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Abstract

In this article, I discuss teacher education reform and the work of teachers in light of globalization and reflexive modernization. Increasing globalization has meant changed conditions for national education traditionally geared toward nation building and to the nationalizing of lifeworlds. It is assumed that the global economy has made knowledge and lifelong learning essential to economic growth, and governments have considered their citizens, teachers, and schools to be poorly trained for the demands of knowledge economies. Consequently, nation-states have invested massively in teacher education because of the vital role effective high-quality teachers are expected to play in preparation for working on global markets and for the competitive edge of nations. However, recent teacher education reform can be criticized for a one-sided orientation toward principles of economic growth, effectiveness, and competitiveness at the expense of other important educational aims, such as the development of reflective and communicative capacities and education for cosmopolitan citizenship. Moreover, recent teacher education reform in various nation-states seems to neglect how processes of reflexive modernization profoundly change schools, society, and the teaching situation, and undermine the principles that marked earlier phases of nation-centered modernization. I discuss teacher education and the work of teachers as reflexive modern practices and phenomena within the framework of critical social theory, and I mainly use Ulrich Beck’s theory of reflexive modernization. I argue that increased reflexivity, institutionalized individualization, and cosmopolitization constitute reasons for the re-contextualization of teacher education away from the uncritical influence of the primacy of the economy, instrumental rationalization, and other principles of modernization that are now running dry. In the final part, I discuss the importance of moving from a mainly economically oriented, globalist view of learning to a multidimensional, cosmopolitan view of learning in teacher education and education in general.
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Society is undergoing rapid change mainly characterized by a growing interdependence of people and nations around the globe. The sovereignty of autonomous nation-states has been eroded, and culture and identity, previously thought of as corresponding to certain territories, are now uncoupled from their territorial pasts due to migration and demographic changes as well as worldwide webs of meaning and action. Global markets and the emergence of knowledge economies are reshaping working life, and the only thing worse than foreign investors breaking national economies apart is their absence and decision to engage with others. This global development has meant changed conditions for national education, which has been massively reformed in various nation-states in response to globalization. The global economy has made knowledge and lifelong learning essential to economic growth and competitive edge, it is assumed, and governments have considered their citizens, teachers and schools to be poorly trained for new demands. Consequently, nation-states have invested massively in education and teacher education because teachers are expected to play a vital role in the creation of a human capital well prepared for the global economy. The making of highly effective, high-quality teachers has become a major concern for nation-states all over the world.

Teacher education reform in the 21st century can be criticized for being almost exclusively oriented toward principles of economic growth, effectiveness, and competitiveness at the expense of other important aims of education in the global era, such as the development of reflective and communicative capacities and education for cosmopolitan citizenship. Moreover, recent teacher education reform in various nation-states seems to neglect the ways in which processes of reflexive modernization profoundly change schools and society, and undermine the principles and traits that marked earlier phases of nation-centered modernization and education. In what follows, I will discuss and problematize teacher education reform and the work of teachers in the light of globalization and reflexive modernization. I will argue that a cosmopolitan view of learning is not only more adequately suited to global and reflexive modern challenges in education compared to the dominant economic views expressed in recent education reform, but also better suited to a new teaching situation resulting from global changes that teachers are likely to meet in the lifeworld of schools. In the first part, I discuss the global reform wave that can be seen as a response to certain perceptions of globalization in education, and how the preparation of teachers and future members of society seems to boil down to merely economic concerns. In the second and third part, I will bring a critical social theoretical context to the discussion with the aim of examining teacher education and the work of teachers as reflexive modern practices and phenomena. I mainly use Ulrich Beck’s theory of reflexive modernization, and I argue that changes in schools and society because of increased reflexivity, individualization, and cosmopolitization constitute reasons for the re-contextualization of teacher education away from the uncritical influence of the primacy of the economy, instrumental rationalization, and other principles of modernization now running dry. In the fourth and final part, I discuss the importance of moving from a mainly economic, globalist view of learning to a multidimensional, cosmopolitan view of learning in teacher
education, aiming at responding to global changes in schools and society that have become largely cosmopolitan in their nature.

**TEACHER EDUCATION, GLOBALIZATION, AND THE CURRENT WAVE OF REFORM**

Education has been held to be one of those rare things that cannot be treated exclusively as one commodity among others on the market. In liberal societies, people are more or less free to spend their time, money, and resources on whatever goods they believe fit their needs and preferences, but education is usually made compulsory according to a set of rights and obligations equal for all. Education is usually held to be a public concern or a collective good. However, it is not surprising, in times of increasing individualization, marketization, and promises of freedom of choice, that a number of people think that there is something wrong with this public view of education. Many people claim their parental rights to decide over their children's education. They are not willing to accept collective goals restraining the career options of their children or goals that might conflict with ideas or traditions they hold true, right or good. On the other hand, it is not surprising that others still think that these people are wrong because they believe that the education of future generations is a public concern for all citizens within a nation-state, not to be handed over to the arbitrary or exclusive interests of individuals. It might be said that the latter view is typical of modern education and that the former view can be seen as a contender, expressing opinions similar to those argued by people who never wanted compulsory national education in the first place.

In my opinion, Brian Barry expresses a modern view of education when he states that compulsory education rests on the belief that it is a public concern for all citizens within a nation-state. He thinks of adults as responsible members and citizens of society largely capable of functioning well and managing their own affairs. He also thinks that these presumptions are satisfied only if children are brought up in such a way that they will have acquired the necessary knowledge and capacities when they become adults themselves. That is why citizens of liberal or modern societies cannot be indifferent to the way in which children are raised and educated because they depend on their members being fit to exercise a wide range of responsibilities and perform various social functions in their roles as parents, citizens, employees, or simply as actors in civic society. Moreover, children do not have the same opportunities and abilities as adults to protect their own needs and interests, and they are vulnerable to neglect and abuse. The state and educational institutions should therefore not only prepare children for their future lives as equal members and citizens of society, but also protect their most basic needs and interests as the moral subjects they are and are becoming. In other words, educational institutions should protect children and young people from being treated merely as a means to someone’s or some groups’ ends without at the same time being treated as
ends in themselves. This view seems fair because the obligations that we put on our children and young people are accompanied by institutional responsibilities toward them. Alain Touraine takes the argument a step further when he says that modern education has been too closely tied to our preparing children for social functions, such as the life of work, higher education, or citizenship. He thinks that we need to strengthen our children’s position as subjects in a changing social world characterized by individualization and marketization. Touraine argues that we need to make space for and support children in developing their self-knowledge, autonomy, and personalities as well as their abilities to express themselves and listen to others in communicative and cooperative activities. From this point of view, education cannot merely be identified with or legitimated against the pre-fixed functions one generation chooses for the next to fit into. This would mean a toning down of the instrumental character of modern education to make space for teaching and learning not necessarily linked to pre-established goals and functions.

