

Chapter 2

Challenges and Opportunities: Resocialization as a Framework for Global Citizenship Education

Anatoli Rapoport

Citizenship and the Challenge of Globalization

Historically, citizenship evolved into a concept that expanded well beyond its primary meaning. As an increasingly contested construct, citizenship is placed at the center of political, ideological, and cultural debates. This is because citizenship is seen as a virtue that can be actively practiced by society members to resist increasing political apathy and indifference among voters, because it is the measure that helps exercise individual rights against a well visible hand of government, and because citizenship is perceived as a means of minority struggle to achieve desirable equality and status. Citizenship is a multifaceted multifunctional construct that is difficult to define in a traditional manner. Marshall's (1950) theory of historical progression of citizenship based on the development of civil, political, and social rights well describes the chronological development of the concept, but it is no longer sufficient to encompass all aspects and characteristics of citizenship as it is understood in the twenty-first century. Marshall's theory has been challenged by a rising number of competing models of citizenship (Carter 2006) that are usually conceptualized and interpreted through various discourses.

The discursive framework-based approach, in which the model of citizenship is determined by both context and involved agents (Abowitz and Harnish 2006), has become a primary systemic instrument in citizenship model classification. Until recently, at least one aspect of citizenship was almost universally accepted: citizenship has been interpreted through an individual relationship with a nation state when loyalty to the state and building a common identity were at the core of citizenship education (Lawson and Scott 2002). To be a citizen implied that a person, at a

A. Rapoport (✉)
Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Purdue University,
West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA
e-mail: rapoport@purdue.edu

minimum, had a number of responsibilities to the state and to other members of the community and, at the same time, enjoyed rights that the state awarded him or her as compensation for fulfilling their responsibilities. The raising wave of globalization and unification profoundly influenced the very notion of citizenship by not only infusing a more distinct global perspective but also by challenging the core principles and foundations of citizenship as idiosyncratically nation or nation-state related concepts. For more and more people globalization is a fact, elusive but real. Everyone is affected by it and everyone has their strong opinion about it: it is either beneficial because it helps connect people, creates more wealth, expands boundaries of human knowledge, and helps in protecting basic human rights; or damaging because it ruins traditional relationships and values, redistributes wealth, and harms environment. However, for the majority, globalization is associated with further modernization and economic development and there is a consensus that it cannot be stopped. Whether or not the predominant orientation to globalization is positive or negative, everyone understands that from now on we have to prepare our children to live in an increasingly interconnected globalized society. Joseph Zajda (2009) argues that judging by the amount of knowledge generated due to globalization and by its effect on societies and educational institutions, “nation states ...are likely to lose their power and capacity to affect their future directions, as the struggle for knowledge domination, production, and dissemination becomes a new form of cultural domination, and a knowledge- and technology-driven social stratification” (p. 18). The areas of rights, responsibilities, duties, or privileges are expanding and multiplying so that an individual’s expectation of loyalty, commitment, and belonging is no longer limited to a living place or nation but also comes from a sense of belonging to a more expanded community, to the world (McIntosh 2005). This expanded model of citizenship is increasingly becoming a center of scholars’ attention. In turn, it has come to be seen as an umbrella model for several sub-models: global citizenship, cosmopolitan citizenship, supra-national citizenship, or transnational citizenship.

Is Global Citizenship Real?

Social science scholars and the corporate world have been discussing the global citizenship phenomenon for a long time. However, it is necessary to note that this concept is still not universally accepted. School practitioners are not very vocal about it. We hear much about global aspects of citizenship at conferences but not in classrooms. What makes the concept of global citizenship so controversial? Much of the criticism is related to its social and political aspects. Wood (2008) denounces global citizenship because citizenship is a technology of governance rather than “an unambiguously emancipatory, empowering institution” (p. 25) and there are no formal political structures at the global level that citizenship could be a part of. An absence of relevant global institutions together with disbelief in global ethics or in the role of an individual in global affairs is the primary reasons why people are

