

# Chapter 2

## Rethinking Global Education in the Twenty-first Century

Sadiq A. Abdullahi

### 2.1 Global Pedagogy

One of the main goals of global education is to develop in students the knowledge, skills, and attitudes for effective national and global citizenship (Zajda et al. 2009). Other goals include developing students' capability to act responsibly and contribute productively in the global community. The central objectives are to prepare and develop students to (a) understand multiple perspectives and demonstrate knowledge of different cultural understanding (beliefs, values, perspectives, practices, and products); (b) understand similarities and differences in peoples, cultures, and nations; (c) demonstrate knowledge of global dynamics, issues, problems, trends, and systems; (d) demonstrate the capacity to think, write, reflect, and articulate issues, problems, and ideas from historical, philosophical, sociological, psychological, and global comparative context; and (e) develop and demonstrate the ability to make decision and apply knowledge of global education to solve problems in the global community (Abdullahi 2004; Zajda 2005; Zajda 2010a; Zajda and Rust 2009).

In the twentieth century, global educators were faced with issues and problems emanating from the two great wars. Understanding conflicts is an important theme in global education. There are three broad categories of conflict: religious warfare, ethnic conflict, and conflicts that arose out of historical animosity between groups and individuals, such as resource demand or simple greed. For example, the ideological conflict between the USA and the Soviet Union over liberalism, communism, and fascism, and capitalism and democracy shifted emphasis to improving some aspects of the American education. During this conflict in 1957, the Soviet Union launched *Sputnik 1*. This suggested that the Soviets were winning the technological and military race conflict. Furthermore, in the 1960s, the struggle for civil and human rights and poverty control in the USA took on a global dimension as

---

S.A. Abdullahi (✉)  
Florida International University, Homestead Senior High School,  
2351 SE 12th Avenue, Homestead, FL 33035, USA  
e-mail: [abdullahis@dadeschools.net](mailto:abdullahis@dadeschools.net)

many countries in the developing world, particularly in Africa, fought and won political independence from European domination. As a consequence, many global educators were concerned about the implications for education everywhere.

In the twenty-first century, global educators deal with issues and problems caused by poverty, globalization, global terrorism, and human and ecological abuses. Observers of global events believe that the increase in social and political violence is a direct result of the perpetual neglect by the governments. Consider the situation in Africa. There are reports of high poverty and increase in malaria and AIDS cases in the western, eastern, and southern part of Africa. The ethnic and religious conflicts between Christians and Muslims, Hindus and Muslims, Hutus and Tutsis, blacks and Afrikaners are disturbing. Global educators are quick to make the case that a problem in one part of the world has the potential to affect other parts of the world. They argue that the world is interconnected and interdependent (see Zajda et al. 2008; Zajda 2010).

As a consequence, Merry Merryfield, one of the leading proponents of global education, called on social-studies global educators to move beyond the global education conceived in the twentieth century to a global education for a new world, a world characterized by globalization, global terrorism, human rights, and ecological abuses. The new framework must seriously consider how to develop a pedagogy that will be integrative and link language, religion, politics, economics, and legal systems to one universal mode transmitting learning and knowledge to future generations without seriously undermining national sovereignty and national identity.

### ***2.1.1 Historical Context***

Global education or international education is not a new phenomenon. Since 1918, there has been a need to establish international schools to deal with problems caused by World War I. World War I left an unparallel distribution of political and military power and economic imbalances in Europe. In 1945, after the end of World War II, there was an urgent need to educate the world, particularly after the creation of the United Nations in 1948 and the Declaration of Human Rights. In 1960, there was the emergence of the Cold War. The subsequent collapse of the Cold War led to the conceptualization of a global education within the context of citizenship education in American public schools (Zajda and Daun 2009).

The global events of 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, such as the oil glut, the IMF/World Bank structural adjustment policies in the developing world, the integration of national economies, and globalization, ushered in a rethinking of the purpose and goals of education. However, in the 2000s, the global community has to confront the emergence of religious fundamentalism, corporate greed, human rights, and environmental abuses.