Lately, the meaning, scope, quality, and aims of education have been heatedly debated, reformed, and changed worldwide. Much of the debate on and the changes in education have been fuelled by certain perceptions of the pressures of globalization and the growing world-wide interconnectedness between persons as well as between nations. Global interconnectivity and markets are increasing in their scope, intensity, speed, and impact and have become such a pervasive feature of society that education can no longer have as its starting point the idea of a sovereign nation as a center of economic, cultural, social, political, and moral gravity. Globalization, or more correctly, certain perceptions of globalization have led nation states to reform education. It is assumed that the growing global economy has made knowledge, competiveness, and lifelong learning essential to economic growth, and governments have considered their citizens, teachers, and schools to be poorly trained to meet the demands of globally interconnected knowledge economies. For nation states competing on global markets, this situation can be perceived as an economic risk, and this particular perception of risk is often used as an argument for urgent educational reform. Consequently, nation-states have invested massively in education on the premise that a flexible human capital committed to lifelong learning is the key to economic growth and social cohesion for nations competing on global markets. Teacher education is not merely a part of this global movement of educational reform; rather, it is held to be a vital part.

The quality of teachers is increasingly thought of as the crucial factor for delivering high-quality education in the era of globalization. The making of high-quality teachers is central to every nation competing on global markets. In many nations, increased salaries have become the standard solution, but recently economists have begun to worry that this solution is inadequate in the light of the growing need to make a strong impact on student achievement by the effective use of resources. The OECD report *Teachers Matter—Attracting, Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers* can be seen as an important document reflecting new, ongoing strategies in the making and shaping of teachers:
All countries are seeking to improve their schools, and to respond better to higher social and economic expectations. As the most significant and costly resource in schools, teachers are central to school improvement efforts. Improving the efficiency and equity of schooling depends, in large measure, on ensuring that competent people want to work as teachers, that their teaching is of high quality, and that all students have access to high quality teaching.17

The OECD report describes global changes in the teaching profession with a main focus on education in European nations. The report states what teachers are likely to know already: schools have become more complex. Teachers are expected to deal with differences in background and language; to be sensitive to other cultures and gender issues; to promote tolerant social cohesion; to respond effectively to students with learning and behavioural issues; to use and teach the latest technologies; to keep up with changing fields of knowledge as well as student assessment; and, finally, they are expected to be capable of preparing students to be self-directed learners, able and motivated to keep learning over a lifetime.18 The work of teachers seems to be not only complex; global changes in the lifeworld of schools have created a new teaching situation in cultural, social, political, pedagogical, technological and economic aspects.

Different nation-states use different reform strategies in their making of high-quality teachers, but according to the same OECD report, they share many common policy directions as well. Typically, they stress the importance of teacher effectiveness and well-shaped teacher profiles for the purpose of establishing improved and clear alignment between teacher knowledge and skills and the clearly defined tasks of schools. They view teacher development as a lifelong task, and they aim at making teaching a more flexible career choice. They seek to transform the teaching profession into a knowledge-rich profession anchored in the academic disciplines and scientific research. They also stress the importance of developing accountability systems for promoting student outcomes. It is actually striking how similarly different nations perceive and respond to global changes, and how similarly they envision the making of high-quality teachers and their link to economic functions and interests.19 Let me briefly discuss a few examples from different nation-states that have recently carried out similar teacher education reform.20

In 2009, the National Institute of Education of Singapore released a Teacher Education Model for the 21st century based on the premise that education must respond urgently to the global, technology-driven knowledge economy.21 High-quality teachers are expected to prepare all students to become knowledgeable workers in the context of rapid globalization. The new model for teacher training aims at strengthening the flexibility of future teachers so that they can commit themselves to delivering whatever is expected of them in times of rapid change. It also aims at enhancing teachers’ knowledge of assessment so that they can use the best possible practices in influencing student outcomes, and the teachers themselves must be prepared to teach within well-developed systems of performance management.22 In China, large-scale teacher education reforms have been taking place in response to the perceived pressure to adapt to knowledge economies, economic
globalization and developments in information and communication technology. In these reforms, the alignment between teacher skills and the clearly defined tasks of schools has been stressed, and the high-quality teacher should embrace well-defined goals that make clear assessment possible. In Russia, a New School Policy was approved in 2010 aiming at the creation of a workforce prepared for the demands of knowledge-based economies and technological development. Riabov and Rakitov reflect on Russian education and conclude that: ‘there is still a definite shortage of capable and well-trained specialists, especially those of engineering profile—highly qualified professionals in management, business, and specialized sectors of the national economy’. It is the teacher that will be assigned the delicate task to ‘create the innovative cadre potential of Russia’. Similar perceptions of educational challenges in the light of globalization and technological development are expressed in the USA. Arthur Levine claims that the job of the teacher has changed, and that teacher education needs to change if American children are to succeed in an increasingly interconnected world in which they are compared with their peers worldwide. Schools must prepare students for a competitive, international economy, and teacher education needs to attract high-ability individuals to teaching careers, preferably in math and science.