skeptical of global citizenship. Scholars explain the difficulty to define global citizenship by pointing out that there is no global government to which we owe allegiance and there are no international laws that are enacted without nations' endorsement (Dower 2003; Noddings 2005). We cannot use a traditional technical definition of citizenship to describe global citizenship, for there is no global government that defines the status of a global citizen. However, many theorists do not consider the absence of a global governing body a serious obstacle for global citizenship because it simply shifts the focus from law to politics (Delanty 2002). To avoid the "global government" problem, some authors suggest an associational approach (Lagos 2002; Steenbergen 1994) in which global citizenship is not defined by legal bureaucratic sanctions but by individuals' associations with the place or polity where they reside, work, or spend time. The European Union is an example of such an association. The emerging global civil society faces several accusations itself: that it is terminologically ambiguous, that its supporters uncritically apply nation-state phenomena to global processes, and that it undermines democracy by weakening the democratic institutions of nation-states (Corry 2006). Armstrong (2006) argues that the supposedly "global" elements of global citizenship are much less universal and transcendent. Miller (in Carter 2006, p. 5) calls the idea of global citizenship utopian because "the conditions for global citizenship do not exist and the term is therefore at best metaphorical." Although the role of the nation-state in citizenship education is constantly changing as a consequence of both sub-national and supra-national forces (Barr 2005; Ramirez 1997), the potentially pervasive role of the nation-state in the construction of global citizenship remains problematic due to unresolved tensions in cultural and value-oriented perspectives between Western and non-Western countries (White and Openshaw 2002).

Another reason for debates, mostly theoretical, about global citizenship is the absence of consensus of what global citizenship entails. Most authors identify several factors that cause an increased interest in supra-national models of citizenship and consequent changes in citizenship education. The most noticeable among them are globalization, increasing cultural and social diversity, erosion of traditional nation-state related models of citizenship, creation of supra-national governing bodies, codification of international human rights, proliferation of transnational non-governmental organizations, and the rise of such phenomena as global ethics, global consciousness, and global law, to name a few (Banks 2004; Dower 2003; Gaudelli 2009; Myers 2006; Stromquist 2009). Noddings (2005) suggests that global citizen is the one who is concerned with the welfare of a nation, region, or globe; concerned with the well-being of particular physical places; who is interested in social as well as economic justice; and who supports world peace. McIntosh (2005) proposes a more emotional definition that involves affection, respect, care, curiosity, and concern for well-being of all living beings. She associates global citizenship with habits and capacities of mind, heart, body, and soul that "have to do with working for and preserving a network of relationship and connection across lines of difference and distinctness, while keeping and deepening a sense of one's own identity and integrity" (p. 23). Dower (2003) argues that the status of a global citizen is made up of three components: (a) normative – as global citizens, we have certain duties that

extend to all human beings; (b) existential – we all are members of the global community, whether institutional or quasi-political in character; (c) aspirational – as global citizens, we expect basic values to be realized more fully that requires strengthening communities, institutions, and legal frameworks. The idea of global citizenship is the general notion that human beings are citizens of the world; that we are members of the wider community of humanity, going beyond the scope of the nation-state and exhibiting some form or amount of identity, loyalty, or commitment (Dower and Williams 2002). However, precisely what global citizenship means is a matter of debate as is whether we are or should be global citizens (Dower and Williams 2002; Abowitz and Harnish 2006). Pike (2008) rightly asserted that the “challenge for global citizenship education appears to lie more in the interpretation of, and justification for, its central concept” (p. 473).

Although the term global citizen is relatively new, the idea that it represents has occupied minds for centuries. Like any big idea, global citizenship is ostensibly interpreted by people differently due to people’s own ideologies and contexts. Thus, a discourse, as a primary locus where ideology, language, and context intersect and where meanings are negotiated and crystallized, becomes a space in which to look for definitions. Discursive typologization is helpful in that it avoids one-dimensional definitions and describes global citizenship as a multifaceted concept. Stromquist (2009) organized her typology around major features of the global model of citizenship that include: (a) proponents, (b) fundamental perspective, (c) key objectives, (d) driving forces, (e) values, (f) governance, and (g) beneficiaries. According to Stromquist (2009), the four discourses that help understand those features are:

