Chapter 7
Diversity and Global Citizenship in Educational Policies: Debates and Prospects

Kathrine Maleq and Abdeljalil Akkari

Abstract This chapter examines how social and political contexts have influenced the definition and operationalization of citizenship education and multicultural education in curricula and address the debates surrounding GCE in culturally diverse societies. In nation-states characterized by diversity, there have been calls for a renewed focus on forms of civic education which promote national belonging and loyalty; such calls often target, either explicitly or implicitly, students from minority or migration backgrounds. An apparent binary is established, between those who see the primary purpose of citizenship education as nation-building, and those who want to promote global solidarity (Osler, J Curric Stud 43(1): 1–24, 2011, p. 2). The challenge for GCE is therefore to strike a balance between local, national and global belonging that ensures both national cohesion and a sense of global responsibility. We conclude by proposing that Global citizenship be taught through youth engagement which is connected with skills such as creativity, critical thinking, communication skills and citizenship skills.

Keywords Citizenship education · Cultural diversity · Global citizenship education · Identity · Multicultural education · Nation-building

Diversity and Global Citizenship in Educational Policies: Introduction

Since the beginning of the twenty-first century, citizenship education has stimulated interest at both national and international levels (Banks, 2009), especially in nation-states characterized by diversity (Osler, 2011). However, deep societal changes resulting from globalization along with increased cultural and ethnic diversity are reshaping traditional models of civic identity, and as a result are increasing focus on

K. Maleq (✉) · A. Akkari
University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland
e-mail: Katherine.maleq@unige.ch

© Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2022

J. Zajda, S. Majhanovich (eds.), *Discourses of Globalisation, Ideology, Education and Policy Reforms*, Globalisation, Comparative Education and Policy Research 26,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-71583-0_7

alternative, cosmopolitan, global and multicultural identity models (Zajda & Majhanovich, 2021). In addition, the expansion of ICT (information and communication technology) has facilitated the creation of international networks and communities with shared interests and concerns, reinforcing a feeling of belonging to a global community, creating for some social groups a sense of world citizenship identity and fostering a civic engagement in global issues. In this context, the concept of Global Citizenship Education (GCE) seems increasingly relevant to contemporary educational systems, although the ideological tensions that underlie its different approaches render it a source of contestation.

A History of Citizenship Education

What it means to be a citizen has been shifting for nearly two centuries as many countries experience growing diversity and decolonialization. Citizenship education, in contrast, remains mostly nation-centric with little acknowledgement to the world's interconnection or to how local views are linked and interdependent to a global worldview. In keeping with its historical tradition, citizenship curricula have been primarily focused on developing a national identity and allegiance as well as knowledge of political institutions with the Nation-State.

Historically, public schooling focused on building national identity by teaching a national language, civic values, and national history. This process inevitably enabled the elites to retain control over cultural and ideological narratives by shaping the minds of future societies (Osborne, 2000). As such, citizenship education is best described by an act of assimilating minorities into the dominant culture (Banks, 2008, 2009).

Traditional conceptions of citizenship have however evolved under the influence of globalization, migration flows, international treaties and frameworks for international human rights protection (Zajda, 2020). The expansion of ICT (information and communications technology) has, for its part, facilitated the creation of international networks and communities who share similar interests and concerns (Sassen, 2002). These trends have created a sense of world citizenship identity and a sense of belonging to a global community as well as opportunities for civic engagement in global issues. Climate change and other sustainability challenges have proven that global issues cannot uniquely be addressed by actions within national borders. Finally, demographic changes such as increasing diversity experienced in many countries has also shaped this evolution. As a result, traditional national-centric models of citizenship education no longer reflect today's changing realities (Castles & Davidson, 2000).