In Britain, teacher education reform is also clearly geared toward developing knowledge and skills crucial for a national competitive edge in the global marketplace. German teacher education has also been subject to recent change in terms of structure, quality control and the conceptions of quality in teaching. Traditional German teacher education is no longer held to be acceptable in the light of international competition. In the German tradition, Blömeke says, ‘reflection has always had a high status in school as well as in teacher education, higher than measurable factual knowledge or its application to narrowly defined tasks’. However, the reflective tradition scored low in OECD rankings. Education is now profoundly shaped by the European Commission’s vision of lifelong learning as well as the perceived pressure from PISA studies; and the application of factual knowledge as preparation of a flexible workforce for the new global economy is emphasized. The European Commission’s vision for a united Europe involves us Europeans becoming the most competitive, knowledge-based economy in the world. A market-oriented concept of lifelong learning closely linked to key competencies involved in such learning can be seen as core values aiming at shaping national education in the European member states. In Sweden, teacher education reform is clearly shaped by the national competitive edge and the concept of lifelong learning: ‘If Sweden is to regain its position as a leading knowledge-based and industrialized country, we must invest in world-class education for pre-school and school teachers’. A Swedish university website presents new courses for in-service training, all of which can be linked to the European concept of lifelong learning and key competences: mathematics, science, language, digital media and tools, entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial learning.

In Norway, according to Garm and Karlsen, newspapers presented the disturbing fact that Norwegian pupils were only scoring average on the OECD ranking.
Many members of the Norwegian parliament reacted instantly, declaring the end of social cosiness in schools and the beginning of a steady orientation toward academic skills and a focus on subject knowledge. Reforms were passed in the name of higher quality and better governance, where the former was to be interpreted as ‘in accordance with international standards’ and the latter in terms of ‘New Public Management’. These new reforms were directed toward standardization, outcomes, assessments and increased performance, and the earlier cultural, social and value-oriented understanding of the teaching profession was rhetorically re-contextualized as fuzzy cosiness not appropriate for an education in the name of the competitive edge. The new global economy, it was argued, needs flexible and innovative students who can adapt quickly to change as well as students with high academic standards in central subjects such as mathematics and science. Norwegian teacher education reform assumes that teacher students have insufficient knowledge of the subjects they teach: ‘What is needed, according to this argumentation, are not more critical, reflective teacher students with analytical social science competencies, but teachers with basic competencies in subjects important for an expanding, competitive worldwide industry’.35

As this brief discussion shows, the view that education should prepare future members of society for a wide range of responsibilities and for performing several social functions seems to boil down to merely economic concerns under the heat of globalization. Educational reform is largely articulated in economic terms and linked to economic aims, and it is almost exclusively geared toward the perceived demands of knowledge economies and the competitive edge of nations competing on global markets. The making of high-quality teachers is primarily connected to this national competition, and the teachers themselves are frequently seen as precious commodities on the educational market.36 If a teacher is skilled in so-called ‘demand areas’ such as mathematics, science and technology, he or she needs to be attracted to and retained in schools. This can be interpreted as narrowing down the aims and scope of education, at the same time as the instrumental character of education is strengthened with regard to the result-oriented working life of teachers. Tato claims that teachers worldwide are increasingly monitored and assessed and that ‘formal and informal accountability mechanisms are continuously created to secure compliance with globally determined standards of quality in teacher learning and practice’.37 Bates states that the new high-quality teacher is expected to deliver desired outcomes within regimes of testing, governance and accountability.38 However, changes perceived in the teaching situation and the lifeworld of schools seem to be poorly responded to in the global making of high-quality teachers.

Facing global challenges, different nation-states seem to orient themselves toward a competitive edge, increased instrumentalization and subject centeredness in the name of more and better knowledge linked to the demands of knowledge economies. It seems to be assumed that important global challenges in education can be translated into clearly defined tasks and met with clearly defined action plans carried out by effectively profiled teachers with well-developed, task-aligned skills and knowledge in schools subjects derived from the disciplines of science. It is not clear
how the interests of both children and teachers are protected in these global campaigns for a flexible human capital and a competitive workforce ready to deliver whatever is expected of them. It is not clear how the strengthening of subject knowledge can meet the multidimensional challenges of a new teaching situation. There seems to be something awkward and even paradoxical about teacher education and teacher education reform in the 21st century.

THE TEACHING SITUATION, THE LIFEWORLD AND THE PRIMACY OF THE ECONOMY

In order to discuss important aspects of teacher education reform in the era of globalization, I will introduce a social-theoretic context of meaning into the discussion. The reason is that it can be productive to understand both teacher education reform and the work of teachers and the making of high-quality teachers in the context of some deeper structures or theoretically grounded principles of modernization. Habermas’s social theory of communicative action can provide a good starting point for a discussion of teacher education as a reflexive modern phenomenon.

Habermas understands society in terms of an essentially communicatively constituted and meaningfully structured lifeworld. He believes that, normally and traditionally, members of a lifeworld can use a shared bank of interpretations in their dealings with the world, and that they can draw solidarity crucial for social cohesion from inherited values, norms and established patterns of relationships and social roles. However, the space for making these moves has shrunk recently because many assumptions previously taken for granted in terms of shared backgrounds, beliefs, values and norms have either become invalid, or lost their status as given. Shared meanings, roles and mutual relationships must often be achieved through communication and investigation, and members of lifeworlds must in many cases and to a large extent create new conceptual and social resources for their cultural re-construction, social integration and socialization because their old ones have simply run dry. Culture understood as a bank of resources for interpretation is increasingly becoming de-territorialized and shaped by interconnected, worldwide webs of meaning and action. Earlier patterns of social integration and role functions assigned to people are being eroded by processes of modernization, individualization and globalization, and the social integration and coordination of action in society are increasingly becoming dependent on market solutions and individual accomplishments rather than fixed roles and stable patterns of relationships. Changes in the socio-cultural architecture of lifeworlds call for increased reflexivity, and members of a lifeworld must increasingly perceive, interpret and react to change in all dimensions of social practice and not only in its economic dimensions in their efforts to secure the continuation of culture, society and identity. These changes in the lifeworld are not only relevant for society at large but also for the lifeworlds of schools, the teaching situation and the nearly unilateral focus on the economy promoted by education reformers globally, as discussed above.
The primacy of the economy in education, teacher education and in the expected work of high-quality teachers is not only about the aims of education; rather, it is a process that changes education and the role of teachers in education on at least three levels. The first level concerns the economic aims of education, the second the economic norms governing educational institutions and the third how national and international competition are expected to work as promoters of quality in education, as mentioned above. The primacy of economy at the level of governance means that education is conceptualized as an input–output system in the name of economic growth and effectiveness. New Public Management can be seen as a highly influential cluster of strategies for educational change motivated by the very same imperative: economic norms should have primacy in educational governance. Clearly defined goals and tasks, result orientation, cost effectiveness, de-regulation, managerial leadership, accountability structures, customer orientation, the equalization among service organs in society, instrumental rationalization, external motivation strategies and competition as an indicator of quality build the economic backbone of New Public Management. The primacy of the economy has meant that the market is no longer an outside force surrounding educational institutions and the lifeworld of schools; rather, it is now an inside force regulating schools, universities and many other public institutions around the world. It has come to signify a new neoliberal homogenization of the logic of governance of educational institutions, and, according to Peters, of a nation-state that mainly seeks to create individuals in the shape of competitive entrepreneurs. The primacy of the economy is one important context that high-quality teachers worldwide are supposed to draw their resources from in their dealings with the world, their relations and their identity formation, no matter how complex the teaching situation is.