- World Culture. This discourse is based on sociological perspectives and holds that a global culture is emerging characterized by diversity as well as ubiquitous recognition of human rights.
- New-Era Realism. Based on political perspectives, this discourse is formed by the idea that global citizenship is a hegemonic attempt of a few world players, particularly the United States, to create a world order to mask their self-interests.
- Corporate Citizenship. This discourse, based on economic perspectives, posits corporations as new world citizens that do not respect national borders, whose “transnational liberalism is sponsored by governing elites and informed by principles of trade liberalization and corporative advantage” (p. 13).
- Planetary Vessel. This discourse, stemming from grassroots groups, acknowledges concern for universal human rights and recognizes new global problems that transcend national borders, such as environment, health, sustainability, peace, and security.

Gaudelli (2009) employed heuristics to define five different discourses of global citizenship: (a) neoliberal, where a global citizen is still affiliated nationally but is governed by a universal market conception; (b) national, where civic identity is a social compact between the nation and the citizen; (c) Marxist, which bases global citizenship on class, primarily proletarian, collectives that transcend national

borders; (d) world justice and governance that rationalizes global citizenship through global human rights, international law, and global civil society; and (e) cosmopolitan, whose framework of global citizenship includes matters of value, morality, and humane treatment.

So, is global citizenship a utopian theory, a phantom, a theoretical construct existing only in the minds of theoreticians, or a real status that all humans can enjoy? On the one hand, citizenship as a form of membership possesses such a feature as exclusiveness – one is excluded from a traditionally understood citizenship “club” if he or she does not possess attributes artificially constructed by “club management.” This archaic hegemonic idea of exclusiveness served well in the times of the emergence of new nations and new nation-states. On the other hand, as citizenship increasingly comes to be understood as shared rights, both human and civil, that all individuals should enjoy; as shared responsibilities of all human beings for survival of the planet, a clean environment, and a sustainable future; and as a collection of ethical principles and values that all humans embrace regardless of their cultural, ethnic, or religious backgrounds, the idea of citizenship that is shared and acknowledged by all humans is gaining strength. It is possible to say that the global citizenship model emulates many national citizenship models in which people acquire citizenship status automatically by the virtue of the circumstances of their birth. For example, all those born in the United States are automatically US citizens, but it is the task of the society (parents, school, institutions) to fully socialize a legal citizen into a *national* citizen. Following this logic, all human beings are legal global citizens by birth, and it is the task of the society to fully socialize them into *global* citizens, or, in other words, to make them aware of their global citizenship status. In general, the problem of global citizenship is no longer whether or not it exists but rather how citizens should exercise their global status. This problem can be rephrased in the following way: What should parents, schools, and institutions do to help young people become aware of their status as not only local or national citizens but also as global citizens and particularly, how can we make all people, young and old alike, active global citizens?

Since the 1990s, many in developing countries have viewed globalization as a new hegemonic endeavor, as a new attempt of “encroaching imperialism” of the West, to re-colonize the world. In our metaphorically determined world, globalization for many in developing countries has become a symbol of poverty, injustice, and cultural degradation, and so has the West that epitomizes this global phenomenon (Lal 2004; Stromquist 2009). Gradually, globalization has become synonymous to Westernization and Americanization. Like all paradigmatic changes of such scale, globalization is a very controversial and ambiguous process that has both advantages and disadvantages. For example, questionable international policy of the United States, immediately linked by some shrewd politicians to the outcomes of globalization, contributed to the negative image of both the United States and globalization. Ironically, unlike in Canada, or Great Britain, or Australia globalization in the United States, where the traditions of isolationism are still strong, is perceived by many, mostly in conservative circles, as a conspiracy launched by some mythical

world government, usually personified by the United Nations, against core American values. Myers (2006) noted that the paradox of globalization in the United States is that people fear the same threat that the rest of the world blames Americans for: that globalization “is causing us to lose our national identity and the ‘American way of life,’ and that regional free-trade pacts are eliminating local jobs” (p. 371). As a result, the complex, ambiguous, controversial, and provocative concept of globalization is either ignored in many US schools or presented solely through the economic interdependence framework. Teachers are sometimes instructed not to touch upon the concept of globalization due mostly to its controversial nature (Rapoport 2010). It is not surprising, therefore, that by 2009 globalization was mentioned in the social studies standards of only 15 states (Rapoport 2009). However, in most recently revised and updated social studies standards, globalization is presented both as an economic concept and as a more ubiquitous and nuanced phenomenon, which is a promising sign.

