Teacher Education for Citizenship in a Globalized World: a Case Study in Spain

Marta Estellés, (marta.estelles@unican.es)

University of Cantabria, Spain

Jesús Romero, (jesus.romero@unican.es)

University of Cantabria, Spain

_____

Abstract: Considering the attention that global citizenship education has recently received, it is not much of a surprise that teacher education programs and courses around the world are including stated goals related to the preparation of teachers to educate their students for global and participatory citizenship. This is also the case of the Faculty of Education at the University of Cantabria (Spain). This study explores how a group of teacher educators from this university conceptualize citizenship education, if they include global perspectives in their notions, and how they educate for democracy in an increasingly globalized world. Although teacher education can contribute to challenge pre-service teachers' perceptions of the nation state as the only locus for democracy and citizenship, the inclusion of global perspectives done by these teacher educators has been very limited. Also, the participants that were more globally concerned were those who had a stronger sense of social justice.

Key words: global citizenship education; teacher education; global perspectives in citizenship education; teacher educators' perceptions and pedagogies.

_____

Introduction

During the last decades there has been an increasing number of scholars and educational practitioners all over the globe who claim that nation-centered models of citizenship education cannot prepare students for such an interconnected world. Many of their discourses, empirical investigations, and proposals have been lumped together in what has been called *global citizenship education*. Considering the attention that it has recently received, it is not much of a surprise that teacher education programs and courses around the world are including stated goals related to the preparation of teachers to educate their future students for global, engaged, and participatory citizenship. This is also the case of the Faculty of Education at the University of Cantabria, which is situated in the north of Spain. Although there is some evidence from empirical research on teacher education and global citizenship education (An, 2014; Gaudelli & Wylie, 2012), we still know little about how teacher educators think and do in this regard. This study explores how a group of teacher educators from the University of Cantabria conceptualize citizenship education, if they include global perspectives in their notions, and how they educate for democracy in an increasingly globalized world.

Literature Review

Global Perspectives in Citizenship Education

The term global citizenship education is a concept more and more frequently used by scholars and educational discourses. However, there is no consensus on what this term means (Gaudelli, 2009; Noddings, 2005; Shultz, 2007). Many scholars have tried to bring some clarity to the variety of discourses (Gaudielli, 2009; Myers, 2010; Shultz, 2007). Most global or transnational citizenship discourses have based their statements on at least one of the three following premises. The first is directly connected to the ancient Stoic tradition of cosmopolitanism, which implies the recognition of human beings beyond one's state (Heater, 2004; Nussbaum, 1997). This principle has led many educators and researchers to deem teaching about diversity and human rights as essential, though not always sufficient, in citizenship education (Hahn, 2005). The second is related to the consideration of the increasing economic, political, and cultural globalization of the world that challenges traditional ways of understanding citizenship towards others in flux (Isin, 2009). As Knight-Abowitz and Harnish (2006) say, "Membership is more fluid and transcends national or regional borders" (p. 675). In the field of citizenship education, that interconnectedness, although not particular to our century (Held, 1997), requires taking into account that political and social decisions should consider local and global effects. For this reason, Hahn (2001) claimed that "[c]itizenship education must acknowledge that decisions made in one part of the globe have consequences elsewhere" (p. 21) and Merryfield and Wilson (2005) advised of the importance of understanding the interdependence of the global systems, and developing a perspective consciousness (Hanvey, 1982). That interconnectedness requires not only awareness but also action in global context. As Banks (2008) stated, "[A]s citizens of the global community, students also must develop a deep understanding of the need to take action and make decisions to help solve the world's difficult problems" (p. 134). In this sense, Davies, Evans, and Reid (2005), for instance, proposed the following guidelines for giving a global approach: a) using global content, b) linking past, present, and future, c) emphasizing the affective, d) exploring issues, and e) encouraging action. The third premise is based on the idea that, as globalization is a social process with lack of control and regulation, often driven by powers with little or no democratic legitimacy (Archibugi, 2008; Archibugi & Held, 2011; Held, 1997, 2010; Romero & Luis, 2008), a global conception of citizenship "augments the sovereignty of the individuals within the transnational community rather than augmenting a state in hopes that it will bequeath such benefits to its citizens" (Knight-Abowitz & Harnish, 2006, p. 677). Nevertheless, "[c]itizen education based on identity defined by membership in a 'nation' rests on the mistaken assumption that democracy is effectively pursued within the nation-state, whose influence and authority has been reduced by globalization" (Enslin, 2000, p. 149). Other categories of identity, however, such as race, gender or social class cross national borders (Knight-Abowitz & Harnish, 2006). As a consequence, authors such as Hill (2002) link global education to the knowledge of "social justice and equity; interdependence; sustainable development; cultural diversity; peace and conflict; population concerns; languages" (p. 26). Moreover, Held (1997, 2016) argued that, because it is not possible to place effective political power within the national government (since it is shared by agents at local, national and international levels), it is necessary to build global governance. This means that to govern democratically problems that affect all of us, people have to participate in many different political communities configured on different scales. Thus, he advocates the necessity of a "multiple citizenship," a concept that connotes full membership on multiple governance levels.

