Nation-Building, Identity and Citizenship Education: Introduction

Joseph Zajda

1 Nation-Building, Identity, and Citizenship Education

In examining a complex interplay between nation-building, social identity, and citizenship education globally we need to draw on comparative and international discourses concerning other cultures (Stromquist & Monkman, 2000; Chabbott & Elliott, 2002; Biraimah, 2005; Saha, 2005; Zajda, Majhanovich, & Rust, 2006; Zajda, Davies, & Majhanovich, 2008). One such attempt was the book *Understanding Others, Education Ourselves* (Chabbott & Elliott, 2002, p. 9), where it is argued that comparative and international discourses surrounding other cultures can often lead us to 'identify and question beliefs and assumptions that are taken for granted', by 'making the familiar strange' and the 'strange familiar', and questioning the 'universality' of our beliefs and assumptions. This is a good and pragmatic starting point for our analysis of the nexus between nation-building, identity, and citizenship education. At the core of our discussion is the very notion of national identity and its ongoing social and political transformation in the global culture (Giddens, 1990; Secombe & Zajda, 1999; Saha, 2005; Smolicz, 2006; Zajda, Davies, & Majhanovich, 2008).

1.1 Nation State

Before we proceed any further, we need to clarify the current usage of the concept 'nation state'. As Smolicz (2006) explains, the state can be viewed as a political and territorial unit, 'vested with legitimate power and a network of the dependent institutions to manage political, economic and legal structures' (p. 115). Smolicz lists conferral of citizenship as the ultimate acknowledgement of the individual's membership of a state.

Australian Catholic University, Melbourne Campus

Thus, a given nation state exists where there is a 'political apparatus … ruling over a given territory, whose authority is backed by a legal system' (Giddens, 1990, p. 301). Benedict Anderson (1991, 2006), on the other hand, defines a nation as 'an imagined political community (that is) imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign'. He argues that an imagined community is different from an existing society because members do not see the actual community, but imagine it in their minds. Hence, as Anderson explains, a nation 'is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion' (Anderson, 2006, pp. 6–7).

Anderson falls into the modernist and historicist perspectives on nations, national identity, and nationalism. Like Eric Hobsbawm (1990) and others he argues that nations, national identity, and nationalism are products of modernity. This paradigm is diametrically opposed to the traditionalists or primordialists, who believe that nations have existed since the dawn of human history. Hence, Anderson's imagined communities can be seen as a form of modernist version of social constructionism, echoing postmodern cartography of Roland Paulston (1996), constructs of imagined social cartography. Unlike, Anderson, Anthony Smith (2001) argues that even when nations are the product of modernity, it is possible to find ethnic elements that survive and flourish in modern nations, despite globalisation.

A 'nation', usually defined in terms of culture, ethnicity, and geographic space, has the right to constitute and govern an independent or autonomous political community, based on a shared history, cultural heritage, and the rule of law. Members of a 'nation', as a 'community of culture', are attached by 'emotional bonds' (Kloskowska, 1997, p. 70), and share a common ideology (Szacki, 1984, p. 11). According to Smolicz (2006), there are at least three models that are used to distinguish among the basic criteria for membership of a nation:

1. The ancestry-based model (*ius sanguinis*) relies on descent as one of the basic criteria of belonging to a nation.
2. The territorially based model (*ius soli*) uses culture and language as a necessary requirement for membership.
3. Migration-derived model represents a modification of the latter type and requires a commitment to a set of shared cultural/core values. It allows a degree of cultural pluralism for a 'range of cultural characteristics of diverse groups' that constitute pluralist democracies today (Smolicz, 2006, p. 116).

However, Smolicz (2006) also adds that the rise of globalisation and global interculturalism, and what Smith called a 'family of cultures', indicates that it may well be 'increasingly difficult for an individual to remain a citizen of just one state and a member of just one nation' (Smolicz, 2006, p. 129; Smith, 1991, p. 172). Given that most states today are increasingly becoming ethnically, linguistically, and culturally heterogeneous, in some ways attributed to forces of globalisation and economic migration, we could consider a 'multinational nation' and a 'family

of cultures', as Smith (1991), Smolicz (1999, 2006), and others do in their works, as dynamic constructs, which challenge a geopolitically and ideologically defined nation.