## 2.2 Global Education in American Schools

The introduction of global education in the American schools in the USA began with the publication of the Foreign Policy Association's report entitled *An Examination of Objectives and Priorities in International Education in U.S. Secondary Schools* in 1968. The publication paved the way for the conceptualization, design, and implementation of global education programs in teacher education and public schools. As a result, global teacher educators, such as Lee Anderson, Charlotte Anderson, John Goodlad, Robert Hanvey, Jan Tucker, Kenneth Tye, Steven Lamy, Merry Merryfield, Toni Kirkwood, and James Becker conceptualized, designed, and implemented global education programs for teacher education in the early 1970s. Their work was a response to changes in the world caused by political and economic forces. They believe that information and knowledge about the world should inform our collective minds, so that young people everywhere can better understand themselves and their role in the world relative to other people, cultures, and nations. Their ultimate goal is to see students become active participants in changing their communities and the world. They also believe that global education can be the mechanism for social and political change at the school level.

The integration of global education into the American schools has been slow and difficult. Tucker and Evans (1996) wrote that during the mid-1980s, some global education programs came under attack from every corner, including the Center for Teaching International Relations (CTIR), University of Denver. As a consequence, many colleges of education and school districts across the nation failed to endorse or promote global education. Even lessons learned from World War II and the end of the Cold War were not enough to sway people in the direction of promoting and developing global perspectives in American schools. There was the perception by the radical right wing that "global education is un-American and has a secular humanistic plot" (p. 193).

Two global education programs – the Iowa Global Education Association (IGEIA) program, which grew out of the model United Nations program in the early 1970s, and the Chadwick Alger's "*Columbus and the World, the World in Columbus*," were designed to supplement the teaching of citizenship education program. Citizenship education was the core organizing theme of social studies education in American schools at the elementary level. The pilot programs subsequently became the models for other global education programs.

### 2.2.1 Task Force for Global Education

In 1977, Ernest Boyer, United States Commissioner of Education, established a Task Force on Global Education to examine the national need for global perspectives in education. One of the findings was that there is a need for developing global

perspectives in American schools. In the 1980s, another Task Force of the United States Governors Association, chaired by former Governor of Arkansas and former president, William J. Clinton, was formed. One of the conclusions of the task force was that international education is as important as economic prosperity, national security, and world stability. The Task Force made seven recommendations:

1. International education must become a part of the basic education of all of our students
2. More of our students must gain proficiency in foreign languages
3. Teachers must know more about international issues
4. Schools and teachers need to know about the wealth of resources and materials, other than textbooks, that are available for international education
5. All graduates of our colleges and universities must be knowledgeable about the broader world and conversant in another language
6. Business and community support of international education should be increased
7. The business community must have access to international education, particularly information about exports, trade regulations, and overseas cultures (America in Transition 1989).

As a result of the declaration, colleges of education and school districts across the nation began to encourage the teaching of global education. Many global educators developed courses and applied for various types of state and federal grants. In 1981, the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), the leading professional organization for social-studies educators, issued policy position statements that urged schools to become effective agents of citizenship education for a global age. In 1982, the NCSS defined global education as “the efforts to cultivate in young people a perspective of the world, which emphasizes the interconnections among cultures, species, and the planet (p. 1).” The NCSS recommended that social-studies curricula should emphasize:

1. Globalization of the human experience
2. Individuals, non-state groups, such as multinational corporations, churches, and scientific organizations, as well as local governments and national leaders
3. People and the environment
4. Linkages between past and present social, political, economic, and ecological realities and alternatives futures and
5. All people making choices in the ways in which they participate in world affairs.

Since the 1981 NCSS declaration, past presidents have urged social-studies global educators to promote and advance the teaching of global education in colleges of education and American schools. For example, in 1983, NCSS President, Carole Hahn, challenged social-studies educators to prepare students to be both national citizens and citizens of the global society. In 1992, NCSS President, Charlotte Anderson, urged social-studies educators to help students understand and address global issues. She stressed that students need to learn from, and work collaboratively with, individuals representing diverse cultures, religions, and lifestyles in a spirit of mutual respect and open dialog.

In the 1990s, national professional organizations, such as the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education also issued position statements supporting global education in schools. Many state departments of education also issued mandates to school district to support and endorse the teaching of global perspectives in elementary and secondary schools. Wisconsin was one of the first state departments of education to promote international education. Other state departments beginning with those in Michigan, Ohio, New York, and Florida followed the suit. National and state agencies were immediately formed to design curriculum frameworks for global education. For example, in 1982, the Florida Department of Education accepted the Florida State Board of Education, a framework for developing global education programs at the local level.

### 2.3 Global Education

One of the fundamental goals of global education is to prepare students for responsible national and global citizenship in an increasingly interconnected and interdependent world. Developing students' global perspectives and cross-cultural sensitivity and understanding are the means that global educators use to achieve their goals.