Considering the variety of discourses regarding global citizenship education, there are hence many

Corresponding author email: marta.estelles@unican.es

ways of encouraging global perspectives when educating citizens. Beyond including global standpoints while teaching current issues, there is a need for "teaching earth citizenship," based on the awareness of humanity as a planetary fate (Morin, 1999). Also, understanding the interdependence of global systems is important as well (Merryfield & Wilson, 2005). Hanvey (1982) added to these two aspects a) perspective consciousness, b) cross-cultural/intercultural awareness, and c) awareness of human choices to participate. Pike (2000) and Banks (2008) also emphasize the dimension of decision-making and action. As Banks (2008) highlighted: "[a]s citizens of the global community, students also must develop a deep understanding of the need to take action and make decisions to help solve the world's difficult problems" (p. 134). Similarly, Zong (2009) considered the following perspectives: "cultural learning and understanding, appreciating multiple perspectives and fostering tolerance, addressing prevailing global issues, teaching about the connections and collaborations among the nations, promoting peace, and critical understanding of issues and events" (p. 620). Thus, developing global awareness and engagement are the key points of most of the models defined.

Teacher Education for Global Citizenship in Spain

As Logan (2011) said, "If schools are to educate for democratic citizenship, the manner in which pre-service teacher education helps teacher candidates to understand citizenship and how it will be utilized in their future teaching practices, is a true concern" (p. 153). In this regard, how well future teachers will be prepared to deal with the challenges of citizenship education in a globalized world is, at least to some extent, related to the democratic experiences and perspectives of their teacher educators (Carr, 2008). Indeed, not a few scholars (An, 2014; Gaudelli & Wylie, 2012; Rapoport, 2010, 2015; among others) have argued for more attention to global elements of citizenship in preservice teacher programs. However, very little attention has been paid to explore how global citizenship education is perceived and carried out by teacher educators. This demand becomes even more important when research on pre-service teachers' conceptions shows the superficial understandings they have about citizenship education and democracy (Borghi, et al., 2012; De la Montaña, 2012; Marri, et al., 2014; Martin, 2010, 2008; Peterson & Knowles, 2009; Ross & Yeager, 1999; Sunal, et al., 2009; Vera, et al., 2012) and their increasing interest in education for global citizenship (Robbins et al., 2003) and the use of global (Holden & Hicks, 2007) and controversial issues (Barchuk & Harkins, 2010).

In Spain, citizenship education was implemented in 2006 as a compulsory subject for elementary and secondary school, following the recommendations of the European Parliament (Engel, 2014; Gómez & García, 2013; González & Beas, 2012; Puig, et al., 2010). Since that date, national educational laws have also included, among their stated purposes, preparing children to grow as global citizens. Before that year, the democratic Constitution adopted in 1978 considered the formation of citizens as an educational aim, but national curricula paid little attention to it (González & Beas, 2012; Naval & Arbués, 2016). The inclusion of this obligatory subject, as well as the European Higher Education Reform, has led to many teacher education curricula to include citizenship as an educational goal (Bolívar, 2007). Nevertheless, this goal has not always been implemented as a compulsory course in teacher preparation programs, but frequently as a cross-curricular topic without clear guidelines (Estepa, 2012). As a consequence, those teacher educators genuinely interested in citizenship education are the ones who voluntarily take the responsibility of achieving this aim in their courses. However, we know little about how those teacher educators prepare their students to become effectively engaged in an increasingly globalized world, and to educate for global citizenship.