1.2 National Identity

In this chapter we draw on works by Benedict Anderson (2006), Jerzy Smolicz (1999, 2006), and Anthony Smith (1991) in defining 'national identity'. Like most social theorists, Smolicz (1999) sees national identity as being defined by ancestral, territorial, political, and cultural dimensions (p. 12), and he also refers to a sense of 'belonging-ness' to the country, or identification with place (p. 15). Smith (2001) refers to 'the continuous reproduction and reinterpretation of the pattern of values, symbols, memories, myths and traditions that compose the distinctive heritage of nations, and the identifications of individuals with that pattern and heritage and with its cultural elements' (Smith, 2001, p.18). 'National identity' has always been one of the ontological and teleological goals of promoting nationalism, and a defining dimension of the nation-building process. National identity has certain core characteristics, which are emphasised at varying degrees from one nation to the next. As Smith (1991) explains, the six main attributes of ethnic community, as a foundation of national identity, are:

1. A collective proper name
2. A myth of common ancestry
3. Shared historical memories
4. One or more differentiating elements of common culture
5. An association with a specific 'homeland'
6. A sense of solidarity for significant sectors of the population (Smith, 1991, p. 21)

1.3 Elements of National Identity

'National' identity refers to politico-economic and technological community. In a philosophical, legal, and social theory sense, nation denotes 'a community of people obeying the same laws and institutions within a given territory' (Smith, 1991, p. 9). Hence, the defining elements of 'national' identity include:

(a) Territory, the homeland, or 'historic land'
(b) A community, or a patria, a community of laws and institutions with a single political will
(c) Citizenship and associated sense of legal equality among the members
(d) Common values, mass culture, civic ideology, and traditions (including common historical memories, myths, symbols, and traditions (Smith, 1991, pp. 9–11)

In short, the above elements denote a Western model of an 'ethnic' perception of the nation and national identity. Meselidis (2008) argues that modern Greek identity is not 'purely a recent ideological construction or fiction of governments', since national independence in 1821, in 'order to create and maintain the nation', but is based on historical sentiment, myths, memories, values, and traditions in Greek *ethnies* pre-dating the modern nation. Meselidis draws on Smith's definition of national identity in terms of ethnicity (Smith, 1998, pp. 170–198). There are strong cultural bonds and continuities between modern Greek national identities and the pre-modern (pre-1500 CE) cultural and historical Greek ethnic communities. This does not mean, however, that national identities do not change over the *longue durée*, as, indeed, Smith's working definition implies (Meselidis, 2008). There is strong evidence in school textbooks (see Zajda, 2008) to suggest that there is a continuous process of redefinition, revision, reinterpretation, and rewriting of historical narratives, in order to reimagine national identity and nationalism.

1.4   The Role of Historiography in Nation-Building

Social identity is drawn from a variety of sources. In particular, historiography greatly influences a society's sense of identity. Indeed as Welsh (2004) puts it, explaining Australia's evolution as a nation state, history texts are a way in which a nation or state can, 'explain to the rest of the world how this remarkable society has evolved into a nation' (p. xxxviii). Nation-building architects make extensive use of history to promote those historical narratives that embody the politically correct teleology of the state (Anderson, 1991; Smith, 2001). It has been suggested that the historiographies of the new states in Eastern Europe, with parallels in the Russian Federation, China, and elsewhere, engaging in nation-building process, continue to be essentially 'monolithic and intolerant to alternative views as those of their communist predecessors, merely exchanging a communist ideological colouring for a national one' (Janmaat & Vickers, 2007, p. 270). Janmaat argues that the new post-Soviet government in the Ukraine was only too ready to use history education to promote a new sense of a nationhood, which would maximise Ukrainian distinctiveness, and its cultural significance in the former Soviet Union (Zajda, 2008).

   Continuing global public and political debates about the role of historical explanation and the development of historical consciousness in schools when dealing with popular understandings of a nation's growth has given history a significant role in repositioning competing and ideologically driven discourses of historical narratives and processes (Nicholls, 2006; Janmaat, 2007; Kaplan, 2007; Zajda, 2007a). Taylor and Young (2003), referring to the role of historical explanation and the development of historical consciousness with respect to a nation's growth, argue that the main issues are national identity and balanced representations of the past. In Russia for instance, as in other countries undergoing a similar process of nation-building, the three most significant issues defining the repositioning of the politically correct historical narratives are preferred images of the past, reminiscent of Anderson's (1991) 'imagined community'—patriotism and national identity.

