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ABSTRACT

The research discussed that global and ecological citizenship discourse became vital for all current citizenship models; apart from the relational needs between humans and the environment, nature also needed to be preserved for survival and efforts to increase civic values. However, this conceptual-theoretical debate about the development and influence of this discourse created an antinomy among the dominant theories that had a place in contemporary citizenship discourse. Qualitatively, the research contributed to exploring the development of global and ecological citizenship discourse and its influence on students' experiences of citizenship in Indonesia. It was built on ‘theoretical eclecticism’ and focused on the respondent’s ‘cognitive response’ combined with a critical realism perspective to analyze data, which was obtained randomly in various places and students from various majors by prioritizing the main aspects: mental existence; external existence; and essence as a knowledge domain; awareness; and their experiences. Each meeting lasted between 30 to 45 minutes with 100 respondents. Descriptively, the research results indicate that the development of global and ecological citizenship discourse has not received attention and has a significant impact on the discourse of education and citizenship experience in Indonesia. The ecological dimension lacks or does not yet have a close relationship with all other dimensions in the citizen’s experience as a form of civic virtue, including knowledge, awareness, and actions, both economic, social, and political.
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INTRODUCTION

Education has experienced a fairly intensely significant evolution and progressivity in various fields and disciplines. In general, it has made impressive achievements through findings from scientific work practices that offer empirical evidence with a high degree of probability. However, the definition of education itself has become quite varied, bi-dimensional, or universal and, in certain parts, has accelerated according to the context and developments in their respective fields. Carr (2003) and Peters (2010), for example, tend to avoid ideological and philosophical debates about the goals and subjectivity of education. Giroux (1988), Bauman (2005; 2010; 2011), and Slattery (2012) have emphasized the difference between modern and postmodern discourse. Meanwhile, with a tone that seems more simplistic than various opinions about education definitively. Radosavljevich (1911) has introduced education as ‘variation’ and ‘adaptation’.

However, considering the didactic aspect to understand the historical-sociological context of education and the experience of citizenship in Indonesia, as well as the discourses that follow, the research predominantly follows two definitions of education, either synchronously or diachronically. This is the effort to explore the social and cultural roots of society, including the influence of the two dominant ‘orders’ in the Indonesian government, which play a role in the education ecosystem to a certain extent, form a paradigm as well as the intellectual climate.
also citizenship experience of the community. First, education and learning cannot possibly be understood if separated from the socio-cultural foundation in which they are located, as stated by Schuelka & Engsig (2020). Second, in addition to implying an externality process, education and learning, if using another definition derived by Fawns et al. (2021), is also an individual internality process.

According to the context of Civic Education, it is always a visual form of knowledge and understanding of the term ‘good citizen’ in a relational sense, both between citizens and the government and the state, as well as between citizens with the environment and nature. This means that good citizens are individuals or groups with knowledge and methodological interpretation for actual actions toward good practices of living together in the natural environment and society, upholding humanity, and being open, tolerant, and responsible. All these qualities of knowledge and abilities are the domain of citizen engagement.

More clearly, the indicators of civic engagement, as stated by Karliani et al. (2019), are the need to maintain a sense of humanity, empathy, openness, ethics, and broad responsibility, including to the environment. Meanwhile, ecological citizenship requires active involvement in the environment because it is an effort to maintain and grow connectedness with nature (Soga & Gaston, 2016), including community engagement and empowerment (Blair, Wescott, & Miller, 2016) to achieve meaningful conservation behaviors and outcomes (Shwartz et al., 2014). The increasing rate of urbanization, as pointed out by Charles and Linklater (2015), is one of the many reasons why citizen involvement is important. It also demands a variety of solutions, including the need for ‘scientific programs for citizens’ with smart device technology (Davis, Taylor, & Martin, 2019; McKinley et al., 2017; Schröter et al., 2017).