Corresponding author email: marta.estelles@unican.es

The Study

This article presents the findings of a study conducted among a group of teacher educators from the Faculty of Education at the University of Cantabria in Spain. The purpose of the study was to explore how these teacher educators conceptualize citizenship education, if they incorporate global perspectives in their notions, and what pedagogies they use to address it.

Participants

For the participant selection, it was important to identify those teacher educators most interested in citizenship education within that medium-sized public university in the north of Spain. In order to do it, we analyzed all the teaching syllabi of the degree in Elementary Education. Participants were selected based on the next criteria: a) faculty members responsible for any core course b) of the degree in Elementary Education c) whose syllabi make explicit reference to citizenship education, according to the definition given by the Eurydice Report (2005, 2012) [1]. From the 29 teacher educators in charge of any obligatory course, nine teacher educators fulfilled all the requirements, and all of them agreed to participate in the study. Six of the teacher educators were male and three were female. All of them belong to the Education Department but were part of different knowledge areas of expertise: Educational and Developmental Psychology, Didactic and School Organization, Didactics of Social Sciences, Didactics of Experimental Sciences, and Theory and History of Education.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data collection was performed using semi-structured interviews with these nine teacher educators. Interview questions were based on previous studies (Patterson, et al., 2012; Carr, 2008; Martin, 2008; Davies, et al., 1999). Most of them were open-ended and they mainly focused on a) the reasons why they think citizenship education is important; b) how they consider it should be addressed; c) to what extent they believe that goal is achieved in their courses and how it is realized; and d) what they think a good citizen is. We did not mention anything related to global perspectives or global citizenship education while having the interviews, in order to avoid giving them clues of what we 'wanted' to hear. Interviews were carried out throughout the month of May 2013. They lasted between forty minutes and one hour and they were recorded and transcribed in full to ensure accuracy. Also, the interviewees were asked for feedback on the interview transcripts. In order to ensure confidentiality, all the participants were assigned pseudonyms.

The data collected were coded using a category system that combined two different classifications in the same heuristic tool. On the one hand, the typology elaborated by the Eurydice reports (2005, 2012) identify the essential components of citizenship education. On the other hand, a classification was based on the works of Hanvey (1982) and Merryfield (1998) on the different dimensions of global education: perspective consciousness, state of the planet awareness, awareness of human choices,

---

[1] According to the definition of Eurydice (2012), citizenship education "include[s] four main aspects (a) political literacy, (b) critical thinking and analytical skills, (c) attitudes and values and (d) active participation" (p. 17). We chose this broad definition trying to integrate as many answers as possible, without removing completely the boundaries between citizenship and character education, according to Davies, Gorard, and McGuinn (2005) and Althof and Berkowitz (2006).

cross-cultural awareness, interconnectedness of humans through time and understanding global issues. These two classifications were combined as follows. From the Eurydice reports, we distinguished the basic categories: political literacy, development of critical thinking and values, and participation. At the same time, we used the dimensions contemplated by Hanvey and Merryfield to detect and analyze the possible inclusion of global perspectives in each of these three categories. In other words, both classifications constitute the weft and warp of the analysis system used in this study as a heuristic tool.

Findings

During the interviews, all participants showed very different beliefs of what citizenship education means for them, even though all of them described it as a very important mission that both school and teacher colleges should address. In their interviews a wide variety of thematic threads arose, and the use of the "citizenship education" term often seemed to be characterized by breadth and ambiguity. All the teacher educators contextualized the concept of citizenship education through familiar discourses. In many cases those discourses coincided with the ones derived from their own academic discipline affiliation. For this reason, Elia and Paula, both psychologists, resorted constantly to psychology to justify their opinions; and Ignacio and Martin, PhD in geology and chemistry respectively, linked citizenship education to the importance of scientific popularization. None of them explicitly mentioned the term global citizenship education, not even any related expression such as international education, cosmopolitan education, multicultural education, etc. However, the absence of this term in their interviews does not necessarily mean that they do not consider global issues for their classes or any global citizenship-related topic.

