capital flows both domestically and internationally; and finally, policy makers who reform, revise, construct and legislate educational policy, trade and investment tax incentives, citizenship and guest worker visa restrictions or liberalization, and so forth. In short, although global capital and ideas/information flows are largely corporate driven, the nation state retains considerable control over "local" provision for its own people (e.g., health, education, housing, citizenship) and "local" legal provision for the in and outflows of globalisation in the form of people, goods and services.

In that regard, education remains a resolutely local and national project. However, it has to provide an end product suited to current and emergent labour market conditions, literate in new ICTs (whether at head office or on the factory floor), flexible in new socio-cultural environments (whether at work or in diasporic neighbourhoods), and more self-reliant in the context of a new social contract with the state. This new social contract in many nation states no longer provides public social services from cradle to grave. Education and health has been opened to the market place and privatisation, which leaves public schooling and medical care underfunded, understaffed and its remnants left to the suburban, fringe city, or inner city poor (Davis, 2006). Public transportation, public spaces, playgrounds and parks have fared no better. Secure housing in gated communities, private education and health cover, and safe spaces and places are the preserve of the bourgeois elite, the new ruling class and "new money" elite.

This then, is a context of a new historical dis-order that begins with a 'porosity' of the nation state and the vulnerability of the social subject within it. These conditions are supported by the unequal regional and class impacts of globalisation, increased global economic and trade interdependence alongside increasing social and economic inequalities within and across nation-states. Amongst the educational community, concerns have re-emerged about how to achieve social justice, equality, social integration and cohesion. But these in turn cannot be addressed independent of larger macro-political and social questions about how to best govern locally and globally, govern capital and reign in excess, ensure workers’ or humanitarian rights. It is on this note that theorists of cosmopolitanism have reinvigorated debate about what kind of social subject the state is creating, and what rights (cultural, ethnic, religious, linguistic, etc.) and responsibilities ought to be safeguarded. Our concern is with the kind of teacher and, importantly, the kind of education that can best address both the knowledge and skills required to participate meaningfully in a risky and volatile transnational world order, where any remaining certainties of the liberal welfare state or social democratic egalitarianism are fast disappearing.
Debates around cosmopolitanism have arisen in relation to various crises the
nation state has undergone as a consequence of massive global economic
restructuring beginning in the 1980s, the rapid diffusion of new technologies, and
the real and abstract dissolution of traditional boundaries. This has meant change in
geopolitical and regional boundaries and solidarities, from the collapse of the
Berlin Wall, the dissolution of the former Baltic states and the USSR. As Innis
(1951) predicted, the technological reorganisation of traditional time and space has
been accompanied by alteration of fiscal and nation state boundaries. Bodies,
capital, discourse and images traverse the globe rapidly and with synergistic
political economic effects. Massive migrant flows followed civil wars and
humanitarian crises, collapsing labour markets in one region and burgeoning
cheaper labour markets and newly established economic zones in other regions.
Many place-bound political and ethnic communities have become untethered from
locality and turned into tidal flows of people traversing the globe in search for
work, safety and a "better life", while the bourgeois elite joined the upper-
airstream of transnational capitalism as new global corporate employees. "New
money" gentrified the urban landscape, sending millions of people to suburbs
discarded by the upwardly-mobile middle class or to new edge cities of concentrated
poverty, crime, lack of social services, safe public spaces, transportation, and so
forth. Appadurai (1996) characterizes these flows of capital, people, ideoscapes,
infoscapes, and mediascapes as multi-layered, disjunctured, criss-crossing in new
networks of community, identification, and affiliation. Old ethnic and/or political
affiliations, previously place-bound and relatively contained within pockets of the
nation state, have steadily become unanchored and reconnected in new places with
"new neighbours" and new mixes of linguistic, cultural, religious, and ethnic/racial
differences. This is the new cosmopolitanism.

Cosmopolitanism thus is often used to posit a global civil society, a global
citzenry and community. In such a society, the social subject is redefined in terms
of multiple ethno-national affiliations, mobile on the flows of global labour
opportunities, 'outward' looking, and at ease in a life world of difference —
multilingual, multietnic, multiracial, multi-classed, multicultural. The cosmopolitan
subject engages with a plurality of different peoples, cultural values, perceptions,
political interests and claims. This in turn makes "reasoning from the point of view
of others" (Benhabib, 1992) a critical tool for survival.