Following its specific framework, as explained by Kennedy and Brunold (2016), citizenship education includes knowledge and understanding of a democratic society that is skilled and capable and has social and cultural values, attitudes, and participation that direct citizens to real action. In a broader framework, it is an effort to spread understanding about the importance of involving young citizens in community institutions in principle (Schulz, 2019). Furthermore, they are expected to be able to develop critical judgments based on factual information and have awareness and respect for the rights and obligations of citizens. However, it is a challenging job to explain the complexity of the reach of citizenship education more comprehensively (Tarozzi & Carlos, 2018). Like the citizenship literature in large-scale, international studies about knowledge and attitudes, also experiences of citizenship are sponsored by the IEA for the evaluation of educational achievement, e.g., Torney-Purta, Schwille, & Armadeo (1999); Torney-Purta et al. (2001); Schulz et al. (2010); Schulz et al. (2018); Knowles, Torney-Purta, and Barber (2018), which all of them focuses entirely on understanding transnational citizenship.

Therefore, it is important to consider Banks’ (2020) statement that the balance between the demands of nationalism and globalization, on the one hand also unity and diversity on the other, is a powerful discourse, thus, relevant in the context of the nation-state framework. Playing an important role, of course, educational discourse, especially in the context of global and ecological citizenship, which has developed in recent years, continues to demand not only the scholars of citizenship. However, interdisciplinary scholars worldwide continue cultivating sensitivity towards issues that develop around citizenship discourses such as education, the environment, human rights, democracy, economics, law, public ethics, moral philosophy, and social and political discourse. It can also use its theoretical, conceptual epistemology basis to the paradigmatic level to accelerate knowledge and implement citizen behavior in domestic and transnational contexts.

Civic Education in the global discourse is part of the seventeen sustainable development goals with a global indicator framework in the idea by PBB since 2014-2017 (UNStats, 2021), hereinafter referred to as ‘Three Main Areas of Education’ by Leite (2021) including global citizenship, sustainable development, and climate change. Citizenship education is pursued as a course in social sciences that focus on climate change issues (MGIEP, 2019), as well as an integrated curriculum that incorporates cross-disciplinary perspectives such as environmental, social, and economic (Sterling, 2016). Thus, the quality of Civic Education in a broad overview can be understood comprehensively, not only as part of the main education instrument to develop and vindicate a democratic society within the framework of nation-state nationalism. However, it is more a part of the demands for a thorough global citizenship curriculum, in which each country is obliged to equip its citizens with knowledge and understanding as well as responsive actions, which lead to awareness of one earth and citizens’ concern for the environment, as a form of ‘civic engagement’ and ‘civic participation’.

The emphasis on citizen participation in the sustainable development agenda is based on global and ecological citizenship to raise awareness and emphasize rights, as well as obligations towards the environment and nature. It can be found in the New Urban Agenda contained in verse 13 point (b) by the United Nations General Assembly (2017) reads: ‘... participatory, promote civic engagement engender a sense of belonging ownership among all their inhabitants, prioritize safe, inclusive, accessible, green and quality public spaces that are friendly for families, enhance social and intergenerational interactions, cultural expressions and political participation (...) and foster social cohesion, inclusion and safety in peaceful and pluralistic societies, where the needs of all inhabitants are met, recognizing the specific needs of those in a vulnerable situation.”

Of course, this discourse requires acceleration of knowledge as well as the capabilities of citizens,
especially in the third world such as Indonesia. Therefore, various supporting comparative arguments as stimulation active in the research builds, not only based on the results of recent research on the discourse of global and ecological citizenship practices. However, it is more based on the knowledge, awareness, and experience of local students or academics on the discourse of the environmental crisis, which has become a collective problem, as well as the extent to which the significance of the discourses affects different citizenship experiences in Indonesia.

This is intended so that researchers can capture the real phenomenon of the impact of the development of global and ecological citizenship discourse on knowledge, awareness, and practice of citizenship through the ‘cognitive response’ shown by students.