A willingness open citizenship education's references to a wider community can to some extent be seen in European states such as France and England. In France, although citizenship education remains largely national-centric, references to the larger European community have been gradually added since the 1980s (Legris, 2010; Ménard, 2017) and debates are ongoing regarding the importance given to an

overreaching value of universality, strongly rooted in the French Republican tradition and the growing need to recognize the cultural diversity of students, especially in underprivileged suburbs (Legris, 2010). However, in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks committed in the country in 2015, the fostering of 'French Republican Values' and the defense of principles of secularism became one again central in educational policy, with the assumption that it would help build national unity and combat radicalism (Chauvigné, 2018). In other words, citizenship education shifted back to a more national-centric approach. Nevertheless, the practical applications of the principle of secularism, such as the prohibition of wearing of headscarves in schools and public institutions, remain widely debated and a source of tension (Diallo et al., 2016). In addition, addressing citizenship without awareness that a significant number of French youth who have cultural roots from former French colonies may not share the national narrative about France's colonial past or the national citizenship paradigm presents a problem.

In England, citizenship education has also become a much-debated political issue since its introduction in the National Curriculum. In response to the outburst of racial tensions in Northern England in 2001 followed by the terrorist attack in London in 2005, Ajegbo et al. (2007) published the Diversity and Citizenship Curriculum Review that gave impetus to teaching about diversity (Davies & Chong, 2016). The National Curriculum guidelines published the following year "advocated a global and multicultural dimension which incorporated to a limited extent the notion of a European dimension" (Faas, 2011, p. 488). In 2014, a new policy shift took place, adopting a more conservative approach to citizenship education that included the promotion of 'Fundamental British Values' of democracy, rule of law, individual liberty, mutual respect and tolerance for those of different faiths and beliefs (Department for Education 2014). As part of the anti-radicalization 'Prevent Strategy' (Starkey, 2018), this new approach to citizenship education also places a strong focus on character education (Davies & Chong, 2016). In this tense political context, "the constitution of British-ness has been an increasingly visible part of the political discourse throughout this century, in response to concerns about population movements, integration of minorities, cohesion and terrorism" (Vincent, 2019, p. 17).

Overall, the debates about citizenship education in schools can be seen as a microcosm of the broader debates about citizenship in society (Kerr, 2003) and political agendas have direct implications for educational policy (Wilkins & Olmedo, 2018). Growing diversity in many countries has given rise to questions about the definition, purpose, and intended outcomes of citizenship education and has encouraged "debate about the meaning of nationality, national identity and citizenship and the extent to which individuals and groups from both majority and minority communities feel a sense of belonging to the nation and State" (Osler & Starkey, 2006, p. 288). Consequently, we can see that these debates have intensified in countries such as France and England in which the governments are turning towards citizenship education as a means to fight against terrorism and radicalization. However, this has generated controversy and questions have been raised concerning the risk of intensifying "processes of 'othering' through the

marginalisation and degradation of minority groups and communities (in this case young Muslims)" (Bamber et al., 2018, p. 437).

Overall, these recent policy shifts illustrate that approaches to citizenship education are closely linked to their historical and political national contexts. As suggested by Osborne (2005) "historical struggles and political debates over its meaning have made citizenship an arena where competing interests and philosophies contend, to the point that one might reasonably claim that the essence of citizenship is to be found in the continuing debate over what it means to be a citizen" (p. 13). Citizenship education has its roots in the need to consolidate national identity (Osler & Starkey, 2001) but needs to evolve to meet the challenges of multicultural societies. However, the challenge to find a balance between the desire to build national unity and growing demands to promote and recognize cultural pluralism inevitably creates tensions connected to the design of citizenship education curricula. Indeed, citizenship education approaches in multicultural societies still strive to strike a balance between local, national and global belonging that ensure both national unity and a sense of global responsibility. In this respect, global citizenship may provide an opportunity to value multiple identities and cultural diversity and build competences to navigate cultural differences.

Furthermore, in culturally diverse countries, there is a need to strengthen a culture of inclusive and participatory democracy by not only including citizens from all cultural, ethnic, linguistic and religious backgrounds, but also by making sure this diversity is reflected in state-run institutions and political representative bodies.