Martha Nussbaum is highly critical of the primacy of the economy in education, which she understands as narrowing down to:

The goal of the nation [...] should be economic growth. Never mind about distribution and social equality, never mind about the preconditions of stable democracy, never mind about the quality of race and gender relations, never mind about the improvement of other aspects of human being’s quality of life that are not well linked to economic growth.

Nussbaum and many others argue that this economic development in education and teacher education narrows the scope of education and the functions it should be assigned in a modern society, and that it threatens the continuation of important aspects of education such as the development of critical or reflective capacities, education for democratic citizenship and moral education in the global era. However, the primacy of the economy in education is particularly problematic if one adds to this picture certain nation-centered traits and functions characterizing educational institutions in modern society.

The process of modernization goes hand in hand with the development of a cultural bank of interpretations in the lifeworld that can be qualified as knowledge. The development of a knowledge-based society can be characterized by the
replacement of tradition-guided action with knowledge-guided action, where the interpretations that count as knowledge mainly spring from the disciplines of science. In this process, members of a lifeworld are uncoupled from their traditional pasts, and the reflective appropriation of knowledge seems to be an inescapable trait of human life in a modern society. The need for reflection in securing the continuation of the lifeworld grows out of breaking with tradition-guided action in pre-modern societies but also with the character of rationalization in early modern societies. Education has played an important part in this process of rationalization, but this process has not only been about knowledge. Early modern education was typically aimed at nation-building, which meant efforts to shift people’s loyalties from the bonds they established in their local communities to the nation as the center of economic, moral, cultural, political and social gravity: moral loyalties were to be shaped by means of national values, norms and virtues; cultural bonds were to be shaped by means of national languages, national religions, national cultural heritages and common world views; political bonds were to be shaped in terms of roles, rights and duties connected to national citizenship; and historical bonds were to be shaped by means of a common national history fostering a sense of continuity in and belongingness to a nation. The function of education was therefore not only the rationalization of an increasingly knowledge-based society or lifeworld. Education was also geared towards the nationalization of lifeworlds.

Audrey Osler thinks that education in general and citizenship education in particular assume a natural belongingness to a nation-state, but this belongingness and its traditional meaning are now being challenged by an increased global interconnectedness between nations as well as diversification within nations. Will Kymlicka claims that diversity was largely ignored or stifled by models of normalcy in the political and educational institutions of early modernity. Stephen Castles argues that even if the cultural diversity in schools and society has forced policymakers to take diversification seriously, pressure toward conformity and homogenization often remains in educational practice. A new face of homogenization is discussed in research on successful schools competing on educational markets as they need to attract students who will count as assets for their ranking, and as a consequence, immigrant, dissonant or poorly performing children are often perceived as liabilities. Nussbaum, who proposes a cosmopolitan view of education, adds that our understanding of nations can no longer be restricted to a national outlook; rather, the understanding of a nation requires an understanding of the world, a nation’s global interconnectedness and its plural source of culture. This seems to require the study of a world history that cannot be confused with the stereotyping of others as a consequence of one’s nation-centered outlook on the distant others as well as on one’s fellow citizens in a diversified community. In this light, it seems naïve to believe that changes in the lifeworlds of schools and the teaching situation, calling for increased respect for differences, sensitivity toward culture and gender but also tolerant and respectful social cohesion, can be implemented automatically in educational institutions traditionally shaped by the logic of national integration and homogenization and now increasingly shaped
by international comparison and national competitiveness on global markets. This mismatch between the teaching situation and the making of high-quality teachers can definitely create a dilemma: the teachers cannot unreflectively draw their teaching resources from the nation-centered heritage that formed educational institutions and many traditions in the past, and the new resources they can draw from the primacy of the economy in its narrow scope run the risk of being blind to the complexity of the teaching situation.

The lifeworld that works as a background to all educational activities has profoundly changed. Cultural and social resources that used to be taken for granted in the early, nation-centered modern school and society are in many aspects no longer valid. Teachers must respond to this de-traditionalization, de-conventionalization and de-nationalization in their complex practice, and they cannot take for granted moves from the early, nation-centered modern educational past as valid. The primacy of the economy in teacher education runs the risk of neglecting the multi-dimensional education, reflective and communicative in character, that teachers will now need to enter lifeworlds of schools where knowledge, roles, relationships, authority, work climate, norms and values need to be dealt with reflectively and communicatively and not only instrumentally or competitively. One paradox of recent teacher education reform and its visions of high-quality teachers is that increased complexity, reflexivity and de-traditionalization are responded to in instrumental and one-sided approaches focusing largely on subject-centeredness, profiling, clearly defined tasks, accountability mechanisms, standardization and assessment. Teacher education and educational institutions in general have, like many other modern institutions, become a part of the problem they are assigned to solve in our reflexive phase of modernization.²⁴

TEACHER EDUCATION AND REFLEXIVE MODERNIZATION

Recent changes in the work of teachers and teacher education can be understood as reflexive modern phenomena, and it is therefore also fruitful to bring Ulrich Beck’s theory of reflexive modernization into the discussion.⁵⁵ Reflexive modernization can be understood as a transformation of modern society largely connected to an increase in the production of manufactured, incalculable risk and uncertainties, forced or institutionalized individualization and increasing multidimensional globalization, or cosmopolitization. Beck’s theory is relevant in this context because of its focus on the ways in which present dynamics of change in schools and society depends on unforeseen consequences of earlier processes of modernization.