Political Literacy

Two teacher educators highlighted the importance of the *political literacy* dimension of citizenship education, under a strong sense of social justice: Daniel and Roberto. Concretely, they focused on the understanding of social problems: "We always work on issues of social relevance and they have to learn about this problem. That is one of the things we do in the course" (Daniel). Moreover, for Roberto, the study of those social problems should organize the school curriculum:

> [W]e were interested in reorienting the curriculum in a way that allows students to understand that schools can help boys and girls understand everyday life problems. Around that concern of what everyday life problems should be studied, we became interested in citizenship education, in a broad sense.

Both considered *understanding global issues* very important to achieve that aim. As they argued, global perspectives should be taken into account to be aware of current social issues, because social problems are increasingly global. In the following answer, Roberto explained how globally oriented standpoints are necessary to understand what happens in our everyday life:

> The child has to understand the world where he lives and the world where he lives is what is close for him but what is close for him is not what is physically close… the nearest may be things that are hundreds of thousands of miles away, why? Because through the economy and new technologies, the world has globalized… So we must prepare students to understand what happens in everyday life.

Corresponding author email: marta.estelles@unican.es

For these teacher educators, including global perspectives must be connected to social change, fostering therefore an *awareness of human choices*. Even everyday decisions like what to buy at the supermarket may have consequences in other parts of the globe (Roberto and Daniel). See, for instance, the following response of Daniel:

> I think basically the type of knowledge that we would have to teach is related to what someone, as a citizen, needs to be included, to live and to have a decent life in a concrete society. And not only to have a decent life but also to be able to fight for the improvement, in terms of human development, of the society in which he participates, considering that we live in a global society. We should start thinking more globally. To sum up, they should learn all those contents that help them to live a decent life, which also include gender perspectives.

The latter is not the only mention Daniel made in his interview to the importance of including gender perspectives. It can be seen in this attempt, which is an interest in developing what Hanvey (1982) called *a perspective consciousness*. Something similar happened in Roberto's interview in relation to social class, as most of the examples of social problems he cited were related to it: hunger, poverty, unemployment… He also used this category to *interconnect humans through time* when asking: "I don't know why they [children] should learn about the Middle Ages, why not the poor or the hungry? Why princesses and knights? And not hunger or poverty? […] If we take poverty we can take examples from different spaces and times". In responses like the previous, one might also observe how he questioned traditional disciplines and the justice-oriented vision of education that underlies his answers. This is also obvious in the contents of his course, when he fully embraces the notion of the curriculum as a social construction and teaches about social problems such as hunger and food production.

In sum, it seems that the sense of social justice leads them to deem issues of gender and social class as globally oriented and essential in citizenship education, beyond traditional disciplines. For them, social issues are global in nature and, as a consequence, citizenship education should be addressed considering global perspectives.

Another group of teacher educators also emphasized the *political literacy* dimension of citizenship education. However, their approach was completely different. The four teacher educators included in this group gave higher priority to disciplinary knowledge and, as a consequence, *references to global issues were very scarce*. Some (Alejandro and Martín) highlighted the contribution that the knowledge of different disciplines makes to the education of citizens, while others (Jorge and Lucía) stressed the importance of acquiring civic knowledge (of how the legal and political systems work). An example of the first is found in Alejandro's interview when he stated that:

> In my opinion, citizenship education shouldn't be limited to one course like "Education for Citizenship." No. The responsibility of educating citizens is from every subject in the school curriculum: Mathematics, Science, Physical Science, Social Science, History, Geography, Literature… They are all small pieces of a mosaic that aims to shape citizens. Which is not to say that there are not specific subjects… I'm thinking of subjects like Literature, History, Art and Philosophy, which of course are aimed at educating citizens.

From this perspective, teacher educators outline an indirect approach to citizenship education by assuming that Philosophy, Literature, Art, History or Mathematics, as they contribute to develop certain thinking skills or to understand reality, provide per se a service to citizenship education.

In Jorge's interview, examples of the second can be observed when he insisted on the need to know the functioning of the political system, how the country is governed, the state structures and so on:

> The first thing is that from a very early age, they must have some understanding, I won't say theoretical… but they must understand institutions, the functions of institutions… For example, if right now at any university you start asking colleagues about the concept of Europe, about the European Constitution, about the European Parliament, about what happens there… Nobody knows anything. There is a tremendous lack of knowledge of the political system we have today in Spain.