Current debates around the main issues in historiography and the role of historical narratives in the nation-building process echo similar controversies in the UK in the 1980s (Phillips, 1998), in the USA during the 1990s (Nash, Crabtree, & Dunn, 2000), as well as recent debates in Japan, Canada, Germany, France, Italy, Greece, the Ukraine, Korea, China, and the Russian Federation. In the USA, for example, on 18 January 1995, the 'History Wars' erupted on the floors of the United States Congress. In a debate on national history standards, Senator Slade Gordon (Republican, Washington) asked the question 'George Washington or Bart Simpson—which figure represented a 'more important part of our Nation's history for our children to study?'. He attempted to define the national character of history teaching for future generations (Stearns, Seixas, & Wineburg, 2000, p. 1). School history texts, as instruments of ideological transformation and nation-building, are currently closely monitored by the state, in counties like Japan, China, the Russian Federation, and Greece, to name a few. In other countries, these processes are still present but in less formal and more ad hoc ways. In the Russian Federation, for example, it represents an ideologically driven nation-building process, and social and political transformation of society, which was overseen by the Putin government until 2007, and which continues today.

2   Identity Politics and Dominant Ideology

In addition to examining the processes affecting identity politics and nation-building, we need to consider the role of dominant ideology, or hegemony, defining such processes. In particular, we need to remind ourselves that globalisation is not an apolitical phenomenon, and nation-building and citizenship education are hegemonic manifestations of reinvented nationalism and patriotism. By accepting globalisation and its economic and technocratic imperatives, we are likely to sink into the ocean of conformity and impotent cynicism. Schmidt (2000) warns us against accepting the status quo, for the 'the individual is obliterated not by confronting the system, but by conforming to it' (p. 252). Nation-building processes, currently taking place in many countries, including the USA, Japan, China, and the Russian Federation, are reinvented narratives of traditional values and militant patriotism of the past. Samuel Johnson (1775) stated that '[p]atriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel.' Boswell tells us that Samuel Johnson made this famous pronouncement in 1775. James Boswell, a biographer of Samuel Johnson, assures us that Johnson was not indicting patriotism in general, only superficial patriotism (http://www.samueljohnson. com/refuge.html). As Bahruth (2005) observes, 'countless scoundrels would have us wrap ourselves in the flag, while the liberties it pretends to represent are shrinking under the pressure of the rhetorical patriotic act' (Bahruth, 2005, p. xi). Current debates in numerous countries around the world on citizenship education, nationalism, and values education reflect a neo-liberal ideology of uncritical conformity, order, and obedience.

2.1 Historical Thinking as Cultural Capital

In discussing a complex interplay between nation-building, social identity, and citizenship we need to refer to historical thinking as cultural capital (Zajda & Whitehouse, 2008). The concepts of cultural and social capital play a significant and critical part in historical thinking. Bourdieu (1986) defined cultural capital in terms of the knowledge and skills advantages necessary for social mobility. Saha (2005) argues that cultural and social capital are 'two important concepts in understanding many economic and social processes in all societies' (Saha, 2005, p. 753). Bourdieu (1986) identified four types of capital which are particularly relevant to teaching history: economic, cultural, social, and symbolic. In teaching historical understanding and thinking, cultural and social capitals enable us to understand the 'forces of globalisation' and 'ideological transformations' affecting nations and individuals (Zajda, 2005, p. 1). In general, globalisation refers to cultural, economic, and educational integration, where the world is 'becoming more homogeneous with respect to a wide range of economic and social processes' (Saha, 2005, p. 752).

In historical thinking, the notions of power, cultural and social capital, together with an analysis of an unequal distribution of socially valued commodities globally, are necessary for understanding various forces affecting the dynamics of historical evolution of societies. Such an analysis, grounded in historical thinking and semblance, where we imagine what is was like for them, and the 'Other', we can have a far deeper and meaningful understanding of nation-building, social identity, and citizenship in the twenty-first century. It is here, in a Jeffersonian sense, that education holds the potential for an 'enlightened citizenry' (Bahruth, 2005, p. xi). Discourses surrounding other cultures, nation-building, and identity politics can often lead us to identify and question beliefs and assumptions that are taken for granted, by making the familiar strange and the strange familiar, and questioning the 'universality' of our beliefs and assumptions. It is not sufficient to depict cultural differences in intercultural research, and there is now a need to rediscover to what degree such culturally differences can be 'generalised' across cultures. In particular, the issues to be addressed in future research should include: What kinds of roles do our perceptions concerning cultures, identity, and the nation state play in intercultural dialogue and conflict analysis? And what is the relationship between globalisation, social change, and emerging cultural values?