The obstacles to global citizenship and global citizenship education described earlier are the result of general ideological and cultural realities and tensions in the society. Globalization that deeply influenced the school reform development unexpectedly generated new discourses and discovered a never-seen-before multiplicity of truth. Debates about globalization, curriculum, and pedagogy magnified through the metaphorically constructed reality, revealed the centrality of properly negotiated terms and meanings as well as the importance of culture, both political and imaginary-traditional, or the lack thereof in our understanding of citizenship. The routine of permanency particularly for the traditionalistic societies, turned into the chaos “of the centrifugal proliferation of interpretation and genres” overnight (Matus and McCarthy 2003). Suddenly, people discovered that the world was no longer monochromic, and even more disturbing was the fact that it had never been monochromic. Therefore, survival in this new era required people to acquire new knowledge, to learn and to practice new skills, and to carefully reexamine their values. The most challenging curricular task in this new environment was to develop the ability to deconstruct previously unquestioned assumptions (Smith 2003) in order to reconstruct and eventually to renegotiate newly contextualized meanings. Together with pro-global forces, a number of extra-systemic contextual elements are a part of a macro level system (Bronfenbrenner 1979) that directly influences education. However, various intro-systemic factors within education potentially hold back the development of global citizenship education in schools. Among those intra-educational obstacles are a lack of pre-service teacher preparation, insufficient curricular and methodological guidance, a lack of interest in and sometimes intentional ignoring of global education among legislators, and an absence of citizenship-related topics at global-themed teacher professional development seminars. Research conducted among pre-service and in-service teachers demonstrates that teachers are usually oblivious about curricular content materials or instructional strategies related to global citizenship or other supra-national models of citizenship (Gallavan 2008; Gaudelli 2009; Myers 2006; Rapoport 2010; Robbins et al. 2003; Yamashita 2006).

Resocialization as a Possible Framework for Global Citizenship Education

Citizenship education is not only confined in school or other institutes of formal education. Citizenship education is a result of multiple influences and school is only one of them. Parents, peers, culture, media, literature, everything that Bronfenbrenner called human ecology are explicit and implicit sources of citizenship education. Our perception of citizenship is nation-centered. We were “born” this way. It is simply difficult to comprehend that citizenship can be anything but a nation-centered phenomenon. The centuries of nation-centered hegemony convinced individuals that the nation state is the only protector and in order to return the favor, individuals should pay respect to this common geographic space by volunteering to abide by the rules allegedly created to keep this space in order. Expanding global processes, or what is routinely called globalization, have changed our perception of stability, protection, or belonging. More and more people begin to realize that even the most powerful nation states are no longer sole repositories or sources of protection, or wealth, or stability, and consequently the idea of belonging shifts too. Citizens of nation X wear clothes from nation A, keep money in nation B, use oil from nation C, adore music from nation D, and expect protection from both internal and external enemies from nations E, F, and G. Nation state is no longer a sole protector of an individual, on the contrary, global community through its agencies or through the formation of public opinion becomes a universal protector of rights and freedoms.

Thus national citizenship, particularly in its traditional legalistic meaning, is becoming an instrument of a nation state, or to be precise, national elites, to convince its inhabitants that contractual relations with the given system within a given geographic space is the only valid guardian against outsiders. In this game of created reality, two other phantoms, patriotism and nationalism, whose reinvented versions manifest themselves in nation building and citizenship education (Zajda 2009, 2015a), play a very ambiguous but extremely important role. These two constructs have been increasingly used as a counterpoint to globalization, as the most powerful tool for particularists and conservative antiglobalists. Originally, patriotism and, to a lesser extent, nationalism were created to linguistically solidify a natural attachment of an individual to his or her place of birth or extended family; but centuries eventually turned them into effective tools of hegemonic social and political oppressions (Apple 2002; Gomberg 1990; Sperling 2003).

