CICE Current Issues in Comparative Education

Volume 12(1) / Fall 2009 • ISSN 1523-1615 • http://www.tc.edu/cice

Cosmopolitanism, Education and Comparative Education

GUEST EDITORIAL INTRODUCTION

3 **Cosmopolitanism, Education and Comparative Education**
Andria Wisler

ARTICLES

6 **Rethinking 'Cosmopolitanism' as an Analytic for the Comparative Study of Globalization and Education**
Noah W. Sobe

14 **The Ethics and Ontology of Cosmopolitanism: Education for a Shared Humanity**
Dale Snauwaert

23 **Lonely Business or Mutual Concern: The Role of Comparative Education in the Cosmopolitan Citizenship Debates**
Anatoli Rapoport

33 **Cosmopolitanism in Civic Education: Exploring Cross-National Trends, 1970-2008**
Patricia Bromley

45 **Study Abroad and Development of Global Citizen Identity and Cosmopolitan Ideals in Undergraduates**
Karen Hendershot and Jill Sperandio

56 **Educating the World: Teachers and their Work as Defined by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)**
Helen Harper and Judith Dunkerly

66 **World-systems Analysis in Comparative Education: An Alternative to Cosmopolitanism**
Tom G. Griffiths and Lisa Knezevic

76 **Smashing Cosmopolitanism: The Neo-liberal Destruction of Cosmopolitan Education in East-Central Europe**
Robert J. Imre and Zsuzsa Millei

ESSAY

86 **The Evolution of a Cosmopolitan Identity: Transforming Culture**
Shannan Spisak

92 **About the Contributors**

CURRENT ISSUES IN COMPARATIVE EDUCATION
Volume 12, Issue 1 (2009)

EDITORIAL BOARD

INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD

COPYRIGHT

DISCLAIMER

Lonely Business or Mutual Concern: The Role of Comparative Education in the Cosmopolitan Citizenship Debates

Anatoli Rapoport
Purdue University

Cosmopolitan and global discourses are more and more often used for conceptualization and interpretation of citizenship. However, in the United States, the majority of schools are still resistant to incorporating cosmopolitan and global perspectives into citizenship education curriculum. This paper addresses challenges of cosmopolitan and global citizenship education in the United States. Three major challenges, namely (a) terminological and theoretical divergence, (b) lack of awareness among educators, and (c) patriotism-focused curricula are discussed. Also, the perspective areas of comparative education research to advance cosmopolitan and global education agendas are identified.

Citizenship is one of the most contested concepts in social sciences. Hence, citizenship education since the very beginning of public schooling has been and still remains at the focal point of political and educational debates. The intensification of debates in the last decades was mostly the result of belated attempts to coordinate curricular development in citizenship education with the rationalization of numerous emerging facets of citizenship. Marshall's (1950) theory of the historical progression of citizenship based on the development of civil, political, and social rights has been challenged by a rising number of competing models of citizenship (Carter, 2006). These models are usually conceptualized and interpreted through various discourses. Abowitz and Harnish (2006) identified seven such discourses: civic republican, liberal, feminist, reconstructionist, cultural, queer, and transnational. Urry (1999) categorized models of citizenship as cultural, minority, ecological, cosmopolitan, consumer, and mobility (in Adalbjarnardottir, 2002).

The purpose of this article is to explore the relations between comparative education research and the two most controversial models of citizenship education, namely cosmopolitan and global citizenship. I begin by summarizing conditions that make various forms of supra-national citizenship, including cosmopolitan and global, a significant part in citizenship education discourses. I will then analyze the main problems that cosmopolitan and global citizenship education face in the United States, and, finally, I will suggest how comparative education research can contribute to the development and advancement of a cosmopolitan and global worldview in citizenship education, particularly in the United States.