3 Nation-Building, Identity, and Citizenship Education: Cross-cultural Perspectives

In his chapter, 'Globalisation, Nation-Building, and Cultural Identity: The Role of Intercultural Dialogue', Joseph Zajda (Australian Catholic University) argues that globalisation discourses have affected the nature of intercultural dialogue and the debate surrounding nation-building processes, social identity, and citizenship

education. Recent global events depicting violence, conflicts, and war demonstrate the need to reassert the relevance of intercultural dialogue in an increasingly interdependent world. Intercultural dialogue needs to focus more on emerging significant issues in cross-cultural understanding globally, affecting identity politics, liberty, and democracy. Michiyo Kiwako Okuma-Nyström (Institute of International Education, Stockholm University), in 'Globalisation, Identities, and Diversified School Education', argues that identities are increasingly constructed and reconstructed both locally and globally simultaneously, and that school, as a major agency of socialisation, contributes to identity formation processes. It is suggested that new social identities, such as global consumer, are constantly constructed, shaped, and transformed under the impact of the mass media and forces of globalisation.

Patricia K. Kubow (Bowling Green University), in 'Democracy, Identity, and Citizenship Education in South Africa: Defining a Nation in a Post-colonial and Global Era', offers a critique of President Thabo Mbeki's call for South Africans to define themselves in terms of who they are. This is a new approach of the country's nation-building efforts. Here, social identity reconstruction is to be accomplished, in part, through a reassertion of African indigenous knowledge systems that draw on the histories, traditions, and values of cultural populations disadvantaged during apartheid. Kubow believes that both the postcolonial and global contexts pose challenges to South Africa's self-definition as a nation state. A serious threat to South Africa's nation-building and the construction of social identity is globalisation itself. With its Western-driven and hegemonic dimensions, economic and cultural forces of globalisation tend to dislodge local culture and decontextualise pluralist democracy. In this particular context, citizenship education, according to Kubow, is likely to play a significant role in helping people to think more critically about their past, present, and future as part of the nation-building project.

Detlef Oesterreich (Max-Planck Institute for Human Development) discusses the Civic Education Project of the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) conducted in Eastern Europe. According to him, civic education has three major goals: political knowledge and understanding, democratic attitudes, and a readiness for democratic political action. The survey as such offered the first opportunity to directly compare civic education between young people in the East and in the West.

Suzanne Majhanovich (University of Western Ontario) discusses different ways in a globalised world that linguistic minorities within nation states advocate for linguistic policies favourable to their language, in an attempt to protect their sense of ethnic identity. The chapter reviews the ways in which governing bodies have tried to come to terms with the English–French reality of Canada. It analyses, within the framework of multicultural education, social justice, and equity, various policy initiatives to acknowledge and preserve where feasible indigenous languages, and demonstrates various ways in which speakers of other languages are accommodated.

Similarly, Jerzy Smolicz and Margaret Secombe (University of Adelaide) examine the inherent tensions and dichotomies between globalisation, the nation state, citizenship, identity, and multiculturalism. They argue that the building of

multi-ethnic nation states, based on the ideology of multiculturalism, can offer tolerance and peace within a common supranational identity in the global world. They also believe that a supranational identity that respects cultural and linguistic diversity within a global culture may counteract interracial and religious conflicts, and forces responsible for the continuing fundamentally inspired ethnic fragmentation and disharmony and offer a new model for global solidarity, based on authentic and empowering global interculturalism. Grace Feuerverger (OISE/University of Toronto), in her case study, examines perceptions of Jewish-Canadian high school students in Montréal and Toronto towards the learning of Hebrew, their ancestral language and the language that is now symbolic of secular, and not only religious, Jewish diasporic identity in the post-Holocaust, postmodern world. She comments on the interrelationships between Hebrew language learning and definitions of Jewish identity, and concludes that the learning of Hebrew has significant social-psychological implications for Jewish students in Canada.