The combined concept of kosmos (world/known universe) and polis (city/
community) is an historical ideal much like democracy. Both are ideal aspirations
of individuals living as "citizens" or members of both "local" community (village,
town, city, canton, nation, state, federation of states, etc.) and of the larger world
consisting of multiple and different locales and locals. Cosmopolitanism is as much
about a new vantage point of "looking outward"—seeing one's own localism and
locale as part of a larger world order of differences and experiencing the myriad
of geographic, cultural, religious, linguistic, value, customary and attitudinal
differences—as it is about a cultural and political perspective on the social
subject and on issues of "global" governance. In short, theories and perspectives
of cosmopolitanism can be broadly divided into cultural and political
cosmopolitanism. Hannerz (1992) sees cultural cosmopolitanism as a "willingness to engage with the other ... an intellectual and aesthetic stance of openness toward divergent cultural experiences, a search for contrasts rather than uniformity" (p. 238). Political cosmopolitanism is more focussed on issues of and tensions around local-global governance, particularly in light of post-Cold War resurgences of ethnonationalist sentiments, identity and citizenship, the weakening of the nation state (i.e., nationalism vs. cosmopolitanism), and re-theorizations of 19th century idealist philosophy to more adequately deal with today's global force field of the political, the economic and the "cosmopolitical" (e.g., Archibugi et al., 1999; Cheah & Robbins, 1998).

At the same time, rapid economic and cultural globalisation since at least the 1970s, in tandem with a range of political, economic, and labour market crises (and not least the decisive and divisive "clash of civilizations" debacle of 9/11), has put issues of global governance, nation-state governance, "citizenship", individual and communitarian political and humanitarian rights back on the agenda. Historically, the 'democratic' state—however flawed and contradictory its institutionalised interpretations have been actualised in 'western' states—constitutes, at the national level, "the greatest success that ordinary people have had in catching up to capital and power" (Calhoun, 2003, p. 111). Its auspices are maintained through labour unionism, the right to assembly, to strike, to vote, or indeed, universal free secular education. Despite the pull towards marketised, differentiated educational systems as a hallmark of the new world order, we would make the case that the imperatives and possibilities for democratic state education remain. These remain both as a defence of the state and its citizenry in the face of corporate global capital, and, ironically, as a means for seeing beyond the interests and boundaries of the state to anticipate, critique and ameliorate the effects of global capital upon the environment, cultures, communities and individuals both locally and globally. It is from this stance that the notion of a new world teacher—a teacher as cosmopolitan—emerges.

THE NEW WORLD TEACHER

We have argued that strong state institutions remain the most powerful mediating forces to the spread of global, corporate culture, with a complexity of local effects. State education systems, schools, teachers and teaching have the potential for a critical educational engagement with, about and around cultural and economic globalisation; that is, an approach to curriculum and teaching that by definition entails moving and working with students to critically analyse local and global impacts of new cultural, economic and technological flows, and a dialogic approach to education that quite literally involves a weaving between the global and the local, the word and the world, between community cultures and those of others. With the combined representational technologies of oral language, writing and print, and digital communications, the means for using the compression of space and time for purposes of dialogue and critical analysis are increasingly available to teachers. But to do so will require something far more than a teacher...
who is skilled in reproducing the local and the national, or skilled in the practices of the industrial-era school. We conclude by making the case for the new world teacher as a critical cosmopolitan subject.

For their part, teachers are engaged in cosmopolitan relations at three levels:

- As mobile professionals and guest workers: Teacher migration within and between countries is increasing. With expansion of world language English and the continued building of educational infrastructure in developing countries, there are increasing flows of language teachers across borders, with English-as-a-Second Language teachers playing a significant role in the spread of corporate business and governance from the North and West. "Expat" teachers across Asia, the Middle East, and the Americas now constitute a sizeable, competitive and mobile workforce.

- As professionals whose local communities and student bodies are changing under the impacts of cultural and economic globalisation: Even where they may stay within their local jurisdiction, global and regional population flows are leading to increased diversity of students and economically difficult community conditions. This entails the break-up of educational and community monocultures, where they might have existed, with increasing linguistic, cultural and religious diversity, but as well the emergence of new "epistemological diversity" and learning styles affiliated with digital cultures, new youth identities and the emergence of "world kids".

- As multiliterate subjects: Teachers by definition are masters of the communications technologies for constructing "possible worlds" for students to read, engage with, critically analyse and, indeed, visit and inhabit. This means that teachers act as gatekeepers and mediators, structuring students’ access to and engagement with non-local cultural worlds.

In these ways, teachers are necessarily participants in travelling cultures, as key players in shaping and mediating economic and social conditions for the cultural, linguistic and epistemological diversification and, potentially, hybridisation of the very educational institutions where we work. Rogers, Marshall and Tyson’s (2006) recent study of pre-service US teachers brings home the idea that every teacher is a traveller, touched by and touching cultural and linguistic diversity. However, being a cultural tourist ("boning up" on the local cultural artefacts and sites but not seeing, understanding or engaging with the issues of power, identity, practice and conflict within cultures and communities) has severe limits. Programs like those described in the critical multiculturalism literature are key starting points. Moving forward, however, will require looking beyond a local politics of voice and official national versions of multiculturalism, however enabling these might be. Learning to act across cultures in ways that make a difference in working class and minority classrooms and schools will require something beyond recognition of difference, speaking position and history.