Throughout its history, citizenship has been interpreted as an individual relationship with a nation state in which loyalty to the state and building a common identity were at the core of citizenship education (Lawson and Scott, 2002). Since the rise of a nation state, nationality and citizenship have been almost synonymous (Davies, Evans, & Reid, 2005; Heater, 1999). To be a citizen implied that a person at minimum had a number of responsibilities to the state and other members of the community and, at the same time, enjoyed rights that the state awarded him or her as a compensation for entrusted responsibilities. Shared legal rights and responsibilities inevitably required that all those who possessed those rights and accepted responsibilities also shared values and beliefs. Hence, to become a citizen a person had to be socialized through the system directly or indirectly controlled by the society or community. This system is called a public

Current Issues in Comparative Education, Vol. 12(1): 23-32.

education, and citizenship education is one of its most important components. The development of a national system of education was one of the first tasks of a polity usually called a nation state and concurrently one of the first indicators of such a polity emergence. Conversely, because national identity (nation state membership) and citizenship (a set of legal rights and responsibilities to a socio-cultural-political entity called nation) were believed to be inseparable, attempts to break the links between education and the state were met with fierce resistance (Davies, Evans, & Reid, 2005).

The nation-state is no longer a sole repository of citizenship. There are a number of aspects that weaken national citizenship and make this concept vulnerable and susceptible to increasing skepticism. First, if we accept the imaginary status of nation (Anderson, 1991; Zajda, 2009), why would we assume that a nation-state or, in other words, a geographic space with a legal governing system to protect or expand itself, is less vulnerable or less susceptible to changes? In this regard, the term nation-building presents an interesting example of syntactic dichotomy: on the one hand, the nation-building process, as the term implies, aims at building a nation; on the other, due to its ideological nature, nation-building is an endless never-stopping process whose ultimate goal, a nation, never takes a final shape. That is why history, or rather mythology, that is usually taken for history is so carefully monitored and constructed to make sure that "a continuous process of redefinition, revision, reinterpretation, and rewriting of historical narratives" (Zajda, 2009, 4) is under control.

The emergence of globalization and global consciousness profoundly influenced the notion of citizenship and citizenship education rationales by infusing a more distinct global perspective and by challenging the core principles of citizenship as an idiosyncratically nation or nation-state related concept. Global citizenship is central to understanding cosmopolitanism. Most researchers use the terms 'global citizenship' and 'cosmopolitan citizenship' interchangeably. Tully (2008), for example, used the term cosmopolitan to denote global liberal citizenship that he juxtaposed to global (global/local) or global democratic citizenship. Delanty (2002), on the contrary, argued that globalization opens up possibilities of cosmopolitan citizenship, and cautioned not to confuse cosmopolitanism with globalization.

The dialogue surrounding the national versus cosmopolitan citizenship dichotomy is complicated by fundamental traditionalism of a society and by the lack of convincing examples of cosmopolitan citizenship. The dialogue is increasingly complex due to the political interests of elites who usurp nationalistic discourses to pursue their own populist goals. History knows numerous examples, some of them recent, when accusation in alleged cosmopolitanism equated public ostracism, arrest, or even death. Such stigmatization of cosmopolitism and globalization complicates the dialogue even further.

Theoretical and systemic challenges that global or cosmopolitan citizenship conceptually pose deeply impact programmatic or curricular narratives as well as all educational discourses. Although the idea of cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitan citizenship has been known since the times of the Greek and Roman Stoics, it received attention in formal citizenship education discourses fairly recently and not everywhere. Even in countries where the discourses of transnational citizenships are actively supported and where political leaders and educators are involved in the discussion, teachers face substantial difficulties in teaching about global or cosmopolitan citizenship. Teachers in Hong Kong and Shanghai, for example, support global citizenship education but experience pressure from the exam-oriented curriculum, lack of training, and inadequate support from the school administration and government officials (Lee & Leung, 2006).

After examining how individual teachers in Ontario schools prioritized global citizenship issues in their teaching, Michele Schweisfurth (2006) concluded that the teachers had to and were able to "interpret the prescribed curriculum imaginatively" (p. 49) to justify their own aims in teaching about global citizenship. Despite the global citizenship education-friendly civics curriculum and standards in Ontario, the general encompassing message to teachers was about curricular standardization. Although teachers were taught through professional development to look at the curriculum guidelines from a global citizenship education angle, they found themselves at the periphery of the profession.