Although they did not mention patriotism, both perspectives, however, *implicitly assume the limits of citizenship within the boundaries of the country or the European Union*. That is because, on the one hand, they did not reference global issues in their interviews and, on the other, many subjects based much of their narratives in national settings (History, Geography or Civics) or in the national language (Literature). For example, Jorge's course related to the History of Education is mainly focused on the traditional historical development of education in Spain, with some references to other European pedagogues such as Montessori, Milani or Makarenko.

Critical Thinking and Values

Two teacher educators (Paula and Ignacio) stressed the relevance of *developing certain thinking skills and values* when educating for citizenship. They did not mention anything related to the importance of understanding global issues. However, in their conceptualizations of citizenship education, some global perspectives can be identified in relation to *cross-cultural awareness*. In her course, Paula teaches about human rights because she deems them basic and universal, above personal opinions and cultures. Yet she recognized that the knowledge of human rights is not enough and highlights the need to cultivate certain skills and competencies (critical thinking, empathy, conflict resolution…) to put them into practice: "to exercise [citizenship] in a real way we need to have those thinking skills and that appropriate moral development to carry out an action," because, she explained: "I think that what has influenced me the most (in my training as a citizen) has been the development that I have gained in my personal skills that are prior to those citizenship skills." That is why she insisted on the need to develop those "previous" personal skills. Her defense of not only focusing on the "theoretical" knowledge but paying attention to the "practical" development of certain skills led her to consider teaching methodology as the key issue in the education of citizens:

> I think sometimes it (CE) has been too focused on knowledge rather than on the skills that are behind to be able to exercise it (C)… then we are not talking only about contents… we are talking about the methodology of how it is taught, right? To what extent are participatory methodologies where critical thinking is generated, where reflection, discussion takes place, where real place is given to different types of opinions…

Accordingly, she declared using a wide a variety of active methods in her classes to encourage students' participation, such as role playing games, group works, debates, moral dilemmas, and so forth.

The importance of teaching methodology was also stressed by Ignacio, who emphasized the need of encouraging respect for diversity through citizenship education. For him, it should be done by fostering debate and other classroom activities: "Question: How would you work all that? Response:

Mainly, encouraging discussion in class, so that students can see the different opinions that their partners have." Although there is a clear sense of *universalism* under the term "respect for diversity," the concrete references that he made to diversity are more related to issues of individual tolerance rather than to issues of social justice. Also, when Paula mentioned the convenience of teaching human rights and developing certain social and moral skills, it was also noticeable that humanism was behind her proposal. However, those themes were presented in an unproblematic and depoliticized way when believing that those skills can be developed "previously" to face public affairs and social problems. For this reason, the moral dilemmas that she used in her classes referred to personal problems with the family or classmates and the skills she worked on were empathy, assertiveness, teamwork, and creativity. In this regard, we can also observe here another indirect approach to citizenship education by following the logic: as we contribute to the development of certain values and thinking skills, we educate for citizenship, instead of redesigning the curriculum according to the question: what does a citizen need to know, or what skills should a citizen cultivate?

In short, the two teacher educators who emphasized the developing of certain skills and values over other dimensions of citizenship education incorporated very timidly some work on cross-cultural awareness that in the end was reduced to the use of active methods in their courses.

Active Participation

One remarkable point is that all participants overlooked participation in global contexts, which to some extent is consistent with the fact that participation has been the most neglected dimension of citizenship education. Only one teacher educator (Elia) considered civic participation as relevant when educating for citizenship, relating it to social change. However, no mention was made to active participation in global issues, nor even when she explicitly talked about the different levels of citizen participation:

> People should understand the world in which they live and participate. In each context, there has to be spaces where people can participate to transform those contexts: the school, the neighborhood where the school is, the municipality, the region… because the world is understood at different levels… for example, the economy of the town, of the city hall, of the families, of the school… Understanding things should also mean creating opportunities for their participation as citizens, in which they can contribute with their views and make some kind of change, for example through initiatives such as service learning.