Global education is the study of the interface of political, ecological, cultural, and economic systems in the world. Teacher educators have developed programs geared toward improving teachers' global thinking and global consciousness by developing global awareness programs through the expansion of social-studies curriculum with more content on Africa, Asia, Latin America, Europe, and the Middle East. Others have infused the voices of others in the curriculum (Kirkwood 1995; Merryfield 2001; Zajda 2010b; Zajda et al. 2008; Zajda, Biraimah & Gaudelli 2008; Zajda and Rust 2009).

Anderson (1991) argued that global teacher educators should prepare secondary social studies teachers to teach about issues and problems of the world, such as foreign policy, maintenance of national security, control of warfare, reduction of world poverty, promotion of human rights, and preservation of environment. Furthermore, Anderson argued that global educators at the secondary level should focus on expanding and improving the study of world history, world geography, world economics, world politics, or world ecology. Others seek to expand students' understanding of cultural diversity through the cross-cultural study of literature, art, music, dance, religion, and social customs. Many others seek to expand and improve the study of foreign languages, including the rarely studied languages that are of growing importance to the USA, such as Japanese, Chinese, Russian, and Arabic.

Still, many other global educators devote their energies to improving instruction about the other regions of the world such as Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America. Still others focus on improving education about world problems such as the maintenance of national security, the control of warfare, the reduction of world poverty, the promotion of human rights, and the preservation of ecological well-being.

Some seek to place the study of American society and its history in a world context so as to highlight the ways in which American cities, states, and the nation as a whole are linked to the rest of world (p. 13). With the emergence of twenty-first century issues and problems, global educators began to rethink global education for the new century. This was evidenced in national, regional, and international presentations at conferences on global and international education worldwide.

*Globalization.* Globalization has economic roots and political consequences. It also has implication for global pedagogy. How do we create and deliver instruction in the global pedagogical jargon that will bind and not divide people, cultures, and nations? Stromquist (2002) believes that global educators need to become highly conscious of the effects of globalization in shaping the contemporary world. The vision for the reconceptualization of the field for the new century should be guided by the idea of inclusion, diversity, and commonality. Although global issues, such as global warming, environmental pollution, population growth, hunger, refugees, poverty, conflicts, inflation, AIDS, etc., continued to form the content for global education, how teachers deliver the content becomes critical. However, topics such as uncensored information on the Internet, illegal drug trafficking, corporate greed and corruption, intolerance, and religious extremism allow social-studies teachers to frame controversial topics within the context of current events to discuss, analyze, evaluate, and predict future outcomes. Thus, content knowledge and content delivery have become an integral part of the rethinking process.

The problems of globalization in developing nations can also offer teachers and students the opportunity to analyze global issues and problems comparatively. The idea that the world has not only become an interdependent and interconnected global village, but also a stage for increasingly hostile and violent place where political and economic mismanagement and perpetual conflicts should be critically examined and analyzed. Global teacher educators understand that teachers and students must be active participants in addressing and resolving global problems.

## 2.4 Conceptualizing Global Education

Merry Merryfield (1997) believes that it is important to examine the work of several scholars when reconceptualizing what global education should look like in the twenty-first century. As the readers will see in the next section, there are different conceptualization models for global education. Some teacher education programs have used a specific framework, while others have adapted ideas from other scholars. The fundamental question in any reconceptualization process is the attempt to answer the *what, why, how, and when* questions of global education (Zajda 2005). The ultimate goal of global education is to have a student change his/her worldview, from negative to positive. For example, a white student in Alabama, USA, may view a black student in Zaria, Nigeria, favorably. With information and new knowledge, the student may change his or her negative cultural mindset. Developing a global perspective therefore becomes a critical part of teaching global education? Why do

global educators begin with clarifying what perspective consciousness is? Robert Hanvey provides an insight, and defines perspective consciousness as the “recognition or awareness on the part of the individual that he or she has a view of the world that is not universally shared, that this view of the world has been and continues to be shaped by influences that often escape conscious detection, and that others have views of the world that are profoundly different from one’s own” (Hanvey 1976).