Numerous researchers observe an increasing interest in global and international education in the United States. The interest is fostered by the ubiquity and omnipresence of globalization, its positive and negative impacts are evident through increasing diversity and mobility of the population, recent economic growths and crises, and through an almost palpable interdependence of cultures. If we are so eager to apply a global framework in teaching social sciences, natural sciences, or humanities, why do we become so hesitant when it comes to conceptualizing global or cosmopolitan citizenship? Why do we more and more often hear about cosmopolitan citizenship, global citizenship, or transnational citizenship at research conferences, yet hardly ever in classrooms?

In 1994, Martha Nussbaum argued that one of the fundamental goals of American citizenship, namely a national unity in devotion to justice and equality, would be better served "by the very old ideal of the cosmopolitan, the person, whose allegiance is to the worldwide community of human beings" (1994, 4). However, fifteen years later "the very old ideal of a cosmopolitan" is still missing in classroom discourses. I would like to focus on three reasons why cosmopolitan or global perspectives in citizenship education are still not welcomed in US schools.

First, teachers are practitioners. Unlike theoreticians, practitioners like to operate with concrete terms. Cosmopolitanism, cosmopolitan citizenship, global citizenship, and transnational citizenship are disputed concepts that have supporters and opponents. Not surprisingly, these controversial concepts generate a lot of criticism, mostly related to their social and political aspects. Cosmopolitanism ignores the crucial humanizing role of identity politics in a complicated world of contracts, markets, and legal personhood, stated Benjamin Barber (2002) while debating Martha Nussbaum's (2002) vision of cosmopolitanism. Additionally, Wood (2008) denounced global citizenship because citizenship is a technology of governance rather than "an unambiguously emancipatory, empowering institution" (Wood, at 25) and there are no formal political structures at the global level inclusive of citizenship. The emerging global civil society, frequently related to cosmopolitan citizenship, faces several accusations itself: it is terminologically ambiguous, its supporters uncritically apply nation-state phenomena to global processes, and it undermines democracy by weakening the democratic institutions of nation-states (Corry, 2006).

Armstrong (2006) argued that the supposedly "global" elements of global and cosmopolitan citizenship are not universal and transcendent. Although the role and place of the nation-state in citizenship education is constantly changing as a consequence of both sub-national and supranational 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 & Openshaw, 2002). For example, Glazer (2002) indicates cosmopolitanism is a purely Western value strongly resisted by the developing world. The advocacy of cosmopolitanism, Glazer (2002)

contends, is viewed suspiciously in developing countries as an arrogant insistence of former colonizers to reinstall their Western values.

Global citizenship is critical to understanding cosmopolitanism. However, not only is global citizenship a highly contested concept, it is also barely known to the majority of educators. Thus, unawareness is the second reason why cosmopolitanism or global citizenship is hardly present in US classrooms. Though schools can be aligned with transnational efforts in promoting global civility (Reimers, 2006), not all schools and educators share this view or know how to pursue this goal. Research demonstrates that teachers are mostly oblivious to the purposes, methods, or content of global citizenship education. Of over 700 teachers in England who rated education for global citizenship as important, very few were confident of their ability to teach it (Davies et al. in Yamashita, 2006).

A study of how Indiana teachers conceptualize global citizenship (Rapoport, 2008) demonstrated that the concept of global citizenship is still rarely mentioned in the classroom. The participants of the study agreed that it was important to infuse global dimensions into all aspects of citizenship education. However, it remained unclear if they had a clear vision of what global citizenship entailed or if they possessed a comprehensible rationale for teaching global citizenship. Without additional curricular guidance or substantive and programmatic methodological support, teachers in the study rationalized and contextualized cosmopolitan and global citizenship based on their own extensive international experiences. The major factor that influenced their curricular choices and decisions in regard to global citizenship was their understanding of the concept. For this reason, they conceptualized global citizenship through the frameworks and discourses of the subject that they were teaching. As one of the teachers put it, "We cannot teach what we do not know" (p.11).