There are two interconnected but different meanings of ‘reflexivity’ of equal importance in this context. One is connected with the need for developing reflective capacities in securing the continuation of the lifeworld that grows out of breaking with tradition-guided action in pre-modern societies and the nation-centered character of rationalization in early modern societies. As discussed above, the downgrading of reflection did in fact bother researchers of teacher education reform,
and in this social theoretic context the reason why this seem to be problematic can be explained: it can threaten a healthy re-construction of the lifeworld in times of global change when the resources drawn from a nation-centered past are no longer valid. If high-quality teachers are supposed to respond effectively to changes in the lifeworld, then the down-grading of reflection seem to be a strange move in teacher education. However, there is another sense of reflexivity that has come to the fore in the present reflexive phase of modernization. Many resources and principles important for an earlier phase of modernization in society have been undermined mainly because of unforeseen side effects. The second sense of the term ‘reflexive modernization’ captures the self-transformation of the first nation-centered, modern society through processes and side effects largely unintended and unforeseen. Beck believes that:

The key factor has been the dynamic power of technological and economic innovation within the framework of global capitalism. This dynamism, championed and released by the movement we know as neoliberalism, has been revolutionizing the very foundations of society. The term ‘reflexive modernization’, then, refers to the transition away from a first modernity locked within the national state, and toward a second, open, risk-filled modernity characterized by general insecurity.

In early modern society, presumptions of homogenous national integration, fixed gender relations, a stable working life in national economies, taking and exercising social control, secure calculation of risks, finding rational solutions to all manufactured problems and foreseeing consequences of human action were held possible and plausible. These presumptions have now become radically undermined. This mean that education and education reform can no longer take place in a lifeworld assumed to be controllable, given, stable and locked within nation-centered horizons of meaning and action. We cannot know what kind of knowledge, working life, social practices, political arrangements, values and skills will count as valuable in the future, and even in the near future. In many cases, we cannot know if our actions are to be counted as good or bad because we cannot foresee consequences in the globally interconnected world society. Institutions like science, politics, law, business but also education were once seen as guarantors of a common good, but lately many of us have started to perceive them as co-producers of risk. In a reflexive modern society shaped by our responding to unforeseen consequences of earlier processes of modernization and characterized by insecurity and a global interdependence whereby people anywhere can affect people everywhere, we experience a global risk production that shows no respect for national boundaries. Global warming, ozone-layer damage, global financial crises, the eroding of welfare states, xenophobic nationalism and the increasing clefts between the globally rich and the poor are only a few examples of how we today have to live and deal with consequences of human actions performed within the core institutions of modernity. The world-wide web of risk production cannot only be understood as the unfortunate consequences of human action; rather, the production of risk is built-in in our social networks and institutions in globally interconnected nations competing on global markets. That is why we might experience institutional paradoxes: the same institutions that
produce global problems, conflicts and risk are the very same ones we are hoping will solve them.

This is bad news for the proponent of more and better knowledge as a universal cure for the challenges of globalization and the unmet needs of knowledge economies. Beck argues that it is not only the kind of knowledge but also the character of the knowledge-based society itself that has changed in the light of increased reflexivity: ‘Talk of knowledge-society is a euphemism of the first modernity. World risk society is a non-knowledge society in a very precise sense. In contrast to the pre-modern era, it cannot be overcome by more and better knowledge, more and better science; rather, precisely the opposite holds: it is the product of more and better science’. This particular dimension of risk is present in recent teacher education reform because of its largely uncritical focus on passing on more and better knowledge to future teachers in the name of national competitiveness. Moreover, the increasing need for reflection and the reflective use of knowledge is not only actualized in relation to teachers trying to secure the continuation of the lifeworld in times of change; rather, the need for reflection grows of importance as the status of knowledge changes and our use of knowledge is increasingly connected to risk. Teacher education reform in the 21st century can be seen as a co-producer of risk. What price are we going to pay for a one-sided focus on economic growth and a competitive edge, and what makes us think that these instrumental reforms constitute effective means for economic ends at all in our unstable and unpredictable reflexive modern world? What price are we going to pay for largely neglecting reflexive modern challenges in teacher education reform shaped by principles from an early, nation-centered modern past? Teacher education reform seems to display many of the confident presumptions that Beck thought of as belonging to an early nation-centered, modern mind-set.

However, to appreciate more fully how increased reflexivity is relevant to education, to the work of teachers and to teacher education, we need to take into consideration another de-traditionalizing principle at work in reflexive modernization, that is, forced or institutionalized individualization. In the reflexive modern society, individualization consists in transforming human identity from something given into a lifelong task. Class, gender and to some extent ethnicity and nationality used to be seen as inescapable categories shaping individualization processes, and in schools, student and teacher roles were clearly defined, making the professional socialization of teachers much more a process of fitting in than the accomplishment of something new. However, the character of individualization has changed. Prefixed models to fit into with regard to social, professional and personal identities are no longer valid due to changes in the lifeworld. Beck claims that there is an individualistic misunderstanding of individualization based on the assumption that it is a process that grows from individual choice or preference when in fact it is, to a large extent, something that has been imposed on individuals. Individualization is largely a matter of fate and not a choice; it charges individual actors both with the responsibility for performing their lifelong task and for the consequences of their performance. This is why Beck thinks that how we actually live our lives becomes
a biographical solution to systemic contradictions: we are forced to be free because we cannot choose our fate.\textsuperscript{64}

It is important to make a distinction between the neoliberal idea of the free market individual and the concept of institutionalized individualism. Neoliberal economics assumes that individuals alone can master the whole of their lives as self-entrepreneurs, renewing themselves from no other source than themselves.\textsuperscript{65} However, this notion of a self-sufficient self-entrepreneur is highly problematic, and according to Beck,\textsuperscript{66} it threatens what is still left of the welfare state because it underestimates mutual obligations, solidarity, relationships or bonds between members of society. Moreover, it frustrates many attempts to re-construct notions of citizenship in the global age beyond aggregated consumer power.\textsuperscript{67} Institutionalized individualization, on the other hand, is a structural characteristic of a reflexive modern society that does not threaten its integration or cohesion in itself but rather makes integration possible thanks to constant interpretation, creation, communication and negotiation between individuals lacking pre-fixed roles or models to fit into. In times when schools and society are undergoing reflexive transformation in the light of manufactured risk, it is important to remember that individualization need not be articulated in neoliberal and monadic terms, however common this is in education reform worldwide.\textsuperscript{68} This becomes clear in the light of an increased individualization of risk in the process of reflexive modernization.