## 2.5 Global Education: Structure and Design

Merry Merryfield (1997) believes that some global educators presume that a clear conceptualization, structure, and design are critical for successful dissemination and institutionalization of global education. There was consensus among global educators that the global education for the twentieth century has failed to achieve its intended outcome. For example, in the 1980s, the National Governors Association reported that there was inadequate teacher preparation in global education and international studies. As a result, the USA is failing to meet the economic, political, and social challenges of today’s world.

In 1988, the Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State University and Land Grant Colleges issued a document titled *The Purposes of American Education Today: Conceptions of Schooling*, in which the Association outlined the vision and objectives for teacher education that failed to represent a global vision. The document asserted that schools must (a) emphasize on the acquisition of basic, traditional subject matter skills, (b) provide a humane environment, (c) provide modern technology, (d) provide a pedagogy to accompany modern technology, (e) acknowledge that teachers are critically important, (f) collaborate and form partnership with the lower schools, (g) cultivate rigor and optimism in students, (h) develop aesthetic and affective domain in young people, and finally, (i) be inclusive of all students. However, the Association failed to assert that schools of education should develop a global-education curriculum that will prepare preservice teachers to be active leaders in teaching and promoting global education.

Despite the lack of support from the Association, which was made up of deans of schools and colleges of education, global teacher educators developed programs and competed against other academic programs within the college. At the public schools level, the primary responsibility of teaching global education lies with secondary social studies teachers, many of whom simply infuse global education content in their curriculum.

## 2.6 Global Education Curriculum

The global education curriculum has been shaped by the early global educators, many of whom have offered different versions of global education in the 1970s. Individuals like Robert Hanvey, Chad Alger, James Becker, Lee Anderson, Steven



Lamy, Willard Kniep, Roland Case, Charlotte Anderson, Jan Tucker, and Merry Merryfield have advanced different models of global education.

### 2.6.1 *Global Education Models*

The Florida International University's social studies/global education program has used the Robert Hanvey framework to teach global education. The framework has been outlined in his seminal paper, *An Attainable Global Perspective* (1976), in which he outlined five interdisciplinary and interconnected dimensions of global education: (a) perspective consciousness, (b) state-of-the-planet awareness, (c) cross-cultural awareness, (d) awareness of global dynamics, and (e) awareness of human choices.

The Chad Alger framework has been captured in his work at the Mershon Center's *Columbus and the World* program that focused on real-life connections between Columbus, Ohio, and the rest of the world. Many teachers, teacher educators, and state departments of education have adopted this framework. In 1986, Alger and Jim Harf presented five basic themes for global education: values, transaction, actors, procedures and mechanisms, and issues.

The James Becker framework focuses on a world-centered, global approach versus teaching that is nationalistic or regional. He emphasized the holistic approaches to global education, which bridge several disciplines. He provided teachers with multiple avenues for conceptualizing how global education can be infused into social studies.

The Willard Kniep framework offers the curricular dimensions for global education. Kniep's dimension include: (a) universal and diverse human values and cultures, (b) global systems (economic, political, technological, ecological), (c) persistent global problems and issues (peace and security, development, environmental, human rights), and (d) global history.

The Roland Case framework builds on Hanvey and Kniep conceptual frameworks. Case (1991) believes that global perspectives should have a substantive and perceptual dimension. In the substantive dimension, he argues that knowledge of the various features of the world and the way they work should be emphasized to improve students' cognitive development. Teachers should promote knowledge of people and places beyond the student's own community and country, and knowledge of events and issues beyond the local and immediate environment. In the perceptual dimension, Case believes that teachers should encourage students to use the substantive global knowledge as a lens with which they can focus their discussion of controversial global issues, so that the students can learn to be open-minded. Case's differentiation of the substantive and the perceptual stresses open-mindedness, anticipation of complexity, resistance to stereotyping, inclination to empathize, and nonchauvinism.

The Charlotte Anderson framework, mainly designed for elementary schools include the following: (a) you are a human being, (b) your home is planet Earth,



(c) you are a citizen of a multicultural society, and (d) you live in an interrelated world. Global education curriculum offers scope and sequence for developing global perspectives. According to Lamy (1991), a successful global education program should have the following: (a) should introduce teachers to substantive and verifiable information, (b) courses or programs should provide teachers with opportunities to explore the core assumptions and values, (c) prepare students for the future by introducing them to a wide range of analytical, interpretive, and evaluative skills, and (d) must introduce students to strategies for participation and involvement in local, national, and international affairs.