The lack of curricular guidance also contributes to the problem. In 2008, the term globalization was mentioned in the social studies standards of only fifteen states. Moreover, social studies standards of only two states (Maryland and Mississippi) contained the term global citizenship. As for cosmopolitan citizenship, this term was absent from social studies standards of all states (Rapoport, 2009). Possibly, states do not include concepts of cosmopolitan or global citizenship into their standards because these concepts are relatively new and highly contested. As a result of such shortsighted policy, these concepts are neglected in US schools. A number of theoretical works (Bottery, 2006; Engler & Hunt, 2004; Reimers, 2006) remind us that teachers need clear guidance to justify their interest in teaching about trans-national forms of citizenship, even those committed to teaching from a global perspective, particularly in the time of accountability and test-driven curricula. The absence of guidance, together with the increasing trend to permeate educational discourses with international or global narratives, sends mixed messages to both education officials and teachers.

A final challenge to cosmopolitan and global perspectives in citizenship education is the fear that any perspective going beyond national citizenship undermines patriotism. In most cases, patriotism is conceptualized in its traditional meaning. This is particularly true in the United States where, on the one hand, schooling disproportionately favors national identity over learning about the world and, on the other hand, teachers can be accused of being unpatriotic when they promote critical discussion of government policy (Loewen, 1995; Myers, 2006; White & Openshaw, 2002). Patriotism is generally defined as a special affinity one has toward their country, a "sense of positive identification with and feelings of affective attachment to one's country" (Schatz, Staub, & Levine, 1999).

Despite the expanding theoretical substantiation of the need to shift popular allegiances to the rule of law and constitution rather than to an individual country (Habermas, 2001; Nussbaum, 2002), most scholars correlate the paradigm of patriotic discourses with an individual country or locality. However, patriotic sentiments are seen differently by different people. On the one hand, patriotism denotes loyalty to the nation, or country, a pride for the nation's culture and achievements, a respectful understanding and appreciation of the nation's history, or a love of country based on political allegiance, shared values, and a shared history and culture (Finn, 2007; Fonte, 1997; Lutovinov, 2006; Ravitch 2007).

On the other hand, patriotic discourses are becoming more inclusive; their materials increasingly question subjects and objects of national pride and critically revise and reevaluate national histories and myths (Apple, 2002; Gomberg, 1990; Lowen, 1996; Merry, 2007; Nash, 2005; Nussbaum, 2002). As a social construct that gradually developed as a result of human cultural activity, patriotism in its various forms appeared as a societal phenomenon. After going through reciprocal typification, and habitualization, it became an institutionalized construct, a part of social reality (Berger & Luckman, 1966). Educators should remember that social constructs, such as patriotism or citizenship, particularly interpreted through their traditional more conservative framework, can be manipulated by various actors to achieve immediate political or social goals (Apple, 2002; Li & Brewer, 2004; Rapoport, 2009, Skitka, 2005; Sperling, 2003). However, the traditional meaning of patriotism has been challenged more and more often (Apple, 2002; Branson, 2002; Nussbaum, 1994; Merry, 2007). The idea of patriotism as a more inclusive construct, particularly in regard to multicultural and intercultural discourses, is becoming more acceptable. "A useful definition of patriotism," noted Akhmad and Szpara (2005) "should not hinge on the legal status in a polity but embrace citizens' allegiance to universal human values, democratic ideals, and the human rights and dignity of all people in the world" (p. 10).

In sum, three central challenges to global and cosmopolitan citizenship education in the U.S. are terminological and theoretical divergence; lack of awareness among educators; and patriotism-focused curricula. They are justifiable topics for debate, although they understandably slow down the transition to the new level of citizenship education. There are more and more curricular materials (e.g. Global Citizenship in Your Classroom http://www.globalsolutionspgh.org or High School for Global Citizenship http://hs-gc.org) on global and cosmopolitan citizenship and curricular and classroom action research (Gaudelli & Fernikes, 2004; Myers, 2006) that help US teachers better see the perspectives of global and cosmopolitan citizenship education. However, the examples are not numerous enough to turn into critical mass that would make healthy theoretical debates a part of conventional discourse among practitioners and school administrators.