The challenge resides in how to create nation-states that recognize and incorporate the diversity of their citizens, but also embrace an overarching set of shared values, ideals, and goals to which all citizens are committed. A nation-state can only secure the liberties of cultural, ethnic, language, and religious groups and enable them to experience freedom, justice, and peace by unifying its citizens around a set of democratic values such as human rights, justice, and equality. Educating citizens to understand this unity-diversity tension and act accordingly is therefore crucial (Banks et al., 2005, p. 7).

The Crisis of Multicultural Education

Both through civil rights movements and international migration, schools started in the 60s and 70s to hear the voices of cultural and ethnic differences and have been endorsing a multiculturalism approach, with a focus on embracing cultural diversity. Multiculturalism seeks to highlight differences among groups in positive ways. As it most often takes an apolitical and ahistorical stance, the focus is generally on celebration of diversity and an assumption of an egalitarian society where all groups are treated equally (Kishimoto, 2018). While this approach seeks to promote empathy and tolerance, it has suffered from many shortcomings. Indeed, many authors point out that educational strategies that primarily focus on celebrating culture run the risk of creating a "us" versus "them" binaries, de-politicizing racism discourse,

as well as reinforcing harmful power structures and the continual centering of White experience (Bedard, 2000; Eidoo et al., 2011; Kishimoto, 2018; Raby, 2004).

In practice, we can therefore see that schools often limit multicultural education to activities aimed at celebrating cultural diversity and recognizing the ethnic and cultural heritage of students and their families. Although these activities are often portrayed as a vehicle for cultural inclusion, they generally fail to develop a deeper understanding of cultural complexities and dominance relationships (Watkins & Noble, 2019). By showcasing essentialized representations of cultures, they "rest on a kind of simple moralism that resists intellectual scrutiny: a moralism that suggests the primary lesson is to be nice" (Watkins & Noble, 2019, p.297). This "feel good" approaches to ethnic and cultural diversity seem to have become the favored approach in schools, overshadowing other educational aspects of multicultural education and failing to incorporate a critical understanding of multicultural issues. In this respect, Walking and Nobel (2019) caution that:

> A multiculturalism that emphasizes feeling good is primarily concerned with moral rules of engagement, of doing and saying what is culturally appropriate, as if one could arrive at a checklist of 'dos and don'ts' for each group. Of course, multiculturalism has operated in this way and it is an approach that has influenced multicultural education (p. 299).

Furthermore, celebrating cultural diversity as a "demographic fact" is solely based on the premise that ethnic diversity is in itself an added value. Whilst it is important to work with students and teachers on cultural diversity, it is also important encourage them to reflect on their responsibilities, rights and privileges in a global interconnected world, beyond their national belongings/borders (Akkari & Maleq, 2021).

We argue that linking multicultural education and citizenship education under the umbrella of GCE could help students understand the interconnections between issues related to citizenship, democracy, participation, multiple and fluid identity, ambiguity, diversity, social justice, global issues and sustainability. Schools are faced with the challenge to educate youth to imagine creative solutions to existing global issues and future challenges. In this sense, global citizenship may provide an opportunity to value multiple identities and cultural diversity, build understanding of root causes of global issues of inequality and discrimination and help create a fairer, more sustainable and just global society.

Overall, there is a need to rethink dominant approaches to multicultural education in order to:

- Propose a wider definition of culture that transcends national, ethnic and religious boundaries
- Move beyond essentialized cultural celebration activities
- Critically challenge the cultural deficit theory
- Value hybrid, cross-border and fluid forms of cultural identify
- View tolerance to ambiguity and the ability to cross cultural boundaries as key aspects of multicultural education
- Develop a critical understanding of global power dynamics and roots of global inequality.

We believe it is high time to change the citizenship paradigm that is based on the premise that individuals should be committed and faithful to one Nation and one passport. Today's youth, especially in urban cities, need to develop adaptive and transnational skills.