Kaori Okano (La Trobe University) examines multicultural education policies in Japan. She argues that while Japan has always been a multi-ethnic entity, it propagated an assimilationist ideology by promoting its policy of monolingualism and mono-culturalism. One consequence of globalisation in education has been the authorities' reluctant recognition of the multi-ethnic student population, with the arrival of many immigrants since the early 1990s. Okano's research demonstrates that the central government's responses to immigrants in education have been active and well resourced. However, the policies towards new immigrants have focused on language and cultural adaptation, and the affirmation of cultural pluralism. Okano explores how these approaches to multicultural education have interacted with, and contributed to, the development of local-level multicultural education policies and the interaction of globalising forces and local activism.

Daniel Kirk (University of Sharjah, United Arab Emirates & University of Georgia), and Diane Napier (University of Georgia) explore the impact of forces of globalisation and intercultural dimensions on the process of social transformation in the higher education sector in the United Arab Emirates. Elisabeth Regnault (Louis Pasteur University, France) discusses various successful models of intercultural education in Europe which affect cultural identity. Halla B. Holmarsdottir (Institute for Educational Research, University of Oslo) presents an analysis of the Language in Education Policy in South Africa and the subsequent implementation of additive and functional multilingualism. Stephen Carney (Copenhagen University) and Ulla Ambrosius Madsen (Roskilde University) discuss schooling and the formation of identities in modern Nepal.

4   Conclusion

In evaluating current research on nation-building, social identity, and citizenship education globally, it needs to be concluded that the modern construct of the nation state is under constant pressure from the forces of globalisation. It is a paradox that

cultural globalisation is unleashing forces that tend to standardise lifestyles through commodities, information technology, and the mass media. Yet, at the same time, globalisation creates opportunities for cultural resistance by 'powerfully entrenched local cultures' (Smolicz, 2006, p. 118), where both the 'old' (traditional) and/or indigenous historical minorities and the 'new' migrant communities are growing as a result of economic globalisation and job mobility. One could argue that the state's very autonomy and its regulatory role have been eroded by forces of globalisation and decentralisation and privatisation in particular (Zajda, 2004, 2006). However, globalisation, with its seemingly ubiquitous dimension of cosmopolitanism, while impacting nation states, national identities, and nationalism, does not necessarily transcend or supersede them (Smith, 1991, p. 175). In a post-structuralist and postmodern sense, individuals have a potential to develop and maintain multiple identities in the global culture.

In selecting these chapters for inclusion in this volume (see also the previous volumes in the *Globalisation, Comparative Education, and Policy Research* 12-volume Book Series, Springer, 2008, http://www.springeronline.com/sgw/cda/frontpage), we have deliberately included scholarly research which is representative of diverse people, regions, and institutions. Our contributors engaged in an informed critical discourse about the nature of the relationship between nation-building, social identity, and citizenship education globally. While we, and the authors, clearly have views about this relationship, we invite the reader into a discourse analysing their views and those of whom they live and work with. Our task was not to present a hegemonic monolithic sense about *what is*, but to extend, inform, and critique assumptions about the nation-building processes, contested discourses of social identity and citizenship education, and their possible implications for a global social stratification and social justice for nation states in the future (Biraimah, 2005; Zajda, 2005; Clayton, 2006; Zajda, Davies, & Majhanovich, 2008; Zajda, Biraimah, & Gaudelli, 2008).

Finally, the rise of global interculturalism, intercultural dialogue, and multicultural citizenship represents an evolving cultural integration and diversity, where an individual can belong to more than one cultural community, as well as to more than one state. Intercultural dialogue is one of the most effective means of overcoming politico-ethnocentric barriers, in order to include the Other. As Smolicz (2006) and Zajda (2007b) explain, global interculturalism can facilitate intercultural dialogue and cultural interaction—both *within* the nations concerned, in order to promote an 'ethos of multiculturalism', and *between* them, in the sense of intercultural dialogue (Smolicz, 2006, p. 130).

References

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.
Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined Communities*. New York: Verso.
Bahruth, R. (2005). Foreword. In P. McLaren & R. Farahmandpur (Eds.), *Teaching Against Global Capitalism and the New Imperialism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Biraimah, B. (2005). Achieving Equitable Outcomes or Reinforcing Social Inequalities? *Educational Practice and Theory*, 27(2), 25–34.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The Forms of Capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241–258). New York: Greenwood Press.

Chabbott, C. & Elliott, E. (Eds.). (2002). *Understanding Others, Educating Ourselves*. National Research Council. Washington DC: the National Academy Press.

Clayton, T. (2006). *Rethinking Hegemony*. Melbourne: James Nicholas.

Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Oxford: Polity Press.