It is also important to enclose the predictive urgency of various arguments and scientific findings, as well as post-factum in some tiered observations made, to fulfill the purpose of the research. In the research of NOAA (2021), the hottest years have at least begun since 2015 and 2016, when carbon dioxide production increased, but the earth’s ability to absorb deficits. On the other hand, global warming continues and destabilizes the planet. Amazon in Brazil, based on observation from Cannon (2019) in the Global-Forest report, has experienced massive deforestation, population and the forest vegetation in the area is almost twice as large as Luxembourg or ± 4500 kilometers are lost, and this figure is likely to continue increasing every year. Meanwhile, the level of greenhouse gas emissions will also have a serious impact for at least the forward centuries (Mengel et al., 2018).

A number of juxtapositions from the global phenomenon that emerged regarding environmental catastrophes have created environmental campaigns with high resonance and ecological attitudes from citizens around the world. They are asked to be more critical toward their government policies, both national and international related natural resource control, production and trade, the potential for disasters and the government’s mitigation capabilities, as well as their anticipation of survival and the economic well-being of the world’s citizens. In Indonesia, environmental problems also arise, at least in different variants. Around 600 plantation companies out of 2056 registered palm oil corporations, for example, carry out plantings of more than 10 hectares. Most of the oil palms are planted in the area clearly defined by the government as forests included in national parks; Ramsar wetlands; and a UNESCO world heritage site (Jong, 2021). It means that almost a third of oil palm companies operate illegally or outside the rule, contributing to forest loss. The illegal logging of hundreds of cubic meters of mangrove wood with export destinations to Singapore and Malaysia, due to low economic impact, also increased by about ± 280% in the Riau Islands - Batam in the observations of Sahputra (2021). On the other hand, the government’s declaration of coal ash as non-hazardous waste has stimulated criticism and censure from environmental activists and institutions (Gokkon, 2021).

The position of the research, specifically, will focus on the civic experience, which covers knowledge, awareness, also practice. In particular, the concrete citizenship experiences of students in developing countries like Indonesia. Using the S-O-R theoretical conceptual device updated by Kim, Lee, and Jung (2020) about the interconnection between input (stimulus), process (organism) as well as output (response) and form the ‘cognitive response’ of the respondents, which then the researcher combines with the RTS (Realist Theory of Science) critical realism perspective from Bhaskar (2008) in which the interpretation of reality by theories does not have the monolithic.

The research mainly builds as a theoretical eclecticism adapted to regional contexts and rill phenomena and the results of recent empirical studies. Thus, the research becomes one of the new variants in the discourse of dominant theories surrounding the project of global and ecological citizenship in the third world. Where the research is built, it is precisely above the theoretical skepticism in the middle debate on citizenship theories, which has begun to gain a place and is dominant but is not enough to significantly impact life phenomena, especially issues, and discourses of environmental. It clearly degrades questions about the response and influence of environmental discourse on the knowledge, awareness, and experiences of the young citizens, especially students and broadly academics, in the research.

The research has some questions to answered. Does the discourse of global and ecological citizenship currently developing have any empirical significance to the paradigm and practice of the civic experience of students in Indonesia at large? How do they, as young citizens in Indonesia, understand the concept of global and ecological citizenship that is developing today? What is the concrete form of ecological citizenship as a citizenship experience in the practice of student life in Indonesia? These questions are developed in the research and seek to critically fulfill the research that needs to qualitatively describe the impact of the development of global and ecological citizenship discourse in Indonesia in the 21st century.