Diaz et al. (1999) believe that global education should be organized in two fundamental ways. The first is the discrete approach. They believe that the discrete approach consists of (a) creation of a separate unit or separate course. They argue that one of the disadvantages of creating a separate unit is that students may or may not make the connection to global knowledge and to the rest of the curriculum.

The other approach is the infusion approach. This approach enables a social-studies teacher to integrate global content and information into his or her instruction, using current local, state, national, and international issues. They argue that issues in global education are better explored using the infusion approach. They also argue that the infusion approach may pose some difficulties for teachers, because some of them may lack the global knowledge and pedagogy necessary to teach global education. They recommend that global education curriculum should include (a) the teachers' awareness of the attitudes toward global education, which are present in the schools and communities, where they teach and (b) teachers' awareness and use of the different global education models. Both the approaches offer the students the opportunity to learn about the world. Many school districts in America encourage the infusion model. There are cases wherein, an International Business (IB), a magnet program offers global education as a discrete course. The next section provides concrete examples and illustrations of how global education can be taught using a global education framework.

Other global educators, such as Toni Kirkwood (1995) have written that global education is designed to expand an individual's perception of the world. Students with a global perspective are sensitive to the multicultural, bilingual, multilingual, and transnational nature of the human condition. She argues that students should exhibit an intellectual curiosity about the world that transcends local, national, and regional boundaries. Merryfield (1997) believes that global education curriculum should have the following elements: (a) human beliefs and values, (b) global systems, (c) global issues and problems, (d) global history, (e) cross-cultural understanding and interaction, (f) awareness of human choices, (g) development of analytical and evaluative skills, and (h) strategies for participation and involvement. Merryfield (2001) believes that the center of global education should include multiple voices, moving away from Euro-centric, imperial worldviews that divide the world, toward a global-centric and cross-cultural worldview that unites the world. Moreover, Merryfield suggests that there is a need to reexamine what global knowledge the teachers have and how they teach in the classroom.

Furthermore, believe that a global-education curriculum should select content that establishes linkages between various interacting global systems. They argue that global content should reflect the fact that all global issues, such as environment, political economy, sustainable development, world economy, and security are closely interrelated and interconnected. The American Forum for Global Education (2002) also supports the structuring of global education curricula in American schools to include (a) conflicts, (b) economic systems, (c) global belief systems, (d) human rights, (d) planet management and empowerment, (e) political systems, (f) population, (g) race and ethnicity, (h) technocratic revolution, and (i) sustainable development. Tonkin (2002) maintains that a global-education curriculum will become significant when global issues, problems, and challenges become relevant to the lives of teachers and students.

## 2.7 Examples of Classroom Implementation

Robert Hanvey's Global Education framework has been used for teaching a course called *Developing Global Perspective* at the college level. At the secondary level, the global content across the two disciplines, America Government and Economics, has been included. The infusion approach is highly recommended at the secondary level, and other approaches could also be considered.

### 2.7.1 Global Pedagogy

The social-studies teachers who participated in this study were observed for 3 months at different high schools in Miami-Dade County Public Schools. According to Grossman (1998), in an authentic global classroom, global educators must provide an environment for "authentic" learning experiences. In an authentic classroom, a lesson must allow for higher order thinking, depth of knowledge, substantive conversation, and connections to the world beyond the classroom. Massialas (1996) suggested that global curriculum should be organized around the following criteria: (a) relevance, (b) reflection, (c) action, (d) practicality, and (e) depth of understanding (Diaz et al. 1999). The Hanvey (1976) global education five dimensions help global educators to sort information into manageable categories for an authentic discussion in the classroom.

The first dimension is *Perspective Consciousness*. In this dimension, the teacher will use instructional strategies, such as discussion of multiple perspectives concerning ideas and issues, simulations on perceptions of different societal norms and practices, differentiation between prejudice and discrimination, values clarification, causes and consequences of stereotyping, and the importance of respecting others with different orientations. Abdullahi (2004) observed that teachers used critical analyses of print and nonprint resources, identification of global events, issues,

and problems, and examination of the effects of world conditions to address *state-of-the-planet awareness*, or Hanvey's dimension 1. A teacher should include discussion of multiple perspectives concerning ideas and issues, and simulations on the perceptions of different societal norms and practices.

The second dimension is the *State-of-the-Planet Awareness*. In this dimension, a teacher should include critical analysis of print and nonprint resources, identification of global issues and their impact, examination of the effects of world conditions on the students' lives and community, and mapping of cultural, physical, and interdependent regional characteristics.