Risks and institutional paradoxes are produced constantly, but the duty and necessity to cope with them is increasingly being individualized. Beck thinks that risk management has been outsourced from the basic institutions of modernity to the individual. All kinds of everyday problems connected with food, traveling, old-age insurance, work, climate change and so on are increasingly being handed over to individuals ‘condemned to transform themselves into indigenous tinkerers and do-it-yourselves creators of their own increasingly unviable identities […] balancing on a circus high wire between divorce, losing their jobs, permanent self-praise and flexible entrepreneurship. They are not artists creating themselves, but bunglers cobbling an identity together.’\textsuperscript{69} Faced with the problems and uncertainties of the globalized world, individuals are thrown back on themselves to make their own decisions. Beck argues that science, politics and the legal system can no longer define and control risk in rational ways, and the individual is likely to mistrust experts and institutions in their dealing with risks.\textsuperscript{70} As a result, the reflexive modern individual is often caught in a cluster of paradoxes: a \textit{paradox of trust}, because he or she cannot trust the experts and institutions of modernity they are supposed to trust. \textit{Decision paradoxes} evolve at all levels of society because of the insecurity of knowledge and action: the greater the risk, the smaller the bank of trustworthy knowledge, the more urgent and impossible is the decision. Beck also thinks that \textit{paradoxes of responsibility} penetrate reflexive modern life because individuals are condemned to individualization and self-responsibility despite the fact that they are often severed from the decision contexts, which escape their influence.\textsuperscript{71} This is highly relevant to the individualization of teachers and the vital role they are supposed to play in the era of globalization. If neoliberal agendas and the primacy of the economy are the primary contexts
from which high-quality teachers are supposed to draw their cognitive and social resources, then education run the risk of responding to the individualization of risk with monadic self-sufficient entrepreneurship rather than the communicative and cooperative inter-subjectivity that seem to be essential to the continuation of the lifeworld in the face of change and danger.

Recent teacher education reform cannot only be seen as a co-producer of risk. It can also be seen as an outsourcer of risk. The individual high-quality teacher is supposed to use his or her skills to solve most problem complexes in education, including the one-sidedness of educational reform in the light of changes in the lifeworld of schools and the teaching situation. The teacher is also held accountable for a vast and difficult multidimensional task as if social control and predictable rational solutions to reflexive modern challenges were possible. The professional individualization of teachers require the creation of something new in many dimensions of the lifeworld, but policy makers worldwide seem to understand the individualization of high-quality teachers in an instrumental way as if they could just fit into ready-made systems of performance geared to whatever task is expected from them. Moreover, the steady orientation toward more and better knowledge in central subjects can hide the fact that no one is in a position to grasp with certainty what will count as valuable in the future. One might say that the risky business of policymakers consists in their laying most or all educational eggs in one competitive basket.

Educational institutions are shot through with tensions, if not paradoxes, such as customer orientation versus collective goals; private goods versus public goods; economic aims versus other aims; standardization versus needs for innovation; nation-centeredness versus openness to others; knowledge versus non-knowledge; treating ourselves as ends in ourselves or merely as a means for the ends of others and so on. The outsourcing of risk can be read into recent teacher education reform in the sense that institutional tensions and paradoxes caused by increased reflexivity seem to be bravely translated into the rhetoric of high-quality teachers and their richness in knowledge and skills. The fate of lifelong-learning teachers is held to be to constantly re-make themselves in order to be ready to deliver, and to be held accountable for whatever task they are asked to do without being effective participants in decision-making contexts affecting their work. This can be seen as an increasing instrumentalization in the work of teachers, and a very problematic one in the light of risk and paradoxes.

Hence, the individualization of risk and danger and the evolving paradoxes provide reasons for the re-contextualization of modern education and teacher education away from the uncritical influence of principles of modernization, which are now running dry, toward a reflexive modern awareness of the aims and functions of education as well as the balancing of instrumental rationalization in educational institutions. In fact, reflexive modernization can be seen as a social theoretic and realist critique of instrumental reason, and its one-sided reflective structure limited to creating utility-maximizing relationships between means and pre-fixed ends.72 An unhappy marriage between institutionalized and neoliberal views of individualization
is perhaps most problematic in this instrumental aspect: if education is to foster self-sufficient, competitive, monadic self-entrepreneurs loyal to a competitive nation, then educational institutions seem to lack a non-competitive cultural, moral and political response to globalization in the changing face of global risk. Beck thinks that reflexive modernization both compels and enables the re-contextualization of the basic institutions of modernity, and the philosopher Kwame Anthony Appiah has stressed the importance of our forming new ‘ideas and institutions that will allow us to live together as the global tribe we have become’. This will be briefly addressed in the final and in many aspects concluding part.

**FROM GLOBALIST TO COSMOPOLITAN LEARNING**

Education has played an important role in the modernization and rationalization of society, and early modern education was typically aimed at nation-building, which meant efforts to shift people’s loyalties from the bonds they established in their local communities to the nation as the center of economic, moral, cultural, political and social gravity. The function of education was, therefore, not only geared to the rationalization but also to the nationalization of society and its members. This strong tradition can be understood as a nationalist view of learning. However, recent reforms in education can be seen as a response to certain perceptions of globalization and in the discussion above I have referred to this as an orientation towards a primacy of the economy. The preparation of future members of society seems to boil down to economic concerns under the heat of globalization. Education reform is largely articulated in economic terms and linked to economic aims. It is almost exclusively geared to the perceived demands of knowledge economies and the competitive edge of nations competing on global markets. The teacher and teacher education are held to be vital parts in the global movement of educational reform, and it is mainly teacher education and the work of teachers that I have been discussing above, even if the topic cannot be clearly separated from education in general.