If we are so dependent of other nations, why are we so persistent in the idea that we are still citizens of nation X? Exactly because we were “born” and socialized this way. It is interesting that the term citizenship education in some languages can be translated also as citizenship upbringing. This demonstrates a natural inseparable link between citizenship education and socialization. Socialization is a broader concept, which is seen as the process of acquiring norms of behavior accepted in the society, and as an ongoing developmental process to acquire and internalize basic knowledge, values, beliefs, and relevant skills. Political socialization, as a component of general socialization, results in acquiring knowledge about the political

system and how it works. Individuals internalize the society's political value system and ideology and come to understand its symbols and rituals. They become informed about the role of active and passive members of the polity, and may participate in political and civic life (Owen 2008). Although socialization through its agents, such as family, school, or other institutions, constructs and reconstructs identities both locally and globally (Kiwako Okuma-Nyström 2009; Zajda 2009, 2015b), it still remains a predominantly local area-centered and nation-centered phenomenon. Socialization has been nation-centered probably since the emergence of nations and later nation states.

Vigorous debates about the essence of global citizenship, its curricular content, and pedagogical implementation, leave little space in our highly compartmentalized system of education for a basic question: Where does global citizenship education belong? We routinely say that socialization and citizenship education are multi-component systems that involve a number of agencies – the government, community, media, parents, peers, and school – which all have their share in socializing a child, in making a child a responsible and informed citizen. However, who particularly should be doing the work? Which agency is best equipped to provide conditions, space, and guidance for developing knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to educate globally minded citizens? Observers record the increasing influence of a family, which is the primary agent of socialization, on what can be called socialization for global citizenship (Myers-Walls 2001; Flanagan 2001). At the same time, the role of a family as a provider of socialization for global citizenship is ambiguous. Families appreciate the importance of peace, equality, clean environment, and justice. Many families educate their children to respect and value these global phenomena. At the same time, families fight for particular issues in their own best interests, usually defined in local terms. On the one hand, families would demonstrate the need to fight poverty in developing countries and support their development economically; on the other hand, the same families may support tougher restrictions for immigrants who, as they erroneously believe, threaten their economic and social wellbeing (Somlai 2001).

Unlike families, schools are better equipped for bringing up and educating children in the idea of global citizenship. It seems that school can play the leading role in the process of preparation of the youth for global citizenship, as school is designed to reflect on and to react to emerging challenges, particularly cultural, social, or ideological. It is not surprising that yet in 1967, Hess and Torney categorically concluded that, for example in the United States, the “public school is the most important and effective instrument of political socialization” (p. 5). It remains to be seen whether the reaction of many schools is timely and adequate, the public and educators themselves are often skeptical about it. Nevertheless, school remains the core element of the citizenship education network. But school curriculum, which is a set of ideas, texts, practices, and pedagogies, usually focuses on the disciplines. Global citizenship education, as an inherently multi- and interdisciplinary area, lacks what Gaudelli (2009) called “disciplinary heritage” (p. 78). Although each school discipline has a potential to introduce elements of citizenship in its content, and many do, the discipline-based approach nevertheless nar-

rows a school's capacities to present any model of citizenship in its entirety. Ostensibly, global citizenship education is usually conceptualized within the frameworks of international education, global education, multicultural education, peace education, human rights education, or economic education. Practitioners are well aware that none of these approaches, with the possible exception of economic education, has yet secured a position in school curricula. Thus, global citizenship education, if taught as one of the topics within these frameworks, would become even more secondary. Such curricular insecurity discourages even those teachers who are enthusiastic about global citizenship.