The third dimension is *Awareness of Global Dynamics*. In this dimension, a teacher uses a comparative study of cultures, role-playing, and storytelling; inquiry into cultural borrowing, cultural diffusion, and their effects on people and nations; emphasis on the commonalities rather than the differences in the cultures; and development of tolerance and empathy.

The fourth dimension is *Cross-Cultural Awareness*. A teacher uses cross-cultural understanding and interaction, open-mindedness, interdependence, interconnectedness, anticipation of global complexity, and resistance to stereotyping, to help a student develop cultural sensitivity and understanding. A teacher differentiates between prejudice and discrimination, values clarification, causes and consequences of stereotyping and scapegoat, and the importance of respecting others with different orientations. A teacher should include strategies that demonstrate systems-thinking, cultural, economic, ecological, political, social, and technological interdependence among the nations, and identification of reciprocal linkages of people and nations to local communities.

The fifth dimension is *Awareness of Human Choices*. In this dimension, a teacher uses comparative study of different cultures, examination of cultural, economic, ecological, political, social, and technological interdependence among the nations, and inquiry into the decisions and choices that individuals, groups, and nations make to shape the world. A teacher should include inquiry into the choices that individuals, groups, and nations make, which influence the future of the world, identify, plan, and implement a community project of local and global implications, and connect electronically with peers worldwide to share concerns and propose solutions to global problems.

## 2.8 Conclusion

The global village is upon us. The twenty-first century is approaching the first quarter. Foreign policies, economic cooperation, and education policy reforms around the world promote national interests. Globalization has economic, political, and educational consequences (Zajda and Rust 2009). Global educators and social-studies teachers, in particular, must revise global education for the twenty-first century. Global education offers the promise and hope for a world desperately in search for answers to global problems.

## References

- Abdullahi, S. A. (2004). *Teachers' knowledge, awareness, and pedagogy of global education in secondary schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida International University, Miami, FL.
- America in transition: International frontier (1989). *Report of the task force on international education*. Washington, DC: National Governors Association.
- Case, R. (1991). Key elements of a global perspective. *Social Education*, 57, 318–325.
- Diaz, C., Massialas, B. G., & Xanthopoulos, G. (1999). *Global perspectives for educators*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- American Forum for Global Education (2002). *Annual report*. New York: American Forum for Global Education.
- Hanvey, R. (1976). *An attainable global perspective*. New York: Center for Global Perspectives.
- Kirkwood, T. F. (1995). *Teaching from a global perspective: a case study of three high school social studies teachers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida International University, Miami, FL.
- Lamy, S. L. (1991). Global education: A conflict of images. In K. A. Tye (Ed.), *Global education: From thought to action* (pp. 49–63). Alexandria, VA: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Merryfield, M. (2001). Moving the center of global education: From imperial worldviews that divide the world to double consciousness, contrapuntal pedagogy, hybridist, and cross-cultural competence. In B. W. Stanley (Ed.), *Critical issues in social studies for the 21st century* (pp. 179–208). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Stromquist, N. P. (2002). *Education in a globalized world: the connectivity of economic power, technology and knowledge*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Tucker, J. L., & Evans, A. M. (1996). Crucial issues in teaching social studies K-12. In B. G. Massialas & R. F. Allen (Eds.), *Critical issues in teaching social studies K-12* (pp. 181–209). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Zajda, J. (2005). *The international handbook of globalisation, education and policy research*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Zajda, J. (Ed.). (2010a). *Global pedagogies*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Zajda, J. (Ed.). (2010b). *Globalization, education and social justice*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Zajda, J., & Daun, H. (Eds.). (2009). *Global values education: Teaching democracy and peace*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Zajda, J., & Rust, V. (2009). *Globalisation, policy and comparative research: Discourses of globalisation*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Zajda, J., Biraimah, B., & Gaudelli, W. (2008). (Eds.). *Education and social inequality in the global culture*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Zajda, J., Daun, H., & Saha, L. (2009). *Nation-building, identity and citizenship education: Cross-cultural perspectives*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Zajda, J., Davies, L., & Majhanovich, S. (Eds.). (2008). *Comparative and global pedagogies: Equity, access and democracy in education*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.



<http://www.springer.com/978-90-481-3616-2>

Global Pedagogies

Schooling for the Future

Zajda, J. (Ed.)

2010, XXII, 208 p., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-90-481-3616-2