Fernando Ramirez (2006) noted, "Cosmopolitanism is arguably both more necessary and more possible than in years past… Schools should thus focus deliberately on the public purposes of educating children to be more cosmopolitan and tolerant, better prepared for citizenship and for global citizenship" (p. 283). Including a cosmopolitan component in various forms of citizenship education prepares children for a world that the Vietnam War generation of 1960's and 1970's could only dream of, the post-Cold War generation of 1980's and 1990's could only hear of, but in which present day schoolchildren will definitely live . Cosmopolitan and global citizenship are developmental components of citizenship education and provide students with multiple perspectives and loyalties.

Cosmopolitan citizenship education can also at least partially help resolve the internal conflict of

every democratic multicultural society —balancing diversity of multiculturalism and uniformity of citizenship. Cosmopolitanism, both semantically and practically, transcends routinely understood multiculturalism and expands the traditional notion of citizenship, thus potentially becoming a more inclusionary and transformative framework for sustainable democratic development (Snauwaert, 2002; Walker & Serrano, 2006). Cosmopolitan citizenship framework helps minorities find their voices by asserting that value variability is an asset, rather than a liability. By teaching cosmopolitanism, educators encourage marginalized groups to view their differences as assets, thereby empowering these groups to use their differences to achieve. This viewpoint helps reconsider an earlier view of education advocating the elimination of difference as the sole path to successful democracy (Walker & Serrano, 2006). Moreover, it is relevant considering the worldwide phenomenon of transnational migration and the unprecedented movement of diverse racial, cultural, ethnic, and religious groups across nation states.

In fact, cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitan citizenship have been a part of American educational tradition for a long time. Thomas Popkewitz (2009) asserted that introducing the concept of cosmopolitanism to the child was central to the pedagogy of the school and, as a result, early progressive education adhered to the ideas of North American Enlightenment philosophers who spoke of cosmopolitanism as a universal mode of living providing a more progressive world of freedom and liberty. Ironically, Popkewitz attributed the notion of "American exceptionalism" to the principles of cosmopolitan citizenship "as an epic account of the progressive development of the highest ideals of cosmopolitan human values and progress" (p. 387).

What does it mean to teach cosmopolitan or global citizenship? What does it mean to incorporate a cosmopolitan component in citizenship education? How do we deconstruct cosmopolitan citizenship, provide knowledge, and develop skills and dispositions that are critical for future global citizens? What is the place of cosmopolitan citizenship education in the broader matrix of citizenship education? How can teachers appropriately apply the interdisciplinary potential of cosmopolitanism in the classroom and beyond? Practitioners addressing global and cosmopolitan perspectives in their teaching face these questions. Comparative inquiry and analysis play a significant role in providing teachers and administrators with new visions and innovative ideas to incorporate cosmopolitan and global frameworks into citizenship education.

Comparative and international education research can help advance cosmopolitan and global agendas in citizenship education by demonstrating that there is no real alternative to the advancement of transnational and supra-national forms of citizenship. Almost all recent works in comparative education addressing citizenship education indicate the transformative role of globalization and a growing need for multi-dimensional citizenship education considering the polyphony of contexts from local to global (Dejaeghere, 2008; Kennedy, Hahn & Lee, 2008: Myers, 2006; Myers, 2007; Szelényi & Rhoads, 2007). Comparative education research reflects the dynamics of citizenship and citizenship education around the world, as well as a visible shift of citizenship paradigm to include more pronounced forms of cosmopolitan and global citizenship.

The increasing number of studies on global citizenship education reflects two significant trends in the world of education. First, despite existing skepticism, more schools include aspects of cosmopolitan and global citizenship in their curricula. Second, schools are still hesitant, and desire more knowledge and familiarity with the concept of cosmopolitanism and global citizenship. Thus far, a comparative method in international education research efficiently provides evidence for significant political and curricular reforms in education. Comparative and international education researchers can transfer knowledge of the significance and perspectives of cosmopolitan

and global citizenship education to US teachers.

To effectively impact citizenship education in the U.S. and to advance the inclusion of cosmopolitan global worldview, comparative research should focus on:

- Analysis of conditions conducive to the development of cosmopolitan and global citizenship and contexts that make cosmopolitan and global consciousness possible;
- Debates around the notion and essence of citizenship, cosmopolitanism, and globalization and how these concepts are constructed, interpreted, negotiated, and applied in various discourses and practices, particularly educational, in different societies;
- Policies that impact multiple forms of citizenships; and
- Curricular and professional development practices that help teachers and education administrators to better understand the ideas of cosmopolitanism, expanding citizenship, multiple loyalties, and perspective consciousness.