Conclusions and Implications for Teacher Education

Teacher education can contribute to challenge pre-service teachers' perceptions of the nation state as the only locus for democracy and citizenship. However, the inclusion of global perspectives by these teacher educators has been, in general terms, very limited. The participants who were more globally concerned were those who had a stronger sense of social justice. For these two teacher educators, thinking beyond the limits of the state is inherently linked to principles of social justice and universalism. Considering this finding, we embrace Carr's (2008) recommendation when he said that: "Colleges and Faculties of Education need to more conscientiously strive to teach about and for

democracy, focusing on social justice at several levels, and striving to achieve authentic discussion and action" (p. 128). As Knight-Abowitz and Harninsh (2006) claimed, "[t]his form of education goes far beyond the instrumentalist constructions of global interdependence for economic trade that predominates in most curricular texts".

Two other teacher educators made some references to human rights and universalistic values such as diversity. However, their lack of references to issues of social justice, equity, or cultural diversity seems to be more related to an individualistic approach to citizenship education and a limited inclusion of global perspectives. As Davies et al. (2005) said, "We should not be content with educational responses to citizenship in a globalising world that do little more than add international content into citizenship activities or global education activities into citizenship programmes" (p. 73).

Furthermore, most teachers omitted any reference to global issues and gave great importance to disciplines' contribution to the education of citizens. This is evidence of a lack of global perspectives of these teacher educators, because they implicitly assumed that national boundaries are framed by traditional disciplines. After all, the tacit identification of the political community with the nation-state continues to preserve an undeniable strength in what Ross (1995) called the "folk memory" of the disciplines (Romero & Luis, 2008). This implicit identification endures even though national narratives have been challenged by globalization, decolonization, and the emergence of the European Union (Schissler & Soysal, 2005). Thus the inertial territorial delimitation of teaching content is a naturalized convention that is an obstacle for the promotion of a cosmopolitan citizenship. The construction of a global consciousness, by contrast, would require a greater emphasis on the international and cross-border problems that make nation-states and people interdependent. Therefore, the questioning of traditional school subjects in teacher training programs is necessary to educate for global citizenship, as other authors have previously highlighted (Evans, 2015; Popkewitz, 2008; Romero & Luis, 2008). Yet, this is not an issue frequently mentioned in the literature related to global citizenship education. As a consequence, future research is necessary to explore the mechanisms through which traditional disciplines may interfere with the education of global citizens in teacher training programs. In this study, the teacher educators who were more globally concerned were those who advocated for an interdisciplinary approach to the study of public problems and who had a stronger sense of social justice. However, more research is needed to study the relationship between a sense of social justice and the inclusion of global perspectives in citizenship education.

References

Althof, W., & Berkowitz, M. W. (2006). Moral education and character education: Their relationship and roles in citizenship education. *Journal of Moral Education*, *35*(4), 495-518.

An, S. (2014). Preparing elementary teachers as global citizenship educators. *Journal of Education*, *194*(2), 25-38.

Archibugi, D. (2008). *The global commonwealth of citizens. Toward cosmopolitan democracy*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Archibugi, D. & Held, D. (2011). Cosmopolitan democracy: Paths and agents. *Ethics & International Affairs, 25*(4), 433-461.

Banks, J. A. (2008). Diversity, group identity, and citizenship education in a global age. *Educational*

Researcher, *37*(3), 129-139.

Barchuk, Z., & Harkins, M. J. (2010). Why teach globalization? Pre-service teachers' perceptions of the benefits and challenges of teaching globalization issues. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, *5*, 13-23.

Bolívar, A. (2007). *Educación para la Ciudadanía. Algo más que una asignatura.* Barcelona, Spain: Graó.

Borghi, B., Mattozzi, I., & Martinez, R. (2012). Percepciones de ciudadanía y participación entre el profesorado de Historia. In N. De Alba, F. F. García & A. Santisteban (coords.). *Educar para la participación ciudadana en la enseñanza de las Ciencias Sociales* (pp. 241-248). Vol. 2. Sevilla, Spain: Díada.

Carr, P. (2008). Educating for democracy: With or without social justice. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *35*(4), 117-136.

Davies, I., Gregory, I., & Riley, S. C. (1999). *Good citizenship and educational provision.* London, UK, & New York, NY: Falmer Press.

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

Davies, I., Gorard, S., & McGuinn, N. (2005). Citizenship education and character education: similarities and contrasts. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *53*(3), 341-358.