Global Citizenship in Multicultural Contexts

In today's globalized and interconnected world, global citizenship education (GCE) has been identified as a means to prepare youth for an alternative, inclusive and sustainable world. Consequently, schools have a fundamental role to play in empowering learners to become responsible and active global citizens. In recent years, GCE has become a strong policy focus in international agendas, in particular in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development adopted at the United Nations Sustainable Development Summit in September 2015. By drawing attention to the pressing need to foster global citizens, GCE aims to empower learners to act responsively towards global issues and promote a more peaceful, inclusive and sustainable societies. Closely linked to human rights, it conveys values of respect, diversity, tolerance and solidarity (UNESCO, 2015).

There is however a lack of consensus regarding this concept and the values it embodies. Subject to divergent viewpoints and political stances, GCE may be seen as stuck in two contrasting global trends: on one side, post-national forms of identity have gained more momentum in increasingly interconnected, interdependent and culturally diverse contexts and on the other side, populism, nationalism, ethnic conflicts and religious extremism are rising around the world. Furthermore, many countries of immigration are faced with growing hostility towards globalization, multiculturalism and its values (Akkari & Maleq, 2020).

Indeed, many OECD countries are experiencing what could be described as a multilevel crisis of multiculturalism (Chin, 2019). First, a growing number of politicians, not only those from the far-right wing, challenge the efficiency, validity or the added value of multicultural policies. Furthermore, the fight against Islamic extremism is often utilized to discredit multiculturalist and immigration policies. Second, many countries still experience school segregation linked to residential segregation of ethnic minorities and migrants, resulting in ethnic tensions and aggravated inequalities.

Within this context, GCE it is subject to divergent political and ideological views despite being put forward as a means of building competence for a democratic and inclusive society. In the current political climate marked by growing divides on questions relating to immigration and multiculturalism (Tarozzi & Torres, 2016), tensions and opposing viewpoints are rising between those who believe the primary purpose of citizenship education is to build national identity and those who seek to promote global citizenship and solidarity.

It is clear that citizenship education is highly politicized and very much determined by the nature of national political agendas. It is therefore no surprise that the

introduction of a concept like 'global citizenship' in international education discourse is met with mixed feelings divergent understandings.

Nevertheless, in response to a growing need to prepare students for a rapidly changing global world, we can observe that GCE related content has gradually been introduced in national curricula (Akkari & Maleq, 2020). In the European context, Ross and Davies (2018) identify four significant trends of global citizenship: (1) developmental citizenship; (2) global environment issues; (3) universal human rights (4) global identities. Goren and Yemini's (2017) study has also shown that, worldwide, educators and policymakers increasingly seek to integrate GCE, in a bid to "prepare students to navigate and thrive in a modern global society" (p. 170). However, although GCE aims to provide answers to today's global challenges, foster social change and empower global citizenship, its operationalization and implementation at national levels proves to be challenging. Many authors also point out that many policy makers, teacher trainers and teachers seem to have limited understanding of GCE's possibilities (Alazmi, 2021; Bourn et al., 2017; Myers & Rivero, 2020; Rapoport, 2010).

Indeed, despite the concept's universal reach, GCE is largely context-dependent and subject to many interpretations. Within the multitude of definitions and approaches to GCE, Dill (2013) suggests that there are two main approaches to GCE: (1) a global competencies approach, aiming to develop the skills needed to compete in a global world and (2) a global consciousness approach, based on humanist values. For his part, Veugelers (2011) identifies three categories of global citizenship: (1) open global citizenship, which recognizes the interdependence between nation states in the globalized age; (2) moral global citizenship, based on human rights and equality, which emphasizes global responsibilities; and (3) socio-political global citizenship, which seeks to rebalance political power and promote equality and cultural diversity. As you can see, Veugelers' categories are hierarchical, with open global citizenship representing a shallow form of GCE and socio-political global citizenship representing a more profound approach.