Very few people question the centrality of knowledge, skills, and disposition in citizenship education. Thus, the similarity of citizenship education and socialization allows to consider approaches that are based on various socialization theories. One such approach to citizenship education was described by Engle and Ochoa (1988). Discussing the unavoidable tensions in a democracy between individual liberty/diversity and social conformity, they argued that any socialization is a form of coercion. To counterbalance socialization, Engle and Ochoa set forth the idea of countersocialization. They define it as "a learning process designed to foster the independent thought and social criticism that is crucial to political freedom" (p. 31). Countersocialization is also an educational process that allows for critical rationalization, as well as reconsideration, of knowledge and practices that have been instilled and inculcated in an individual since childhood in the form of socialization. As many theoreticians state, it means that not only should each citizen be able to evaluate his or her own beliefs and values, but each should also be able to make sense of complex public issues and participate in democratic life. In this regard, the view of citizenship education as a primary tool of a child's countersocialization presents an intriguing theoretical issue: if we all are already global citizens by the virtue of birth, by our existential status (Dower 2003), then the task of global citizenship education is to challenge traditional nation-oriented citizenship models and to resocialize children by making them aware of their global citizen status. Like countersocialization, resocialization does not lead to a rejection of previous practices and established values, rather, it offers a balance to the socialization experience that is void of reflective thought (Kaviani 2006) and expands the boundaries of individual rights, freedoms, and responsibilities.

Three Perspectives of Resocialization Framework

The resocialization theory contains three strands that help understand the mechanism of acquiring and internalizing new norms. These are the theory of exposure, the theory of transferability, and resistance theory. The theory of exposure focuses on how much exposure individuals have to have to the new environment: the more exposure they have, the more they adapt. Considering the advent of mass communication systems and increasingly expanding global social networks, it will be safe to say that the potential exposure of young people to the world is unprecedented. The

phenomena of Facebook, Twitter, or round-the-clock real time news cycle demonstrate the infinite possibilities of sources that a child is exposed to. Even though there is a technological gap between various nations or regions within nations, this gap is narrowing. More and more children and young adults have an opportunity to get connected with their peers around the world and learn about the world without mediation. In these circumstances, the role of education is not only to provide an access to global resources and thus make exposure possible, but also to help children and young adults navigate in this sea of possibilities and information.

Unlike the theory of exposure, the theory of transferability contends that individual adaptation is geared by more than just exposure to new environment. When the theory of transferability is applied to various groups (i.e. immigrants or refugees), it claims that individual members of these groups are able to draw on past experience and transfer the lessons learned from their old environments, applying them to the new environments (Black et al. 1987; White et al. 2008). In the classical resocialization theory, transferability presents a potential challenge for successful resocialization. However, if considered within the framework of global citizenship resocialization, the transferability argument loses its challenging nature. On the contrary, it provides a very optimistic background. Children and young adults are not moved to other environments, they do not have to transfer their knowledge, skills, or disposition and adapt them to the new circumstances. Their knowledge, skills, and dispositions are a component of the system, they are an inseparable part of the global system. The task of education is to facilitate in adapting and adjusting children's knowledge, skills, and disposition to a broader global paradigm.

A third perspective, resistance theory is grounded in classical political socialization theory. From that perspective, the expectation is that "people acquire relatively enduring orientations toward politics in general and toward their own particular political systems" (Merelman in White et al. 2008, 269). The resistance argument as it applies to global citizenship resocialization framework includes numerous phenomena, among them the disbelief in global citizenship in general, tenacity of such imaginary elements of reality as patriotism or nationalism, or curricular immobility of some educational systems. However, unlike in classical political socialization theory, where resistance is primarily the function of subjects of resocialization, in the case of global citizenship resocialization, resistance to global citizenship education is demonstrated by agents (school, curriculum,) rather than subjects. Also, we have to keep in mind a correlation between the age and resistance: the younger is the child, the less resistant he or she is to the ideas of global citizenship.

Woodrow Wilson once said, "We are citizens of the world. The tragedy of our times is that we do not know this." One hundred years later, it is still a tragedy. It is a tragedy because without being aware of our global status, we cannot act as responsible global citizens. Yet, over 400 years ago, John Amos Comenius (1592–1670), had similar thoughts:

We are all citizens of one world, we are all of one blood. To hate a man because he was born in another country, because he speaks a different language, or because he takes a different view on this subject or that, is a great folly. Desist, I implore you, for we are all equally human.... Let us have but one end in view, the welfare of humanity (quoted in Clark and Nance 2006, p. 149).

It is a tragedy because people are still more divided than united. It is critical to understand that in our interdependent world being a citizen already means being a global citizen.