**METHODS**

The qualitative research focuses on ‘cognitive responses’ from experiences of citizenship, mainly students and, precisely, their experiences of actively participating as citizens who are in contact with various environmental activities. It is conducted within 11 months between 2020-2021, and data is collected through observation and semi-structured interviews. Meanwhile, the questions are framed critically with a phenomenological approach as an effort to explore understanding and capture reality potential based on the cognitive responses of the respondents.
All interviews are conducted randomly in various places with students from different majors, and each meeting lasts between 30 to 45 minutes with 100 respondents. It uses the Indonesian language; then, all transcriptions are converted into English. Critical realism in the research is used to analyze data put forward three main aspects: mental existence, an external existence, and the essence of each that represents the domain of knowledge, awareness, as well as the practice of global and ecological citizenship experiences which derives from respondents’ cognitive response contrasted with the phenomenon that occurs. Research findings are presented argumentatively, based on hermeneutic activities on various information and data from the cognitive response, then arranged in a narrative manner. Table 1 shows research sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIS</th>
<th>RSP</th>
<th>IQ</th>
<th>UNQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCE</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTE</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mth</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scg</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DIS : Discipline Scholarly  
RSP : Respondent  
IQ : Interested Quantity  
UNQ : Uninterested Quantity  
CCE : Civic-citizenship Education  
PTE : Primary Teaching Education  
Mth : Mathematics  
Scg : Sociology

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Ecological citizenship or citizenship with environmental dimensions is a key factor in sustainability, including the green economy cycle, and an important aspect of overcoming environmental problems both nationally and globally (Hadjichambis et al., 2020). Developing principles of distributive ecological justice builds a bold vision of conservation as an activity that should influence policy-making (Wienhues, 2020). Because awareness and concern for the environment are part of chronopolitics focusing on state power, citizenship, and ecology (Kirtsoglou & Simpson, 2020) that are closely related to policy. These statements further indicate the importance of citizens’ involvement in directing their political actions toward justice for the environment in all government policies.

Citizenship Education has been gradual and clearly needed and treated according to needs which are often carried out by regimes, educators, and international and local institutions as an instrument to socialize various interests. The examples are democracy and civic life (Cohen & Eyal, 2021; Ngozwana, 2021), peace (Snaeuwaert, 2020), diversity and multiculturalism (Chu, 2021; Diaz, 2021; Sabzalian, 2019; Vavrus, 2021), morality (Walidaini & Marzuki, 2021), deliberations ability (Ho & Barton, 2020); politics (Chan & Hoyt, 2021), migration and human rights (Osler, 2020), and ideological indoctrination (Cohen, 2019; Kim, 2021; Kim & Kang, 2020, Paul, 2020). This is not strange, but it precisely gives a distinct impression of the development of Civic Education as a kind of ‘reservoir’ of a broad discipline or interdisciplinary.

The development of Civic Education in Indonesia also experiences similar things during certain periods. However, in a broad sense, as written by Ubaedillah (2018), instead of indoctrination, it is only an effort to provide knowledge to citizens about their rights and obligations. The vision of civic education from the old order, for example, to form a “Masyarakat Indonesia Baru”, produced a textbook written by Soepardo (1962). This textbook was published for the purposes of the vision and dedicated to strengthening the mission of “Tri Komando Rakyat” by Soekarno. Meanwhile, Suharto, as the domain of the new order, of course, plays a significant role in his monolithic ideological interpretation of Pancasila and its influence on the development of Indonesian citizenship education. The legacy of the systemic and hegemonic monolithic interpretation of Pancasila forms a different citizenship experience for citizens. Maybe even to this day, when the new order and his system have become a “leaden saga”.

There are very few efforts to socialize, internalize, or extrapolate ecological discourse within the framework of the civics education curriculum in Indonesia, either through academic and social discourse or politically, with the legislation. This is a collective challenge where various environmental degradations occur (IPCC, 2018), for example, loss of the forest and disaster-prone villages (Suriyani, 2021), illegal logging and flooding (Chandra, 2019; 2021), and coal which a hostage village in Indonesia (Syahni, 2021). All the issues raised are efforts to send a signal to the Indonesian public that various environmental crises, both global and national. It ought to be enough for the ecological citizenship dimension existence, which is to complement ‘civic virtue’ with the quality of knowledge, awareness, and positive action of citizens.