Hobsbawm, E. (1990). *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Janmaat, J. (2007). The Ethnic 'Other' in Ukrainian History Textbooks: The Case of Russia and the Russians. *Compare*, 37(3), 307–324.

Janmaat, J. & Vickers, E. (2007). Education and Identity Formation in Post-Cold War Eastern Europe and Asia. *Compare*, 37(3), 267–275.

Kaplan, V. (2007). The History of Reform in Russian Higher Education. *European Education*, 39(2), 37–59.

Kloskowska, A. (1997). Skad i poco narod? *Znak*, 49(502), 69–78.

Meselidis, S. (2008). National Identity, Teachers and Teaching History in Greece: History Wars. Unpublished Paper.

Nash, G., Crabtree, C., & Dunn, R. (2000). *History on Trial*: *Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past*. New York: Vintage.

Nicholls, J. (2006). *School History Textbooks Across Cultures*. Oxford: Symposium Books.

Paulston, R. (Ed.). (1996). *Social Cartography: Mapping Ways of Seeing Social and Educational Change*. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Phillips, R. (1998). *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State; a Study in Educational Politics*. London: Cassell.

Saha, L. (2005). Cultural and Social Capital in Global Perspective. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *International Handbook of Globalisation and Education Policy Research* (pp. 745–755). Dordrecht: Springer.

Schmidt, R. (2000). *Language policy and identity politics in the United States*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Secombe, M. & Zajda, J. (Eds.). (1999). *Education and Culture*. Melbourne: James Nicholas.

Smith, A. D. (1991). *National Identity*. Reno, NV: University of Nevada Press.

Smith, A. D. (1998). *Nationalism and Modernism*. London: Routledge.

Smith, A.D. (2001). *Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History, Polity*. Oxford: Polity Press.

Smolicz, J. (1999). Core Culture. In M. Secombe & J. Zajda (1999) (Eds.), *Education and Culture* (pp. Melbourne: James Nicholas Publishers.

Smolicz, J. (2006). Globalism, Nation-State and Local Cultures. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *Society and the Environment* (pp. 115–133). Melbourne: James Nicholas.

Stearns, P., Seixas, P., & Wineburg, S. (2000). *Knowing, Teaching and Learning History*. New York: NYUP.

Stromquist, N. & Monkman, K. (2000). (Eds.). *Globalization and Education: Integration and Contestation Across Cultures*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Szacki, J. (1984). Introduction. In S. Ossowski (Ed.), *O ojczyznie i narodzie* (On the Fatherland and the Nation). Warsaw: PWN.

Taylor, T & Young, C. (2003). *Making History: A Guide to the Teaching and Learning of History in Australia*. Melbourne: Curriculum Corporation. Available at www.hyperhistory.org.

Welsh, F (2004). *Great Southern Land: A New History of Australia*. London: Penguin.

Zajda, J. (2002). Education and Policy: Changing Paradigms and Issues. *International Review of Education*, 48(1&2), 67–91.

Zajda, J (2004). Decentralisation and Privatisation in Education—The Role of the State. *International Review of Education*, 50(3&4), 199–221.

Zajda, J. (Ed.). (2005). *International Handbook of Globalisation and Education Policy Research*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Zajda, J. (2006). *Decentralisation and Privatisation in Education*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Zajda, J. (2007a). The New History School Textbooks in the Russian Federation: 1992–2004. *Compare*, 37(3), 291–306.

Zajda, J. (2007b). Living Together: Globalisation, Education and Intercultural Dialogue. *Political Crossroads*, 14(1), 37–49.

Zajda, J. (2008). Teachers and the Politics of History Textbooks. In L. Saha & A. Dworkin (Eds.), *The New International Handbook of Research on Teachers and Teaching* (pp. 378–387). New York: Springer Science+Business Media.

Zajda, J. & Whitehouse, J. A. (2008). Teaching History. In L. Saha & A. Dworkin (Eds.), *The New International Handbook of Research on Teachers and Teaching*. New York: Springer.

Zajda, J., Majhanovich, S., & Rust, V. (Eds.). (2006). *Education and Social Justice*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Zajda, J., Davies, L., & Majhanovich, S. (Eds.). (2008). *Comparative and Global Pedagogies: Equity, Access and Democracy in Education*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Zajda, J., Biraimah, B., & Gaudelli, W. (Eds.). (2008). *Education and Social Inequality in the Global Culture*. Dordrecht: Springer.