Conclusion

New global contexts exert economic, political, ideological, and cultural pressure on individuals in all parts of the world. Young people will be much better equipped and prepared to meet global challenges if the school helps them better understand that they are already a part of the globalized world and members of global citizenry. The resocialization approach in teaching for global citizenship is not a panacea; on the contrary, it is one of many possible frameworks that schools and individual teachers can utilize in their practices. At the same time, the resocialization approach demonstrates clear philosophical and curricular paths that education can take to absorb the idea of multiple citizenships. After all, good citizenship is the purpose of education – good local, national, and global citizenship.

References

- Abowitz, K. K., & Harnish, J. (2006). Contemporary discourses of citizenship. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(4), 653–690.
- Apple, M. (2002). Patriotism, pedagogy, and freedom: On the educational meaning of September 11th. *Teachers College Records*, 104(8), 1760–1772.
- Armstrong, C. (2006). Global civil society and the question of global citizenship. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 17(4), 349–357.
- Banks, J. (2004). Teaching for social justice, diversity, and citizenship in a global world. *The Educational Forum*, 68(4), 296–305.
- Barr, H. (2005). Toward a model of citizenship education: Coping with differences in definition. In C. White & R. Openshaw (Eds.), *Democracy at the crossroads* (pp. 55–75). London: Lexington Books.
- Black, J., Niemi, R., & Powell, G., Jr. (1987). Age, resistance, and political learning in a new environment: The case of Canadian immigrants. *Comparative Politics*, 20, 70–84.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Carter, A. (2006). *The political theory of global citizenship*. London: Routledge.
- Clark, M., & Nance, C. (2006). Teaching values of peace and tolerance in the curriculum. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *Education and society* (4th ed., pp. 149–172). Melbourne: James Nicholas Publishers.
- Corry, O. (2006). Global civil society and its discontents. *Voluntas*, 17(4), 303–324.
- Delanty, G. (2002). *Citizenship in a global age: Society, culture, politics*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Dower, N. (2003). *An introduction to global citizenship*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Dower, N., & Williams, J. (2002). *Global citizenship: A critical introduction*. New York: Routledge.
- Engle, S. H., & Ochoa, A. S. (1988). *Education for democratic citizenship*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Flanagan, C. (2001). Families and globalization: A new social contract and agenda for research. In J. A. Myers-Walls, P. Somlai, & R. N. Rapoport (Eds.), *Families as educators for global citizenship* (pp. 23–41). Burlington: Ashgate.
- Gallavan, N. (2008). Examining teacher candidates' views on teaching world citizenship. *The Social Studies*, 99(6), 249–254.
- Gaudelli, W. (2009). Heuristics of global citizenship discourses towards curriculum enhancement. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 25(1), 68–85.
- Gomberg, P. (1990). Patriotism is like racism. *Ethics*, 101(1), 144–150.
- Hess, R., & Torney, J. (1967). *The development of basic attitudes and values toward government and citizenship during the elementary school years* (Report CRP 1078-CP-1). University of Chicago (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 010119), Chicago.
- Kaviani, K. (2006). Influences on social studies teachers' issue-selection for classroom discussion: Social positioning and media. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 1(2), 201–222.
- Kiwako Okuma-Nyström, M. (2009). Globalization, identities, and diversified school education. In J. Zajda, H. Daun, & L. Saha (Eds.), *Nation-building, identity and citizenship education: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 25–42). London: Springer.
- Lagos, T. (2002). *Global citizenship – toward the definition*. Retrieved from: <http://events.facet.iupui.edu/events/IntercampusWorkshops/Summer%20Leadership%20Institute/globalcitizenship.pdf>
- Lal, D. (2004). *In praise of empires: Globalization and order*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lawson, H., & Scott, D. (2002). Introduction. In D. Scott & H. Lawson (Eds.), *Citizenship education and the curriculum* (pp. 2–6). Westport: Alex.
- Marshall, T. (1950). *Citizenship and social class and other essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matus, C., & McCarthy, C. (2003). The triumph of multiplicity and the carnival of difference: Curriculum dilemmas in the age of postcolonialism and globalization. In W. Pinar (Ed.), *International handbook of curriculum research* (pp. 73–82). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- McIntosh, P. (2005). Gender perspectives on educating for global citizenship. In N. Noddings (Ed.), *Educating citizens for global awareness* (pp. 22–39). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Myers, J. (2006). Rethinking the social studies curriculum in the context of globalization: Education for global citizenship in the U.S. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 34(3), 370–394.
- Myers-Walls, J. (2001). How families teach their children about the world. In J. A. Myers-Walls, P. Somlai, & R. N. Rapoport (Eds.), *Families as educators for global citizenship* (pp. 3–12). Burlington: Ashgate.
- Noddings, N. (2005). Global citizenship: Promises and problems. In N. Noddings (Ed.), *Educating citizens for global awareness* (pp. 1–21). New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Owen, D. (2008, September 21–26). *Political socialization in the twenty-first century: recommendations for researchers*. Paper presented at the future of civic education in the 21st century conference, James Madison Montpelier.
- Pike, G. (2008). Reconstructing the legend: Educating for global citizenship. In A. Abdi & L. Schultz (Eds.), *Educating for human rights and global citizenship*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Ramirez, F. O. (1997). The nation-state, citizenship, and educational change: Institutionalization and globalization. In W. Cummings & N. McGinn (Eds.), *International handbook of education and development: Preparing schools students and nations for the twenty-first century* (pp. 47–62). New York: Elsevier Science.
- Rapoport, A. (2009). A forgotten concept: Global citizenship education and state social studies standards. *Journal of Social Studies Research*, 33(1), 75–93.
- Rapoport, A. (2010). We cannot teach what we don't know: Indiana teachers talk about global citizenship education. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 5(3), 1–11.
- Robbins, M., Francis, L. J., & Elliott, E. (2003). Attitudes toward education for global citizenship among trainee teachers. *Research in Education*, 69(1), 93–98.