De la Montaña, J. L. (2012). Formación inicial del profesorado, ciudadanía participativa e historia. In N. De Alba, F. F. García & A. Santisteban (coords.), *Educar para la participación ciudadana en la enseñanza de Ciencias Sociales* (pp. 355-362). Vol. 2. Sevilla: Díada.

Engel, L. C. (2014). Global citizenship and national (re)formations: Analysis of citizenship education reform in Spain. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, *9*(3), 239-254.

Enslin, P. (2000). Education and democratic citizenship: In defence of cosmopolitanism. In M. Leicester, C. Modgil, & S. Modgil (Eds.), *Politics, education and citizenship* (pp. 149-150). New York: Falmer Press.

Estepa, J. (2012). La formación del profesorado para enseñar la participación en el Grado de Maestro y en el Máster en Profesorado de Secundaria. Una alternativa basada en los problemas prácticos profesionales. In N. De Alba, F. F. García & A. Santisteban (coords.). *Educar para la participación ciudadana en la enseñanza de las Ciencias Sociales* (pp. 211-220). Vol. 2. Sevilla, Spain: Díada.

Eurydice (2005). *Citizenship education at school in Europe.* Brussels, Belgium: The Information Network on Education in Europe.

Eurydice (2012). *Citizenship Education in Europe*. Brussels, Belgium: The Information Network on Education in Europe.

Evans, R. W. (2015). *Schooling corporate citizens: How accountability reform has damaged civic*

education and undermined democracy. New York, NY: Routledge.

Gaudelli, W. (2009). Heuristics of global citizenship discourses towards curriculum enhancement. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, *25*(1), 68-85.

Gaudelli, W., & Wylie, S. (2012). Global education and issues-centered education. In S. Totten & J. Pedersen (Eds.), *Educating about social issues in the 20th and 21st centuries: A critical annotated bibliography* (pp. 293–320). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Gómez, A. E., & García, C. R. (2013). El Debate en torno a la Educación para la Ciudadanía en España. Una Cuestión más Ideológica que Curricular. *Enseñanza de las Ciencias Sociales*, *12*, 127-140.

González, E., & Beas, M. (2012). Razones para la implementación de la educación para la ciudadanía y los derechos humanos en el currículo español. *Revista de Estudios y Experiencias en Educación*, *11*(21), 33-46.

Hahn, C. L. (2001). Democratic understanding- Cross-national perspectives. *Theory into Practice*, *40*(1), 14-22.

Hahn, C. L. (2005). Diversity and human rights in England and the United States. In A. Osler (ed.), *Teachers, human rights and diversity* (pp. 23-34). London, UK: Trentham books.

Hanvey, R. G. (1982). An attainable global perspective. *Theory into practice*, *21*(3), 162-167.

Heater, D. (2004). *A History of Education for Citizenship*. London, UK: Routledge Falmer.

Held, D. (1997). *La democracia y el orden global. Del estado moderno al gobierno cosmopolita*. Barcelona, Spain: Paidós.

Held, D. (2010). *Cosmopolitanism. Ideals and realities*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Held, D. (2016). Elements of a theory of global governance. *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, *42*(9), 837-846.

Hill, I. (2002). The history of international education: An international baccalaureate perspective. In M. Hayden, J. Thompson, & G. Walker (Eds.), *International education in practice: Dimensions for national and international schools* (pp. 18-29). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Holden, C., & Hicks, D. (2007). Making global connections- The knowledge, understanding and motivation of trainee teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *23*, 13-23.

Isin, E. (2009). Citizenship in the flux: The figure of the activist citizen. *Subjectivity*, *29*, 367-388.

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

Logan, H. H. (2011). Perceptions of citizenship in preservice rlementary social studies education. *Journal of Peace Education and Social Justice*, *5*.

Marri, A. R., Michael-Luna, S., Cormier, M. S., & Keegan, P. (2014). Urban pre-service K-6 teachers' conceptions of citizenship and civic education- Weighing the risks and rewards. *The Urban*

Review, *46*(1), 63-85.

Martin, L. A. (2008). Elementary and secondary teacher education students' perspectives on citizenship. *Action in Teacher Education*, *30*(3), 54-63.