Broadly, global citizenship has been defined as "awareness, caring, and embracing cultural diversity, while promoting social justice and sustainability, coupled with responsibility to act" (Pierce et al., 2010, p. 167). As stated previously, the fundamental spirit of global citizenship education is learning to live together. It promotes respect for diversity and solidarity for humanity and can be practiced not only globally, but also locally. In this respect, providing students with opportunities to learn about such fundamental values such as non-discrimination and non-violence is a good starting point for global citizenship education. For example, teaching students to treat immigrant and migrant children present in the local community with respect and dignity is a valid action for global citizenship education, as much as teaching them to learn about cultures outside their national borders (UNESCO, 2016).

Evans et al. (2009) also point out that teaching global citizenship has been informed by traditional citizenship education and has adopted its five main themes: awareness of related concepts; identification with civic communities; understanding of civil, political, socioeconomic, and cultural rights; individual reflexivity regarding

citizen thinking; and identification with values that lead to citizenship engagement. From a national perspective, Osborne (2000) suggests that citizenship education involves seven main elements: a sense of identity, awareness of and respect for the rights of others, the fulfillment of duties, political literacy, critical acceptance of social values, personal reflection on these components and necessary academic skills. While there is a general agreement that it is essential to educate youth about citizenship, there is an ongoing disagreement regarding how citizenship should be taught within the education system.

It is important to emphasize that, as GCE finds its place in school curricula alongside more traditional national-centric citizenship education, it may encounter similar challenges. As current models of citizenship education are moving away from knowledge-based approaches, the complexity of its objectives call for a more transversal integration. However, despite the many opportunities of transversal integration, it requires improvements in teacher training (Tsankov, 2017). Furthermore, more research is needed to effectively translate the intentions of empowering students to become active and responsible citizens in the school context.

Finally, the biggest challenge for GCE may be to avoid becoming dogmatic and overcome normative discourse. Eidoo et al. (2011) argue that since GCE is strongly linked to a multicultural education, it may be susceptible to similar critiques, whereby a superficial focus on the similarities of individuals can ignore realities of power dynamics and oppression as well as support an underlying neoliberal, Eurocentric bias (Andreotti, 2014; Eidoo et al., 2011; Hartung, 2017). However, critical models of GCE may provide an opportunity to rethink multicultural approaches to education and build a more complex understanding of settlement, immigration and pluralistic identities, by acknowledging and addressing the dynamics between marginalized and dominant cultures (Eidoo et al., 2011).

Beyond specific curricula components, GCE also requires appropriate educational pedagogies to develop world-mindedness, cross-cultural awareness, respect for the rights of others, and a social justice-oriented approach (Cook, 2008; Eidoo et al., 2011; Evans et al., 2009). Given the growing diversity in many countries, there is a need to acknowledge the complex intersections of race, ethnicity and culture, as well as the legacies of colonization and systemic injustices. In this respect, Andreotti (2014) invites us to reconsider traditional modals of citizenship defined by dominant Eurocentric groups that structure education systems and reflect their perspectives. Given the fact that GCE is generally taught within pre-existing subjects, such as social studies and civics, rather than existing as stand-alone course content (Rapoport, 2009) and lacks an explicit place in curriculum, the issue of appropriate educational pedagogies is even more important. In is however important to note that, since GCE is mostly unstructured in the curricula, it is highly dependent on the knowledge and dedication of individual teachers. In this respect, pre-service and in-service teacher training are key to the integration of GCE in schools.

Teaching Global Citizenship Through Youth Engagement

Learning democracy and citizenship has always been a central concern of pedagogues and educational thinkers. To mention only two of the most influential authors, Dewey and Freinet, their respective work provides a relevant insight into teaching citizenship. For Dewey, democracy is an experimentation that is constantly challenged - not a dogmatic or institutional order (Dewey, 2018, 1998). According to Freinet (1946), cooperative classes are based on a pedagogy of learning through experimental trial and error as well as freedom, responsibility, rights and obligations within a local and global community. Freinet's pedagogy is based on principles of mutual aid, solidarity, autonomy, cooperation (realization of common projects defined together as well as personal projects). The active involvement of learners in civic actions will allow them to develop practical experience and gain an understanding of GCE, since the latter "can be learned, but above all it can be practiced".