The new world teacher is a new cosmopolitan citizen, communicating across and with difference (Luke, 2006/2004), requiring opportunities to develop and practice their own and their students’ intercultural capital. Therefore, teacher education means developing prospective teachers’ capacity to: engage in critical
exchanges, shunts or moves across real and virtual cultural spaces; enhance communicative exchange between human subjects who are differentially situated by culture, space and time; draw informed and critical conclusions about which cultural worlds to take students to (when and with what educational effects); and, engage with, critically analyse, buffer and mediate the flows of information, discourse and cultural practice in everyday learning. So conceived, intercultural capital is not a counterfactual ideal or a normative position per se—our position is that it is a requisite resource or competence for teachers dealing with wired, globalised and globalising, multicultural and multi-standpoint educational contexts. Suffice to say, this version of the teacher doesn’t appear on current national or regional standards statements.

A broad commitment to liberal arts education, to critical intellectual engagement and work, and to breadth of understanding and capacity to engage with the new economic, cultural and social realities would be critical considerations for teacher education. However, as we have noted, increasing social and economic inequalities within and across nation-states has meant the re-emergence of concerns about how to achieve social justice, equality, social integration and cohesion. The new world teacher and her students will need the knowledge and skills required to work and participate meaningfully in a risky and volatile transnational world order characterised by fast-disappearing certainties of the liberal welfare state or social democratic egalitarianism. She will need to develop the capacity to “reason from the point of view of others” (Benhabib, 1992) and a “willingness to engage with the other ... searching for contrasts rather than uniformity” (Hannerz, 1992). This new world teacher can be thought of as a “cultural pedagogue”, someone with a “consciousness of possibility”, and an ability to imagine a better state of things (Tierney, 2006). She would have a sense of origin, broker between students and the world, and work within and across spaces for the betterment of individuals and groups, supporting individuals’ and communities’ views simultaneously.

Therefore, teacher education curriculum and pedagogy might be problem-based and include in-depth study of cases, both real and virtual. The curriculum would certainly be more than a study of various cultures and accompanied by international exchanges for students and faculty. Thinking of global or international education as another “topic” or course in the teacher education curriculum will not cut it. Global/cultural education must be at once a transnational and local endeavour as well as face-to-face and virtual place of work.

Simply, the trick for emerging “world teachers” is to develop for themselves and their students modes of intercultural capital; that is, knowledge and dispositions that have exchange value and power in the intrinsically intercultural exchanges of new social fields of teaching and learning, work and everyday life. The new world teacher would pursue the capacity to shunt between the local and global, to explicate and engage with the broad flows of knowledge and information, technologies and populations, artefacts and practice that characterizes the present historical moment.
CONCLUSION

We have outlined contradictions associated with the ways in which teachers' work is being defined by governments, employers, businesses and the profession, and the localised ways in which entry into the profession and progress within it are regulated. Our view is that parochial national debates about teacher testing, licensing, or local needs of systems for curriculum implementers or school-based managers are stop-gap measures for systems caught in the headlights of rapid social, economic and cultural change. We challenge the construction of the generic teacher where teachers' knowledge and professional practice are assumed to be static commodities that can be objectified, represented by standards, and measured as visible outcomes, transmitted with new economies of scale and efficiency to culturally, linguistically and experientially generic trainees across and irrespective of local histories and sites, and reassembled and deployed in generic schools, regardless of the diverse industrial, ideological and cultural conditions where teachers actually live and work. We have argued for a whole-scale re-envisioning of teachers and teaching across compressed and dynamic relations of time and space, beyond narrow regional parochialism, state regulation, and ethno-national methodologies.

To rebuild teaching as a cosmopolitan form of work requires a major re-thinking of teacher education. It would entail an exploration and articulation of the ethical and moral dimensions of teaching as work in relation to globalised flows and economics. For us to recover, reframe and rebuild teaching as work in postmodern democratic education, we may indeed require a re-assertion of a strong vision of what is distinctive about each of our nation's education systems and argue for new versions of democratic entitlement and new visions of what schooling can enable. To simply argue that teachers should become activist intellectuals is to beg a prior question: Such activism requires an understanding of the limits of teaching as national and regional project. Our sense is that calls for "professionalism" and "activism" may not be enough to restore the honour and symbolic capital of the community of teachers in a time of major economic and cultural change. Without a cosmopolitan, intercultural vision and new (local and regional, national and transnational) social contracts around issues of cultural reconciliation and cohesion, immigration, and, indeed, geopolitical responsibility and environmental ethics, such moves risk reclaiming—however unintentionally—a parochial nationalism and a restorationist industrial strategy.
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