Martin, L. A. (2010). A comparative analysis of teacher education students' views about citizenship education. *Action in Teacher Education*, *32*(2), 56-69.

Merryfield, M. M. (1998). Pedagogy for global perspectives in education: Studies of teachers' thinking and practice. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *26*(3), 342-379.

Merryfield, M. M., & Wilson, A. H. (2005). *Social studies and the world: Teaching global perspectives* (No. 103). National Council for the Social Studies.

Morin, E. (1999). *Seven complex lessons in education for the vuture*. Paris, France: UNESCO Publishing.

Myers, J. P. (2010). Exploring adolescents' thinking about globalization in an international education program. *Journal of Research in International Education*, *9*(2), 153-167.

Naval, C., & Arbués, E. (2016). Citizenship education versus reality: The facts in Spain. In A. Peterson, R. Hattam, M. Zembylas, & J. Arthur (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of education for ctizenship and social justice* (pp. 593-612). London, UK: Palgrave Handbooks.

Noddings, N. (2005). Global citizenship: Promises and problems. In N. Noddings (Ed.), *Educating citizens for global swareness* (pp. 1-21). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1997). *Cultivating humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Patterson, N., Doppen, F., & Misco, T. (2012). Beyond personally responsible: A study of teacher conceptualizations of citizenship education. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, *7*(2), 191-206.

Peterson, A., & Knowles, C. (2009). Active citizenship: A preliminary study into student teacher understandings. *Educational Research*, *51*(1), 39-59.

Pike, G. (2000). Global education and national identity: In pursuit of meaning. *Theory into Practice*, *39*(2), 64-73.

Popkewitz, T. S. (2009). *El cosmopolitismo y la era de la reforma escolar. La ciencia, la educación y la construcción de la sociedad mediante la construcción de la infancia*. Madrid, Spain: Morata.

Puig, M., Domene, S., & Morales, J. A. (2010). Educación para la ciudadanía: referentes europeos. *Teoría de la Educación*, *22*(2), 85-110.

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.

Rapoport, A. (2015). Global citizenship education. Classroom teachers' perspectives and approaches. In J. R. Harshman, T. Augustine, & M. M. Merryfield (Eds.). *Research in global citizenship education* (pp. 119-135). Greensboro, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Robbins, M., Francis, L. J., & Elliott, E. (2003). Attitudes toward education for global citizenship among trainee teachers. *Research in Education*, *69*(1), 93-98.

Romero, J., & Luis, A. (2008). El conocimiento socio-geográfico en la escuela: las tensiones inherentes a la transmisión institucionalizada de cultura y los dilemas de la educación para la democracia en este mundo globalizado. *Scripta Nova: Revista Electrónica de Geografía y Ciencias Sociales*, Vol. 12, *270*(123).

Ross, A. (1995). The rise and fall of the social subjects in the curriculum. In J. Ahier & A. Ross (Eds.), *The social subjects within the curriculum. Children's social learning in the national curriculum* (pp. 53-78). London, UK: The Falmer Press.

Ross, D. D., & Yeager, E. (1999). What does democracy mean to prospective elementary teachers? *Journal of Teacher Education*, *50*(4), 255.

Schissler, H., & Soysal, Y. N. (eds.) (2005). *The nation, Europe, and the world. Textbooks and curricula in transition*. New York, NY, & Oxford, UK: Berghahn Books.

Shultz, L. (2007). Educating for global citizenship: Conflicting agendas and understandings. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, *53*(3), 248-258.

Sunal, C. S., Kelley, L. A., & Sunal, D. W. (2009). Citizenship education in the elementary classroom: Teacher candidates photograph and describe their perceptions. *Journal of Social Studies Research*, *33* (1), 33–70.

Vera, M. I., Seva, F., & Soriano, M. C. (2012). ¿Están preparados los futuros profesores de Ciencias Sociales para formar ciudadanos democráticos? In N. De Alba, F. F. García & A. Santisteban (coords.). *Educar para la participación ciudadana en la enseñanza de las Ciencias Sociales* (pp. 321-338)*.* Vol. 2. Sevilla, Spain: Díada.

Zong, G. (2009). Developing preservice teachers' global understanding through computer-mediated communication technology. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *25*(5), 617-625.