Research in comparative and international education is intrinsically cosmopolitan. By engaging in comparative research, scholars and practitioners assert that despite differences in cultures, contexts, or conditions, there is something that enables us to observe, study, and compare phenomena in various educational systems. Martha Nussbaum (2002) said that becoming a citizen of the world is often a lonely business. Because only a few were able to comprehend the world as a unique community of humans, it was hard to distance from the imagined communities and mythologies that people identified with. We are living in a different time. We understand that the world is much more multi-faceted and interdependent. Humanity is in the process of acquiring the capacity to look beyond national borders, to transcend values and ideals. Cosmopolitan and global citizenship education is a perfect instrument to help in this process, and comparative education research will keep this instrument properly calibrated.

References

Abowitz, K. K., & Harnish, J. (2006). Contemporary discourses of citizenship. *Review of Educational Research, 76*(4), 653-690.

Adalbjarnardottir, S. (2002). Citizenship education and teachers' professional development. .In D. Scott & H. Lawson (Eds.), *Citizenship education and the curriculum* (pp. 132-149). Ablex Publishing: Westport, CT

Ahmad, I., & Szpara, M. Y. (2005). Education for democratic citizenship and peace: Proposal for a cosmopolitan model. *Educational Studies, 38*(1), 8-23.

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities*. London: Verso

Armstrong, C. (2006). Global civil society and the question of global citizenship. *Voluntas*, 17(4), 349-57.

Apple, M. (2002). Patriotism, pedagogy, and freedom: On the educational meaning of September 11th. *Teachers College Record, 104*(8),1760-1772.

Barber, B. (2002). Constitutional faith. In M. Nussbaum, *For love of country?* (pp. 30-37). Boston: Beacon Press.

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.

Berger, P. L., & Luckman, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Bottery, M. (2006). Education and globalization: Redefining the role of the educational professional. *Educational Review, 58*(1), 95-113.

Branson, M. (2002). *Patriotism and civic literacy*. Paper presented at "We the People…" State and District Coordinators conference. Washington, DC.

Carter, A. (2006). *The political theory of global citizenship*. London: Routledge

Corry, O. (2006). Global civil society and its discontents. *Voluntas, 17*(4), 303-324.

Davies, I., Evans, M., & Reid, A. (2005). Globalizing citizenship education? A critique of "global education" and "citizenship education." *British Journal of Educational Studies, 53*(1), 66-89.

Dejaeghere, J. (2008). Citizenship as privilege and power: Australian educators' lived experiences as citizens. *Comparative Education Review*, *52*(3), 357-380.

Delanty, G. (2002). *Citizenship in a global age: Society, culture, politics*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Engler, J. M., & Hunt, Jr. J. B. (2004). Preparing our students for work and citizenship in the Global Age. *Phi Delta Kappan, 86*(3), 197-99

Finn, C. E. (2007). Teaching patriotism – with conviction. In J. Westheimer & H. Zinn (Eds.), *Pledging allegiance: The politics of patriotism in America's schools* (pp. 95-98). New York: Teachers College Press.

Fonte, J. (1997). Post-West syndrome: When patriotism is threatened, so are the roots of democracy. *National Review*, October 27.

Gaudelli, W., & Fernekes, W. (2004). Teaching about global human rights for global citizenship: Action research in the social studies curriculum. *The Social Studies, 95*(1), 16-26.

Glazer, N. (2002). Limits of loyalty. In M. Nussbaum, *For love of country?* (pp. 61-65). Boston: Beacon Press.

Gomberg, P. (1990). Patriotism is like racism. *Ethics,* 101(1), 144-150.

Habermas, J. (2001). *The postnational constellation: Political essays*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Heater, D. (1999). *What is citizenship?* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Kennedy, K., Hahn, C., & Lee, W. (2008). Constructing citizenship: Comparing the views of

students in Australia, Hong Kong, and the United States. *Comparative Education Review, 52*(1), 53-92.