The primacy of the economy in education and recent teacher education reform seem to include a view of learning that may be thought of as a globalist view of learning. Such a view of learning champions economic aims, norms and quality standards in education, and often at the expense of other important aspects of education. It is mainly legitimated by the perceived needs for a nation’s competitive edge on global markets and economic growth, and perceptions of economic risk threatening national economies challenged by the forces of globalization. The globalist view of learning is mainly articulated in economic vocabularies and worldviews closely accompanied by neoliberal agendas for policy making. The globalist view of learning assumes uncritically that responses to reflexive modern problem complexes in teacher education can be made in terms of more and better knowledge, lifelong learning, teacher effectiveness, flexibility, well-shaped teacher profiles, alignment between task and competence and accountability structures. In light of changes in the lifeworld of schools and the challenges that in many aspects constitute a new teaching situation
for teachers, globalists seem to believe that they can be effectively responded to with a focus on subject-centeredness, profiling, clearly defined tasks, accountability mechanisms, standardization and increased assessment. This particular view of learning in teacher education seems to assume that reflexive modern problem complexes can be overcome with more and better knowledge, and it seems to assume that early modern presumptions about nation-centeredness, social control, calculation of risks and predictable rational solutions to manufactured problems are still valid.

However, I believe that both the earlier nationalist view of learning and the recent globalist view of learning are flawed, and that there are compelling reasons to introduce a cosmopolitan view of learning in response to global challenges in and the reflexive modernization of education and teacher education. A view that includes economic aspects without accepting the primacy of the economy as it has been discussed above. First, a cosmopolitan view of learning takes institutional responsibilities toward teachers and their students seriously. Educational institutions should not merely prepare people for roles and functions in society. They should also protect members of society from being treated merely as a means for some groups’ ends. Second, a cosmopolitan view of learning is more adequately adapted to the challenges that teachers are likely to meet in a new teaching situation compared to the globalist view, and such a view of learning is likely to avoid dilemmas resulting from a mismatch between the primacy of the economy and the multidimensional complexity of the teaching situation, as discussed above. Moreover, the cosmopolitan view of learning is articulated with respect to the multidimensionality of the lifeworld and not only with respect to economic dimensions of society. Third, a cosmopolitan view of learning aims at de-parochializing education in times when the primacy of the economy is narrowing the scope of education and its functions in a way that also seems to threaten the continuation of many aspects held important in education in the global era, such as the development of reflective and communicative capacities and education for cosmopolitan citizenship. Fourth, it also aims at the de-nationalizing of education in times of increased global interconnectedness between nations as well as diversification within nations. Fifth, cosmopolitan learning includes an awareness of the reflexive modern challenges that undermine presumptions of an early modern mind-set regarding the core institutions of modernity and their possibilities and limitations, and it therefore includes risk awareness as well as an awareness of institutional paradoxes as a consequence of increased reflexivity. A cosmopolitan view of learning accepts the non-knowing character of knowledge economies and society, and it is important to teacher education not because it claims to know what will count as more and better skills and knowledge in the future but precisely because no one is in a position to claim with certainty such knowledge. Sixth, a cosmopolitan view of learning avoids the identification of institutionalized individualization with neoliberal, monadic views of individualization. Educational institutions cannot only be assigned the function to promote a competitive edge on global markets carried out by self-renewing entrepreneurs: rather, they must also promote non-competitive cultural, moral and political responses to globalization.
which cannot simply be thought of as fuzzy cosiness when it is the re-construction of
the lifeworld at risk that is at stake. However, a cosmopolitan learning cannot be
articulated within a globalist conception of globalization. In what follows, I will very
briefly sketch what I find important for a cosmopolitan view of learning as an
adequate response to global change and processes of reflexive modernization.

Globalization cannot be captured only in terms of economic dimensions. It is also
a multidimensional process that changes nation-states from within as well as from
without. It can be understood in terms of another de-traditionalizing process at work
in reflexive modern society, that is, cosmopolitization. The concept of cosmopolitiza-
tion captures not only globalization in its economic aspects under economic
descriptions but also changes in society and education in multi-dimensional terms
including cultural, social, political and moral aspects. 75 Cosmopolitization can be
understood as a process in which the global and the local are conceived of not as
cultural polarities but as reciprocally interpenetrating principles. It is largely a
process that changes society, nation-states and schools, and as a result social reality
has become cosmopolitan in its structure. The new teaching situation discussed
above is largely the result of a cosmopolitization of the lifeworld of schools. My brief
sketch of cosmopolitan learning will be articulated in relation to the cosmopolitiza-
tion of schools and society, or the lifeworld. Such a view of learning includes many of
the economic aspects discussed earlier, but it does not accept the one-dimensional
and instrumental primacy of economy as the proper context for educational change
and learning.

Culturally, national education used to be geared toward the formation of national
cultures and identities that can be seen as attempts to represent a diverse society
as belonging to one great national family. 76 In times of reflexive modernization,
such attempts can only be seen as misguided. Simultaneously, our theories of identity
formation used to include assumptions about cultures belonging to a specific
territory, and these were conditioned by our separating ourselves from what was
perceived as foreign. 77 Cosmopolitization makes such formations and representa-
tions highly problematic; not only do they neglect the plural source of culture and
meaning as well as the recognition of different lifestyles and cultures within a nation;
they also fail to take the everyday experiences of citizens, teachers and young
people seriously in that they are likely to construct shifting and multi-vocally shaped
identities. 78 As a result of cosmopolitization, cultural goods and meanings are
increasingly uncoupled from their territorial pasts in the world-wide web of meaning.
Cosmopolitization makes commonly made assumptions about identity formation,
the nature of language and culture and social integration in education and elsewhere
empirically false. This aspect of the cosmopolitan character of social reality calls
for responses other than the instrumentalism and the monadic individualism of the
globalist view of learning. A cosmopolitan view of learning calls for a response in
terms of the development of reflective, communicative and dialogical capacities
as well as a shift in educational governance: the logic of instrumental reason needs
to be complemented and balanced with strategies built on the dialogical logic
of communicative rationality. 79 Aims, goals, roles, relationships and the making of
identities need to be dealt with reflectively and communicatively with openness to the view of others, and not only instrumentally as if meaning and action were determinate.