- Smith, D. G. (2003). Curriculum and teaching face globalization. In W. Pinar (Ed.), *International handbook of curriculum research* (pp. 35–52). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Somlai, P. (2001). Global citizenship: An essay on its contradictions. In J. A. Myers-Walls, P. Somlai, & R. N. Rapoport (Eds.), *Families as educators for global citizenship* (pp. 13–22). Burlington: Ashgate.
- Sperling, V. (2003). The last refuge of a scoundrel; patriotism, militarism and the Russian national idea. *Nations and Nationalism*, 9(2), 235–253.
- Steenbergen, B. (1994). *The condition of citizenship*. London: Sage Publications.
- Stromquist, N. P. (2009). Theorizing global citizenship: Discourses, challenges, and implications for education. *Interamerican Journal of Education for Democracy*, 2(1), 6–29.
- White, C., & Openshaw, R. (2002). Translating the national to the global in citizenship education. In D. Scott & H. Lawson (Eds.), *Citizenship education and the curriculum* (pp. 151–166). Westport: Alex.
- White, S., Nevitte, N., Blais, A., Gidengil, E., & Fournier, P. (2008). The political resocialization of immigrants: Resistance or lifelong learning? *Political Research Quarterly*, 61(2), 268–281.
- Wood, P. (2008). The impossibility of global citizenship. *Brock Education*, 17, 22–37.
- Yamashita, H. (2006). Global citizenship education and war: The needs of teachers and learners. *Educational Review*, 58(1), 27–39.
- Zajda, J. (2009). Nation-building, identity, and citizenship education: Introduction. In J. Zajda, H. Daun, & L. Saha (Eds.), *Nation-building, identity and citizenship education: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 1–11). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Zajda, J. (2015a). Globalisation, ideology and history school textbooks: The Russian federation. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *Nation-building and history education in a global culture* (pp. 29–50). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Zajda, J. (2015b). Nation-building and history education in a global culture. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *Nation-building and history education in a global culture* (pp. 183–189). Dordrecht: Springer.



<http://www.springer.com/978-3-319-19505-6>

Globalisation, Ideology and Politics of Education
Reforms

Zajda, J. (Ed.)

2015, XIX, 167 p., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-19505-6