Lawson, H., & Scott, D. (2002). Introduction. In D. Scott & H. Lawson (Eds.), *Citizenship education and the curriculum* (pp. 2-6). Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing

Lee, W., & Leung, S. (2006). Global citizenship education in Hong Kong and Shanghai secondary schools: Ideals, realities and expectations. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning, 2*(2), 68-84.

Li, Q., & Brewer, M. (2004). What does it mean to be an American? Patriotism, nationalism, and American identity after 9/11. *Political Psychology, 25*(5), 727-739.

Lowen, J. (1996). *Lies my teacher told me: Everything your American history textbook got wrong*. New York: Touchstone.

Lutovinov, V.I. (2006). Grazhdansko-patrioticheskoye vospitaniye segodnya (Civic-patriotic education today). *Pedagogika, 5*, 53-59.

Merry, M. (2007). Patriotism, history and the legitimate aims of American education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 41*(4), 377-399.

Myers, J. (2006). Rethinking the social studies curriculum in the context of globalization: Esducation for global citizenship in the U.S. *Theory and Research in Social Education., 34*(3), 370-394.

Myers, J. (2007). Citizenship education practices of politically active teachers in Porto Alegre, Brazil and Toronto, Canada. *Comparative Education Review, 51*(1), 1-24.

Nash, M. A. (2005). "How to be thankful for being free": Searching for a convergence of discourses on teaching patriotism, citizenship, and United States history. *Teachers College Record, 107*(1), 214-240.

Nussbaum, M. (1994). Patriotism and cosmopolitanism. *The Boston Review, 19*(5), 3-16.

Nussbaum, M. (2002). Patriotism and cosmopolitanism. In M. Nussbaum, *For love of country?* (pp. 3-17). Boston: Beacon Press.

Popkewitz, T. S. (2009). Double gesture of cosmopolitanism and comparative studies of education. In R. Cowen & A. M. Kazamias (Eds.), *International handbook of comparative education,* (pp. 385-401). Springer: Netherlands.

Ramirez, F. O. (1997). The nation-state, citizenship, and educational change: Institutionalization and globalization. In W. Cummings & McGinn, N. (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. (2008). *We cannot teach what we don't know: Indiana teachers talk about global citizenship education*. Paper presented at National Council for the Social Studies annual meting, Huston, TX, November 14, 2008.

Rapoport, A. (2009). A forgotten concept: Global citizenship education and state social studies standards. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, *33*(1), 91-112.

Ravitch, D. (2006). Should we teach patriotism, *Phi Delta Kappan*, *87*(8), 579-581.

Reimers, F. (2006). Citizenship, identity and education: Examining the public purposes of schools in an age of globalization. *Prospects*, 36(3), 275-294.

Schatz, R. T., Staub, E, & Lavine, H. (1999). On the varieties of national attachments: Blind versus constructive patriotism. *Political Psychology, 20*(1), 151-174.

Schweisfurth, M. (2006). Education for global citizenship: Teacher agency and curricular structure in Ontario schools. *Educational Review, 58*(1), 41-50.

Skitka, L. (2005). Patriotism or nationalism? Understanding post-September 11, 2001 flag-display behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 35*(10), 1995-2011.

Sperling, V. (2003). The last refuge of a scoundrel; patriotism, militarism and the Russian national idea. *Nations and Nationalism, 9*(2), 235-253.

Szelényi, K., & Rhoads, R. (2007). Citizenship in a global context: The perspectives of international graduate students in the United States. *Comparative Education Review, 51*(1), 25-47.

Tully, J. (2008). Two meanings of global citizenship: Modern and diverse. In M. Peters, H. Blee, & A. Britton (Eds.), *Global citizenship education: Philosophy, theory, and pedagogy.* Rotterdam: Sense Publications.

Walker, J., & Serrano, A. (2006). Formulating a cosmopolitan approach to immigration and social policy: Lessons from American (north and south) indigenous and immigrant groups. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 9(1).

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, CT: Ablex Publishing.

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). Amsterdam: Springer.