Culturally Responsive Pedagogy, which focuses on both acknowledging and considering the complexities of student diversity and integrating students' prior knowledge and experience into the classroom (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995), may also constitute a pedagogical approach worth exploring in relation to GCE. Allowing students to view themselves as valuable contributors to their communities and actively promoting student empowerment by encouraging them to draw on their own experiences and culture to foster positive environments (Grant & Asimeng-Boahene, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1995), Culturally Responsive Pedagogy's approach has a social justice-oriented standpoint and is closely linked to GCE.

We argue that the most effective approach to GCE is through youth engagement and the involvement of young people in their institutions, communities and decisions. By focusing on youth engagement, GCE could help youth to be perceived as responsible and informed democratic members of the world who can actively contribute to the social and political arenas in which they have been typically excluded (Hartung, 2017). This may enable young people to see themselves as agents of change and open opportunities to develop competencies and encourage young people to seek involvement (Bulling et al., 2013). Furthermore, this approach may increase youths' sense of community and allow young people to act as agents of change, positively impacting both themselves and community development (Checkoway & Gutiérrez, 2006; Perkins et al., 2001; Zeldin et al., 2013). With an increasing willingness from youth to engaging in unconventional forms of civic participation and engage in environmental activism, schools need to adapt their approach to civics and citizenship education. In our technology-laden modern world, social media plays a significant role in extending the impact of social movements, allowing the creation of support networks and giving a platform to get non-dominant voices into the discussion (Mundt et al., 2018). For instance, Mundt et al.'s (2018) case study on Black Lives Matter highlights the potential of social medial for building connections, mobilizing participants and amplifying alternative narratives.

Conclusion

In this chapter we have highlighted the current pedagogical challenges and opportunities for GCE. Probably the most important challenge to overcome is the conceptual fuzziness around the concept of GCE along with conflicting perspectives that range from neoliberal conformism to radical and critical proposals. In terms of opportunities and pedagogical potential, GCE could help redefine multicultural education by situating it in the global context and connecting it to the imperatives of sustainable development. In today's globalized and interconnected world, the greatest limitation of multicultural education is its national framework. Whilst it is important to work with students and teachers on cultural diversity, it is also important to encourage them to reflect on their responsibilities, rights and privileges in a global interconnected world, beyond their national belongings/borders. Finally, there is an urgent need to bring the concept of GCE to life, through the engagement of youth and their involvement in educational institutions. It is therefore not only a question of learning about global citizenship, but also of practicing it on a daily basis.

References

Ajegbo, K., Kiwan, D., & Sharma, S. (2007). *Curriculum review: Diversity and citizenship*. Department for Education and Skills.

Akkari, A., & Maleq, K. (Eds.). (2020). *Global citizenship education: Critical and international perspectives*. Springer.

Akkari, A., & Maleq, K. (2021). *Global Citizenship Education: re-envisioning multicultural education in a time of globalization., RIPE*, 14.

Alazmi, H. S. (2021). Leveraging international experts' perspectives to reframe citizenship in social studies curriculum during the globalisation era: Shifting to a global citizenship education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 1–19.

Andreotti, V. O. (2014). Soft versus critical global citizenship education. In S. McCloskey (Ed.), *Development education in policy and practice* (pp. 21–31). Palgrave Macmillan.

Bamber, P., Bullivant, A., Clark, A., & Lundie, D. (2018). Educating global Britain: Perils and possibilities promoting 'national' values through critical global citizenship education. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 66*(4), 433–453.

Banks, J. A. (2008). Diversity, group identity, and citizenship education in a global age. *Educational Researcher, 37*(3), 129–139.

Banks, J. A. (2009). Human rights, diversity, and citizenship education. *The Educational Forum, 73*, 100–110.

Banks, J., McGhee, C., Cortes, C., Hahn, C., Merryfield, M., Moodley, K., Murphy-Shigematus, S., Osler, A., Park, C., & Parker, W. C. (2005). *Democracy and diversity: Principles and concepts for educating citizens in a global age*. Center for Multicultural Education, University of Washington.