Morally, cosmopolitization means the extension of our space of moral interpretations and moral responsibilities in respect of national loyalty, but it also means changed conditions for emotional imagination and empathic perspective-taking; the import and export of cultural meaning, worldwide media and demographic change open up for cosmopolitan empathy because those who used to be seen as distant strangers can now often be recognized as neighbours. A commonly made assumption is that moral sympathies are restricted to a closed circle of significant others, neighbours or fellow citizens that we experience as same, but the meaning and the scope of that assumption have altered. Boundaries between strangers and neighbours are often blurred, and in the globally connected society, people anywhere can affect people everywhere. Our global interconnectedness introduces the very idea that citizenship education, moral responsibility but also moral sympathy can be understood in cosmopolitan terms, that is, understanding ourselves at least partly as citizens of the world and taking seriously our responsibilities and obligations to global others, whether living nearby or far away. However, for educational institutions aiming almost exclusively at competitiveness and once formed to instil loyalty to national norms, values and political majority cultures, the increasingly cosmopolitan character of social reality constitutes a challenge: to educate people whose moral responsibilities and sympathies transcend their local and national contexts to include all individual human beings in the world-wide web of interconnected relations that we may refer to as our diverse society. We do have several reasons, as Delanty suggests, for starting to recognize the other not only as different but also as related. The cosmopolitization of society calls for a moral response that cannot be reduced to loyalty to national values and norms and a view of relatedness that cannot only be dealt with in competitive terms. It calls for the development of inclusive moral attitudes, and the developing of an awareness of our global interconnectivity and relatedness, and as a consequence, pedagogies of both homogenization and difference need to be transcended.

Socially, when local, national and global cultures interpenetrate, and nationally demarcated societies are becoming increasingly diversified, we cannot expect a harmonious national family or a broad consensus regarding lifestyles and values. Moreover, our global interconnectedness makes our habitual identification of nations with societies somewhat misleading. In many respects, we have reason to think of ourselves as co-existing in one common society, our society, in which there are many nations; and in our society, the political autonomy of sovereign nation-states has become a social fiction rather than a social fact. The cosmopolitan character of social reality makes the re-negotiation of concepts like ‘society’, ‘democracy’, ‘justice’, ‘market’, ‘responsibility’ and so on necessary, resulting in a break with nationalistic social science and nation-centered education. In the cosmopolitized society, Beck argues, we can trace a new communicative logic forcing people to co-operate who otherwise do not want to have anything to do with one another. It is the increasing
experience of risk that forms a new kind of unification in diversification, and many forms of compulsory democratic co-operation and not only competition can be traced between people who think of themselves as having to deal with common concerns that have recently been forced upon them. Cosmopolitization in the social dimension calls for more than the promotion of competitive relations among people, and it is this aspect of society that makes it important not to confuse neoliberal economic individualization with forced or institutionalized individualization. The individualization of risk and the unification in diversification calls for cooperative problem-solving and the cooperative resolving of conflicts. It also calls for the de-nationalization and critical re-contextualization of much of our nation-centered social vocabulary, and school subjects can no longer automatically be subordinated to the overarching goal of creating homogenous national identities or the competitive edge in society.

Politically, the processes of globalization lead to the paradox of our times, according to David Held. The common concerns we must grapple with are becoming increasingly global, but the means for addressing them are national and local. Globalization has meant that the idea of a self-determining collective can no longer be identified with a nation-state. Since effective political power must take place within networks no longer restricted by national borders, we have no other alternative than to accept political cosmopolitanism, which in turn implies the re-contextualization of citizenship, citizenship education and nation-centered political frameworks. However, this problem cannot be solved within the dominant global neoliberal political orientation in education and elsewhere because of its inadequate development of non-market solutions and factors and of the cooperative coordination of political action. Held claims that the neoliberal agenda has ‘weakened the ability to govern—locally, nationally and globally—and it has eroded the capacity to provide urgent public goods. Economic freedom is championed at the expense of social justice and environmental sustainability, with long-term damage to both’. Therefore, the shaping of educational institutions in terms of the primacy of the economy accelerates their roles as co-producers of political risk. The globalist view of learning is mainly politically passive in that teachers, students and citizens at large should merely adapt to changes and deliver what is expected of them. A cosmopolitan view of learning and teacher education, on the other hand, is politically active, calling for the development of capacities for social change, public deliberation and political participation. Children, young people and their teachers must be able to make and not only take change and decisions, and teachers should be counted on as important participants in an on-going discussion about the aims of education rather than being reduced to tools for purposes imposed on them. A cosmopolitan view of learning calls for a cosmopolitan view of citizenship as a response to global change.

Globalists respond to globalization almost exclusively from principles of economic growth, effectiveness and competitiveness. A cosmopolitan response to increased reflexivity, individualization and cosmopolitization, to sum up, also takes seriously aims such as educating people whose moral responsibilities and obligations transcend
their local and national contexts to include all individual and groups of human beings in our society; people who can dialogically communicate with and are willing to learn from others, near or distant, and recognize others in terms of being the same, different, equal but not necessarily right, no matter what cultural background they come from; people whose understanding of citizenship is active, responsible and inclusive and not exclusively connected to national interests and arrangements; and people who acknowledge the plural source of culture, who understand relations of interdependence and independence in society and who can critically identify moral problematic aspects of nationally formed habits, institutions and education.

A cosmopolitan view of learning can be seen as a response to reflexive modern challenges in schools and society that have become largely cosmopolitan in their nature. It is a modern view of learning because it rests on the belief that education is a public concern for all citizens within a nation-state. However, in the global era marked by increasing world-wide interconnectivity, the conditions for modern national education has changed in one important sense: education within a given nation seems to be the concern of all members of the world risk society who can no longer be indifferent to the way children, young people and their teachers are educated in schools around the globe.
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