A number of students from various disciplines have shared in the research and more or less provided an overview of their knowledge, awareness, and experience of citizenship. However, enthusiasm shows a serious gap between understanding and participation. No specific involvement shows a significant influence from the discourses of global citizenship and ecology as that makes up a special experience of the respondents. The average answer is close to each other in linguistic preferences based on the choice of words, phrases, or sentences. The language repeatedly used also alternates from them all cognitive responses such as awareness and concern for the environment, planting trees, guarding and protecting the forest, not
torturing and killing animals, or rejecting the trade in the wild animal.

Only a few principally oriented also participate and consistently follow the social-environment movement, environmental-based community organizations, similar institutions, NGOs, and other communities. Both local and global have an intense, hands-on, and active focus on field practice. The quality of the answers is minimal, not correlated with experience, vague, and sometimes misunderstanding. It is found in almost all cognitive responses of respondents in sessions and categories, disciplines, and majors. At least 28 people from 60 samples of CCE students do not have interest and knowledge, are indifferent, or at least pay less attention to issues, materials, and developments in citizenship discourse.

While the remaining 32 people mostly have a priori interest but have no experience of involvement in any environmental activities. A small number of the PTE population comments on the more exciting experience; 13 out of 20 people are at least involved in various environmental activities. Be affiliated with various ecological movements, both members and initiators actively carry out environmental conservation, green socialization, reporting and publication of news containing environmental destruction, either by the community, corporations, or the state, such as disputes over land and customary forests, over-exploitation of resources, refusal of mining, demonstrations against the government’s policies on the environment, and encouraging efforts to legislate laws governing environmental rights policies. A little information from a small number of individuals about their activities illustrates the ecological citizenship represented by some Elementary School Teacher Education (PGSD) students. At least these results are good enough to ensure the influence of the discourse.

Although explicit, in the research, there are no or very few students who have real experience as a reference for the practice of creating new etymological prototypes, which refer to concrete forms and can be referred to as models of ecological citizenship, such as ‘City-based citizenship or City-zenship’ in terms of Barak (2020). Ecological democracy by Baber and Bartlett (2019) and Takacs (2020), as well as the narrative and use of similar terms, such as citizen science and ecological democracy from Peters (2020), also its relation to the offer of radical democracy by Dirik (2021) to increase awareness and sensibility to various issues of citizenship including ‘stateless citizenship’. However, the gradual novelty of the research will open a discussion about the discourse of global and ecological citizenship, as well as its influence in Indonesia and how all of these things might intersect and attract attention.

It is maneuvering in an overlapping area about the influence of the development of global and ecological citizenship discourse in Indonesia and its relation to various theoretical predictions from analytical and critical studies of academics, both to build antitheses and speculative efforts to avoid contradictions or even as political intrigue. The research tries to go beyond the possibility of the efforts made by Suša (2019), which narratively tries to synthesize collaboration between global citizenship education and education for sustainable development in the focus of Khoo and Jørgensen (2021) analysis, which rests on meta-conceptualization Sund and Pashby (2020) with a counter-narrative in the critical tendencies towards the typology of global citizenship education which is evolving from Pashby et al. (2020) where is it based critique of global citizenship education ideology from Pais and Costa (2020) with the support of the heuristic framework and the cartographic model design of Andreotti et al. (2016).

CONCLUSIONS

The research discusses various cognitive responses of students about civic experience based on their knowledge, awareness, and concrete practice. It has been descriptively, providing an illustration that the development of global and ecological citizenship discourse has not received significant attention and impact in the discourse of Civic Education in Indonesia. Within certain limits, the experience of citizenship in Indonesia is only interpreted in the domain of character education in general and morals in particular which appear to be more dominant. The ecological dimension is a variable that is less or not closely related to all other dimensions in their citizens’ experience and life as one of the ‘civic virtues’ that underlies the knowledge, awareness, and actions of citizens in economic, social, and political.
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