Bedard, G. (2000). Deconstructing whiteness: Pedagogical implications for anti-racism education. In G. J. S. Dei & A. Calliste (Eds.), *Power, knowledge and anti-racism education: A critical reader* (pp. 41–56). Fernwood Publishing.

Bourn, D., Hunt, F., & Bamber, P. (2017). *A review of education for sustainable development and global citizenship education in teacher education*. UNESCO. https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10030831/1/bournhuntbamber.pdf

Bulling, D., Carson, L., DeKraai, M., Garcia, A., & Raisio, H. (2013). Deliberation models featuring youth participation. *International Journal of Child, Youth and Family Studies, 3*, 409–432.

Castles, S., & Davidson, A. (2000). *Citizenship and migration: Globalization and the politics of belonging*. Routledge.

Chauvigné, C. (2018). La démocratie à l'école: quels savoirs, quelles valeurs pour quelle éducation? *Education et socialisation, 48*, 1–16.

Checkoway, B., & Gutiérrez, L. (2006). Youth participation and community change: An introduction. *Journal of Community Practice, 14*(1–2), 1–9.

Chin, R. (2019). *The crisis of multiculturalism in Europe: A history*. Princeton University Press.

Cook, S. A. (2008). Give peace a chance: The diminution of peace in global education in the United States, United Kingdom, and Canada. *Canadian Journal of Education, 31*(4), 889–913.

Davies, I., & Chong, E. K. M. (2016). Current challenges for citizenship education in England. *Asian Education and Development Studies, 5*(1), 20–36.

Dewey, J. (1998). *The essential Dewey: Pragmatism, education, democracy* (Vol. 1). Indiana University Press.

Dewey, J. (2018). *Ecrits politiques*. Gallimard.

Diallo, I., Embarki, M., & Abdallah, K. B. (2016). Education for citizenship at school in France: Trajectory, tensions and contradictions. In A. Peterson, R. Hattam, M. Zembylas, & J. Artur (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of education for citizenship and social justice* (pp. 391–409). Palgrave Macmillan.

Dill, J. S. (2013). *The longings and limits of global citizenship education: The moral pedagogy of schooling in a cosmopolitan age*. Routledge.

Eidoo, S., Ingram, L. A., Macdonald, A., Nabavi, M., Pashby, K., & Stille, S. (2011). Through the kaleidoscope: Intersections between theoretical perspectives and classroom implications in critical global citizenship education. *Canadian Journal of Education, 34*(4), 59–85.

Evans, M., Ingram, L. A., Macdonald, A., & Weber, N. (2009). Mapping the "global dimension" of citizenship education in Canada: The complex interplay of theory, practice and context. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning, 5*(2), 17–34.

Faas, D. (2011). The nation, Europe, and migration: A comparison of geography, history, and citizenship education curricula in Greece, Germany, and England. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 43*(4), 471–492.

Freinet, C. (1946). *L'École Moderne Française.* Paris, éditions Ophrys.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, practice & research*. Teachers College Press.

Grant, R. A., & Asimeng-Boahene, L. (2006). Culturally responsive pedagogy in citizenship education: Using African proverbs as tools for teaching in urban schools. *Multicultural Perspectives, 8*(4), 17–24.

Hartung, C. (2017). Global citizenship incorporated: Competing responsibilities in the education of global citizens. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 38*(1), 16–29.

Kerr, D. (2003). Citizenship education in England: The making of a new subject. *JSSE-Journal of Social Science Education, 2*, 1–10.

Kishimoto, K. (2018). Anti-racist pedagogy: From faculty's self-reflection to organizing within and beyond the classroom. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 21*(4), 540–554.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465–491.

Legris, P. (2010). Les programmes d'histoire en France: la construction progressive d'une « citoyenneté plurielle » (1980–2010). *École, histoire et nation, 126*, 121–154.

Ménard, C. (2017). Déplacements et tensions dans les politiques éducatives de 1985 à 2015: l'exemple des injonctions à propos de l'enseignement moral et civique. *Education et socialisation, 46*, 1–15.

Mundt, M., Ross, K., & Burnett, C. M. (2018). Scaling social movements through social media: The case of Black lives matter. *Social Media and Society*, 1–14.

Myers, J. P., & Rivero, K. (2020). Challenging preservice teachers' understandings of globalization: Critical knowledge for global citizenship education. *The Journal of Social Studies Research, 44*(4), 383–396.

Osborne, K. (2000). Public school and citizenship education in Canada. *Canadian Ethnic Studies, 32*(1), 8–37.

Osborne, K. (2005). Political education and citizenship: Teaching for civic engagement. *Education Canada, 45*(1), 13–16.

Osler, A. (2011). Teacher interpretations of citizenship education: National identity, cosmopolitan ideals, and political realities. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 43*(1), 1–24.

Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2001). Citizenship education and national identities in France and England: Inclusive or exclusive? *Oxford Review of Education, 27*(2), 287–305.

Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2006). Education for democratic citizenship: A review of research, policy and practice 1995–2005. *Research Papers in Education, 21*(4), 433–466.

Perkins, D. F., Borden, L. M., & Villarruel, F. A. (2001). Community youth development: A partnership for action. *School Community Journal, 11*, 39–56.

Pierce, L., Reysen, S., & Katzarska-Miller, I. (2010). The search for a definition of global citizenship. In S. Reysen (Ed.), *Global citizenship: Americans within the world*. Symposium conducted at the 54th annual meeting of the American Studies Association of Texas, Commerce, TX.

Raby, R. (2004). "There's no racism at my school, it's just joking around": Ramifications for anti-racist education. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 7*(4), 367–383.

Rapoport, A. (2009). A forgotten concept: Global citizenship education and state social studies standards. *The Journal of Social Studies Research, 33*(1), 91–113.

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), 179–190.

Ross, A., & Davies, I. (2018). Europe and global citizenship. In I. Davies, L.-C. Ho, D. Kiwan, C. L. Peck, A. Peterson, E. San, & Y. Waghid (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of global citizenship and education* (pp. 21–36). Palgrave Macmillan.

Sassen, S. (2002). Towards post-national and denationalized citizenship. In E. F. Isin & B. S. Turner (Eds.), *Handbook of citizenship education* (pp. 277–291). Sage.

Starkey, H. (2018). Fundamental British values and citizenship education: Tensions between national and global perspectives. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography, 100*(2), 149–162.

Tarozzi, M., & Torres, C. A. (2016). *Global citizenship education and the crises of multiculturalism*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Tsankov, N. (2017). Development of transversal competences in school education (a didactic interpretation). *International Journal of Cognitive Research in Science, Engineering and Education, 5*(2), 129–144.

UNESCO. (2015). *Global citizenship education. Topics and learning objectives*. UNESCO.

UNESCO. (2016). *The ABCs of global citizenship education*. UNESCO.

Veugelers, W. (2011). The moral and the political in global citizenship: Appreciating differences in education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 9*, 473–485.

Vincent, C. (2019). Cohesion, citizenship and coherence: Schools' responses to the British values policy. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 40*(1), 17–32.

Watkins, M., & Noble, G. (2019). Lazy multiculturalism: Cultural essentialism and the persistence of the multicultural day in Australian schools. *Ethnography and Education, 14*(3), 295–310.

Wilkins, A., & Olmedo, A. (Eds.). (2018). *Education governance and social theory: Interdisciplinary approaches to research*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Zajda, J. (2020). Evaluating research on human rights education globally. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *Human rights education globally*. Springer.

Zajda, J., & Majhanovich, S. (Eds.). (2021). *Globalisation, cultural identity and nation-building: The changing paradigms*. Springer.

Zeldin, S., Christens, B. D., & Powers, J. L. (2013). The psychology and practice of youth-adult partnership: Bridging generations for youth development and community change. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 51*, 385–397.